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### Oberservation 1: The Status Quo

#### Despite 84 % of the population living in metropolitan areas, federal support for mass transit infrastructure is declining, as funds continue to support highways and roads

Regan 12 (Ed Regan, 6-7-12, CDM Smith, “Ground Zero: America’s Cities Need New Infrastructure and Transit Funding”, http://cdmsmith.com/en-US/Insights/Funding-Future-Mobility/Exit-3A-Ground-Zero.aspx, 7-12-12, SD)

While underfunding of transportation infrastructure affects both rural and urban systems in virtually all areas of the United States, it can be argued that some of the most significant impacts are felt in larger urban areas. And for good reason—U.S. cities house the majority of the population, putting more strain on infrastructure. According to the 2010 census, almost 84 percent of the U.S. population lives in metropolitan areas; 75 percent in the top 100 urban regions alone. While only about 27 percent of all roadway mileage is located in urban areas, these roads carry two-thirds of total vehicle miles traveled, according to the U.S. Federal Highway Administration. Perhaps most important, almost all of the United States’ traffic congestion occurs in heavily populated cities, where expensive problems become expensive solutions. The economic impact of time wasted in traffic tops $100 billion per year by some estimates; however, adding capacity is much more expensive in cities than in rural areas. In short, the biggest mobility challenges of the future—and the most significant front in the war on climate change—can be found in our larger cities. Unfortunately, they are also where we find our greatest funding shortfalls as well. It is becoming increasingly apparent that we can’t beat congestion in our larger cities by widening highways alone. Mobility solutions of the future will be multimodal, including much more investment in public transit. Transit is a vital resource to battle urban congestion, and will become even more important in the war on global warming as we try to reduce fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. While transit accommodates a huge proportion of urban travel in a few cities like New York, in most cases the transit share is still relatively low—less than 5 percent on a daily basis and typically no more than 10 percent during rush hours. These numbers often reduce public support for transit funding, particularly the diversion of taxes paid by road users to transit investments. This silo philosophy stands in the way of integrated multimodal mobility solutions that will be needed in the future. However, there are signs the silos are falling, especially in our largest cities, which are increasingly finding their own sources of transportation funding in the face of declining revenue from federal and state sources. Data from the American Public Transit Association shows the current funding picture of all transit agencies across the United States, including capital investment and operating costs. In total, federal transit funding accounts for less than 20 percent of costs nationwide. A good portion of the nearly $11 billion in federal funds dedicated to transit comes from a special dedication from the Highway Trust Fund, although this is in doubt as well. Because transit is considered by many to be a “local” issue, this earmarking of funding derived primarily from the federal gas tax on highway users is under threat, as evidenced by a recent proposal in the House of Representatives to eliminate transit funding from the Trust Fund; a proposal which has since been withdrawn. On the other end of the spectrum, about 60 percent of total transit funding comes from local sources. Farebox revenue—the fares actually paid by transit users—covers about one-third of operating costs, but none of the capital cost. Many argue that transit users should pay a higher share of the cost of providing transit. This is an argument that may have merit, but also suffers from a lack of perception of funding sources. With the gas tax for highway funding so low, and essentially invisible to drivers since it is automatically paid at the pump, the public often perceives highways as free; basically an entitlement. Transit users, on the other hand, pay for use at the turnstile and more directly experience their contribution. The benefits of transit are easy to see—increased use can help overcome gridlock on crowded roads and also help reduce fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. However, increased transit funding is not always as clear a discussion. Since drivers perceive they pay nothing to use roads, it is difficult to increase the share of transit usage while acknowledging the need to raise transit fares. However, that might change if we adopted a more direct program of user fees for highway use.

#### This is part of a broader neoliberal re-structuring of the urban economy. Decreasing federal support forces localities to generate revenue through increased privatization of public goods.

Brenner & Theodore 02 [Neil, Department of Sociology and Metropolitan Studies Program, New York University and Nik, Urban Planning and Policy Program and Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois at Chicago, Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism”, 2002,

[http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore\_](http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore_ citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf)

[citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf](http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore_ citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf)] TM

The preceding discussion underscored the ways in which the worldwide ascendancy of neoliberalism during the early 1980s was closely intertwined with a pervasive rescaling of capital-labor relations, intercapitalist competition, financial and monetary regulation, state power, the international configuration, and uneven development throughout the world economy. As the taken-for-granted primacy of the national scale has been undermined in each of these arenas, inherited formations of urban governance have likewise been reconfigured quite systematically throughout the older industrialized world. While the processes of institutional creative destruction associated with actually existing neoliberalism are clearly transpiring at all spatial scales, it can be argued that they are occurring with particular intensity at the urban scale, within major cities and city-regions. On the one hand, cities today are embedded within a highly uncertain geoeconomic environment characterized by monetary chaos, speculative movements of financial capital, global location strategies by major transnational corporations, and rapidly intensifying interlocality competition (Swyngedouw 1992b). In the context of this deepening “global-local disorder” (Peck and Tickell 1994), most local governments have been constrained—to some degree, independently of their political orientation and national context—to adjust to heightened levels of economic uncertainty by engaging in short-termist forms of interspatial competition, place-marketing, and regulatory undercutting in order to attract investments and jobs (Leitner and Sheppard 1998). Meanwhile, the retrenchment of national welfare state regimes and national intergovernmental systems has likewise imposed powerful new fiscal constraints upon cities, leading to major budgetary cuts during a period in which local social problems and conflicts have intensified in conjunction with rapid economic restructuring.On the other hand, in many cases, neoliberal programs have also been directly “interiorized” into urban policy regimes, as newly formed territorial alliances attempt to rejuvenate local economies through a shock treatment of deregulation, privatization, liberalization, and enhanced fiscal austerity. In this context, cities—including their suburban peripheries—have become increasingly important geographical targets and institutional laboratories for a variety of neoliberal policy experiments, from place-marketing, enterprise and empowerment zones, local tax abatements, urban development corporations, public– private partnerships, and new forms of local boosterism to workfare policies, property-redevelopment schemes, business-incubator projects, new strategies of social control, policing, and surveillance, and a host of other institutional modifications within the local and regional state apparatus. As the contributions to this volume indicate in detail, the overarching goal of such neoliberal urban policy experiments is to mobilize city space as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices. Table 2 schematically illustrates some of the many politico-institutional mechanisms through which neoliberal projects have been localized within North American and western European cities during the past two decades, distinguishing in turn their constituent (partially) destructive and (tendentially) creative moments. Table 2 is intended to provide a broad overview of the manifold ways in which contemporary processes of neoliberalization have affected the institutional geographies of cities throughout North America and Western Europe. For present purposes, two additional aspects of the processes of creative destruction depicted in the table deserve explication.

#### Public transportation is a lynchpin of this neoliberal strategy-by controlling the movement and structure of the urban environment, privatized infrastructure exacerbates fragmentation and inequality.

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

Public transportation, as one crucial component of a city's transportation network, enables the mobility and flow of people and goods that make cities livable. Public transportation plays a vital role in the urban economy in that it creates place-based advantages, facilitates the circulation of capital, and attracts investment in local real estate markets. At the level of everyday lived experience, public transit shapes and constrains opportunity (time it takes to access jobs, schools, and services) and sociospatial relations into the built environment. In many places, public transportation is also wielded as an instrument of power, dominance, and social control, entrenching the privileges of the affluent and the disadvantages of working people into the built environment (Graham and Marvin, 2001). Therefore, trends in public transportation infrastructure and service levels constitute one dimension of uneven geographical development in urban areas. My research considers the ways in which neoliberalism and global city building are shaping new patterns of uneven geographic development in the public transit sector by focusing on public transportation planning and investment in the city of Chicago. The purpose of my paper is to contribute to the scholarship on the politics of infrastructure (Keil and Young, 2008; McFarlane and Rutherford, 2008) emphasizing the ways in which infrastructure and cities are produced and transformed together in a global context as well as how these processes contribute to urban fragmentation and inequality. The second part of this paper positions my study in the literature on entrepreneurial urban governments, neoliberal public transportation projects, and emerging sociospatial relations of inclusion and exclusion in the global city. The third part examines public transportation planning and new construction projects taking place in the city of Chicago in order to illustrate the impact of neoliberalization on the geography of uneven public transportation development. The narrative was assembled through a combination of documents produced by government, transit and planning agencies, secondary sources (mostly journalistic materials and documents produced by nonprofit groups), interviews, and nonparticipant observation of community meetings. My investigation of Chicago's public transportation policy reveals that the city is sinking scarce transit funds into projects that transform the downtown Central Area into the image of a global city. These global city public transit projects are prioritized over expanding access to transit for working-class and minority residents living in transit-poor areas of the city. Additionally, the neoliberal squeeze of the public sector has resulted in declining service levels and the neglect of basic maintenance across the system, contributing to unreliable and poor public transportation service. These trends in public transportation policy pursued by the city of Chicago reveal the nature of uneven geographic development taking shape within this neoliberalizing city, where the global city growth machine favors business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago's global city downtown showcase zone. I conclude with a discussion on how neoliberal public transportation planning interlocks with neoliberal housing policies enacted in the city of Chicago to create new patterns of racial segregation and exclusion.

#### This continued transfer of transportation from the public to the private is a form of accumulation by dispossession-it is a contraction of the democratic public sphere in the name of expanding private capital

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

Urbanization, we may conclude, has played a crucial role in the absorption of capital surpluses, at ever increasing geographical scales, but at the price of burgeoning processes of creative destruction that have dispossessed the masses of any right to the city whatsoever. The planet as building site collides with the ‘planet of slums’. [16] Periodically this ends in revolt, as in Paris in 1871 or the US after the assassination of Martin Luther King in 1968. If, as seems likely, fiscal difficulties mount and the hitherto successful neoliberal, postmodernist and consumerist phase of capitalist surplus-absorption through urbanization is at an end and a broader crisis ensues, then the question arises: where is our 68 or, even more dramatically, our version of the Commune? As with the financial system, the answer is bound to be much more complex precisely because the urban process is now global in scope. Signs of rebellion are everywhere: the unrest in China and India is chronic, civil wars rage in Africa, Latin America is in ferment. Any of these revolts could become contagious. Unlike the fiscal system, however, the urban and peri-urban social movements of opposition, of which there are many around the world, are not tightly coupled; indeed most have no connection to each other. If they somehow did come together, what should they demand? The answer to the last question is simple enough in principle: greater democratic control over the production and utilization of the surplus. Since the urban process is a major channel of surplus use, establishing democratic management over its urban deployment constitutes the right to the city. Throughout capitalist history, some of the surplus value has been taxed, and in social-democratic phases the proportion at the state’s disposal rose significantly. The neoliberal project over the last thirty years has been oriented towards privatizing that control. The data for all OECD countries show, however, that the state’s portion of gross output has been roughly constant since the 1970s. [17] The main achievement of the neoliberal assault, then, has been to prevent the public share from expanding as it did in the 1960s. Neoliberalism has also created new systems of governance that integrate state and corporate interests, and through the application of money power, it has ensured that the disbursement of the surplus through the state apparatus favours corporate capital and the upper classes in shaping the urban process. Raising the proportion of the surplus held by the state will only have a positive impact if the state itself is brought back under democratic control.

#### Neoliberal control of transportation systems is a symptom of the way the whole neoliberal order exacerbates social inequalities, liquidates democratic practices, and reduces culture and education to indexes of profitability.

Giroux, Global TV Network Chair in Communications at McMaster University in Canada, author of The Abandoned Generation: Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear, 2004 (Henry A., “Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-liberalism: making the political more pedagogical,” Policy Futures in Education, Volume: 2, p. 495 and 496, JS)

Neo-liberalism has become one of the most pervasive and dangerous ideologies of the twenty-first century. Its pervasiveness is evident not only in its unparalleled influence on the global economy, but also by its power to redefine the very nature of politics and sociality. Free-market fundamentalism rather than democratic idealism is now the driving force of economics and politics in most of the world. It is a market ideology driven not just by profits, but also by an ability to reproduce itself with such success that, to paraphrase Fred Jameson, it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of neo-liberal capitalism.[4] Wedded to the belief that the market should be the organizing principle for all political, social, and economic decisions, neo-liberalism wages an incessant attack on democracy, public goods, the welfare state, and non-commodified values. Under neo-liberalism, everything either is for sale or is plundered for profit: public lands are looted by logging companies and corporate ranchers; politicians willingly hand the public’s airwaves over to powerful broadcasters and large corporate interests without a dime going into the public trust; the environment is polluted and despoiled in the name of profit-making just as the government passes legislation to make it easier for corporations to do so; what public services have survived the Reagan–Bush era are gutted in order to lower the taxes of major corporations (or line their pockets through no-bid contracts, as in the infamous case of Halliburton); entire populations, especially those of color who are poor, are considered disposable; schools more closely resemble either jails or high-end shopping malls, depending on their clientele; and teachers are forced to get revenue for their schools by hawking everything from hamburgers to pizza parties. Under neo-liberalism, the state now makes a grim alignment with corporate capital and transnational corporations. Gone are the days when the state ‘assumed responsibility for a range of social needs’.[5] Instead, agencies of government now pursue a wide range of ‘“deregulations”, privatizations, and abdications of responsibility to the market and private philanthropy’.[6] Deregulation, in turn, promotes ‘widespread, systematic disinvestment in the nation’s basic productive capacity’.[7] As neo-liberal policies dominate politics and social life, the breathless rhetoric of the global victory of free-market rationality is invoked to cut public expenditures and undermine those non- commodified public spheres that serve as the repository for critical education, language, and publicintervention. Spewed forth by the mass media, right-wing intellectuals, religious fanatics, and politicians, neo-liberal ideology, with its merciless emphasis on deregulation and privatization, has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and social relations – particularly those public spheres where such values are learned and take root. Public services such as health care, childcare, public assistance, education, and transportation are now subject to the rules of the market. Social relations between parents and children, doctors and patients, and teachers and students are reduced to those of supplier and customer, just as the laws of market replace those non-commodified values capable of defending vital public goods and spheres. Forsaking the public good for the private good and hawking the needs of the corporate and private sector as the only source of sound investment, neo-liberal ideology produces, legitimates, and exacerbates the existence of persistent poverty, inadequate health care, racial apartheid in the inner cities, and the growing inequalities between the rich and the poor.[8] In its capacity to dehistoricize and naturalize such sweeping social change, as well as in its aggressive attempts to destroy all of the public spheres necessary for the defense of a genuine democracy, neo-liberalism reproduces the conditions for unleashing the most brutalizing forces of capitalism. Social Darwinism, with its brutalizing indifference to human suffering, has risen like a phoenix from the ashes of the nineteenth century and can now be seen in full display on most reality television programs and in the unfettered self-interest that now drives popular culture and fits so well with the spirit of neo-fascism. As social bonds are replaced by unadulterated materialism and narcissism, public concerns are now understood and experienced as utterly private miseries, except when offered up on The Jerry Springer Show as fodder for entertainment. Where public space – or its mass-mediated simulacrum – does exist, it is mainly used as a highly orchestrated and sensational confessional for private woes, a cut-throat game of winner takes all replacing more traditional forms of courtship as in Who Wants to Marry a Millionaire? or as an advertisement for crass consumerism, like MTV’s Cribs.

#### Neoliberalism requires a logic whereby whole populations are sacrificed as collateral damage to the expansion of markets.

Santos 03 (Boaventura de Sousa, director of the Center for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra, EUROZINE, COLLECTIVE SUICIDE OR GLOBALIZATION FROM BELOW, <http://www.eurozine.com/article/2003-03-26-santos-en.html>)

Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war against Iraq and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, - and much more if the costs of reconstruction are added - enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years.

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should fully fund public development and control of fare-free public transit in all metropolitan areas in the United States.

### Observation 2: Solvency

#### The plan solves: free-fare transportation systems return mobility to the peoples as a public good. This improves all transportation infrastructure and opens up new spaces which can resist neoliberal control.

Olsen 07 [Dave, Journalist for The Tyee, “Fare-Free Public Transit Could Be Headed to a City Near You”, [http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree\_public\_transit\_could\_be\_headed\_to\_a\_ city\_near\_you](http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree_public_transit_could_be_headed_to_a_%20city_near_you), 7/26/07, Accessed: 7/12/12] JDO

Recently I met the people who run Island Transit in Whidbey Island, Wash., and rode their fare-free bus system. It's a serious operation with 56 buses and 101 vans. Ridership tops a million a year. Its operating budget is $8,392,677 -- none of it from fares, all from a 0.6 percent sales tax collected in Island County. Despite the pressure to conform, the pressure to make users pay and the pressure from conservative politicians at all levels, Island Transit has been fare-free from day one and is proudly so 20 years later. Not one Island Transit bus, shelter or van has advertising on it. All of Island Transit's buses are bike rack equipped and wheelchair accessible. For folks with disabilities, Island Transit also offers a paratransit service with door-to-door service. Island Transit has developed a simple policy around dealing with behavior that is unruly or disturbing to others: "The operator is the captain of their own ship." This is backed up by a state law regarding unlawful bus conduct. A bothersome rider first gets a written warning. The next time, his or her riding privileges are revoked. These privileges are only restored after completing a Rider Privilege Agreement. Island Transit has further protected its employees by installing a camera system in every vehicle. The big brotherness of it is acknowledged, but the safety of their operators simply takes priority. "Show me another transit system in Washington state," said Island Transit operator Odis D. Jenkins, "where the teenagers more often than not say 'thank you' when they get off." Done right, fare-free transit can transform society, says Patrick Condon, an expert on sustainable urban development who knows the system in Amherst, Mass. "Free transit changed the region for the better. Students, teens and the elderly were able to move much more freely through the region. Some ascribed the resurgence of Northampton, Mass, at least in part, to the availability of free transit. Fares in that region would have provided such a small percentage of capital and operating costs that their loss was made up for by contributions by the major institutions to benefit: the five colleges in the region," says Condon, a professor at the University of British Columbia. Another success story, a decade old, can be found in Hasselt, Belgium. This city of 70,000 residents, with 300,000 commuters from the surrounding area, has made traveling by bus easy, affordable and efficient. Now, people in Hasselt often speak of "their" bus system and with good reason. The Boulevard Shuttle leaves you waiting for at most five minutes, the Central Shuttle has a 10-minute frequency, and systemwide you never have to wait more than a half an hour. A prime lesson offered by Hasselt is the fact that it radically improved the bus system as well as its walking and cycling infrastructure before it removed the fareboxes. In 1996, there were only three bus routes with about 18,000 service hours/year. Today, there are 11 routes with more than 95,000 service hours/year. The transit system in Hasselt cost taxpayers approximately $1.8 million in 2006. This amounts to 1 percent of its municipal budget and makes up about 26 percent of the total operating cost of the transit system. The Flemish national government covered the rest (approximately $5.25 million) under a long-term agreement. Hasselt City Council's principal aim in introducing free public transport was to promote the new bus system to such a degree that it would catch on and become the natural option for getting around. And it did -- immediately. On the first day, bus ridership increased 783 percent! The first full year of free-fare transit saw an increase of 900 percent over the previous year; by 2001, the increase was up to 1,223 percent, and ridership continues to go up every day.

#### Free mass transit is the key to developing a broad-based anti-neoliberalism movement—rejecting commodification of public goods creates genuine political dialogues and offers concrete visions for how to transform material conditions of oppression for the poor.

Schein, assistant professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 11 (Rebecca, 2011, “Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing the Political Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign,” Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research, Volume: 22, p. 115, EBB)

Mass transit is an essential pillar of Toronto’s public infrastructure, yet its transit system is among the least “public” public systems in the world. Estimated at between 70 and 80 percent, Toronto’s “fare-box recovery ratio”—the percentage of the system’s operating budget paid for by individual riders at the fare-box—is among the highest in the North America and more than doubles that of some other large cities around the world (Toronto Environmental Alliance, 2009; Toronto Board of Trade, 2010). Many other transit systems in comparable cities “recoup” less than half of their operating budgets from fares, relying more heavily on subsidies from multiple levels of government. According to the Toronto Board of Trade (2010), “essentially no North American or European transit systems operate in [the] manner [of Toronto]” with respect to transit funding. Riders rarely think about rising “fare-box recovery ratios,” but few have failed to notice that fares have increased from $1.10 in 1991 to $3.00 in 2010—the last fare-hike in January 2010 arriving in the context of high unemployment and rising demand for emergency food and shelter services in the city. The fare-box recovery ratio represents a rough quantification of the efficiency with which neoliberal governments have divested from the public sphere and downloaded costs to the most vulnerable individuals. The failure to invest seriously in mass transit in recent decades has meant, moreover, that many Toronto residents outside the downtown core pay high fares for service that is inconvenient and inefficient. While the operating subsidies that support other transit systems reflect an understanding of mass transit as a public good, yielding benefits to entire communities and ecosystems, Toronto’s system increasingly treats transit as a commodity, consumed and paid for by individual riders. The funding structure of Toronto’s transit system is effectively a form of regressive taxation: although all of Toronto’s residents benefit from transit infrastructure—including the car-owners who never ride a bus—our “public” system is funded disproportionately out of the pockets of the low- and middle-income people who rely on mass transportation in their daily lives. The demand for free and accessible public transit has the potential not only to develop into a broad-based movement, but also to drive the development of the new kind of organization that the Assembly aspires to become. The Assembly is committed to its call for the outright abolition of transit fares, not merely a fare-freeze or fare-reduction. What is exciting to me about the free transit campaign is that the expression of a radical anti-capitalist principle—the outright de-commodification of public goods and services—actually serves in this instance to invite rather than foreclose genuine political dialogue about values, tactics, and strategies. While still in its early stages, the free transit campaign is already pushing us to elaborate both analytical and strategic links between commodification, environmental justice, the limits and capacities of public sector unions, and the interlocking forms of exclusion faced by people marginalized by poverty, racism, immigration status, or disability. Free transit could represent a site of convergence between many distinct activist circles in the city and foster greater integration and collaboration between environmental advocacy, anti-poverty work, and diverse human rights organizations. If the free transit campaign does succeed in bringing diverse and distinct activist cultures into conversation with each other, it will force the Assembly to grapple with strategic questions about its relationship to less radical organizations in the city. Given the marginalization and isolation that have long plagued leftist groups in Toronto and elsewhere, this should be a welcome challenge, particularly if the Assembly hopes to become an effective left pole in a broad alliance. Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is the concreteness of vision. Within the left, efforts to elaborate a broad anti-capitalist vision too often run aground at the level of abstractions, generalities, and platitudes. Most Toronto residents would draw a blank if asked to “imagine a world without capitalism,” but what Torontonian who has ever waited for a bus can’t begin to imagine an alternate future for the city, built on the backbone of a fully public mass transit system? The invitation to imagine free transit is an invitation for transit riders to imagine themselves not simply as consumers of a commodity, but as members of a public entitled to participate in conversations about the kind of city they want to live in. Without devolving into abstract and alienating debates over the meaning of, say, socialism, the call for free transit invokes the things we value: vibrant neighbourhoods; clean air and water; participatory politics; equitable distribution of resources; public space where we are free to speak, gather, play, create, and organize. Even the most skeptical response to the idea of free transit—“how will you fund it?”—is the opening of a productive conversation about taxation and control over public resources. The call for free transit can effectively open a space for an unscripted political dialogue about the meaning of fair taxation, public goods, collective priorities, and public accountability for resource allocation.

#### Free mass transit is the starting point for building anti-capitalism--plan builds coalitions and allows for other projects to expand in a proactive movement

Schein, 2011 (Assistant Prof Human Rights –The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011, Rebecca. "Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing thePolitical Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign", Alternate Routes volume http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421)

The idea of a free transit movement immediately foregrounds a number of thorny strategic questions for the left in Toronto: how to build trust, dialogue, and support for a free transit movement within the transit union; how to address and re-focus the widespread anger, mistrust, and resentment directed at the public sector in the current climate; how to sustain and advance anti-capitalist principles while building productive relationships within broader progressive milieux. Navigating these questions will be challenging, and the Assembly is still a long way from a coherent and systematic approach to answering them. But the fact that these questions surface so quickly and urgently is a positive sign of the ambition and seriousness with which the Assembly is approaching the organization of a free transit movement. The free transit campaign will push the Assembly to develop further its internal organizational and decision-making capacities, but it will also demand an outward-looking, inclusive process, in which the Assembly’s role is to open space for debate, dialogue, and collective strategizing. The Keynesian Revival: a Marxian Critique 121 122 Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research In fact, the transit system itself can provide the venue for us to stage public discussions about our collective resources and to share alternative visions for our city: the transit system is a readymade classroom, theatre, and art gallery, attended every day by people who could come to recognize their stake in the de-commodification of public goods of many kinds. My hope is that Toronto’s buses, streetcars, and subway platforms could be places for experimentation, places to develop the new tactics, organizing skills, and relationships that might permit us to really depart from the prevailing script.

#### The critique of neoliberalism comes first: neoliberalism has so thoroughly entrenched itself into our political imaginations that it has become common sense. Until we question neoliberalism genuine political engagement and education is impossible.

Hofmeyr, Department of Philosophy, University of Pretoria, 2008 (Dr. A. B. (Benda), “Behind the Ivory Tower: The Public Role of the Intellectual Today,” Phronimon, Volume: 9, 79-81 JS)

But what exactly is neo-liberalism and how did it conquer the world in just three short decades? According to David Harvey (2005: 2), “[n]eoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade”. Since the 1970s there has been a decisive turn to neo-liberalism in political- economic practices and thinking everywhere. Deregulation, privatisation, and withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision have become common practice. Almost all states, from those rising from the ashes of the Soviet Union to entrenched old-style social democracies and welfare states such as New Zealand and Sweden have succumbed – either voluntarily or in response to coercive pressures – to the neo-liberalising trend. Post-apartheid South Africa continues fervently along the neo-liberal path carved out by the Apartheid government of the late 1980s, and even present-day China is towing the line. Neo-liberalism is making its coercive influence felt everywhere from corporate boardrooms, financial, state and international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) responsible for regulating global finance and trade, but also in universities and the media. As the dominant mode of contemporary discourse and thought, it has infiltrated not only our politics and our economy, but also our commonsensical way of interpreting, understanding and relating to the world encompassing every sphere of life – the private as well as the public (Harvey 2005: 3). But what accounts for the pervasive success and avid global implementation of the neo-liberal ideology? The widespread prevalence of neo-liberalism might be best explained with the aid of Plato’s wisdom who proclaimed in The Republic that “the best guardians” are “those who have the greatest skill in watching over the interests of the community” (Plato 1955: 156-165 [412-421c]). In order to be able to lead successfully, a leader does not propose what is useful for himself, but what is useful for the one he commands. According to Plato, then, to command is to be in accord with the will of one’s subjects. In his commentary on Plato, Levinas (1953: 15) explains this as follows: [t]he apparent heteronomy of a command is in reality but an autonomy, for the freedom to command is not a blind force but a rational act of thought. A will can accept the order of another will only because it finds that order in itself... If the will is contrary to reason, it will come up against the absolute resistance of reason. For a rule, ideology or form of government to be imposed successfully, in other words, it must coincide with the interests of those on which it is imposed. To command, in short, is to do the will of the one who obeys! This holds not just for the commands of the philosopher-king, however, but also for those of the tyrant and therefore harbours the danger of slavery. The despotism of the senses – what Plato calls the animality with which we are infected from within – constitutes the source of tyranny. This is when obedience no longer follows from a free and rational consciousness, but from inclination; when supreme violence becomes supreme gentleness, and we accept it as though it came from ourselves (ibid., p. 16). Herein lies the secret of neo-liberalism’s success. Harvey (2005: 5) explains it as follows: For any way of thought to become dominant, a conceptual apparatus has to be advanced that appeals to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the possibilities inherent in the social world we inhabit. If successful, this conceptual apparatus becomes so embedded in common sense as to be taken for granted and not open to question. The founding figures of neoliberal thought took political ideals of human dignity and individual freedom as fundamental, as ‘the central values of civilization’. In so doing they chose wisely, for these are indeed compelling and seductive ideals. These values, they held, were threatened not only by fascism, dictatorships, and communism, but by all forms of state intervention that substituted collective judgements for those of individuals free to choose (my emphasis). This is, of course, exactly what Gramsci meant by hegemony, which refers to the reign of a certain system of values that derive its force from consent and consensus rather than force or enforcement. This leads to the maintenance of the status quo in power relations through the permeation throughout society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality (think, for example, of neoconservatism), which affords it popular support and legitimacy. To the extent that this prevailing consciousness is internalised by the population, it becomes part of what is generally called “common sense” so that the philosophy, culture and morality of the ruling elite comes to appear as the natural order of things (Boggs 1976: 39). The neo-liberal conviction that individual freedoms are guaranteed by freedom of the market and of trade, is deceptive, however. The freedoms attached to profitable capital accumulation – the fundamental goal of neo- liberal regimes – reflect the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital (Harvey 2005: 7) instead of what Plato calls “the interests of the community”.

#### Generalized access to infrastructure is key to reduce income inequality and improve growth

César Calderón Teaching at University of Alcalá and Managing Partner in consulting autoritas, Luis Servén, Research Manager for Macroeconomics and Growth in the Development Research Group, September 2004 (THE EFFECTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ON GROWTH AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION, Central Bank of Chile Working Papers N° 270, <http://www.bcentral.cl/estudios/documentos-trabajo/pdf/dtbc270.pdf>) TM

It has long been recognized that an adequate supply of infrastructure services is an essential ingredient for productivity and growth.1 In recent years, however, the role of infrastructure has received increased attention. From the academic perspective, a rapidly growing literature – starting with the seminal work of Aschauer (1989) – has sought to quantify the contribution of infrastructure to income and growth.2 From the policy perspective, the renewed concern with infrastructure can be traced to two worldwide developments that took place over the last two decades. The first one was the retrenchment of the public sector since the mid 1980s, in most industrial and developing countries, from its dominant position in the provision of infrastructure, under the increasing pressures of fiscal adjustment and consolidation. The second was the opening up of infrastructure industries to private participation, part of a worldwide drive toward increasing reliance on markets and private sector activity, which has been reflected in widespread privatization of public utilities and multiplication of concessions and other forms of public-private partnership. While this process first gained momentum in industrial countries (notably the U.K.), over the last decade it has extended to a growing number of developing economies, particularly in Latin America. Infrastructure has become an ubiquitous theme in a variety of areas of the policy debate. For example, there is persuasive evidence that adequate infrastructure provision is a key element in the “behind the border” agenda required for trade liberalization to achieve its intended objective of efficient resource reallocation and export growth. Also, a number of studies have argued that generalized access to infrastructure services plays a key role in helping reduce income inequality.3 Against this background, there is a growing perception that in many countries the pressures of fiscal consolidation have led to a compression of public infrastructure spending, which has not been offset by the increase in private sector participation, thus resulting in an insufficient provision of infrastructure services with potentially major adverse effects on growth and inequality.4

#### Ontology first- challenging the metaphysical assumptions of the relationship between humans and economic policy is key to political investigation and resistance

Oksala, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project is Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, 2011 (Johanna, November 3rd, “Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality,” Constellations, Volume: 18, Pages 482 and 483, JS)

If we accept my analysis of the relationship between neoliberalism and political violence, however, irrational violence appears to become the only meaningful form that violent resistance against neoliberalism can take. The implication of the specific relationship between neoliberalism and political violence is, paradoxically, that there can be no cost-effective and, in this sense, rational practices of violence that could function as genuine resistance against it. Burning cars in rich neighbourhoods instead of poor ones would mean adopting the very political ontology one is attempting to question and transform: all human behavior should not be reduced to cost-effective means, to an end. If we want to oppose neoliberalism not just as an economic policy, but also as a socio-political matrix, we have to challenge the ontological framework that explains all human behavior through the economic analysis of its costs and effects. Some forms of behavior, such as violence, must retain an irreducibly moral and political meaning. The paradoxical relationship between neoliberalism and violent resistance does not obviously imply that the only meaningful form of protest against neoliberalism is irrational violence. On the contrary, it should constitute a strong reason not to engage in violence, but to seek other ways of resisting. While we have to accept that practical forms of resistance against neoliberalism have to consider the efficaciousness of their strategies and even apply strictly economic, cost-benefit analysis to some of their actions, economic rationality should not form the framework for assessing violence as a form of resistance. We should question neoliberalism’s exclusive stake to rationality and introduce alternative means and ends to the political arena: justice, compassion, creativity and solidarity, for example. Many of the peaceful protests against neoliberal hegemony – demonstrations, public performances and the occupation of public spaces – provide good examples of this. I am thus not promoting mindless, irrational violence, but I contend that the economic irrationality of violence does not amount to its meaninglessness, not unless we have lost all frameworks other than the neoliberal for understanding social reality. The expressive and disruptive forces of violence are a genuine and sometimes appealing alternative to people disenchanted with the all-encompassing framework of cost-benefit analysis and the systemic, “rational” forms of violence compatible with it. I also disagree with Zˇizˇek’s claim that advanced capitalism is worldless in the sense that it contains no worldview. Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism contains an explicit worldview: it holds metaphysical assumptions about what human beings and societies are essentially like by maintaining a belief that human beings are always rational beings driven by natural self-interest. This is not a problem, a lamentable manifestation of the human condition, but something to be affirmed because it is ultimately the engine for economic growth. Neoliberalism also advances values and political ideals for the optimal organisation of human societies: the maximal material wellbeing of the population must be the undisputed goal of all societies and it is achieved only by continuous economic growth. The importance of free competition and the privileging of market mechanisms is thus not based solely on their economic rationality. They are understood as the means for a good life where good life is understood to include both maximal wealth and freedom. Free markets guarantee that people have maximal choice in cheap products and services and are thus not only maximally wealthy, but also free. The prevalent characteristic of neoliberalism is not just the conviction that free markets provide the optimal organising mechanism for capitalist economies. More fundamentally, the conviction is that they provide the optimal organising mechanism for the entirety of human life and social interaction: the necessary conditions for political freedom and a morality based on individual responsibility.33 The free market is thus not just an economic, but also a moral and political force. It does not function simply as the most efficient means for allocating resources: it is the optimum context for achieving human freedom and happiness. Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism maps a cognitive space for individuals with very clear objectives and the means of achieving them. Some would express the objective by saying that it is quite simply wealth – whoever dies with the most toys wins. Some would say that the ultimate objective of any form of liberalism is freedom. That ultimately amounts to the same things, however, because “money is. . .the greatest instrument of freedom ever invented by man.”34 And the best means for achieving wealth is unlimited competition in the free market. As Foucault saw it, the art of government developed by the Ordoliberals in and around the 1930s had become the programme of most governments in capitalist countries by 1979 when he delivered his lectures. Since then this political ontology has become even more expansive and deeply ingrained. It has circumscribed our everyday life in the last 30 years to the extent that it has not just been the dominant economic theory, it has been constitutive of our life-world and ultimately of ourselves. Its triumph does not mean that we have become a standardised, mass society of consumption and spectacle, as some social critics have insisted. It rather means that we live in a society that is oriented towards the multiplicity and differentiation of enterprises. We have become entrepreneurs of our lives, competing in the free market called society. We compete in an ever-expanding range of fields, and invest in ourselves by enhancing our abilities and appearance, by improving our strategies of life coaching and time management. Our life has become an enterprise that we must lead to success. Within this framework irrational violence does not appear morally wrong or politically compromised: it is simply a losing strategy, and this, paradoxically, remains its appeal and its significance.

# Inherency

#### Public-Private Partnerships are on the Rise.

Young Hoon KWAK, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Project Management, Dr Ying-Yi Chih PhD Lecturer ANU College of Business and Economics, C. Williams Ibbs, Ph.D., University of California at Berkeley, 2009(Young Hoon KWAK, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Project Management, Dr Ying-Yi Chih PhD Lecturer ANU College of Business and Economics, C. Williams Ibbs, Ph.D., University of California at Berkeley CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW VOL. 51, NO. 2 WINTER 2009 CMR.BERKELEY.EDU)

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs**)** have emerged as one of the major approaches for delivering infrastructure projects in recent years. If properly formulated and managed, a PPP can provide a number of benefits to the public sector such as: alleviating the financial burden on the public sector due to rising infrastructure development costs; allowing risks to be transferred from the public to the private sector; and increasing the “value for money” spent for infrastructure services by providing more efficient, lower cost, and reliable services.1 However, the experience of the public sector with PPPs has not always been positive. Many PPP projects are either held up or terminated due to: wide gaps between public and private sector expectations; lack of clear government objectives and commitment; complex decision making; poorly defined sector policies; inadequate legal/regulatory frameworks; poor risk management; low credibility of government policies; inadequate domestic capital markets; lack of mechanisms to attract long-term finance from private sources at affordable rates; poor transparency; and lack of competition.2 Despite numerous negative experiences,3 many governments (e.g., the UK and Australia) continue to view PPPs as one of the key strategies for delivering public services and infrastructure. Therefore, understanding and enhancing knowledge of PPPs continue to be a matter of significance and importance. During the past decades, researchers have conducted studies that cover a wide range of topics, such as how to select an appropriate concessionaire, what are the critical factors for the success or failure of PPP projects, what roles the government should play in PPP projects, and more. This article collects, codifies, and consolidates these previous research findings to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of PPPs. It discusses the definitions, types, examples of worldwide applications, benefits, and obstacles of Towards a Comprehensive Understanding of Public Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Development 52 CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW VOL. 51, NO. 2 WINTER 2009 CMR.BERKELEY.EDU PPPs through an in-depth literature review on PPP-related research in the last 20 years. Key findings derived from various researchers and lessons learned are presented and recommendations for both public and private sectors are offered for the future of PPPs for infrastructure development.

#### Private Corporations Are Taking up a Larger Role in Public Transportation

Lewis M. Branscomb, James Keller, Jun 17, 1996

(Lewis M. Branscomb, BA in physics from Duke University, PhD in physics from Harvard University, James Keller, Ph.D. in Mathematics, MIT Press, Jun 17, 1996, Converging Infrastructures: Intelligent Transportation and the National Information Infrastructure, p. vii-viii)

Advances in communications and information technologies are critically important for improving the performance of the transportation system; a modern and efficient transportation system is essential for promoting economic development and raising our collective standard of living. Many of the improvements to the transportation system will rely on the ability of private firms and public agencies to gather, process, analyze, and disseminate information to travelers about the availability of different transportation services and the performance of the transportation system. The Department of Transportation – in partnership with many private-sector companies and state and local governments – has been supporting a program to develop and implement Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). ITS integrates advanced communications, computers, sensors, satellites, and information processing technologies into transportation systems. Major advances in computers, communication, and electronics technologies are making it possible to implement ITS at a reasonable cost. No longer viewed as science fiction, ITS technologies are being adopted by communities throughout the nation to solve today’s transportation problems.

#### Cities increasingly privatize their services to serve the neoliberal system, reducing the ‘right to the city’

Purcell 2 (Mark, 2002, “Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant,” GeoJournal, Volume: 58, p. 99-108, EBB)

The increased autonomy of local governance institutions has been accompanied by a shift in their policy orientation. The main shift has been toward competition: in the context of neoliberal restructuring, local governance institutions have placed increasing emphasis on maintaining their region’s economic competitiveness (Harvey, 1989; Peck, 1998; Swyngedouw, 1996). In the past, local governance was associated more with administering national-scale redistribution schemes designed to stimulate consumer demand and support a national economy based on mass production and mass consumption (Amin, 1994). Since economic restructuring has made the local economy increasingly less a function of the national economy, local governments have become more concerned with ensuring that the local area competes effectively in the global economy. No longer do local leaders feel they can rely on national policy makers to advocate for the economic fortunes of their locality. Therefore, the literature argues, economic development and competitiveness have become the primary imperative that drives local policy-making. Local places increasingly engage in supply-side intervention designed to attract investment to the local area: they assist technology transfer to stimulate high-tech growth, they take a greater role in planning and funding infrastructure improvements, and they offer job retraining designed to provide a ﬂexible labor force for the new economy (Leitner, 1990; Painter, 1995; Peck and Jones, 1995).In moving away from demand-oriented redistribution and toward supply-oriented competition, local government has begun to seek greater efﬁciency by reorganizing its overall structure. It has begun to contract out services to volunteer organizations and private ﬁrms, and it has developed quasi-public bodies – such as ‘quangos’, training and enterprise councils, urban development corporations, and public-private partnerships – to carry out many of the functions of local government (Krumholz, 1999; Payne and Skelcher, 1997; Walzer and York, 1998). In order to ensure the local area is more competitive in the global economy, the local state has ‘outsourced’ some functions so that it can reconﬁgure itself to become more like a ﬂexible ﬁrm. It has developed ‘an emphasis on customer care; leaner, ﬂatter managerial hierarchies; budgetary devolution; multiskilling and ﬂexibility of the workforce; a key role for information and information technology; and the adoption of new managerial ideologies’ (Hoggett, 1987; Painter, 1995, p. 282). Overall, the argument is that a shift from local government to local governance is underway; in its effort to compete for increasingly mobile investment capital, the local state (government) has transferred many of its powers and duties to complex networks of new state, quasi-state, and non-state institutions (governance) (Hay and Jessop, 1995; Painter and Goodwin, 1995; Ward, 2000). The result has been a much more complex and rapidly evolving set of institutions that govern urban areas. In the main, scholars worry that the new governance ethos is driven particularly by the imperative of capitalist accumulation. It eschews democratic deliberation as inefﬁcient and inappropriate for present economic circumstances. Moreover, the new governance institutions are increasingly outside the local state, meaning more governing decisions are being made by actors not directly accountable to the local electorate and conventional democratic control. The fear, in short, is that these new institutions and their new policy imperatives exclude local inhabitants from the decisions that shape their cities. Overall, research on globalization and urban governance change has declared an urgent need for new strategies to counteract the growing disenfranchisement of urban inhabitants. Investigation into such strategies has begun, and much of it has involved empirical examinations of new movements among marginalized urban populations who advocate some form of renewed democratic control (e.g., Keil, 1998; Pulido, 2000). Among those academics who are searching for an alternative to neoliberal disenfranchisement, many have begun to explore ‘the right to the city’ as a promising possibility (Holston, 1999; Holston and Appadurai, 1999; Isin, 1996, 2000; Isin and Wood, 1999; Rights to the city, 1998, 2002; Sandercock, 1998; Sassen, 2000; Smith, 1993; Soja, 1996, 2000). Beyond academia, the term is also gaining greater attention. To name just a few examples, it is evoked in conﬂicts over housing (Grant Building Tenants Association, 2001; Olds, 1998) against patriarchal cities (City & Shelter et al., no date; United Nations Center for Human Settlements, 2001), for participatory planning (Daniel, 2001), and against social exclusion in cities more generally (Buroni, 1998; Cities for human rights, 1998; Worldwide Conference on the Right to Cities free from discrimination and inequality, 2002).

PPPs are Running Transportation Infrastructure  
E. S. Savas, 1997 (E. S. Savas, 1997, former Assistant Secretary of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, “PRIVATIZATION AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS” p.2)

By Public-Private Partnership. Infrastructure projects are increasingly being built through public-private partnerships (PPPs). Unlike the general use of this term as mentioned above, PPP in this sense refers to an arrangement where government states its need for capital-intensive, long-lived infrastructure and the desired facility is built using a complex combination of government and (mostly) private financing and then operated by a private entity under a long-term franchise, contract, or lease. The payments are usually spread over twenty to 99 years and cover construction, operation, maintenance, and capital costs. Typical PPP projects are roads, bridges, airports, water systems, pipelines, and power plants, but prisons, stadiums, schools, and municipal buildings have also been developed through this method, as have urban economic development projects.

#### Neo-liberalism has converted public transportation into a private undertaking for profit.

Mizuoka No Date (The Effects of Neo-Liberalism: Politics and Path Dependency in the Provision of Public Transportation. The Australasian Centre for Governance and Management of Urban Transport, GAMUT <http://www.vref.se/download/18.1166db0f120540fe049800012720/Mizuoka+-+Effects+of+Neo+Liberalism.pdf>) ALG

Public transportation constitutes an important part of a regulatory regime. This is because mobility across space is the fundamental prerequisite for sustainable society and economy: capital accumulation needs transporting goods from points of production to consumption; and social integration presupposes spatial integration for free social interaction among people. In the era of Fordism/Keynesianism, provision of public transportation aimed at supporting mass consumption and constituted a part of the general welfare, to keep people stay clear of revolutionary praxis. It also contributed to capital accumulation through more efficient mobility. To ensure these roles to be played, the transportation is normally placed under direct public control so that the government can see to it if these functions work more properly for the welfare of people and spatial homogenisation. In neo-liberalism, these public services are converted into private undertakings for profit. The private operator normally run the sector which is profit-making (cream skimming), and abandon those money-losing sectors without hesitation. The contestation from the residents along the route is discouraged, with a Tibout-like claim, ‘if you, living in countryside, want to use public transportation, you should move to areas where these services are available – if you cannot use public transportation, it is the matter of your (free) choice’. In case of public transportation, nevertheless, the shift from Fordism/Neo-liberalism to neo-liberalism is not so abrupt, because there is path-dependency or geographical inertia that the built form of transport network possesses. Neo-liberalist regime often inherits from Fordism/Keynesianism a denser and more homogenous network of public transportation, which neo-liberalist regime by no means wants to create, and operates deficit-generating sections grudgingly only for a limited time. The operators following the neo-liberalist line eventually divest these lines and abandon them under various pretexts. Political struggles arising from the grass-root people against abandonment of these lines, often generating source of social instability and contestation. This nature of the public transportation system within the shifting regimes of capitalist regulation warrants more detailed scrutiny from the perspective of the political economy.

#### The Government Gives Money to Private Companies to run Mass Transit.

E. S. Savas, 1997

(E. S. Savas, 1997, former Assistant Secretary of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, “PRIVATIZATION AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS” p.7) ABS

By Grants and Other Subsidies. Delegation is also carried out by awarding grants, below-interest loans, favored tax treatment, and other kinds of subsidies. Instead of government itself carrying out an activity, it arranges for a private entity to do the work, and it provides financial support. In the United States, grants are used for mass transit, low-income housing, maritime shipping, and innumerable other activities. Grants are distinguished from contracts in that grants usually involve only the most general requirements (run a bus service, build houses that rent at below-market prices, conduct research, promote the arts), whereas contracts are usually specified in great detail for a particular service (sweep the west side of certain north-south streets between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. on Tuesdays and Fridays). Grants and loans can generally be thought of as one-time payments, often to initiate a new activity, while favorable tax treatment and other subsidies tend to be continuing and to cover pre-existing as well as new services.

# SQ = Neoliberalism

### Transportation = Neolib

#### Social sectors, like transportation, are being privatized now through the neoliberal order which subordinates the means of production and labor

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 26-28, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

There is a second sector that has increased enormously in significance through the clearly increasing life expectancy (which in Central Europe in the last 160 years has risen from approximately 40 to almost 80 years) and modernisation and urbanisation as well as the extensive development of a global exchange society: the field of common goods like health care, public infrastructure in transportation and communication and so forth. The protection of the natural and human environment is similarly a common good. Even the banking system and the credit institutes as well as the legal system belong to this field. The recent financial crisis shows that these are privately useful but in no sense private goods – although they were treated as if they were. Neoliberalism has developed a game of communalising costs and privatising profits. The demarcation of public goods consists above all in the fact that common goods can be destroyed by excessive and false use. The modern welfare and legal state that has fallen into crisis due to neoliberalism is the backbone of these sectors. The democratic institutions of the state, of communities and of universal security organisations, carry out the most important economic functions on the basis of the enforceable securing of the social and ecological fundamental rights of all. A third sector is the social sector of the production of material and immaterial goods, which are neither public nor common, or are not supposed to be such. This sector is today above all in private and only very partially in statal or cooperative hands. It is based on credit-financed entrepreneurial activity. This then takes on a capitalist form if the combination of the means of production and labour power is subordinated to the imperatives of capital valorisation. An economy based on solidarity, on the basis of needs-oriented fundamental security, regional business cycles, control of capital circulation and strong co-determination, must succeed in breaking up and overcoming this subordination of social and ecological governance and public investment programmes. In this sector there must be established a form of associative property of different actors with different property interests (‘good work’, regional development, innovative and efficient goods for the user, ecological sustainability, and so forth). This postcapitalist entrepreneurial sector is based on the cooperation of a plurality of owners of the same assets (Brie 1990).

#### Public Investment of Transportation Infrastructure Low – Could Allow Return of Neoliberalism

Farmer, Stephanie 2011

(B.A. from Kansas State University, a M.A. from the University of Illinois at Chicago and a PhD from Binghamton University, State University of New York. “Post-Neoliberalism or Deepened Neoliberalism? The Chicago Public Transportation Service and Elite Response during the Great Stagnation” Perspectives on Global Development & Technology; 2011, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p73-84, 12p p. 73)

After three decades of neoliberal economic policies the US economy has fallen into stagnation. Over this same period systemic under-investment in the public sector and public infrastructure has likewise provoked a parallel crisis of decaying physical infrastructure (in bridges, roads, and rails) and diminished public services (in health care, education, and transportation). This situation is ripe for the reversal of neoliberal policies in favor of a Neo-Keynesian state tasked with the responsibility of stimulating the economy through public works projects focused on rebuilding the nation’s infrastructure. When President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, 74 S. Farmer, S. Noonan / PGDT 10 (2011) 73-84 many pundits on both the right and the left took this as a sign of the reemergence of Keynesian economics, with some calling it the “New, New Deal” (Blake 2008; Gingrich 2009; Lazarus 2009). In this article, we consider the possibility that the neoliberal regime is in transition to a Neo-Keynesian future. We use Chicago’s public transit system as a case study to examine the political responses to the economic crisis by local elites to assess the state of neoliberalism in Chicago.

# Neolib bad

## Transportation Infrastructure Reorders Populations

#### Neoliberal transportation infrastructures are instruments of power, dominance, and social control that re-entrench racial segregation and exclusion.

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

Public transportation, as one crucial component of a city's transportation network, enables the mobility and flow of people and goods that make cities livable. Public transportation plays a vital role in the urban economy in that it creates place-based advantages, facilitates the circulation of capital, and attracts investment in local real estate markets. At the level of everyday lived experience, public transit shapes and constrains opportunity (time it takes to access jobs, schools, and services) and sociospatial relations into the built environment. In many places, public transportation is also wielded as an instrument of power, dominance, and social control, entrenching the privileges of the affluent and the disadvantages of working people into the built environment (Graham and Marvin, 2001). Therefore, trends in public transportation infrastructure and service levels constitute one dimension of uneven geographical development in urban areas. My research considers the ways in which neoliberalism and global city building are shaping new patterns of uneven geographic development in the public transit sector by focusing on public transportation planning and investment in the city of Chicago. The purpose of my paper is to contribute to the scholarship on the politics of infrastructure (Keil and Young, 2008; McFarlane and Rutherford, 2008) emphasizing the ways in which infrastructure and cities are produced and transformed together in a global context as well as how these processes contribute to urban fragmentation and inequality. The second part of this paper positions my study in the literature on entrepreneurial urban governments, neoliberal public transportation projects, and emerging sociospatial relations of inclusion and exclusion in the global city. The third part examines public transportation planning and new construction projects taking place in the city of Chicago in order to illustrate the impact of neoliberalization on the geography of uneven public transportation development. The narrative was assembled through a combination of documents produced by government, transit and planning agencies, secondary sources (mostly journalistic materials and documents produced by nonprofit groups), interviews, and nonparticipant observation of community meetings. My investigation of Chicago's public transportation policy reveals that the city is sinking scarce transit funds into projects that transform the downtown Central Area into the image of a global city. These global city public transit projects are prioritized over expanding access to transit for working-class and minority residents living in transit-poor areas of the city. Additionally, the neoliberal squeeze of the public sector has resulted in declining service levels and the neglect of basic maintenance across the system, contributing to unreliable and poor public transportation service. These trends in public transportation policy pursued by the city of Chicago reveal the nature of uneven geographic development taking shape within this neoliberalizing city, where the global city growth machine favors business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago's global city downtown showcase zone. I conclude with a discussion on how neoliberal public transportation planning interlocks with neoliberal housing policies enacted in the city of Chicago to create new patterns of racial segregation and exclusion.

#### Neoliberal forces reconfigures territorial organizations- capital accumulation, historical class, social, and political relationships, and institutional policies by localities divide populations along class/race lines

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

Since the production of space is inherently a social phenomenon, a theory of uneven geographic development should be attuned to the particular articulation of structural forces and social relations in capitalist society. Uneven geographic development is produced by a constellation of factors consisting of (1) the embedding of capital accumulation processes in space; (2) historical class, social, and political relations contingent to a geography that privileges some places, social groups, or activities over others; (3) the preexisting built environment; (4) institutional and political policies implemented in localities; and (5) consumption preferences (Harvey, 2006, page 78). Harvey (1999) sketches out the contours of uneven geographic development: ``Uneven development occurs as capital mobilizes particular places as forces of production creating a highly variegated capitalist geography consisting of an unequal distribution of productive forces, institutional arrangements, raw materials, the built environment and transport facilities, as well as differentiations of social relations and a litany of other factors shaping spatial relations'' (page 416). The specific configuration of market forces, state regulation, and class relations at work at a given time and place (the prevailing accumulation regime) profoundly shapes the development of the urban terrain. 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.

#### Neoliberal transit projects are socially regressive - lack of funding for community development and the delocalization of the working class creates and reproduces spatialized racial inequalities

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

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). Neoliberal 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). As municipalities sink their meager financial resources into lumpy global city public transportation infrastructure, residents outside the myopic global city vision are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain development dollars for their communities (Judd, 2003). In this regard, entrepreneurial public transportation policies are reshaping the contours of race-based social exclusion. As real estate developers and creative Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago 1157 class workers mobilize their political and financial power to outcompete lower income groups for rights to the (central) city, they are pushing working-class and minority residents to the margins of the city and into the devalorized inner-suburban ring where affordable housing can be found but public transit service is meager (Dreier et al, 2004). These deepening patterns of exclusion are also reinforced by policies dismantling and disbursing public housing out of the central area and away from public transit. And yet, poor urban African-Americans are more structurally dependent on public transportation to access jobs, services, and cultural amenities (Bullard and Johnson, 1997; Kasarda, 1989). In a more egalitarian policy-making environment, public transportation policy can be a means to reduce the effects of hyper sociospatial racial segregation (Wilson, 1990). However, in the neoliberal approach to urban planning and economic development, public transportation is but one of a constellation of institutions that create and reproduce spatialized racial inequalities.

## Neolib Bad Impacts

### Human Commodification

#### Neoliberal social ideology causes people to be viewed as commodities through the corrosion of the value of the worker to just a cost of production.

Pramono 2 [Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 122, 2002, Accessed 7/3/2012] JDO

The point is that the neoliberal perception of values of society and the free market, especially the ones related to the concept of work, is such that globalisation will soon become the global trap that undermines not only the global economy but also, and most importantly, the human society. Neoliberal perception of values of society and the free market has "created the delusion of economic determinism as a general law for all human society" (Polanyi, 1968: 70). Thus, human society is transformed into a market society (Gill, 1993), a society based on laissez-faire capitalism. The immediate result is the corrosion of the value of work and worker as an integral part of social structure. Market society, according to the neoliberal creed, demands the commodification of money, land, and labour. While labourers are real people, the workers are no longer considered as humans but commodities and therefore are subject to the law of supply and demand. Work is merely an economic of subsistence; a labour sold at market price. For the capitalist who hires the worker, labour is associated with the cost of production. To maximise profit, this cost must be ‘rationalised’ at the lowest level. The market society in effect has relegated the economic and social role of work (the role of which will be dealt with later in this paper) to merely a factor of production.

#### Human Commodification creates violence through capitalism by causing the demise of the working class.

Pramono 2 [Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 123, 2002, Accessed 7/2/2012] JDO

The commodification of workers is nonetheless detrimental to the society for two reasons. Firstly, as argued by Polanyi (1944:133), that the capitalist "had no organ to sense the danger involved in the exploitation of the physical strength of the worker". Thus, as had been foreseen by Marx and Engel (1997) in their Communist Manifesto, capitalism develops with increasing exploitation of the working class. Secondly, since workers are commodities, it will be at the disposal of the capitalist to put them to work or to dismiss them. But work is one of the important pillars of the orderly society. The individual self-interest, which is not limited to the economic one, brings woman and man to take part in organisations such as markets and factories (Homans, 1971). These organisations, then, function as external systems that impose social control upon the individual member. The cessation of this relationship, in the case of unemployment, leads toward the condition Durkheim called anomie: the loss of contact, and therefore control, of the social organisation over the individual (cited in Homans, 1971: 69). High mass-unemployment thus causes social disorganisation. The industrious working class is turned into a potentially violent mob or law-breakers. If this happens, normally the authority resorts to a pragmatic solution: reinforces security and builds more prisons. Britain, for instance, allocated 870 million Pound Sterling, which was considered the largest expansion of penal institutions this century, to built twenty-six new prisons between 1983 and 1995. Similar policies have been followed in the US, France, Germany and most other Western industrialised countries (Teeple, 1995). As "the social fabric is tearing apart" (Martin and Schumann, 1997: 103), the demise of the working class is incurring tremendous social cost to societies.

#### Neoliberalism causes humans to be commodified as raw resources including sex slaves and trafficking victims.

Heron 08 [Taitu, Gender and Development Studies, The University of the West Indies. “

Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 94-95, January 2008, Accessed 7/5/12] JDO

Similarly, human beings are increasingly being commodified and traded as sex slaves, prostitutes or trafficking victims' as globalization has seen an unprecedented growth in the underground sex industry (Poulin 2004, p. 3). More women and children are made vulnerable to the already structurally discriminating environment and the hierarchical relationships that exist between the developed countries and dependent countries and between men and women. In recent years under the impact of structural adjustment and neoliberal policies in numerous developing countries as well as in the ex-USSR and Eastern Europe, poor women and children have become “new raw resources” within the framework of national and international business development. According to Poulin (2004, p. 2) “globalization has created a market of sexual exchanges in which millions of women and children have been converted into sexual commodities”. This sex market has been generated through the massive deployment of prostitution (one of the effects of the presence of military forces engaged in wars and/or territorial occupation in particular in the emerging Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency economies), the unprecedented expansion of the tourist industry, and the growth and normalization of pornography (see Box 2). This industry is based on the systematic violation of human rights, for it requires a market in commodified human beings and the complicity of pimps and clients who are prepared to buy and sell women and children. It is only one among many varied instances of the commodification of all of life which is a defining characterization of current neoliberalism, a pattern which hits at the core of human agency and robs one of the dignity inherent in each human being on one hand, and diminishes positive use of agency on the other.

#### Neoliberalism views people as commodities, reducing them to economic figures and distorting reality to fit a simplified model

Brohman 95 (John, June 1995, “Economism and Critical Silences in Development Studies: A Theoretical Critique of Neoliberalism,” Third World Quarterly, Volume: 16, p. 297-318, EBB)

The multifaceted and dynamic nature of development processes makes it necessary to take an interdisciplinary approach to the study of development, one that includes sociocultural, political, and environmental factors as well as those economic. However, neoliberalism and other mainstream development frameworks that draw their conceptual roots from neoclassical theory have virtually omitted non-economic factors of development from serious consideration.' As Hirschman notes, 'The discipline became professionally more narrow at precisely the moment when the problem [of development] demanded broader, more political, and social insights' 2 Characteristically, neoclassical theory treats people as atomistic individuals who are bound together only through market forces. People are reduced to isolated creatures of the marketplace, devoid of history, cultural traditions, political opinions and social relationships beyond simple market exchanges.3 The conventional assumption is that non-market relations and institutions-the broader environments within which economies operate-are universal, unchanging, and have no significant impact on economic activities.4 Economies take on an ahistorical, static nature and economic change becomes solely the result of exogenous changes in tastes and technology.5 Stripped of their social relations and historical dynamism, economies are reduced to simple technical devices for allocating scarce resources. The consequences are often unrealistic and trivial results derived from narrow, simplistic analyses that ignore the complexities surrounding Third World economic realities.

#### **Capitalism destroys world harmony by ignoring the non-exchangeable value of people and the planet. It demands alternatives.**

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

The present systemic crisis of capitalism and its various dimensions in the fields of economy, energy, food, ecosystems, values, requires a new approach. All the crises that have become acute in recent times are the result of the same fundamental logic: 1) it conceives of development in a way that ignores ‘externalities’ (that is, environmental and social damage); 2) it is based on the idea of a planet with infinite resources; 3) it prioritizes exchange value over use value; and 4) it equates the economy with the rate of profitability and the accumulation of capital, creating enormous inequalities. This model, which is at the origin of a spectacular development of global wealth, has reached the end of its historical function, through the destruction it has wrought on nature and the social inequity that it has brought about. It cannot replicate itself or, in contemporary parlance, it is not sustainable. “The economic rationality of capitalism” comments Wim Dierckxsens, “not only tends to deprive large majorities of the world population of their lives, but it destroys the natural life that surrounds us” (2011). The Argentinean economist Jorge Beinstein states that in the last four decades capitalism has become decadent on a world scale (a drop in the productive sector) which has only been disguised for a while by the artificial development of the financial sector and huge military expenditure (J.Beinstein, 2009, 13). For this reason therefore, let it be clear that we cannot only talk about regulation: it is necessary to think of alternatives. These are not the result of purely theoretical reflections, but it necessarily lead to practical policies with longterm objectives, as well as for the short and medium-term.

#### Neoliberalism fails – the only reason it seems inevitable or necessary is because it has destroyed all opposition at the expense of the working class, mass transport and the environment

Kotz 3 (David M., Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, *Socialism and Global Neoliberal Capitalism*, Economics Department and Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, pg. 6-7, <http://people.umass.edu/dmkotz/Soc_and_Global_NL_Kism_03_03.pdf>, 2003, JKE)

The unfavorable conditions faced by ordinary people under global neoliberal capitalism highlight the growing gap between the advanced level of technological development that has been attained and the inability of the system to satisfy individual and collective human needs. This system is remarkably difficult to promote to a general audience, which explains the typical claim that neoliberal transformation, although painful, is “necessary” or “inevitable” or “unavoidable.” What this means is that any alternative economic relations will be destroyed by neoliberal forms on the battlefield of competition, or if necessary, be removed by military force. 4 The unfavorable conditions for ordinary people, and the loss of power which they have experienced, have given rise to opposition movements throughout the world. The working class has been affected in all of its roles in society. As producers, workers have fought, through trade unions and political action, against the worsening living standard and job conditions they have faced. The working class along with other classes and groups have fought against the cutbacks in, and decreasing quality of, collectively provided services such as health care, education, and mass transportation. Peasant movements have fought against attacks on their livelihood and communities. Indigenous communities have fought against encroachments on their communities and cultures. Social reformers have fought the growing penetration of commercialism. Young people have protested against a future that seems to hold little of promise for them. Environmentally conscious people have resisted the dismantling of necessary regulations on corporate activity. Peace activists have protested the continuation of huge military budgets, war, and aggression in the world despite the end of the long Cold War confrontation.

#### Neoliberal-ideology destroys life as we know it and must be rejected

Albo, Professor of Political Science, York University, Toronto, ON, 2007

(Gregory Albo, December, 2007, “Neoliberalism and the Discontented,” Socialist Register, Volume: 44, pg 8, EP)

Neoliberalism has, however, managed to stand its ground. As a consequence, Left politics under neoliberalism has oscillated between, on the one hand, short-term political calculation to avoid further social erosion, and, on the other, a politics of predicting imminent economic crisis if not total socioeconomic chaos that in fact reﬂects the disarray of Left forces and organizational weakness. Yet this is precisely why the socialist Left must be actively engaged, above all, in fostering the formation of new political agencies. One necessary aspect of such an engagement is class reformation through the revitalization of unions, and the linking of unions to workers in new sectors – those struggling for gender and racial equality, and the marginalized, people outside ‘normal’ work processes. It is also necessary to experiment in organizational convergence between the remnants of the independent Left, civic organizations, and the sections within social democracy that remained committed to a transformative project. Such a reformation needs to be grounded in the building up of the educational, communicative and cultural resources – the political and human capacities – necessary for a ‘new socialism’ for the 21st century.11 And concrete anti-neoliberal alliances will need to be forged in struggle to defeat particular initiatives and make inroads against neoliberalism, so as to make such a process of re-formation ‘organic’. Neoliberalism has consistently generated political ﬂashpoints that have blunted its appeal and forced a recalibration of the global ambitions of the ruling classes. The imbalances of world trade, the contradictions of military occupation, the social inequalities of income and work, the inefﬁciencies and monopolies of privatized public assets, the abject failure of carbon trading and other pollution markets to address the global ecological crisis – all these have spawned often inspiring kinds of social and political struggle against neoliberalism. But unless the Left develops viable new collective and democratic organizational capacities, the barbarism that is global neoliberalism will indeed continue to yield its daily horrors in every part of the earth.

### Structural Violence

#### The spread of Neoliberalism creates a sense of injustice that permeates throughout the developing world that psychologically motivates people to regain their sense of personal power through structural violence.

Pramono 2 [Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 131-132, 2002, Accessed 7/2/2012] JDO

A sense of injustice can incite resentment, anger, and violence (Staub, 1989). For instance, following the political reform in 1998, Indonesia is becoming more democratic but poor. Yet, it is the democratisation —more than the simplistically alleged radicalism— which gives rise to the anti-American sentiment. More and more Indonesians dare to challenge, although with little success, the practice of US neoliberal global politics. Why should Indonesians who work for an American leading sportswear company in Indonesia be paid less than US$ 2.00 per day for a product worth US$ 45 - US 80 in American market? (McKinley, 2001). Aside from the question of (in)justice, the rising anti-American sentiment in Indonesia, and in the third world in general, which has sometimes led to violence, should be viewed as a result of frustration, acute deprivation, and sense of powerlessness. Such psychological conditions will motivate peoples to regain a sense of personal efficacy and personal power. If people feel vulnerable to diseases, poverty, the constant threat of military pre-emptive strikes and weapons of mass-destruction, and, ultimately, death, then killing (eg, homicide, genocide) "may give the killer a feeling of invulnerability and power over [the] death" itself (Staub, 1989: 41). Such killings elusively help improve a sense of personal power. And this personal power is a psychological tool to help survive the increasing uncertainty, anarchy or chaos. "Chaos, disorder and sudden profound changes, especially when accompanied by frustration, threat, and attack," for Staub (1989: 41), "invalidate the conceptions of self and world that serve as guides by which new experience acquires meaning and life gains coherence." As such, chaotic changes from a society based on the value of work to a workless society, as discussed in the previous section, would trigger moral panic until the arrival (or the acceptance) of a 'new' ideology that is perceived as able to provide a renewed comprehension. If you were deprived from material gain, why would you not embrace something against (or destroy) all kinds of material gain? (eg, the case of Taliban anti-modernisation policy in Afghanistan) If you were deprived of a better life (and in no way can attain this) why would not you embrace a sub-culture that destroys all kinds of lives (eg, the case of terrorist ideology). In either case, albeit suicidal-genocidal, you were no longer a loser. Thus, the neoliberal global politics help the appeal of such destructive (and murderous) ideology in the decaying society. The point is that not only is the neoliberal theory-as-practice genocidal, as depicted in the previous sections, but also it inflicts difficult life conditions that increase the severity of the existing global genocide. Most big cases of genocide happened in the backdrop of difficult life conditions. Turkey committed genocide against the Armenians after years of humiliation —losses of territory, power, and global political status— before and during the World War I. Difficult life condition following the defeat of Germany in World War I helped Hitler's rise to power. And the Holocaust was committed in the years when Germany was losing World War II. In Cambodia, the Polpot regime committed genocide in 1970s after years of civil war, starvation, and misery. In Argentina, severe economic problems preceded genocide (Staub, 1989). In Rwanda, the collapse of the coffee industry, the country's main national earning, preceded genocide. And in Indonesia, symptoms of genocidal society have been apparent since the collapse of the national economy following the Asian economic meltdown in 1997. With the neoliberal theory-as-practice, genocidal global politics is materialised and intensified.

#### Neoliberalism causes violence through instigating resentment towards the aggressor creating devaluation of others and a basis for violence justified through self-defense.

Pramono 2 [Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 130-131, 2002, Accessed 7/2/2012] JDO

The Latino taxi driver in New York was no fan of Major General Butler or bin Laden, or perhaps, had never heard about them. But he shared with Major General Butler the disgust towards the US exploitation of Latin America. And he, too, shared the grievance to free the world from neoliberal exploitation as articulated in bin Laden's Declaration of War (1996). The point is that those who live under the neoliberal global oppression share the same desire to retaliate. Retaliation aside, aggression, for Staub (1989: 39), "is an effective self-defense, since it communicates that [genocidal] instigation does not pay and makes renewed instigation less likely." But such a communication will only be effective if the conflicting parties speak the same language of violence. Here, self-defense, for one, tends to be interpreted as anticipatory or pre-emptive self-defense. As such, the self-defense always represents naked aggression (eg, the case of the September 11 terrorist attacks and the corresponding attacks of Afghanistan and Iraq). Second, each party can play victim of the other, and thus use the notion of self-defense as the ground of its aggression. Determination to commit self-defense is not only practical, but also psychological. The neoliberal global politics can also incite to the desire to protect the psychological self such as identity and self-esteem (Staub, 1989). Protection against who? A protection against the perceived hegemon, for one, can give rise to the desire for harm doing as suggested in the previous point. But, worse, often "it employs such 'internal', psychological means as scape-goating or devaluation of others, which eventually provides a basis for violence against them" (Staub, 1989: 39). Those who attempt to protect the psychological self can arbitrarily determine the "others", which might include minority and unwanted groups, which have nothing to do with the provoking hegemon. Thus, for instance, facing the mounting US military threat at the end of 2001, the anti-American sentiment within the Taliban regime was directed against the non-Phustun Afganis such as Hazaris, Tajiks and Uzbeks. And in the 1991 Gulf War, the anti-American sentiment within the Iraqi regime was directed against the Kurd minority. The next instigating factor to observe is the question of (in)justice.

#### Neoliberalism is a system imposed by rulers that makes sectors of the population economically worse off, and allows systemic and structural violence

Oksala 11 (Johanna, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project, Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, "Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality," *Constellations* Volume 18, No 3)

Some of the most important critics of neoliberalism have attempted to turn this argument around: they have sought to demonstrate the violence accompanying the spread of neoliberalism. Perhaps its most famous recent critic, Naomi Klein, argued in her bestseller *The Shock Doctrine2* that it is in fact the implementation of neoliberal policies around the globe that has been accompanied by the consistent use of terror – brutal coercion intended to shock the population into accepting the new economic and political order. According to Klein, neoliberal economic policies were always extremely unpopular as they inevitably made the most numerous sectors of the population economically worse off. This meant that they could not be implemented democratically as they would have never survived democratic election. They could only be imposed by repression and force.3The problem that both of these approaches have in common is, in my view, that they understand the connection between a certain type of governmental rationality and political violence as purely external. In both cases violence is seen as an instrumental means by which to consolidate political power. As Klein herself points out, the widespread use of terror is always an indication that the rulers are trying to impose a system – whether political, religious or economic – that has been rejected by large numbers of the people they are ruling.4 Regardless of whether this system is neoliberal, communist or something else, the same kind of violence can be, and has been, used as a means of imposing it. Extreme forms of political violence are understood as an instrument for redistributing power in a way that benefits certain sectors of the population – in the case of neoliberalism these include landowners, multinational corporations and political elites – while disadvantaging the majority. There is thus nothing in the specific rationality of neoliberalism as such – apart from its assumed unpopularity – that connects it with political violence. To put this another way, on the level of political ontology, there is no intrinsic or essential connection between neoliberalism as governmental rationality and political violence: the violence accompanying neoliberalism is instrumental and contingent.5 An alternative to such an instrumental understanding of political violence is to theorise the violence of neoliberalism as structural. Slavoj ˇ Ziˇzek has recently argued for a structural approach to political violence in his book *Violence*6: rather than focusing on concrete or “subjective violence,” we should look for the fundamental link between violence and politics on the level of objective, systemic or structural violence. ˇ Ziˇzek’s provocation is to accuse us of hypocricy: in combating subjective violence, we in fact, by the same gesture, commit “objective violence” that generates the very phenomenon that we attempt to eradicate. When we condemn obvious instances of subjective violence – killings and rapes perpetrated by soldiers against women and children, for example – we choose a hypocritical sentiment of moral outrage while remaining comfortably blind to the actual causes of this violence, its systemic aspects. We are enabling the political and economic system of advanced capitalism to operate smoothly by loudly protesting against its catastrophic consequences. While I strongly agree with ˇ Ziˇzek that any theoretical analysis of political violence cannot be limited to its most direct manifestations, I am unconvinced that the notion of objective violence can help us. According to ˇ Ziˇzek, objective violence refers to the violence inherent to the system itself: the violent consequences of the smooth functioning of the capitalist economic and political system. Objective violence is thus something specific and historical, but it nevertheless refers to a monolithic phenomenon. In the neoliberal capitalist society, objective violence incorporates, among other things, economic structures of exploitation, hunger and poverty, ecological decay, human misery, inadequate welfare systems and systemic inequality.7 The notion of objective violence thus functions as a broad abstraction that does not clarify the specific connections between neoliberalism and political violence, but obfuscates them further. Instead of posing a specific theoretical question about the links between forms of political violence and the rationality of neoliberal economic policy and practice it merges them in an indiscriminate totality. For this cluster of heterogenous elements to meaningfully denote a form of violence, it must furthermore heavily lean on our understanding and experience of subjective violence as individual bodily harm. The argument only works on the basis of an analogy: the harm caused to the environment and certain sectors of the population by advanced capitalism is analogous to the harm caused by physical violence to the body. It is destructive, disabling and unjust.

#### Neoliberalism causes violence through psychologically motivating the oppressed to kill as a “necessary evil”.

Smith 07 [Debra, School of Political and Social Inquiry, Monash University, “Terrorism and the Transformative Subject”, pg.23-25, September 2007, Accessed: 7/5/12] JDO

Published three years after Fromm’s Escape from Freedom, Karl Polanyi’s (2001) [1944] seminal text The Great Transformation also located the origins of Fascism in ill-conceived efforts to liberalise and globalise markets. For Polanyi (2001) [1944] the ruthless logic of the market artificially disconnected people’s economic activities from their social relations, destroying complex relationships of mutual obligation and undermining communal values. The logic underlying Polanyi’s argument develops from his historical observations of how, when left to the devices of free-market economics, society was subverted and altered due to the ‘disembedding’ of the economy from the rest of society. For Polanyi, the artificial divide which classical economic theory and practice creates between the economic realm and the rest of human social activity creates a tension which demands the assertion of protective measures, of which he understood Fascism to be a particularly repugnant expression. Therefore, Polanyi’s analysis suggests that market liberalism is not only conceptually flawed but is also inherently dangerous due to the unsustainable demands it makes on human beings to define themselves in anti-social (and therefore inhumane) economic terms. Indeed, alongside the ‘Great Transformation’ to Industrial society, Polanyi identified a second transformation which was more psychological in nature. In Polanyi’s (2001 [1944]:207) analysis, the appeal of Fascism could be understood as an *emotional* expression of the psychological transformations brought about by free market economics. Therefore, one way of conceptualising the impact of neoliberal globalisation on the human psyche and its relationship to contemporary terrorist violence is to give greater consideration to the role of emotions which act as the mediating force between the individual psyche and social structure. From this perspective, emotion is directly implicated in the terrorist’s attempt to influence their social and political environment. Indeed, interviews with terrorists and examinations of terrorist biographies suggest that feelings of anger, humiliation and frustration figure significantly in the process leading towards terrorist behaviour (For example see Post et al, 2003; Silke, 2003; Sageman, 2004; Fair and Shepherd, 2006). However, terrorists also strongly express ‘positive’ emotions such as love (of Allah and the *Ummah*), courage and admiration (Haidt, 2007). While ‘negative’ emotions may drive a person to seek out a path way for political action, the ‘positive’ emotions may be necessary for the moral justification and framing of a terrorist act. As Hoffman (1998: 131) and Horgan (2005: 16) have pointed out, terrorists rarely carry out acts of violence randomly. Also, along with Cooper (1976) they point out that terrorists often feel sympathy for their victims. Like a soldier in a conventional war, they see the killing as a ‘necessary evil’ in the service of a greater good.

#### Neoliberalism promotes categorizing violence by its cost-effectiveness

Oksala 11 (Johanna, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project, Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, "Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality," *Constellations* Volume 18, No 3)

Neoliberalism thus crucially maintains that all rational behavior – including violence – can be analysed through economic intelligibility and must pass through such an analysis in order for the market to function properly. To the extent that violence is a rational form of behavior its cost and profit can also be calculated, analysed and managed. In the neoliberal framework the essential question is not whether violence is wrong or unjust, because cost-benefit calculations and other market criteria form the framework for rendering it intelligible. Violence becomes invested with a culturally specific meaning – it is understood as a rational and strategic form of conduct, which responds systematically to modifications in the environmental variables, and is therefore susceptible to economic analysis. Foucault argues that for neoliberals there was no substantive definition of crime, for example. A crime was simply that which made the individual incur the risk of being sentenced to a penalty – whether it be for murder or a parking offence. If we consider the subject as homo economicus, the criminal is just another person who invests in an action, expects a profit from it, and accepts the risk of a loss. This means that the criminal system has, above all, to react to the supply of crime. Law enforcement should be a set of instruments of action, which on the market for crime opposes a negative demand for its supply. Crime is primarily understood as a set of risks that have to be managed: prevention and risk-spreading, such as through insurance, assume more importance than detection and correction.29 Penal policy must renounce the objective of the complete suppression and exhaustive nullification of crime. Certain forms of violence, such as domestic violence, must simply be tolerated as being relatively inexpensive and therefore disproportionately costly to remove completely. The objective must not be complete elimination, but a balance between the curves of supply and negative demand. The moral and political dimensions of violence are insignificant from an economic point of view and the policies designed to deal with violence must therefore be built around a strict cost-benefit analysis. Although state-violence as opposed to criminal violence has to be recognised as a form of political violence, it must also be subjected to rational and cost-effective management, and its criticism must be done in market terms. Foucault argues that in neoliberal analyses the general form of the market also becomes an instrument of discrimination in the debates with the administration. The criticism of public authorities is not just a political or juridical criticism, it is a market criticism: there is a permanent economic tribunal confronting government. He claims that faced with excessive governmental action, and in opposition to it, nineteenth century liberalism sought to establish an administrative jurisdiction that would enable the action of public authorities to be assessed in terms of right. Neoliberalism, on the other hand, sought to introduce a sort of economic tribunal that could assesses government action in strictly economic and market terms.30 The worrying consequence of this for critiques of state-violence is that in neoliberal governmentality the criterion for the legitimacy of state-violence becomes its cost-effectiveness.

#### Neoliberalism creates a system where the difference between the economic and social is eliminated.

Oksala 11 (Johanna, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project, Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, "Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality," *Constellations* Volume 18, No 3)

While state-violence thus remains an important political instrument for creating and maintaining the economic game in neoliberal governmentality, all other forms of violence are effectively divested of any political significance. Neoliberalism depoliticises violence by turning it into an economic rather than a political or moral issue. The interventionism introduced by the Ordoliberals translated into the primacy of the economic over the social and the political: neoliberalism was understood as a political rationality that attempted to bring the social and the political domain under economic rationality. The Chicago School took a step further in this direction in completely eliminating the difference between the social and the economic. It was characterised by its use of market-economy analyses to decipher relationships and phenomena, which were previously thought to belong not to the economic realm, but to the social or political realm. The economy was no longer one domain among others with its own particular rationality: it became the rationality of the entirety of human action. Foucault focuses on the work of Gary Becker, who formulated this most strongly by noting that any conduct that responded systematically to modification in the variables of the environment, “which accepts reality,” had to be susceptible to economic analysis.26 Becker’s ground-breaking work in economics demonstrated how a whole range of behaviour was rational from an economic perspective, including such phenomena as altruism and addiction that were generally understood as exceptions to purely economic interests. When economic rationality was defined broadly enough individuals always maximized their welfare as they conceived it: altruism, for example, maximised utility when the welfare of others was the person’s object of interest.27 *Homo economicus* was anyone who accepted reality: he or she was a fundamentally self-interested being who constantly made rational choices based on economic knowledge and the strict calculation of the necessary costs and desired benefits. The generalisation of the economic form of the market to the whole of society functioned effectively as a grid of intelligibility and a principle of decipherment for social relationships and individual behavior. This schema made it possible to reveal in non-economic processes, relations and behaviour a number of formal and intelligible relations. It became possible to generalise the economic form of the market throughout the social body, including relationships that were not conducted, and therefore not usually analysed through monetary exchanges.28

### Unethical

#### Neoliberal ethics result in possessive individualism in which the value of life is reduced to a commodity

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

As in all the preceding phases, this most recent radical expansion of the urban process has brought with it incredible transformations of lifestyle. Quality of urban life has become a commodity, as has the city itself, in a world where consumerism, tourism, cultural and knowledge-based industries have become major aspects of the urban political economy. The postmodernist penchant for encouraging the formation of market niches—in both consumer habits and cultural forms—surrounds the contemporary urban experience with an aura of freedom of choice, provided you have the money. Shopping malls, multiplexes and box stores proliferate, as do fast-food and artisanal market-places. We now have, as urban sociologist Sharon Zukin puts it, ‘pacification by cappuccino’. Even the incoherent, bland and monotonous suburban tract development that continues to dominate in many areas now gets its antidote in a ‘new urbanism’ movement that touts the sale of community and boutique lifestyles to fulfill urban dreams. This is a world in which the neoliberal ethic of intense possessive individualism, and its cognate of political withdrawal from collective forms of action, becomes the template for human socialization. [7] The defence of property values becomes of such paramount political interest that, as Mike Davis points out, the home-owner associations in the state of California become bastions of political reaction, if not of fragmented neighbourhood fascisms. [8] We increasingly live in divided and conflict-prone urban areas. In the past three decades, the neoliberal turn has restored class power to rich elites. Fourteen billionaires have emerged in Mexico since then, and in 2006 that country boasted the richest man on earth, Carlos Slim, at the same time as the incomes of the poor had either stagnated or diminished. The results are indelibly etched on the spatial forms of our cities, which increasingly consist of fortified fragments, gated communities and privatized public spaces kept under constant surveillance. In the developing world in particular, the city is splitting into different separated parts, with the apparent formation of many ‘microstates’. Wealthy neighbourhoods provided with all kinds of services, such as exclusive schools, golf courses, tennis courts and private police patrolling the area around the clock intertwine with illegal settlements where water is available only at public fountains, no sanitation system exists, electricity is pirated by a privileged few, the roads become mud streams whenever it rains, and where house-sharing is the norm. Each fragment appears to live and function autonomously, sticking firmly to what it has been able to grab in the daily fight for survival. [9] Under these conditions, ideals of urban identity, citizenship and belonging—already threatened by the spreading malaise of a neoliberal ethic—become much harder to sustain. Privatized redistribution through criminal activity threatens individual security at every turn, prompting popular demands for police suppression. Even the idea that the city might function as a collective body politic, a site within and from which progressive social movements might emanate, appears implausible. There are, however, urban social movements seeking to overcome isolation and reshape the city in a different image from that put forward by the developers, who are backed by finance, corporate capital and an increasingly entrepreneurially minded local state apparatus.

#### The profit-mongering system of neoliberalism strips humans of their rights to the city

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

The question of what kind of city we want cannot be divorced from that of what kind of social ties, relationship to nature, lifestyles, technologies and aesthetic values we desire. The right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city. It is, moreover, a common rather than an individual right since this transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization. The freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves is, I want to argue, one of the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights. From their inception, cities have arisen through geographical and social concentrations of a surplus product. Urbanization has always been, therefore, a class phenomenon, since surpluses are extracted from somewhere and from somebody, while the control over their disbursement typically lies in a few hands. This general situation persists under capitalism, of course; but since urbanization depends on the mobilization of a surplus product, an intimate connection emerges between the development of capitalism and urbanization.

#### Neoliberalism prevents the public from rightful ownership and ensures accumulation by dispossession

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

Urbanization, we may conclude, has played a crucial role in the absorption of capital surpluses, at ever increasing geographical scales, but at the price of burgeoning processes of creative destruction that have dispossessed the masses of any right to the city whatsoever. The planet as building site collides with the ‘planet of slums’. [16] Periodically this ends in revolt, as in Paris in 1871 or the US after the assassination of Martin Luther King in 1968. If, as seems likely, fiscal difficulties mount and the hitherto successful neoliberal, postmodernist and consumerist phase of capitalist surplus-absorption through urbanization is at an end and a broader crisis ensues, then the question arises: where is our 68 or, even more dramatically, our version of the Commune? As with the financial system, the answer is bound to be much more complex precisely because the urban process is now global in scope. Signs of rebellion are everywhere: the unrest in China and India is chronic, civil wars rage in Africa, Latin America is in ferment. Any of these revolts could become contagious. Unlike the fiscal system, however, the urban and peri-urban social movements of opposition, of which there are many around the world, are not tightly coupled; indeed most have no connection to each other. If they somehow did come together, what should they demand? The answer to the last question is simple enough in principle: greater democratic control over the production and utilization of the surplus. Since the urban process is a major channel of surplus use, establishing democratic management over its urban deployment constitutes the right to the city. Throughout capitalist history, some of the surplus value has been taxed, and in social-democratic phases the proportion at the state’s disposal rose significantly. The neoliberal project over the last thirty years has been oriented towards privatizing that control. The data for all OECD countries show, however, that the state’s portion of gross output has been roughly constant since the 1970s. [17] The main achievement of the neoliberal assault, then, has been to prevent the public share from expanding as it did in the 1960s. Neoliberalism has also created new systems of governance that integrate state and corporate interests, and through the application of money power, it has ensured that the disbursement of the surplus through the state apparatus favours corporate capital and the upper classes in shaping the urban process. Raising the proportion of the surplus held by the state will only have a positive impact if the state itself is brought back under democratic control.

### War

#### War is the flipped side of capitalism; it will exist in our society forever if we don’t reject the current system

Lago 6 (Alessandro Dal, 2006, “The Global State of War,” Ephemera, Volume: 6, p. 9-26, EBB)

Indeed, today more than ever, it is impossible to assume a clear distinction between national and foreign policy. And this not because of the loss of the nation states’ strength. Rather, it is due to the reorganisation of the nation states into constellations or coalitions, more or less variable, which intervene on the world scene for the purpose of supremacy. In other words, it is possible to re-translate Foucault’s (free) version of Clausewitz’s maxim with the following concept: world politics is the continuation of global warfare by other means. Fundamentally, the existence of a dimension of continuum can be established, even if it is clearly articulated, of war and world politics. 28 Foucault’s method allows us to be free of the prejudice that warfare is an anomaly, the detour from humanity’s straight and narrow walk, the emergence from an antiprogressive irrationality, the outbreak of obsolete drives and so on. 29 Naturally, there is something suggestive in these judgements – at least when placed at the individual level of combatant and the horrors he participates in. Yet things appear somewhat different when analysis includes military mechanisms and systems, and their relationship to politics and the global economy. In this case, war seems to be the other face of world politics, a system of options without alternatives, but complementary compared to the working of pacific governments. Since the end of the Cold War, military violence – as the imposition of political choice – has become a norm, a daily fact in the evolution of politics. Wars are therefore political in various measures, and aimed at heterogeneous objectives that are not always evident or completely clear within the apparent rationale which had to justify them. War for resources, war to solve the problem of local resistance, war to redefine the areas of influence. That some of these wars have not only not been declared, but also not considered such, simply implies that today the state of war is omnipresent. 30 And the point is that today the scale is planetary (in principle, each local war has an effect on the whole world), and has ripped asunder the Western ideology of marginalizing the role of war in asserting European-American culture. Liberal economic and democratic ideology, according to which the success of Western ‘values’ – economic wealth, political freedom, representative government, scientific and technological development – were the fruits of an intrinsically superior capacity, and not that of the result of wars over a couple of centuries, which had left millions of dead behind. The deletion of war and its normality from the Social Sciences, from Economic and Political theory, and from absolute Philosophy; the minimising of war in historic discussions as a change to diplomatic-political ‘game’. It would be interesting to proceed, in the footsteps of Michel Foucault and Aby Warburg, to an archaeology or a genealogy of the absence of war in the self-construction of Western thought. For the occasional intuitions of a Machiavelli or a Schmitt, the tortuous pacifist plans of Kant, Nietzsche’s thunderbolts – and even the splendid historic narrations by Foucault or Deleuze – are not sufficient to absolve the tradition of philosophy from the suspicion of connivance, from a silent approval of war.

#### Governments use wars as an excuse to impose neoliberal economic policy

Schwartz, founder of the College of Global Studies, 11 (Michael, “Military Neoliberalism: Endless War and Humanitarian Crisis in the Twenty-First Century”, Pg. 9, SD)

These analyses, bringing neoliberal reform into the full purview of military goals, provide a dynamic explanation for the overarching ideology expressed in the National Security Stategy enunciated by Presidents Bush and Obama. At the same time, it stays within the boundaries of previous analyses, which view of military action as extension of politics. The military role is to overthrow a sitting government and enable the establishment of a more congenial regime that could or would enact neoliberal economic reforms, among many others. In Dodge’s analysis—and that of others sharing his orientation—the military’s role remains one of ‘politics by other means.’ I will argue later that this role expanded during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars to include a more direct role of the military in enacting neoliberal reform.

### Environmental Destruction

#### Neoliberalism destroys the environment – the fixation on material wealth, use of resources and speedy results causes neglect of the environment

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 20-21, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

Second, the ecological reproduction crisis that Fordism had already conjured up is deepening. The primary fixation on accumulation of material wealth and the expansion of the use of resources as well as the emission of dangerous materials into the environment has further speeded up. While the highly developed countries have not changed their development model, other countries with large populations are waiting to take on this outdated development model. Worldwide, the number of cars will double by the year 2030, from currently almost 1 billion to 2 billion, if there is no reversal of policies. The attempt to find a technological solution to the rapid destruction of the natural foundations of human life without a revolution in the mode of production and way of life is completely impossible. Furthermore, finance market capitalism shortens the already short time horizon of capital valorisation to two years. Projects that go on longer than that are increasingly financed less. ‘Slimmed down’ states have had the possibilities of long-term comprehensive investment projects taken from them, while at the same time they still have to step into the breach opened up by the crisis and come up with answers. This leads to a general underinvestment in the renewal and development of the most important fields of social reproduction, particularly in education, culture, environment and heath. There is a reproduction crisis.

#### Neoliberalism Causes Warming Through Refusing Green Transportation

Farmer 09

(Stephanie, “Chicago's public transportation system: The contradictions of neoliberalism in the global city” pg 281)

The political and economic forces shaping public transportation policy is especially relevant as people have become more conscious of the environmental problems associated with the production of greenhouse gases, industrial pollution and natural resource scarcity. Transportation accounts for 25 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions in the United States. Due to an automobile centered transportation system and stand-alone suburban housing patterns per capita energy consumption in the U.S. is twice as high as the per capita energy consumption of the world’s second (Japan) and third (Germany) largest economies (Giddens, Duneier, and Appelbaum 2007). Transitioning to high density urban settlements and a rail and bus mass transit system will inevitably be a central component of the coming efforts to increase the energy efficiency and reduce the ecological destruction associated with capitalism in the United States. And yet, the current neoliberal politics of public transit reveal the challenges that confront those concerned with environmental problems. Investment in transportation alternatives is a time consuming and capital intensive task requiring enormous upfront investments and years of construction to complete. The response to environmental sustainability will be constrained by the current transportation system and configurations of political power in place at this time. Neoliberalism in particular and capitalism in general privilege short- term fixes that maximize profit making. These market principles stand in fundamental contradiction with ecological principles of long-term sustainability and conservation of scarce and finite resources.

#### Capitalism monetizes the biosphere, making it easy to exploit and destroy

Clark and York 5 (Brett and Richard, 2005, “Carbon metabolism: Global capitalism, climate change, and the biospheric rift,” Theory and Society, Volume: 34, p. 391, EBB)

The law of value remains central to understanding capitalism and the ecological crisis. 82 For Marx, “The earth . . . is active as an agent of production in the production of a use-value.” 83 But the value of a particular commodity under the capitalist system is measured in terms of abstract social labor. Any commodity’s value is determined by its socially necessary labor time. Value is put forward in opposition to land and labor, the “original sources of all wealth.” 84 For example, the value of oil is determined by the human labor embodied in the obtaining and processing of the oil and the capital invested in the operation. The value of oil has nothing to do with nature or natural cycles. A contradiction exists between the accumulation of value in the form of abstract social labor and value in the form of the accumulation of material processes. Under capitalism, money serves as the equivalent of value. It is the reiﬁcation of universal labor-time, “the product of universal alienation and of the suppression of all individual labour,” 85 and “a form of social existence separated from the natural existence of the commodity.” 86 Money mystiﬁes labor and nature. In exchange, the qualitative dimensions of social production are erased. “Money ‘solves,”’ Burkett notes, “the contradiction between the generality of value and the particularity of use values by abstracting from the qualitative differentiation of useful labor as conditioned by the material diversity of human and extra-human nature – the true sources of wealth.” 87 There is no drive to maintain the social metabolism in relation to the natural metabolism (a measure of sustainability) under capital. Capital cannot operate under conditions that require the reinvestment of capital into the maintenance of nature. Short-term proﬁts provide the immediate pulse of capitalism. Capital is dictated by the competition for the accumulation of wealth. 88 Money serves as a universal measure and means for international trade and aids capital in its international expansion, as it incorporates more people and nature into the global system. The monetary process comes to dominate the organization of the material processes of production. In this, capitalism successfully conquers the earth (including the atmosphere), taking its destructive ﬁeld of operation to the planetary level. The exploitation of nature is universalized, increasingly bringing all of nature within the sphere of the economy, subjecting it to the rationality of proﬁtability. 89 Capital is the systematic force organizing social production and driving industrialism to intensify the exploitation of nature. Given the logic of capital and its basic operations, the rift in the carbon cycle and global climate change are intrinsically tied to capitalism. In fact, the continued existence of capitalism guarantees the continuation of these events. “Short of human extinction, there is no sense in which capitalism can be relied upon to permanently ‘break down’ under the weight of its depletion and degradation of natural wealth.” 90 Numerous human activities contribute to the accumulation of CO2 and global climate change, including deforestation, desertiﬁcation, and expanded agricultural production, but the burning of fossil fuel is the primary source of greenhouse gases. 91 CO2 is the most abundant greenhouse gas. Society adds “carbon to the atmosphere at a level that is equal to about 7 percent of the natural carbon exchange of atmosphere and oceans.” 92 The increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases have contributed to the warming of the earth, making the mean global temperatures in the 1990s the “warmest ever recorded.” 93 Capitalism, organizing the social relations of commodity production, effectively plunders the historical stock of concentrated energy that has been removed from the biosphere only to transform and transfer this stored energy (coal, oil, and natural gas) from the recesses of the earth to the atmosphere in the form of CO2. In this, capitalism is disrupting the carbon cycle by adding CO2 to the atmosphere at an accelerating rate. At the same time, capital’s constant demand for energy necessitates the continual plundering of the earth for new reserves of fossil fuel. 94 With over 23 billion metric tons of CO2 released into the atmosphere per year, capitalist production is creating “waste emissions faster than natural systems can absorb them.” 95 As a result, CO2 is accumulating – as atmospheric waste – at alarming rates, warming the earth, and potentially causing dramatic climate change.

#### Capitalism disrupts the natural metabolic functions of nature through industrial growth and the commodification of land

Clark and York 5 (Brett and Richard, 2005, “Carbon metabolism: Global capitalism, climate change, and the biospheric rift,” Theory and Society, Volume: 34, p. 391, EBB)

The advent of Homo sapiens brought forth unprecedented social interactions with nature, which included the purposeful use of ﬁre. The anthropogenic burning of plants and trees released stored solar energy into the atmosphere. The ability to control ﬁre decreased human vulnerability to nature. Of course, it was not until the rise of capitalism, and especially the development of industrial capital, that anthropogenic CO2 emissions greatly expanded in scale, through the burning of coal and petroleum, exploiting the historic stock of energy that was stored deep in the earth and releasing it back into the atmosphere. As a result, the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere has increased dramatically, overwhelming the ability of natural sinks – which have also been disrupted by anthropogenic forces – to absorb the additional carbon and leading to climate change. To understand the rift in carbon metabolism, one needs to understand the forces that drive CO2 emissions. It is now widely recognized that humans alter the global climate “by interference with the natural ﬂows of energy through changes in atmospheric composition . . . . Global changes in atmospheric composition occur from anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide that results from the burning of fossil fuels and methane and nitrous oxide from multiple human activities.” 55 Much worse, “we have driven the Earth system from the tightly bounded domain of glacial-interglacial dynamics,” one that deﬁned the Earth system for over 400,000 years. 56 While not recognizing the potential dangers associated with increasing global temperatures, Arrhenius in 1896 noted that industrial operations were contributing to an increase of the CO2 in the natural world. 57 We know now that the quantity of CO2 in the atmosphere “has increased 31 percent since preindustrial times” and that “half of the increase has been since 1965.” 58 Yet relatively little research has considered the404 anthropogenic drivers of CO2 emissions or the systematic forces that organize social production and the release of CO2 in the process. 59 Often industrialism is identiﬁed as the principal factor behind global warming, but this position fails to recognize that industrialism is embedded within a particular global economic system. Understanding the forces and operations of capitalism is necessary for gaining perspective on how industrial social relations function as well as how the human-nature interchange under this system contributes to global climate change. This is not to say that other economic systems do not perpetrate and contribute to environmental degradation. Soviettype societies caused immense environmental deterioration, but this does not negate the importance and urgency of analyzing the social relations, operations, and development of capitalism since it is the political-economic system that is dominant in the world today. Environmental crises have existed throughout human history. 60 In fact, Moore argues that the birth of capitalism was pushed forward, in part, by environmental contradictions and crises in feudalism, namely a metabolic rift particular to the structure of feudal agricultural production. 61 His analysis advances by detailing how capitalist agricultural production continued to create a metabolic rift, but it found temporary relief through establishing a global economy, which increasingly incorporated the world into a metabolic rift of global proportions as agricultural goods (food and ﬁber) were transferred from colonies to European nations. Seeking endless accumulation of capital, agricultural practices were intensiﬁed, as land was consolidated into fewer hands. Foster, through an historical analysis of Liebig and Marx, documents the reemergence of a soil crisis in Europe in the 1800s. 62 Foster and Clark present how this soil crisis led to the global trade of guano to fertilize ﬁelds in Europe and eventually to the development of artiﬁcial fertilizers, which ever since have been used in larger quantities, despite the associated environmental problems that they create. 63

#### Capitalism breaks nature’s laws, establishes an unsustainable draw on the planet’s resources

Clark and York 5 (Brett and Richard, 2005, “Carbon metabolism: Global capitalism, climate change, and the biospheric rift,” Theory and Society, Volume: 34, p. 391, EBB)

Just as the expansion of capitalist agricultural production globalized the metabolic rift of the soil nutrient cycle, capitalist expansion pushed forward technological development that allowed industrial production to take place at ever-greater levels. Previous modes of production primarily lived and operated within the “solar-income constraint,” which involves using the immediate energy captured and provided by the sun. By mining the earth to remove stored energy (past plants and animals) to fuel machines of production, capitalist production has “broken the solar-income budget constraint, and this has thrown [society] out of ecological equilibrium with the rest of the biosphere.” 74 Daly warns that, as a result of these developments, natural cycles are overloaded and the “life-support services of nature are impaired” because of “too large a throughput from the human sector.” 75 The ability to take coal and petroleum from the earth accelerated the expansion of capital, releasing large quantities of CO2 into the atmosphere. This pattern, just as the rift in the soil nutrient cycle, continues, given the logic of capital. Ongoing capitalist development continues to dump CO2 into the atmosphere, placing greater demands upon the carbon cycle to metabolize this material. This uneven process only worsens, given the character of capital. To survive, capital must expand. It is engaged in a process of ceaseless expansion and constant motion. Schumpeter asserted that “capitalism is a process, stationary capitalism would be a contradictio in adjecto.” 76 Marx emphasized that capitalism is a dynamic economic system functioning by and for the accumulation of wealth: However, as representative of the general form of wealth – money – capital is the endless and limitless drive to go beyond its limiting barrier. Every boundary [Grenze] is and has to be a barrier [Schranke] for it. Else it would cease to be capital — money as self-reproductive. If ever it perceived a certain boundary not as a barrier, but became comfortable within it as a boundary, it would itself have declined from exchange value to use value, from the general form of wealth to a speciﬁc, substantial mode of the same. Capital as such creates a speciﬁc value because it cannot create an inﬁnite one all at once; but it is the constant movement to create more of the same. The quantitative boundary of the surplus value appears to it as a mere natural barrier, as a necessity which it constantly tries to violate and beyond which it constantly seeks to go. 77 The operation of the capitalist system is a constant struggle to transcend existing barriers, both social and natural (such as operating within the regulative laws of natural cycles), while at the same time it creates new barriers (such as natural limits and rifts in metabolic cycles), as the world is reshaped and reorganized in the pursuit of proﬁt. Given that capitalism operates globally, there is no natural conﬁnement or pressure to stop the ruin of ecosystems, short of global collapse. 78 Thus, the basic characteristic of capitalism “is that it is a system of self-expanding value in which accumulation of economic surplus – rooted in exploitation and given the force of law by competition – must occur on an ever-larger scale.” 79 The accumulation of capital remains the primary objective in capitalist economies. Sweezy perceptively described the accumulation process and its relationship to nature, in stating, a system driven by capital accumulation is one that never stands still, one that is forever changing, adopting new and discarding old methods of production and distribution, opening up new territories, subjecting to its purposes societies too weak to protect themselves. Caught up in this process of restless innovation and expansion, the system rides roughshod over even its own beneﬁciaries if they get in its way or fall by the roadside. As far as the natural environment is concerned, capitalism perceives it not as something to be cherished and enjoyed but as a means to the paramount ends of proﬁtmaking and still more capital accumulation. 80

#### Capitalism threatens planet by distancing us from nature

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

The current paradigm, that guides the construction of the contemporary world, can be summed up in one word: modernity. This was the result of a profound transformation of European society and culture that for centuries has defined its own paradigm. Undeniably, it represented an advance (Bolivar Echevarria, 2001). However, modernity was not a social abstraction that happened by chance or came out of nowhere. It concerned a collective way of life on the planet, with its material and social bases and its production of ideas. It became well established in history while, at the same time, through a dialectical process, manifesting its contradictions. The emancipation of the individual, human rights, the idea of democracy, the progress of science and its technological applications are some of its products. However, the hegemony of the capitalist market and the imposition of its laws reduced most of these advances to class privileges and colonial relationships that were brutally maintained for five centuries. A number of social struggles enabled some subordinate groups to share in the advantages of modernity, but without changing the paradigm. Now the latter, through its contradictions, has endangered the four fundamental elements for the collective life of humanity on the earth. Because of the distance that had developed between humans and nature, the modernity paradigm led to the overexploitation of nature: in other words, to the devastation of the source of life (Mother Earth). It gave birth to the capitalist market economy that, by its logic, invaded all aspects of life. In the political field the highly centralized Jacobin State resulted from this vision. In the cultural field, unbridled individualism was developed as an ethical necessity, together with the concept of the unlimited progress of humanity, living on an inexhaustible planet and capable of resolving its contradictions through science and technology. This model oriented the development model, including that of the socialist societies, of the XXth century.

#### Capitalism causes environmental degradation and climate change by alienation Mother Earth and falsely imagining infinite resources

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

Modern civilization with its strong control over nature, its high degree of urbanization, has made human beings forget that, at the last resort, they depend totally on nature for their lives. Climate change reminds us of this reality, sometimes in a very brutal way. It therefore means seeing nature, not as a planet to be exploited, nor as natural resources that can be reduced to the status of saleable commodities, but as the source of all life. As such, its capacity to regenerate itself physically and biologically has to be respected. This obviously entails a radical philosophical change. Any relationship with nature that is exclusively utilitarian must be questioned. Capitalism considers ecological damage as 'collateral' and inevitable – though perhaps to be reduced as far as possible; or, even worse, ecological damages are considered as ‘externalities’, since it is ignored in market calculations and consequently in the accumulation of capital. Some authors go much further, and question the anthropocentric bias of these perspectives, proposing new concepts like 'the right of nature', which the Brazilian theologian Leonardo Boff has defended in some of his writings. It was on this basis that the president of the UN General Assembly, Miguel D’Escoto, proposed, in his farewell speech in 2009, a Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth and of Mankind. The same Assembly had previously approved unanimously through the votes of 192 countries the adoption of a Mother Earth Day. It was rightly pointed out that the human being is a part of nature and that a dichotomy should not be set up between the two but rather a symbiosis. Different speakers, supporting this position, maintained that only a shallow anthropocentric attitude could consider the human being as the centre of the world, without taking into account other living beings, including the planet itself. This attitude is indeed having negative ecological effects that are becoming dramatically visible.

#### Capitalism is antithesis to indigenous culture, but diversity solves capitalism

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

Nevertheless it has to be admitted that, when confronted by the logic of capitalism, by development and the advances of urbanization, as well as by the attractions of mindless consumption, the great oriental philosophies and the traditions of the first nations are unable to resist. They are transforming themselves rapidly or even disappearing from the cultural scene, as has been the case with the ‘Asian Tigers’, in China and Vietnam, and also among the indigenous peoples of the American continent and the peoples of Africa. Neoliberalism is accentuating this phenomenon all over the world: it has been an individual and collective aspiration for many to participate in the values of the dominant culture. What happened among the subordinate classes of Europe and with Christianity – this being the first religion to be confronted with capitalism – is being repeated elsewhere. Ideological pollution is very real. However, traditional concepts are now once again being invoked, as tools for historical memory, cultural reconstruction and affirmation of identity, all of which can be very useful when questioning capitalist logic. There is a certain pride in being able to refer to historical cultures and in using its concepts to contribute to a process of social reconstruction, although there is always some danger of falling into a paralyzing fundamentalism, more oriented to the past than to the present. The references to Pacha Mama (Mother Earth) and the Sumak Kawsai (buen vivir) of the Quechua peoples and to the Suma Gamaña (living well together) of the Aymara peoples (Xavier Albó, 2010, 45-55) belong to these categories. These are two of the founding concepts of indigenous peoples which, in concrete historical conditions, signified a specific cosmovision and practices regarding respect for nature and for shared collective life. As such they can inspire contemporary thinking and social organization and can revitalize the symbol. However, success will depend on making the adjustments that will be necessary “in such a way”, as Diana Quiroga Suarez writes, “that the transformation provides an opportunity to combine the best of ancestral and modern wisdom, with knowledge and technology working in step with nature’s processes” (D. Quiroga Suarez, 2009, 107). This, obviously, does not mean questioning the necessary harmony between nature and the human species, or swallowing the capitalist concept of the exploitation of nature as a necessary by-product of the kind of development conceived as just endless material growth. Nor is it to deny the need to revise the philosophy of the relationship with nature which ignores other living species and the capacity of nature to restore its balance. Nor should we undervalue or marginalize the cultures that can offer a healthy critique of humanity, both in its exploitation, brought about by the logic of capitalism, and in the rampant individualism of the consumption model and all the other kinds of behaviour that go with it. Nevertheless it has to be acknowledged that different cultures do exist. If we try to describe the necessary change only in terms of symbolic thinking, representing the symbol as reality, this will come into collision with the cultures that have an analytical approach, and which place the causality of all phenomena into their specific categories, whether physical or social. At the present time the two cultures co-exist. The first comes with a wealth of expression that reflects the strength of the symbol and the importance of ideal, particularly as regards relations with nature. It brings with it truly practical elements, which can easily be translated into knowledge, behaviour and policies. But its cosmovision is difficult for an urban culture in any part of the world to assimilate. The second has clearly reduced itself to a mere practical rationality or even a pure ‘superstructure’ (the "cherry on the cake", as the French anthropologist Maurice Godelier puts it), thus reinforcing capitalist logic and contributing to extending it further, while also admittedly making possible a great advance in knowledge that is useful for resolving practical and political problems. It would be unwise, in fighting against the globalized capitalism that is leading humanity and the planet into disaster, to state one's case in only one cultural language. On the contrary, this is the moment to apply the principle of interculturalism in all its dimensions.

### Democracy

#### The destruction of democracy through Neoliberalism creates a divide between the few and the majority of the poor that imposes destruction of the environment, suffering by the poor, violent conflicts between classes, and benefits the “free” market at the expense of the majority.

Pramono 2 [Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 118-119, 2002, Accessed 7/2/2012] JDO

As such, the genocidal nature of neoliberalism is rooted in the closure (or fundamentalist) character of this paradigm. The closure was amplified in Fukuyama's claim that, by the end of the Cold War, human societies have reached "…the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (1989: 4, italic added). For him, final means the end of history. But what is it that actually comes to an end? It is the very liberalism that comes to an end. With the end of the Cold War, multilateral decisions in the global political economy are increasingly taken over by the autocracy of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. On the World Bank (which is also the case with the IMF), George and Sabelli (1994: 5) comment that "this supranational, non-democratic institution functions very much like the Church, in fact the medieval Church. It has a doctrine, a rigidly structured hierarchy preaching and imposing this doctrine and a quasi-religious mode of self-justification." Their decisions, which are at present largely unchallenged, and worse, must be implemented as a matter of faith, affect more than 80 percent of human beings on the planet. And their fundamentalist decisions that resulted in the dislocation of entire communities, displacement of peoples, destruction of environment, and concentration of wealth in the hand of few rich entrepreneurs, must be accepted by the poor majority as a necessary suffering for salvation of future lives (George and Sabelli, 1994; Stiglitz, 2002). Consequently, the good global governance, which the liberals initially want to attain by promoting international organizations, is undermined by neoclassical fundamentalism. Such fundamentalism, too, undermines democracy, which is a basic tenet of liberalism. Thus, it is contrary to Fukuyama's claim that "the state that emerges at the end of history is…democratic insofar as it exists only with the consent of the governed" (1989: 5). The fact is that Fukuyama's claim that "the state that emerges at the end of history is…democratic insofar as it exists only with the consent of the governed" (1989: 5). The fact is that Fukuyama's common marketization of the world is not a democratic choice, but an imposed truism that neither (developing) states or those governed by them have power or courage to refuse. It is not democratic because the World Bank and the IMF, which by custom or tacit agreement have always been headed by an American and a European respectively, represent the former colonisers of the developing world (i.e. the US for its policy in Latin America; and Europe for its past practices in Asia and Africa). It is not democratic because these global institutions' policies reflect the industrial and financial interests of the former colonisers. And these global institutions are anti-democracy, since the decision making process has always operated behind closed doors (Stiglitz, 2002). Democracy is thus a moribund concept. With the death of democracy, free market as one of the liberal tools to promote peace fails to ensure fair market. Most developed countries, particularly the US, seized the benefit of the free market at the expense of the developing world. A study by the World Bank showed that the income of peoples in Sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region in the world, shrank by more than 2 percent as a consequence of the free market (Stiglitz, 2002). The imposition of a free but unfair market has resulted in global discontent that led to (“new”) post-Cold War global conflicts. After all, the worst scenario is foreseen by Fukuyama: namely, the possible conflicts between "states still in history [eg, developing countries]… and those at the end of history [eg, developed countries]" (1989: 18). What he fails to foresee is the ongoing —increasingly violent— conflicts between the few, who are already at the end of history, and the majority of the poor, who are still in history, within developed (or developing) countries and without. The security failure thus clouds the liberal world.

#### The deregulation of public goods has lead to the perpetual attack of democracy and has unleashed the dehumanizing armies of capitalism that allow neoliberalism to wage its war on the public

Giroux, Global TV Network Chair in Communications at McMaster University in Canada, author of The Abandoned Generation: Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear, 2004 (Henry A., “Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-liberalism: making the political more pedagogical,” Policy Futures in Education, Volume: 2, p. 495 and 496, JS)

Neo-liberalism has become one of the most pervasive and dangerous ideologies of the twenty-first century. Its pervasiveness is evident not only in its unparalleled influence on the global economy, but also by its power to redefine the very nature of politics and sociality. Free-market fundamentalism rather than democratic idealism is now the driving force of economics and politics in most of the world. It is a market ideology driven not just by profits, but also by an ability to reproduce itself with such success that, to paraphrase Fred Jameson, it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of neo-liberal capitalism.[4] Wedded to the belief that the market should be the organizing principle for all political, social, and economic decisions, neo-liberalism wages an incessant attack on democracy, public goods, the welfare state, and non-commodified values. Under neo-liberalism, everything either is for sale or is plundered for profit: public lands are looted by logging companies and corporate ranchers; politicians willingly hand the public’s airwaves over to powerful broadcasters and large corporate interests without a dime going into the public trust; the environment is polluted and despoiled in the name of profit-making just as the government passes legislation to make it easier for corporations to do so; what public services have survived the Reagan–Bush era are gutted in order to lower the taxes of major corporations (or line their pockets through no-bid contracts, as in the infamous case of Halliburton); entire populations, especially those of color who are poor, are considered disposable; schools more closely resemble either jails or high-end shopping malls, depending on their clientele; and teachers are forced to get revenue for their schools by hawking everything from hamburgers to pizza parties. Under neo-liberalism, the state now makes a grim alignment with corporate capital and transnational corporations. Gone are the days when the state ‘assumed responsibility for a range of social needs’.[5] Instead, agencies of government now pursue a wide range of ‘“deregulations”, privatizations, and abdications of responsibility to the market and private philanthropy’.[6] Deregulation, in turn, promotes ‘widespread, systematic disinvestment in the nation’s basic productive capacity’.[7] As neo-liberal policies dominate politics and social life, the breathless rhetoric of the global victory of free-market rationality is invoked to cut public expenditures and undermine those non- commodified public spheres that serve as the repository for critical education, language, and publicintervention. Spewed forth by the mass media, right-wing intellectuals, religious fanatics, and politicians, neo-liberal ideology, with its merciless emphasis on deregulation and privatization, has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and social relations – particularly those public spheres where such values are learned and take root. Public services such as health care, childcare, public assistance, education, and transportation are now subject to the rules of the market. Social relations between parents and children, doctors and patients, and teachers and students are reduced to those of supplier and customer, just as the laws of market replace those non-commodified values capable of defending vital public goods and spheres. Forsaking the public good for the private good and hawking the needs of the corporate and private sector as the only source of sound investment, neo-liberal ideology produces, legitimates, and exacerbates the existence of persistent poverty, inadequate health care, racial apartheid in the inner cities, and the growing inequalities between the rich and the poor.[8] In its capacity to dehistoricize and naturalize such sweeping social change, as well as in its aggressive attempts to destroy all of the public spheres necessary for the defense of a genuine democracy, neo-liberalism reproduces the conditions for unleashing the most brutalizing forces of capitalism. Social Darwinism, with its brutalizing indifference to human suffering, has risen like a phoenix from the ashes of the nineteenth century and can now be seen in full display on most reality television programs and in the unfettered self-interest that now drives popular culture and fits so well with the spirit of neo-fascism. As social bonds are replaced by unadulterated materialism and narcissism, public concerns are now understood and experienced as utterly private miseries, except when offered up on The Jerry Springer Show as fodder for entertainment. Where public space – or its mass-mediated simulacrum – does exist, it is mainly used as a highly orchestrated and sensational confessional for private woes, a cut-throat game of winner takes all replacing more traditional forms of courtship as in Who Wants to Marry a Millionaire? or as an advertisement for crass consumerism, like MTV’s Cribs.

#### Current neoliberal policies destroy democracy through imperialistic and exclusionary justifications – only the plan solves through the enablement of all voices

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 29, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

The decisive condition for the emergence of a new economic order and way of life is the struggle for the democratisation of democracy. Today, democracy, this great achievement of the 20th century, has been debased to a mere facade of imperial claims to power, of the implementation of the imperative of an unleashed capital valorisation and of the protection of egotistical property claims. It has been transformed into an oligarchy of globally acting elites. The alternative to this is participatory democracy, in particular as it is developed in the context of the World Social Forum. The main features of a new participatory democracy are above all four directions of development: first, it involves the production of a universal public sphere, the assurance that all decisions are accessible to those who are affected by them, that there is the obligation to listen to them, to confront their criteria and their critiques. Second, democracy is only possible if it contributes to the development of the other in a way based on solidarity. This is the case above all for those who today have been touched by war, environmental destruction, failure of the state and lack of fundamental conditions for a self-determined life. Third, democracy requires immediately communal, regional and firm-based codetermination with a right to veto if one’s own essential needs are at stake. Fourth, democracy is only possible when people are not threatened by a lack of jobs, poverty in old age, lack of basic goods for a self-determined life, or war. Only when these four conditions are met is the delegation of power to others in any way responsible, for it is only then that it is not transformed into one’s own lack of power.

#### Neoliberalism has infiltrated our democracy and reified imperialist tendencies through the taking over of the political sphere and creation of a preventative security state

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 21-22, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

Fourth, democratisation after 1945 was based on the fact that the citizens, the overwhelming mass of the population, shared in the welfare state. The contradiction between the economic system and democracy was supposed to be at least defused. This social pact – at any rate only valid in a small minority of countries – was thrown away. The hopes of many people in the new national states freed from colonialism were often not realised. Even governments of the left have implemented economic programmes that are subjugated to the primacy of the global investors. Never before have there been so many free elections as today while at the same time the expectations attached to them of a social and economic development that corresponds to these interests have increasingly been followed by disappointment. This is also precisely the case in the European Union. There is a legitimation crisis of the political system, of representative democracy. Fifth, the four already noted crises create such great economic, social, cultural and political tensions in and between states and groups of states that violence necessarily increases. The answer to this at the moment has been a new armaments spiral and the growth of a preventative security state (Braml 2004). Armament expenditures have grown by around 50 per cent in the last decade, above all in the USA. They have not only created a latent civil war domestically (with the highest share of prisoners worldwide – 2.3 million in 2005, every tenth black man between 21 and 29 incarcerated at some point in his life) 3, but have also transformed the Cold War against the Soviet Union into a global civil war ‘against terror’, using military bases in 130 countries. They have built a network of illegal prisons and concentration camps, similar to what occurred in the heyday of the old imperialism. Worldwide, there are estimated to be many thousands of people who are held and tortured in such prisons. At the same time, an asymmetrical terrorist war against the dominance of the USA and the West has begun. Water, raw materials, access to the sea, migration, knowledge, capital, cultural identity – in neoliberalism, everything and anything becomes not only a commodity, but also cause of violent confrontations. With the globalisation of capital, violence has also been globalised. There is a security crisis. The five crises mentioned create high pressure to find alternatives. The five named crises of neoliberal finance market capitalism are the unstable foundation on which politics is undertaken. It is the relations of force between organised social movements, parties, elites and counterelites, states and interest groups, and their strategies, that determine on this basis the real development that takes place. The social costs of maintaining the stability of the system are growing. Resistance is increasing and the profits of neoliberal politics are going down. Along with this, the possibilities of deploying increased resources for crisis management are reduced as well. Feverishly, people are looking for ways out. The USA is confronted by the question of whether it is able to maintain the economic and political foundations of its global leading role or whether it will sink to the level of primus inter pares.

### Laundry Lists

#### The neoliberal crisis threatens millions of lives through ecological contradictions, wars, chaos, privatization, imperialism, racism and subjugation of the state to capitalism

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 16-18, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

The epoch-making experience of those who went through the hells of National Socialism and that of their affected contemporaries must be remembered. The bearable normality of the present in which we live, we who write about it differently from many about whom much is written, covers over the abysses that have opened up. The crisis of neoliberalism is no promisingly good news, but rather means immediately the threatening of the normal life of millions of humans. It can be transformed into an opportunity to stop the menacing accumulation of elements of a new catastrophe of global civilisation and thus to make sure that it does not become the origins of an unleashed barbarism. The probability of 21st century barbarism is now much greater than that of a 21st century society based on solidarity. For Hannah Arendt, it was the crisis of the long century between 1789 and 1914 in which liberalism rose to hegemony and asserted itself that brought forward the elements of total domination. For her, this capitalism thus fell into crisis because liberalism found no civilising answers to the central questions of its time and thus set free tendencies that offered solutions through decivilisation, promised certain groups advancement and power or at least a good income, appeared to have clear simple answers in the face of growing uncertainty and, instead of a demoralising degeneration of the social and political situation, proclaimed a great glorious uprising. 2 Two points in Hannah Arendt’s chosen approach are to be noted. On the one hand, it is often forgotten that social systems are indeed often dominated by a paradigm of reproduction (in the sense of a superstructure), but cannot be reduced to this. Thus the reproduction of contemporary finance capital, as we are currently experiencing, is dependent on statal-imperial support, closely linked to real estate ownership and the pension guarantees of many hundreds of millions of humans, strengthened and at the same time weakened by imperial wars, linked into strategies of state funds of global competitors, which cannot be separated from the ecological contradictions, and so forth. Reproduction is always mediated via ‘others’; it lives only by subjugating the other without, however, destroying it at the same time, making it its own without completely robbing it of its own power, using it without exhausting it. In order to endure this contradiction, capital must resort to crutches (Marx), to forms of socialisation that contradict it. It regularly brings forward in its reproduction elements that put it in question. Stability and fluidity belong together. Modern societies are societies on the edge of chaos. In this, there are the possibilities of regular changes but also the dangers of self-destruction. ‘From the beginning of modernity it has been a case of forcing the world to be different from what it is’ (Baumann 1996: 36). Its vanishing point is the future. Thus, however, the space is open in which new things – different, strangely, conflicting forms – are constituted. This occurs not only in the intermediate spaces and intermediate worlds, but also in the eye of the storm itself. The peaceful liberalism oriented to free trade gave birth to the robber imperialism out of which fascism grew, just as did the social state that is pregnant with the dominance of the social and socialism. Unleashed barbarism and humane civilisation were formed as elements, as seeds, as origins in the processing contradictions of capitalism. In times of crisis these elements could immediately be put together into entirely new totalities – into totalitarian fascisms, but maybe also into societies based on solidarity. Through transformations of conditions, through social, political and intellectual struggles, through wars and global competition, the contradictions of capitalist societies can be pushed in one or the other direction. They thus fall into disequilibrium. The search for solutions to the accumulating problems then becomes increasingly hectic. Ever more robbery, ever more privatisation, ever more armaments and wars, ever more subjugation of the state to the interests of financial market capitalism, or even the attempt to create a new stability through more social justice, renewal of the public sphere, common peaceful development, a politics of sustainability – both are possible. Natural as well as social systems fall time and again out of equilibrium; alternative situations become possible that promise new but very different equilibria. This creates points of bifurcation (Lorenz 1993), which can lead to new relatively stable situations or could flow into chaos (socially: into barbarism). The new either emerges out of the novel recombination of existing elements that emerged in the old, or it does not emerge at all. The transformation of parts leads to the transformation of the system. As the chaos theorist John Holland has formulated it, ‘in evolution it is not a case simply of creating a good animal, but rather of finding good building blocks that can be composed into good animals’ (cited in Waldrop 1993: 212). Allow us to translate these thoughts into the terms of the history of the 20th century: German National Socialism was the worst possible combination of the worst elements of the crisis of liberal capitalist societies that was possible before the invention of the atom bomb. The path of the social state under the leadership of Swedish social democracy was, on the other hand, one of the most humane and social attempts at the reorganisation of capitalist societies. National Socialism led bourgeois societies to the edge of self-destruction. The principle of appropriation, of conquest, of destruction, broke through all limits. The spirits that were called up in order to banish communism raised themselves up to masters that wanted to subjugate the world as a racist gang of thieves. This existential experience and the challenge by Soviet socialism as well as a strong left and workers’ movement were the elements above all that brought the ruling circle in the West to put strong fetters on capitalism after 1945. The ruling circle declared peace, full employment and social security to be their goal. Institutions were created that were supposed to secure the unity of economic and social as well as democratic parliamentary development under the domination of liberal elites. Among these were capital controls, rules for investments, fixed exchange rates, a strong public sector and strict labour legislation. This strategy for managing the crisis created in its turn, however, fundamental contradictions between, on the one hand, elements of social counter-power, planning and regulation, and expansion of public sectors; and, on the other, strong capital accumulation, which had made possible this Fordist welfare-state capitalism. Elements of very opposed directions of development amassed.

#### Neoliberalism causes violence, environmental degeneration, low quality of life, poverty, endemic unemployment, etc.

Slabbert and Ukpere 08 [Wilfred I. and Andre D., "Triumphant capitalism and the future of human, social and economic progress in the post-Cold War era" (2008). Business Papers and Reports. Paper 2. pg. 419-420, Accessed: 7/3/12] JDO

The UN estimated that the world labour force of 2.8 billion people in early 1990s included about 800 million unemployed (120 million of them ofﬁcially registered as such) and over 700 million underemployed (Simai, 1995; Scholte, 2000). Moreover, with the exception of the newly industrialised countries, most third world nations have experienced dismal shortages of opportunities for waged labour, and the end of centralised planning has also brought large-scale unemployment to most countries in transition (Scholte, 2000). On an international level it is the exception rather than the rule to identify companies which have not endured the traumas of retrenchment. Ultimately, retrenchments are self-destructive: buying power is eroded and products cannot be sold, leading to further retrenchments in order to maximise proﬁt (Slabbert, 1996). Capitalism is actually at another crossroad and possibly heading to another formidable crisis. How else could we describe a system that puts phenomenal wealth in the hands of few while a signiﬁcant number of earth’s inhabitants are left to freeze in the coldest element known to man-human indifference? Capitalism by its unnatural constraint on the free ﬂow of wealth decreases the quality of life for many people, while only increasing it for a few individuals (Kowalski, 2000). Furthermore, a momentary thought of the escalating problems of endemic unemployment (Martin and Schumann, 1997), low quality of work life, retrenchment and re-engineering, trans-national movement of fund and corporation, abrasion of state power, crimes and revolution (Kaplan, 2000), the vicious circle of poverty and economic suppressions (Econocides) (Slabbert, 2005), environmental degeneration and moral decadence, all of which are associated with the capitalist trans-national practices, presupposes a new opinion that is inevitable. Global capitalism appears to be running out of control towards some sort of abyss (Greider, 1997). It produces class polarisation. There are underprivileged individuals and groups in the ﬁrst world as well as the third world due to expanding capitalism (Sklair, 2002). Capitalism is indeed producing some calamitous problems for economic security (Scholte, 2000). However, Neo-liberals considered it “sensible politics” to be defending this social order which has degenerated into a kind of destructive madness, and continued to condemn any leftist contribution to ameliorating the crises as destructive utopianism.

### Racism

#### The structure of neoliberalism blames the poor if they are unable to find basic human services on their own

Davis 8 (Angela Y., Professor of History of Consciousness and Feminist Studies at U. C. Santa Cruz, “Recognizing Racism in the Era of Neoliberalism," Presented at Murdoch University in Western Australia, http://www.omi.wa.gov.au/resources/clearinghouse/Recognizing\_Racism\_in\_the\_Era\_of\_Neoliberalism\_davis.pdf.)

The question I want to explore in this talk then is this: how does the persistence of historical meanings of racism and its remedies prevent us from recognizing the complex ways in which racism clandestinely structures prevailing institutions, practices, and ideologies in this era of neoliberalism? Elizabeth Martinez, a legendary Civil Rights and Chicano movement activist, has pointed out, along with her collaborator Arnoldo Garcia of the National Network of Immigrant and Refugee Rights, that the new conditions that constitute neoliberalism and characterize economic development since the 1980s involve an almost total freedom of movement for capital, goods, and services – in other words, the absolute rule of the market. Public expenditures for social services have been drastically cut. There has been constant pressure for the elimination of government intervention and regulation of the market. Thus the privatization of gas and electricity, of healthcare, education and many other human services has emerged as the mode of increased profits for global corporations. Finally, Martinez and Garcia point out, the concept of the public good and the very concept of “community” are being eliminated to make way for the notion of “individual responsibility.” This results in “pressuring the poorest people in a society to find solutions to their lack of health care, education and social security all by themselves – then blaming them if they fail, as ‘lazy’ ”. I would add yet another point to this definition of neoliberalism: the flawed assumption that history does not matter. This idea, formulated by Francis Fukuyama as “The End of History,” also involves, as Dinesh D’Souza put it, “The End of Racism.” Both race and racism are profoundly historical. Thus if we discard biological and thus essentialist notions of “race” as fallacious, it would be erroneous to assume that we can also willfully extricate ourselves from histories of race and racism. Whether we acknowledge it or not, we continue to inhabit these histories, which help to constitute our social and psychic worlds. To recapitulate, neoliberalism sees the market as the very paradigm of freedom and democracy emerges as a synonym for capitalism, which has reemerged as the telos of history. In the official narratives of U.S. history, the historical victories of Civil Rights are dealt with as the final consolidation of democracy in the U.S., having relegating racism to the dustbin of history. The path toward the complete elimination of racism is represented in the neoliberalist discourse of colorblindness. Equality can only be achieved when the law, as well as individual subjects, become blind to race and fail to apprehend the material and ideological work that race continues to do.

#### Understanding the neoliberal rhetoric behind transportation infrastructure is key to solving race-based and class-based disparities

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

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 1168 S Farmer former neighborhood. Those not using Section 8 housing tended to move to the margins of the city's private housing marketöneighborhoods on the West and far South Sideö 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 revalorization 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 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 understanding of growing inequality and uneven geographic development of the neoliberal accumulation regime should include a public infrastructure dimension.

#### Status quo policy is currently neoliberal- cities are shifting into global city status deprioritizing and excluding the working class

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

One of the Central Area transit projects already making headway is the Circle Line new billion-dollar train line named after the proposed route that will form a 3 ^ 5 km circle around the Loop, thereby circumscribing the Central Area gentrified zone. The CTA has already realized the first of three stages towards the construction of the project and is working its way through the federal funding process for the next stage of the project. The Circle Line is one of the first CTA projects to be marketed to the public as an infrastructure project that would boost the global city status of Chicago: ``Greatly enhanced access between the expanding Central Area and the entire region would strengthen the region's position as a primary center of employment and commerce, while also increasing Chicago's competitiveness as a business location among world cities'' (CTA, 2002). According to the Circle Line Plan (CTA, 2002), the Circle Line will provide the already transit-rich residents living in the redeveloped neighborhoods surrounding downtown even more public transit access to entertainment spectacles (the Chicago Bulls' United Center and Chicago Bears' Soldier Field), luxury shopping (Clybourn Avenue and Michigan Avenue), art galleries (East Pilsen and Near West Side), and tourist destinations (Chinatown and Millennium Park). There is a significant auxiliary purpose of the Circle Line; CTA officials say that the Circle Line is not just about providing more service options but it will effectively redraw the downtown boundaries shown in figure 2. Planners hope it will serve as a catalyst for more private real estate development projects. In addition, since the Circle Line physically encases Central Area neighborhoods, the partitioning of space would likewise contribute to the symbolic exclusiveness of the Central Area. An alternative to the Circle Line for linking neighborhoods outside the Loop is the Mid-City Transitway, which has languished on the Chicago Area Transportation Study planning boards since 1990 (the planning body is now known as the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning). The original plans for the Mid-City Transitway proposed a new train line designed as a north ^ south route across the city's West Side, while not directly connecting to the Loop as depicted in figure 2. Unlike the Circle Line, the main beneficiaries of the Mid-City Transitway are residents of areas composed predominantly of working-class Black, Latino, and Polish communities who have less access to public rail transit than do residents living in the Central Area. The original estimated construction cost of the entire 35 km Mid-City Transitway would have been approximately the same as the construction cost of the 10 km of new track needed to complete the Circle Line (Chicago Area Transportation Study, 1998). Nonetheless, when the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan was released in 2003, the Mid-City Transitway was demoted behind the more recently conceived Central Area transit project (Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, 2003). Residents attempted to revive the Mid-City Transitway project as an alternative to the Circle Line at CTA public meetings attended by the author in 2009. Riders implored the CTA to shift the Circle Line route further west so as to include more areas of the city that have no immediate access to the train system. In their reconsideration of the Mid-City Transitway project, the CTA expanded the original plans to include an underground train connecting the Brown and Blue Lines in the north and then running the line south along the West Side. The inclusion of a new underground line inflated the cost estimate to nearly double the original estimate. The CTA then rejected the Mid-City Transitway as an alternative to the Circle Line, claiming the cost ^ benefit analysis (determined by the ratio of cost to future ridership estimates) favored the Circle Line. However, the CTA did not abandon the Mid-City Transitway altogether: though the CTA rejected heavy rail for the corridor, it is now pursuing a strategy of bus rapid transit for the Cicero Avenue corridor, in which one lane of Cicero Avenue will be converted into a dedicated bus lane. This alternative was deemed more economically efficient by the CTA cost ^ benefit metrics, but it also mimics a common development pattern identified in the environmental justice literature in which the path of light-rail or heavy-rail trains tends to be located adjacent to middle-class White neighborhoods while dedicated bus rapid transit, which tends to be slower and generates more air pollution than trains, tends to be developed for African-American, Latino, immigrant, and working-class communities (Boschken, 2002; Bullard and Johnson, 1997; Bullard et al, 2004; Nogrady and King, 2004). And yet, it is the logic of the market and the pattern of state investment that makes low-income and working-class communities more dependent on mass transportation services. For instance, in a 2004 study of Chicago's two largest grocery store chains, fifty three of the sixty three were located in predominantly White neighborhoods (Street, 2007). Another study of five modest-income Black neighborhoods in Chicago found that each had fewer than five bank branches, whereas middle-class White neighborhoods had more than fifteen bank branches (Street, 2007). Commercial sector disinvestment makes African-American, Latino, immigrant, and working-class communities more dependent on public transit to access the meager and dispersed services in their communities. Additionally, transit infrastructure has the potential to spawn transit joint development that can contribute to more economically viable communities (Cervero, 2004).

#### Capitalism creates a society that blames blacks and leads to racism

Reich ‘74 (Michael, Professor of Political Economy at U.C. Berkeley, Director at the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment at U.C. Berkeley, “The Economics of Racism," in D. Gordon, ed., Problems in Political Economy: an Urban Perspective, D.C. Heath, http://tomweston.net/ReichRacism.pdf.)

Once again, the results of this statistical test strongly confirm the hypothesis of our model. The racism variable is statistically significant in all the equations and has the predicted sign: a greater degree of racism results in lower unionization rates and greater degree of schooling inequality among whites. This empirical evidence again suggests that racism is in the economic interests of capitalists and other rich whites and against the economic interests of poor whites and white workers. However, a full assessment of the importance of racism for capitalism would probably conclude that the primary significance of racism is not strictly economic. The simple economics of racism does not explain why many workers seem to be so vehemently racist, when racism is not in their economic self-interest. In non-economic ways, racism helps to legitimize inequality, alienation, and powerlessness—legitimization that is necessary for the stability of the capitalist system as a whole. For example, many whites believe that welfare payments to blacks are a far more important factor in their taxes than is military spending. Through racism, poor whites come to believe that their poverty is caused by blacks who are willing to take away their jobs, and at lower wages, thus concealing the fact that a substantial amount of income inequality is inevitable in a capitalist society. Racism thus transfers the focus of whites' resentment towards blacks and away from capitalism. Racism also provides some psychological benefits to poor and working-class whites. For example, the opportunity to participate in another's oppression compensates for one's own misery. There is a parallel here to the subjugation of women in the family: after a day of alienating labor, the tired husband can compensate by oppressing his wife. Furthermore, not being at the bottom of the heap is some solace for an unsatisfying life; this argument was successfully used by the Southern oligarchy against poor whites allied with blacks in the interracial Populist movement of the late nineteenth century. Thus, racism is likely to take firm root in a society that breeds an individualistic and competitive ethos. In general, blacks provide a convenient and visible scapegoat for problems that actually derive from the institutions of capitalism. As long as building a real alternative to capitalism does not seem feasible to most whites, we can expect that identifiable and vulnerable scapegoats will prove functional to the status quo. These non-economic factors thus neatly dovetail with the economic aspects of racism discussed earlier in their mutual service to the perpetuation of capitalism.

### Poverty

#### **Neoliberalism perpetuates poverty through a cycle that supports the wealthy**

Venn 9

(Couze,Professor of Cultural Theory at Nottingham Trent University, “Neoliberal Political Economy, Biopolitics andColonialism,” Theory, Culture& Society, Vol. 26(6):206–233, Pg. 3)

To offset this reality, supporters of a mythical ‘laissez-faire’ system assert that the growth that liberal economies bring enables wealth to be shared around for the collective good, often referred to as the ‘trickle-down’ effect;2 a supplement of this view, inscribed in neoliberalism, is that the poor have only themselves to blame, because of their backwardness, underdevelopment or their inadequacies as economic subjects.3 This ‘grand narrative’ has its roots amongst the founders of laissez-faire liberalism like Adam Smith, who thought that an economy left to develop according to its ‘natural’ tendencies, without the distorting effects of state intervention, would not only reach equilibrium about the ‘just’ and ‘fair’ or ‘true’ price of commodities (a telling equivalence) but ensure the ‘mutual enrichment’ of both buyer and seller and benefit the society as a whole (Smith, 1812 [1776]: 352, 354). Many issues clamour for attention here, not only questions of principles and models of the nature of the economy, the sustainability of economies based on unending aggregate growth, the causes of poverty, but also questions about underlying discursive and non-discursive mechanisms, such as economic theories or banking practices that link the two in the form of dispositifs, that is, in the form of mechanisms that can be operationalized to achieve desired ends; there remains in the background the problem of imagining a just society and alternative socialities, a problem which raises fundamental ethical and ontological issues. The reconstruction of Foucault’s analysis of liberalism and biopolitics which this article is attempting does not have the scope to address all these issues, yet it is informed by two related propositions that cross them, namely, that poverty is the result of a process of the production of the poor, through mechanisms established for the transfer of wealth that creates the categories of rich and poor, and that economies, unless limited by circumscribing rules, operate as zero-sum games of winners and losers.

#### Neoliberal Policies Seek to Further Private Gains and Will Reject Social Gains

Ronald J. Daniels July 1996 (Ronald J. Daniels, LLM and JD from Yale University, BA from the University of Toronto, president of The Johns Hopkins University, Michael J. Trebilcock, The University of Toronto Law Journal, Vol. 46, No. 3. (Summer, 1996), pp. 375-426. pp. 402-404)

Another argument that is sometimes made for private sector financing of infrastructure projects, notwithstanding the higher cost of private sector capital, is that this serves an economic certification or verification function, and that projects will only proceed that have a positive net present value to the provider, whereas the public sector in selecting projects will not necessarily feel so constrained. This argument has only qualified force. Obviously, a private sector provider, in making his calculus, will be influenced only by private costs and benefits. Where monopolistic setting of user charges is possible, a project may have a positive net value to him even though its social value may be negative, once the dead-weight social losses are taken into account. In contrast, if user charges were to be constrained by regulation to marginal cost (ideally marginal social costs, including congestion and environmental externalities), given the high ratio of fixed to variable costs entailed in many infrastructure projects, revenues are unlikely to cover the costs of the project and to generate a positive net present value. A more complicated scheme of regulated prices, such as Ramsey prices, would permit price discrimination where prices are inversely related to elasticity of demand so that the marginal consumer is served, but average total costs are covered by charging inelastic demanders more than marginal costs. Thus, a private sector provider's judgment on the financial viability of a project is a useful check or discipline on a government's decision to proceed with such a project only if these pricing issues are clearly and appropriately resolved at the outset. Given that the government, albeit through negotiations with the private sector provider, will determine and administer these contractual or regulatory constraints on pricing, this to an important extent endogenizes government policy considerations in the private sector provider's calculus as to the economic viability of the project, and undermines this judgment as an independent second check on the social desirability of the project. Where a project is not to be financed entirely out of user fees, but partly or entirely from government operating subsidies, a private sector provider's judgment as to the financial viability of the project again is not an exogenous check on the government's decision to proceed with it, given that the government's decision over the nature and scale of the subsidies is endogenous to the private provider's calculus. Apart from the necessary relationship between the viability of the initial capital investment and subsequent options with respect to the pricing of services or the nature and size of government operating subsidies, a private sector provider's judgment about the financial viability of a project will reflect only private expected costs and benefits and not expected social costs and benefits. With many large infrastructure projects, there are likely to be significant positive and negative externalities, which will not be reflected in this private calculus, but which government agencies overseeing the project may wish to consider in judging the social viability of the project or in containing or compensating for these externalities through other policies. A private sector firm's willingness to privately finance an infrastructure project may reflect a disregard for negative externalities. Conversely, an unwillingness to privately finance such a project may simply reflect an inability to capture or charge for the benefits of positive externalities. In both cases the private financing decision may not be congruent with a social welfare calculus. Indeed, this is sometimes done with infrastructure. Presumably in this case, the government could simply enter into a management contract for a fixed term, probably accompanied by a lease of existing facilities for the same term, to a private sector provider chosen through a competitive tendering process in very much the way that Demsetz has argued is feasible in creating competition for natural monopoly markets. Several well-known problems present themselves with this option.54 First, if the infrastructure facility has monopoly features to it entailing some degree of market power on the part of the operator, the government faces a choice between, on the one hand, maximizing the sale price of the franchise by allowing the operator to charge monopoly prices to users or, on the other hand, soliciting bids not on the basis of the highest franchise price but the lowest contractually permitted set of user prices. Presumably the latter is the social ideal, in that it avoids the dead-weight losses associated with monopoly pricing, although it imposes a much more substantial burden on the public sector in reviewing and approving initial bids and monitoring adherence to price commitments thereafter and may have less attractive political properties than maximizing the franchise price. Under either form of competitive bidding, the winning bidder presumably has similar incentives to minimize costs over the period of the operating contract in order to maximize net profits. However, a major divergence between a private and social calculus in this respect relates to maintenance costs. Where the assets are long-lived, but the operating contract is of shorter duration, there are obvious incentives for the operator to skimp on maintenance or improvement costs where these will have little or no impact on the revenue stream until the post contract period. This problem could, of course, be solved by making the initial operating contract the same length as the expected life of the assets, thus fully internalizing both the costs and benefits of expenditures on maintenance, although not necessarily capital improvements, replacements, or facility expansion where returns can only be realized thereon beyond the term of the contract. In many cases involving largescale infrastructure, this internalization function may entail initial contracts of 50 or 60 years. Another advantage of integrating the design, construction, financing, and operating functions in these cases 53 Harold Demsetz 'Why Regulate Utilities?' (1968) 11 J. ofI,aw &Econ. 55. 54 For a review of these problems, see Keith Crocker and Scott Masters 'Regulation and Administered Contracts Revisited: Lessons from Transaction-Cost Economics for Public Utility Regulation' J. of Econ. (forthcoming). is that the private provider will have an incentive to minimize the lifecycle costs of the project. Where initial capital investments and ongoing maintenance are substitutes for one another, less initial capital investment results in higher subsequent maintenance and conversely. The optimal mix of the two functions is more likely to be selected by an integrated provider. However, technological uncertainties, uncertainties relating to market demand, and uncertainties relating to the durability or stability of surrounding government policies that may affect the costs or revenues generated by the project make these long-term contracts a much riskier proposition from the perspective of a private sector operator. In turn, the government will have committed itself for the life of the assets to a single operator, notwithstanding the possible subsequent emergence of superior operators. While the government may attempt, in a long-term operating contract, to specify all performance obligations of the operator, over a long-term contract these are very difficult to specify completely ex ante and in any event are likely to entail intensive and costly monitoring. Short-term contracts reduce some of these problems (the difficulty of anticipating all future contingencies) while exacerbating others (the incentive to degrade the assets, for example). Moreover, while there is at least the potential for periodic competitive retendering of the contract, as Williamson has pointed out, asset specificity - in this case, specialized human capital relating to the operation of a facility - may create considerable advantages for the incumbent at contract renewal junctures, and militate against the preservation of a competitive contracting environment.

#### A Neoliberal ideology of plenty downplays the massive effects of globalization on poverty

Heron, Manager of the Social Development, the Planning Institute of Jamaica, 3

(Taitu, “Human Agency in an Era of Neoliberal Globalization”, Pg. 4, SD)

Ideology is a force that affects human agency; and it is the strength of globalization that lies in its ideological influence in peoples' lives. If ideology has to do with social construction of ideas and their promulgation via various media in order to shape one's thinking in a particular direction; it definitely comes into play when one considers how globalization as model of development is promoted. Ideology is not necessarily completely true or false; rather its power lies in its manipulative capacity to obfuscate flawed social conditions, giving an illusory account of their rationale or function, in order to justify and win acceptance of them without protest or resistance in some form (Sypnowich 2001, p. 3). Poverty and inequality are increasingly being regarded as a normality that facilitates and “cradles the system of private capital accumulation and protects the system of capitalist property rights” (Watson 2000, p. 388). The ideological meta-narrative that is communicated is one of a plenty, where more is better and the general acceptance of the idea that each person has the same chance at prosperity. If one is poor, it is the inability of that person to take advantage of the opportunities offered to them by globalization. As such poverty and inequality therefore have no connection to the structural issues of concern for North–South relations such as trade regulations, financial flows, investment conditions, the power of transnational corporations, levels of indebtedness and the rights of workers. The role of international and political economic structures and interests as co-determinants to poverty and continuing inequality is not recognized.

#### Poverty has become so crushing that the poor sell their organs to meet the demand made by the wealthy

Heron, Manager of the Social Development the Planning Institute of Jamaica, 3

(Taitu, “Human Agency in an Era of Neoliberal Globalization”, Pg. 5, SD)

There is danger in an idea or group of ideas amounting to an ideology that seeks to reduce the value of human life to the facilitation and/or provision of materialist accumulation and not much else. This is aggressive-materialist tendency in the agency we see in globalization and some of the agents that have most of the decision-making and financial power over the leading and directing the process of globalization. Another way of looking at this aggressive-materialist expression of agency is to pay attention to the way it affects the agency of the poor. For instance, technological advancements in science and medicine have commodified nature and life forms and thus creating the possibility of cheating disability and postponing death for those who can afford it. It has created a ‘demand’ for vital body parts that can be bought and sold. There is a rising demand for kidneys in the global market; this demand is met from those among the poor in India, Turkey, Romania and the Philippines, who have run out of things to sell: fish are gone, coconuts are priced too low and the demand for unskilled labour is not as high as that for kidneys. Poor persons who have surrendered their agency in order to improve a situation end up being worse off because regular medical attention is required after kidney transplants which they can ill afford and end up neglecting in order to feed their families.

#### Neoliberal Globalization has led to the suicide of 250,000 Indians in just 16 years

CHRGJ and IHRC, Experts in global law and human rights abuse, 11

(Center for Human Rights and Global Justice and International Human Rights Clinic, 2011, “Every Thirty Minutes: Farmer Suicides, Human Rights, and the Agrarian Crisis in India”, New York University of Law, Page 1, SD)

It is estimated that more than a quarter of a million Indian farmers have committed suicide in the last 16 years—the largest wave of recorded suicides in human history. A great number of those affected are cash crop farmers, and cotton farmers in particular. In 2009 alone, the most recent year for which official figures are available, 17,638 farmers committed suicide—that’s one farmer every 30 minutes. While striking on their own, these figures considerably underestimate the actual number of farmer suicides taking place. Women, for example, are often excluded from farmer suicide statistics because most do not have title to land—a common prerequisite for being recognized as a farmer in official statistics and programs. This Report focuses on the human rights of Indian farmers and of the estimated 1.5 million surviving family members who have been affected by the farmer suicide crisis to date. Millions more continue to face the very problems that have driven so many to take their lives. The Report seeks to amplify the many voices calling on the Indian government to act now to put an end to this unmitigated disaster. Farmers in the western state of Maharashtra, for example, now address their suicide notes to the President and Prime Minister, in the hopes that their deaths may force the Indian government to remedy the conditions that have led so many farmers to take their own lives. Rachmandra Raut, who committed suicide in 2010, even went to the trouble of purchasing expensive official stamp paper and—in laying out the reasons for his despair to this official audience—cited two years of successive crop failure and harassment by bank employees attempting to recover his loans. These farmers and their families are among the victims of India’s longstanding agrarian crisis. Economic reforms and the opening of Indian agriculture to the global market over the past two decades have increased costs, while reducing yields and profits for many farmers, to the point of great financial and emotional distress. As a result, smallholder farmers are often trapped in a cycle of debt. During a bad year, money from the sale of the cotton crop might not cover even the initial cost of the inputs, let alone suffice to pay the usurious interest on loans or provide adequate food or necessities for the family. Often the only way out is to take on more loans and buy more inputs, which in turn can lead to even greater debt. Indebtedness is a major and proximate cause of farmer suicides in India. Many farmers, ironically, take their lives by ingesting the very pesticide they went into debt to purchase.

### Imperialism

#### Neoliberalism’s desire for hegemonic expansion will fail and only result in imperialist capitalism with its economically, socially and ecologically destructive tendencies which ultimately results in genocide

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 22-23, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

Postneoliberalism can have many faces. Analytically, four possible postneoliberal scenarios can be distinguished. 4 First, the temptation is great for the USA to want to react to the crises described with an aggressive extension of its dominance, if it is not too late. Nevertheless, it comes up against tight constraints: it could try to extend once again the speculative capital investment possibilities, but the current financial crisis and its own structural weaknesses and debts show the danger of such policies even for the Wall Street-FED complex. It could continue its policy of securing the shrinking raw material sources by military means, but the costs – as the Iraq war shows –are very high and weaken the claim of an empire to be acting in the name of global wellbeing. Furthermore, this only intensifies the global ecological crisis. 5 The ruling elites are tempted to promote the de-integration of the world, to mortgage all of Africa’s raw materials, to seal of further its own borders, just as the European Union is doing. At the same time, the destruction of American society itself continues, since the middle classes will become weaker and are threatened with collapse (hence also the frantic state-led actions to rescue the banks). Imperial dictate externally and free elections domestically in the context of a type of development that is viewed as a threat by the majority in their own land exhaust the institutional configuration of the USA. Additionally, the ‘war against terror’ has only heightened the threats and promoted the rise of competitors like China or India. If the former politics of the USA is continued, it will mean an accelerated accumulation of elements of barbarism in the USA itself and worldwide. The unleashing of capitalism will give rise to a further decivilisation. Already ‘terror suspects’, ‘poverty refugees’ on the high seas, the victims of ecological and social catastrophes as well as of state failures in the Third World have no human rights. They are similar to those who were made ‘stateless’ by National Socialism. These victims are still ‘collateral damage’ and there are no extermination camps. But there have been many steps taken in the direction of lawlessness. If this development is not stopped, there will be a barbarisation of unleashed imperialist capitalism, which will tip over into genocide.

### Extinction

#### The Neoliberal death drive through the mass destruction of others mirrors Nazism and Stalinism in its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market.

Santos 03 (Boaventura de Sousa, director of the Center for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra, EUROZINE, COLLECTIVE SUICIDE OR GLOBALIZATION FROM BELOW, <http://www.eurozine.com/article/2003-03-26-santos-en.html>)

Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war against Iraq and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, - and much more if the costs of reconstruction are added - enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years.

#### Capitalism’s assault on nature will cause human extinction

Clark and York 5 (Brett and Richard, 2005, “Carbon metabolism: Global capitalism, climate change, and the biospheric rift,” Theory and Society, Volume: 34, p. 391, EBB)

Capitalism drives this rift with the biosphere. It is an inherently expansionary system, in pursuit of the accumulation of capital on an ever-greater scale. Capitalism is unable to maintain a sustainable relationship with nature. As Marxist ecologists have argued, its operations and processes maintain the production cycle, while disrupting natural cycles, despite capitalism’s dependence on the natural world for its material operations. The theory of metabolic rift is able to account for how capitalism disrupts natural cycles, in relation to the accumulation of capital process. Capitalist production, despite advances in fuel efﬁciency and technological development, continues to draw upon stored energy, buried deep within the earth, only to pool this carbon back into the atmosphere in increasing quantities. It cannot surmount the Jevons paradox so long as the drive to accumulate operates. There is no natural containment of capitalist operations, short of human extinction. Natural limits are simply obstacles that capital attempts to transcend or work around, only to further the swath of environmental destruction. In this, capitalism undermines the conditions of the atmosphere by leading to the accumulation of carbon waste and the undermining of sinks through deforestation. Ultimately, capital operates as a disruptive force in the ability of the biosphere to sustain life in the long run. Life was an essential component in the creation of the biosphere and the conditions that allowed for further evolution of life forms. Humans, via capitalism, are engaged in a process that may cause irreversible climate change and undermine the ability of human civilization to survive, given the scale and degree of environment degradation. Just like the mending of the metabolic rift in the soil nutrient cycle, addressing the carbon rift will require a transformation in society. Marx contended that systematic change was necessary to repair the rift generated by capitalism. He argued that a society of “associated producers” could “govern the human metabolism with nature in a rational way, bringing it under their collective control instead of being dominated by it as a blind power; accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy and in conditions most worthy and appropriate for their human nature.” 135 Other economic systems, especially in the future, may or may not be inherently in conﬂict with nature. This remains to be seen. We do know that the rift in the carbon cycle continues to expand and deepen. Capital has robbed the global commons, which were used for the absorption of carbon, only to impoverish the future. Technological development cannot assist in mending the carbon rift until it is freed from the dictates of capital relations. Thus, changing the historical system offers the only possibility of slowing global climate change (and we state “slowing,” simply because we will inherit the legacy of carbon that has already accumulated in the biosphere). The planetary nature of climate change and the global reach of capitalism require that efforts to transcend these issues involve global cooperation. Otherwise, the biospheric rift will continue to expand as we race to the inferno.

### Economic Collapse

#### Neoliberalism destroys the economy – over accumulation causes stagnation and lack of real development. Redistribution to the public sector solves

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 19-20, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

A glaring problem arose in the centres of capitalism: the enormous advances in productivity would have made it necessary to redistribute a share of the profits in favour of wages and public services. If an exorbitantly high growth reached its limits, then it required a redistribution at the expense of capital or there would be ‘overaccumulation, long term growth weaknesses and stagnation’ (Huffschmid 2002: 122), or an expansion to the world markets. Capital would have needed to give up its predominance or to create new investment possibilities and to reduce the power of wageworkers and the welfare state. It went on the attack. Since the 1970s, the restictions on capital have been progressively lifted and a transformed institutional arrangement has been created. Its cornerstones are free currency exchange, free world trade and free capital circulation, a new division of labour (including within companies), extensive privatisation and weakening of the negotiation power of wage labour through flexibilisation, part-time labour, lower wage sectors as well as the dominance of short-term shareholder values. Finance funds with a short-term valorisation orientation, greater flexibility and enormous pressure potential have become the dominant controlling force (Windolf 2005: 20-57). The predominance of the USA gained a new foundation: global finance market capitalism has its institutional foundation in the US empire (Panitch; Gindin 2008: 17-47). This neoliberal developmental path is now in its turn in a very deep crisis. The question is whether it stays with the reparative measures of this new finance market capitalism or whether there have emerged forces to introduce fundamental transformations – in one or the other direction. First, the overaccumulation crisis has grown more acute. Only a part of capital could be invested productively, particularly in the new production capacities of the East Asian ‘tigers’ and China. On the other side of the destroyed levees, significant finance and debt bubbles were built up through the indebtedness of developing countries, in the hype of the so-called new economy, in the real estate market, in the life insurance sector, in the debt of the USA itself. There was an explosion of finance claims in property ownership that is not accompanied by by any real economic development. In 1980 the relation of global gross social product and financial assets was 1 : 1.2. By 2006, it had risen to 1 : 3.5. The realisation expectations and entitlements to returns linked to it became a threat to the real economy. Public funds will have to put in 2000 billion dollars in the USA alone in order to stop (perhaps) the latest crisis. Capital valorisation has grown to an extent never seen before in history through the institutional revolution of neoliberalism. It has created disproportions with real development that have not been seen on such a scale since 1928. Valorisation interests and developmental necessities are fundamentally opposed. There is a new overaccumulation crisis.

#### Neoliberalism is destroying the economy – oppression of the working class, increased imperialism, increased inequality, increased commodification, and economic decline prove. Put your capitalism good turns away, this isn’t regular capitalism

Kotz 3 (David M., Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, *Socialism and Global Neoliberal Capitalism*, Economics Department and Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, pg. 5-6, <http://people.umass.edu/dmkotz/Soc_and_Global_NL_Kism_03_03.pdf>, 2003, JKE)

In contrast to the earlier system of regulated, welfare-state capitalism, the current global neoliberal order has offered little in the way of benefits for the working class or other nonprivileged sectors. On the contrary, ordinary people have experienced worsening conditions in practically every aspect of their lives. These include the following: 1. Growing inequality within countries, with a small minority of the rich becoming rapidly richer while middle layers barely maintain their living standard and the majority experience a decline in living standard. 2. Growing inequality between countries, with a significant number of countries experiencing gradual or rapid economic decline. 3. Increasing insecurity among workers, small farmers, and small business. 4. Increasing instability in the economic and financial system. 5. Growing penetration of commercial values in every sphere of society. 6. Increasing direct and indirect domination by transnational corporations and wealthy individuals over states. 7. Mounting threats to the environmental sustainability of the economy and human society. 8. An increasingly open policy of aggressive imperialism by the leading capitalist powers, specifically the US and Britain, with the likelihood of increasing armed conflict in the world. The global neoliberal order has not just brought worsening conditions for ordinary people. It has also systematically disempowered them. Capitalism in every stage grants the major power in society to the capitalist class and its representatives. However, popular groups have historically fought for and exercised some power, though trade unions, political parties, representatives in national and local governments, and various non-governmental organizations. Neoliberalism tends to weaken and marginalize all of the institutions through which popular groups have previously had some voice, concentrating power in the giant transnational corporations and banks and the international institutions which represent them.

# Solvency

### Federal action key

#### Federal budget cuts fiscally constrains cities allowing neoliberal policies to be internalized into urban policy regimes

Brenner & Theodore 02 [Neil, Department of Sociology and Metropolitan Studies Program, New York University and Nik, Urban Planning and Policy Program and Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois at Chicago, Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism”, 2002,

[http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore\_](http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore_ citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf)

[citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf](http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore_ citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf)] TM

The preceding discussion underscored the ways in which the worldwide ascendancy of neoliberalism during the early 1980s was closely intertwined with a pervasive rescaling of capital-labor relations, intercapitalist competition, financial and monetary regulation, state power, the international configuration, and uneven development throughout the world economy. As the taken-for-granted primacy of the national scale has been undermined in each of these arenas, inherited formations of urban governance have likewise been reconfigured quite systematically throughout the older industrialized world. While the processes of institutional creative destruction associated with actually existing neoliberalism are clearly transpiring at all spatial scales, it can be argued that they are occurring with particular intensity at the urban scale, within major cities and city-regions. On the one hand, cities today are embedded within a highly uncertain geoeconomic environment characterized by monetary chaos, speculative movements of financial capital, global location strategies by major transnational corporations, and rapidly intensifying interlocality competition (Swyngedouw 1992b). In the context of this deepening “global-local disorder” (Peck and Tickell 1994), most local governments have been constrained—to some degree, independently of their political orientation and national context—to adjust to heightened levels of economic uncertainty by engaging in short-termist forms of interspatial competition, place-marketing, and regulatory undercutting in order to attract investments and jobs (Leitner and Sheppard 1998). Meanwhile, the retrenchment of national welfare state regimes and national intergovernmental systems has likewise imposed powerful new fiscal constraints upon cities, leading to major budgetary cuts during a period in which local social problems and conflicts have intensified in conjunction with rapid economic restructuring.On the other hand, in many cases, neoliberal programs have also been directly “interiorized” into urban policy regimes, as newly formed territorial alliances attempt to rejuvenate local economies through a shock treatment of deregulation, privatization, liberalization, and enhanced fiscal austerity. In this context, cities—including their suburban peripheries—have become increasingly important geographical targets and institutional laboratories for a variety of neoliberal policy experiments, from place-marketing, enterprise and empowerment zones, local tax abatements, urban development corporations, public– private partnerships, and new forms of local boosterism to workfare policies, property-redevelopment schemes, business-incubator projects, new strategies of social control, policing, and surveillance, and a host of other institutional modifications within the local and regional state apparatus. As the contributions to this volume indicate in detail, the overarching goal of such neoliberal urban policy experiments is to mobilize city space as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices. Table 2 schematically illustrates some of the many politico-institutional mechanisms through which neoliberal projects have been localized within North American and western European cities during the past two decades, distinguishing in turn their constituent (partially) destructive and (tendentially) creative moments. Table 2 is intended to provide a broad overview of the manifold ways in which contemporary processes of neoliberalization have affected the institutional geographies of cities throughout North America and Western Europe. For present purposes, two additional aspects of the processes of creative destruction depicted in the table deserve explication.

#### Neoliberalism is entrenched in the political dialogue behind infrastructure resulting in a realignment of social and spatial relations and increasing the marginalization of the poor and dispossessed- Engaging in the discourse is key to unmasking the system

Barney Warf, Association of American Geographers, Mar., 2003 (Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities, and the Urban Condition by Stephen Graham; Simon Marvin Review, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 93, No. 1, pp. 246-247) TM

Few issues shape urban form and city life more than infrastructure, which underpins the spaces and places of everyday life. Yet it is wondrous how little attention this topic has received from geographers. Indeed, the topic itself?so interesting in its own right?has been made invisible. Infrastructure has long been relegated to the sidelines of urban analysis, eliciting yawns of boredom from those who view it through the lens of technological determinism as an inert web of transportation and communications lines devoid of politics. Hidden from view, neglected in public policy, and ignored by academics, infrastructure consists of the veins and arteries that make urban space possible, the networks that facilitate the timespace compression of urbanity by shuttling people, goods, water, energy, waste, and information within and among cities. Yet this very invisibility itself is coming to an end, in part as skilled theorists such as Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin turn their gaze to the networks that make urban life possible, and dissect the radical changes in infrastructure provision that are unfolding worldwide. By now, the global triumph of neoliberalism is so wideranging and complete that few places or domains of social life lie outside its grasp. In what has become a familiar agenda from Sweden to Turkmenistan, privatization, deregulation, and the collapse of the welfare state are the dominant policies that define the boundaries and limitations of the state. Faith in the optimality of the market has become deeply ensconced in the political discourse of elites everywhere, and this logic is now being applied to the one domain long heralded as the definition of the public good-infrastructure. The result is a radical realignment of social and spatial relations, including new forms of planning, heightened connectivity to the global economy, and increasing marginalization of the poor and dispossessed. Graham and Marvin, whose 1996 book TelecommunU cations and the City earned widespread acclaim for embedding the spatiality of communications systems within political economy, aspire to more lofty analytical goals in this volume, and succeed admirably. They note that contrary to the dry, technical readings of infrastructure that dominate most discourse on this topic, in reality "[C]onfigurations of infrastructure networks are inevitably imbued with biased struggles for social, economic, ecological and political power" (p. 11). Their diverse empirical examples include the urban water supply in Guinea, the Brazilian telecommunications network, Robert Moses's famous Cross-Bronx Expressway, and electricity providers in France, all of which reflect different moments in the complex relations that suture power, space, and infrastructures in contingent and complicated ways. Whereas the implications of neoliberalism for urban planning have been widely explored, the parallel case of infrastructure the imposition of "free-market" logic on public goods has not received the same degree of scrutiny. Long managed through publicly owned and/or regulated monopolies, airports, utilities, telecommunications systems, and the like today are rapidly being broken up, privatized, and subjugated to market discipline. In the process, networks that once ensured a minimal degree of equality in access and service have become fragmented and splintered into myriads of specialized systems tailored to different groups of clients. The story Graham and Marvin tell begins with an analysis of how infrastructure underlay the formation of the modernist city in the late nineteenth century. As standardized road, sewer, electrical, water, and telephone lines were rolled out over the spaces ofthe urban West, the production, distribution, and consumption of these goods acquired the essential character of Fordist production. Such systems were fundamental to the widening of state power and the ideology of progress and modernity, and they sutured the various places within each city into a smoothly functioning whole; in the authors' words, "All spaces of the modern city were thus to be integrated by ubiquitous, democratically accessible and homogenous infrastructure grids, usually under public ownership or control" (p. 52). In neoclassical terms, infrastructures presumed the existence of natural monopolies in which large sunk costs and economies of scale could not sustain competition found in other markets. Instead, public goods would be defined on the basis of nonexcludability and universal service obligations, which, in turn, presumed state oversight, including price controls and cross subsidies among different groups of users. Inshort, modernity, comprehensive urban planning, and network intrastructures all presupposed one another, entangled as they were in the rationalization of space and consciousness simultaneously. The Fordist city itself derivative of and contributing to the Keynesian state, mass production and consumption, standardized housing, and the nuclear family came to exemplify the ideal spatial fix that minimized the periodic disruptions of twentieth century capitalism. This happy situation was not to last indefinitely, however. As we all know, the late twentieth century witnessed the simultaneous implosion of Fordism, Keynesianism, and modernism. As the postwar boom came to an end in the 1970s, the fruits of modernity withered on the vine, and infrastructures suffered through lack of sufficient reinvestment and maintenance. In its place, the flexible city substituted a highly privatized, segmented form of production and consumption tailored to specialized niche markets. The void created by the legitimation crisis in the public sector opened new opportunities for corporate capital to colonize another domain formerly dominated by the state, particularly the low-risk segments that could be detached from less profitable ones. The shift to market-based pricing systems rather than universal pricing generated obvious disadvantages for the poor. Such a maneuver also politicized, or at least made obvious, the politics of infrastructures that had been" the arcane and technical preserve ofthe civil engineer" (p. 102). This transition witnessed the abandonment of concepts of urban space predicated on assumptions that it was, or at least could be, unitary and coherent, and instead saw the birth of perspectives in which the city was decomposed into complex kaleidoscopes of different social and economic enclaves, polycentric metropoles, patchworks of growth and decline, smug gated communities, the forgotten underclass, and an ever-expanding suburban periphery. The volume does ample justice to the complexity of this topic; the authors are careful to avoid the simplistic binary oppositions that often plague analyses of urban life. The shift from integrated, publicly owned or regulated networks to privatized, unbundled ones involves a diversity of institutional configurations that range be? tween the completely public and the totally private. Private networks?water, electricity, telecommunications, gas, and transportation?can emerge out of public ones or be superimposed on top of them, can act as substitutes or rivals, and can serve different niche markets with varying degrees of bypass. Because profit is the guiding imperative of this process, the formation of an urban "archipelago economy" is the direct manifestation of social policies that facilitate the uncoupling of the wealthy from the public commonweal. The fluid, hypermobile networks of digital capitalism and the new geometries of centrality and peripherality that they generate intensify intraregional differences while aligning the most profitable spaces with the prerogatives of international markets and globalized chains of investment. These globalized nodes including not only the well-known examples of London, New York, and Tokyo but, increasingly, many second- and third-tier cities as well recapitulate all of the social inequalities that neoliberalism has generated and accentuated worldwide. In this light, the Internet and related networks are far removed from the emancipatory hyperbole of technological fetishists, but are revealed as mechanisms in the generation of a geography that is as dystopian as it is utopian. Enclaves as diverse as free ports, maquiladoras, export-processing zones, business parks, corporate citadels, technopoles, silicon alleys, multimedia corridors, and e-commerce distribution hubs all testify to the wave of social and spatial inequality that contemporary capitalism has generated in its wake. As wealthy elites ensconce themselves in gated communities, "privatopias," and new towns, social polarization and spatial segregation disfigure what remains of urban life. This notion lies at the core of "splintered urbanism," from which the book draws its title. Graham and Marvin's work also is important in that it includes infrastructures in the economically developing world, where formal networks may not exist or be shabbily maintained and where few resources or incentives exist to provide the requisite services. Because national contexts powerfully shape the privatization of infrastructure, the process is often different in economically less advantaged societies. The authors' case studies of cities such as Istanbul, Mumbai, Manila, Singapore, Johannesburg, and Jakarta shed light on how the "space of flows" marginalizes the exploding peripheries. For example, in Sao Paulo, some of the rich even commute by helicopter, jumping from one high-rise tower to another. In short, this volume is ideal for graduate courses in urban geography and sociology. Throughout, it offers challenging conceptual implications: breaking the "tyranny of spatial scale"; making explicit the spatial imaginary of a humanized alternative urbanism; and forming strategies for resisting the process of splintering, or at least mitigating its most atrocious consequences. As neoliberalism intensifies its class war against the poor, the homeless, and the socially marginal, geographers' understanding of and contributions to discourses that unmask this phenomenon become crucially important. I can think of no better representation of an informed, sophisticated, and erudite example of urban political economy at its very best.

#### A geopolitical strategy of interurban linkage that shifts political horizons away from the locality and into the USFG is key to challenging and dismantling institutional neoliberalism

Neil Brenner Department of Sociology and Metropolitan Studies Program, New York University and Nik Theodore Urban Planning and Policy Program and Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2002 (Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism” http://www.urbaneconomy.org/sites/default/files/Theodore\_citiesandactuallyexistingneoliberalism.pdf) TM

It would appear, then, that cities are not merely localized arenas in which broader global or national projects of neoliberal restructuring unfold. On the contrary, as all of the contributions to this volume indicate, cities have become increasingly central to the reproduction, mutation, and continual reconstitution of neoliberalism itself during the last two decades. Indeed, it might be argued that a marked urbanization of neoliberalism has been occurring during this period, as cities have become strategic targets for an increasingly broad range of neoliberal policy experiments, institutional innovations, and politicoideological projects. Under these conditions, cities have become the incubators for many of the major political and ideological strategies. Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism” 375 through which the dominance of neoliberalism is being maintained (see Smith this volume). The causes, trajectories, and ramifications of this urbanization of neoliberalism remain a matter of intense discussion and debate among critical geographers and other radical scholars. The contributions to this volume may therefore be interpreted on at least two different levels: first, as attempts to document the manifold ways in which cities have figured in the reproduction and transformation of neoliberalism; and second, as attempts to analyze the complex, confusing, and often highly contradictory implications of this ongoing neoliberalization of urban political-economic space. While the contributions represent a range of theoretical, thematic, and political perspectives, they share a common concern: to decode the leaner and meaner urban geographies that have emerged throughout the older industrialized world during the last three decades. It is hoped that such critical decodings may also, in some modest way, help open up new perspectives for imagining and ultimately implementing strategies for pushing back the current neoliberal offensive, both at the urban scale and beyond. At the present time, it remains to be seen whether the powerful contradictions inherent within the current urbanized formation of roll-out neoliberalism will provide openings for more progressive, radical democratic reappropriations of city space, or whether, by contrast, neoliberal agendas will be entrenched still further within the underlying institutional structures of urban governance. Should this latter outcome occur, we have every reason to anticipate the crystallization of still leaner and meaner urban geographies in which cities engage aggressively in mutually destructive place-marketing policies, in which transnational capital is permitted to opt out from supporting local social reproduction, and in which the power of urban citizens to influence the basic conditions of their everyday lives is increasingly undermined. As we contemplate this rather grim scenario of a neoliberalized urban authoritarianism, Harvey’s (1989:16) suggestion from over a decade ago remains as urgently relevant as ever to contemporary struggles to work towards alternative urban futures, grounded upon the priorities of radical democracy, social justice, and grassroots empowerment: The problem is to devise a geopolitical strategy of interurban linkage that mitigates interurban competition and shifts political horizons away from the locality and into a more generalisable challenge to capitalist uneven development … [A] critical perspective on urban entrepreneurialism indicates not only its negative impacts but its potentiality for transformation into a progressive urban corporatism, armed with a keen geopolitical sense of how to build alliances and linkages across space in such a way as to mitigate if not challenge the hegemonic dynamic of capitalist accumulation to dominate the historical geography of social life.

#### **Federal rollback of support leads to neoliberalization and institutional restructuring of cities in favor of market-oriented economic growth and elite consumption practices**

Stephanie Farmer, Department of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2010 (Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA; Environment and Planning A, volume 43, pages 1154 ^ 1172) TM

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. Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago 1155 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. Entrepreneurial 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, 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).

### Must start in transportation

#### **Transportation is the force behind social relations as we know it today**

Tim Cresswell, 2011 (“Towards a Politics of Mobility”, human geographer at the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author of four books on the role of space and mobility in cultural life. <http://www.africancitiesreader.org.za/reader/chapters/026_TowardsaPoliticsofMobility.pdf>, EP)

By politics I mean social relations that involve the production and distribution of power. By a politics of mobility I mean the ways in which mobilities are both productive of such social relations and produced by them. Social relations are of course complicated and diverse. They include relations between classes, genders, ethnicities, nationalities and religious groups, as well as a host of other forms of group identity. Mobility, as with other geographical phenomena, lies at the heart of all of these. Mobility is a resource that is differentially accessed. One person’s speed is another person’s slowness. Some move in such a way that others get fixed in place. Examples of this abound. Consider the school run that allows women (for the most part) to enact an efficient form of mobility so often denied them. At the same time it impacts on the ability of children to walk to school and makes the streets less safe for pedestrians. There is little that is straightforward about such an entanglement of gender, age and mobility. Consider the opening up of borders in the European Union to enable the enactment of the EU mantra of free mobility. This in turn depends on the closing down of mobilities at the borders (often airports) of the new Europe (Balibar 2004; Verstraete 2001). Speeds, slownesses and immobilities are all related in ways that are thoroughly infused with power and its distribution. This politics of mobility is enriched if we think about it in terms of material movement, representation and practice. There is clearly a politics to material movement. Who moves furthest? Who moves fastest? Who moves most often? These are all important components of the politics of mobility that can be answered in part by the traditional approaches of transport studies. But this is only the beginning. There is also a politics of representation. How is mobility discursively constituted? What narratives have been constructed about mobility? How are mobilities represented? Some of the foundational narratives of modernity have been constructed around the brute fact of moving – mobility as liberty and mobility as progress. Everyday language reveals some of the meanings that accompany the idea of movement. We are always trying to get somewhere. No one wants to be stuck or bogged down. These stories appear everywhere from car advertisements to political economic theory

#### **Transportation is key- we can break down walls**

Tim Cresswell, 2011 (“Towards a Politics of Mobility”, human geographer at the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author of four books on the role of space and mobility in cultural life. <http://www.africancitiesreader.org.za/reader/chapters/026_TowardsaPoliticsofMobility.pdf>, EP)

The purpose of this paper is to raise a series of questions about the new mobilities paradigm and to suggest some ways in which a mobilities approach can develop. I have suggested two caveats it is necessary to take on board in contemporary mobility research. One is an awareness of the mobilities of the past. Much that passes for mobilities research has a flavour of technophilia and the love of the new about it. In this formulation it is the current that is mobile, whereas the past was more fixed.Taking a look back into history, consider the role of the medieval vagrant in the constitution of contemporary mobilities. It was the presence of these masterless men that prompted the invention of new forms of surveillance and identity documentation that form the basis for what is going on today in airports and at national borders (Bauman 1987; Groebner 2007). The figure of the vagabond, very much a mobile subject of 15th-century Europe, still moves through the patterns, representations and practices of mobility in the present day (Cresswell 2010). We cannot understand new mobilities, then, without understanding old mobilities. Thinking of mobilities in terms of constellations of movements, representations and practices helps us avoid historical amnesia when thinking about mobility. Reflecting Raymond Williams’s (1977) notions of emerging, dominant and residual traditions that work to shape cultural formations, we can think of constellations of mobility similarly. Elements of the past exist in the present, just as elements of the future surround us. The second caveat is that, in addition to being aware of continuities with the past that make contemporary mobilities intelligible, we need to keep notions of fixity, stasis and immobility in mind. Although there is a temptation to think of a mobile world as something that replaces a world of fixities, we need to constantly consider the politics of obduracy, fixity and friction. The dromological exists alongside the topological and the topographical. Finally, in addition to recognising the importance of historical constellations of mobility in understanding the present, mobility itself can be fine tuned through considering its more specific aspects, each of which has its own politics and each of which is implicated in the constitution of kinetic hierarchies in particular times and places.

#### All forms of transportation have become undoubtedly part of “social and cultural dimensions”

Tim Cresswell, 2011 (“Towards a Politics of Mobility”, Human geographer at the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author of four books on the role of space and mobility in cultural life. <http://www.africancitiesreader.org.za/reader/chapters/026_TowardsaPoliticsofMobility.pdf>, pg 162, EP)

Getting from A to B can be very different depending on how the body moves. Any consideration of mobility has to include the kinds of things people do when they move in various ways. Walking, dancing, driving, flying, running and sailing – practices such as these have played important roles in the construction of social and cultural theory, philosophy and fiction. Take walking, for instance. We can think of the way Michel de Certeau uses walking to examine the spatial grammar of the city that provides a preconstructed stage for the cunning tactics of the walk:The long poem of walking manipulates spatial organizations, no matter how panoptic they may be: it is neither foreign to them (it can take place only within them) nor in conformity with them (it does not receive its identity from them). It creates shadows and ambiguities within them. (1984: 101) This story about walking replicates a number of literatures in which the walker is held forth as an exemplar of rebellion, freedom, and agency in the city – the pedestrian hero (Berman 1988) or the flâneur (Tester 1994). Practices are not just ways of getting from A to B; they are, at least partially, discursively constituted. The possibility of walking is wrapped up in narratives of worthiness, morality and aesthetics that constantly contrast it with more mechanised forms of movement that are represented as less authentic, less worthy and less ethical (Thrift 2004). And it matters where walking happens – the walk in 19th-century Paris is very different from the walk in rural Mali or the walk in the contemporary British countryside.In addition to being a traceable and mapable physical movement which is encoded through representation, walking is also an embodied practice that we experience in ways that are not wholly accounted for by either their objective dimensions or their social and culture dimensions. Here the approaches of both phenomenological inquiry and forms of non-representational theory give insight into the walking experience (Ingold 2004; Wylie 2005). Similar sets of observations can be made about all forms of mobility – they have a physical reality, they are encoded culturally and socially and they are experienced through practice. Importantly, both forms and aspects of mobility are political – they are implicated in the production of power and relations of domination.

### Fare Free Good

#### Free mass transit represents a site to close the gap between the racial, social, and culturally marginalized individuals and areas

Schein, 2011 (Assistant Prof Human Rights –The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011, Rebecca. "Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing thePolitical Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign", Alternate Routes volume http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421)

Riders rarely think about rising “fare-box recovery ratios,” but few have failed to notice that fares have increased from $1.10 in 1991 to $3.00 in 2010—the last fare-hike in January 2010 arriving in the context of high unemployment and rising demand for emergency food and shelter services in the city. The fare-box recov- ery ratio represents a rough quantification of the efficiency with which neoliberal governments have divested from the public sphere and downloaded costs to the most vulnerable individuals. The failure to invest seriously in mass transit in recent decades has meant, moreover, that many Toronto residents outside the downtown core pay high fares for service that is inconvenient and inefficient. While the oper- ating subsidies that support other transit systems reflect an understanding of mass transit as a public good, yielding benefits to entire communities and ecosystems, Toronto’s system increasingly treats transit as a commodity, consumed and paid for by individual riders. The funding structure of Toronto’s transit system is effectively a form of regressive taxation: although all of Toronto’s residents benefit from transit infrastructure—including the car-owners who never ride a bus—our “public” sys- tem is funded disproportionately out of the pockets of the low- and middle-income people who rely on mass transportation in their daily lives. The demand for free and accessible public transit has the potential not only to develop into a broad-based movement, but also to drive the development of the new kind of organization that the Assembly aspires to become. The Assembly is com- mitted to its call for the outright abolition of transit fares, not merely a fare-freeze or fare-reduction. What is exciting to me about the free transit campaign is that the expression of a radical anti-capitalist principle—the outright de-commodification of public goods and services—actually serves in this instance to invite rather than foreclose genuine political dialogue about values, tactics, and strategies. While still in its early stages, the free transit campaign is already pushing us to elaborate both analytical and strategic links between commodification, environmental justice, the limits and capacities of public sector unions, and the interlocking forms of exclu- sion faced by people marginalized by poverty, racism, immigration status, or dis- ability. Free transit could represent a site of convergence between many distinct activist circles in the city and foster greater integration and collaboration between environmental advocacy, anti-poverty work, and diverse human rights organiza- tions. If the free transit campaign does succeed in bringing diverse and distinct activist cultures into conversation with each other, it will force the Assembly to grapple with strategic questions about its relationship to less radical organizations in the city. Given the marginalization and isolation that have long plagued leftist groups in Toronto and elsewhere, this should be a welcome challenge, particularly if the Assembly hopes to become an effective left pole in a broad alliance. Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is the concreteness of vi- sion. Within the left, efforts to elaborate a broad anti-capitalist vision too often run aground at the level of abstractions, generalities, and platitudes. Most Toronto residents would draw a blank if asked to “imagine a world without capitalism,” but what Torontonian who has ever waited for a bus can’t begin to imagine an alternate future for the city, built on the backbone of a fully public mass transit system? The invitation to imagine free transit is an invitation for transit riders to imagine them- selves not simply as consumers of a commodity, but as members of a public entitled to participate in conversations about the kind of city they want to live in. Without devolving into abstract and alienating debates over the meaning of, say, socialism, the call for free transit invokes the things we value: vibrant neighbourhoods; clean air and water; participatory politics; equitable distribution of resources; public space where we are free to speak, gather, play, create, and organize. Even the most skeptical response to the idea of free transit—“how will you fund it?”—is the opening of a productive conversation about taxation and control over public resources. The call for free transit can effectively open a space for an unscripted political dialogue about the meaning of fair taxation, public goods, collective priorities, and public accountability for resource allocation. But perhaps more fundamentally, the free transit campaign is a rare example of a political project on the left that is not reactive, defensive, nostalgic, or alarmist, but hopeful, proactive, and forward-looking. “Crisis talk” is pervasive in much of contemporary culture, but in left circles, it has become difficult to imagine a mode of organizing that is not oriented around predicting or responding to punctuated calamities of various kinds—whether a financial meltdown, an un/natural disaster, the latest wave of layoffs and service cuts, or the systematic violation of basic civil liberties on a weekend in downtown Toronto. In the case of free transit, however, we are free to move ahead with the campaign on our own timeline, to seek out and develop the kinds of relationships and democratic spaces that are necessary to sustain grassroots movements over the long term. For the Assembly, this will mean having the space and time to realistically assess its own capacities and to organically develop its own strategies and priorities. The Assembly does not have modest ambitions: it hopes to nurture a broad- based anti-capitalist movement and to vitalize a new working class politics (Rosen- feld & Fanelli, 2010; Dealy, 2010). Its members are, I think, tired of listening to militant rhetoric unanchored to any genuine hope of winning. The push for an excellent, fully public and accessible transit system is a radical demand with im- mense popular appeal, an ambitious, long-range goal for which clear, achievable interim political victories are possible along the way. Free transit is not a crazy idea. Arguments in favour of free transit have surfaced sporadically in Toronto over the The Keynesian Revival: a Marxian Critique 119 120 Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research years, whether in an editorial by CAW economist Jim Stanford in The Globe and Mail or in a CBC interview with Deborah Cowen, a professor of geography at the University of Toronto (Stanford, 2005; Cowen, 2010). Some cities already have free transit systems, and many have partially free systems—in the downtown core, dur- ing holiday seasons or off-peak hours, or on “spare the air” days when smog levels are high. But in Toronto there has not yet been an initiative focused on building a broad-based movement dedicated to the eventual abolition of transit fares in the name of social, economic, and environmental justice. Without abandoning or compromising its radicalism, the Assembly can push for concrete steps in the direction of de-commodified transit and build productive relationships with individuals and organizations who do not necessarily identify themselves as anti-capitalist. It will be in the process of pushing for interim reforms along the way to a de-commodified transit system that the Assembly will most need to articulate its political principles and its analysis of the spatialization of race and class in Toronto. Free transit in the downtown core may, for instance, be good for Toronto’s tourism industry, but will it benefit the immigrant and working class communities in transit-poor areas of the inner suburbs, who spend proportionately more of their income to access poorer quality services than those available down- town? Proposals to pay for free transit through suburban road tolls will similarly hit hardest those working class communities whose neighbourhoods are so un- derserved by transit that they have no choice but to drive into the city for work. The process of developing interim priorities will not, in other words, postpone the challenge of articulating and popularizing a class-based and anti-racist argument for public infrastructure. Instead, the Assembly will be forced to pursue its most radical aspirations by cultivating a sustained dialogue about the interim remedies and strategies that will both address real needs in our communities and help build a broad-based movement over the long term. It will be through this process of dialogue, I hope, that a new articulation of a politicized working class identity might emerge. Our earliest discussions of the free transit campaign are already pushing us to think about the social complexities that will need to be navigated if we are to build an effective free transit movement. Success will depend on our capacity to carve out and sustain a space for dialogue and negotiation among transit workers and riders, within unions, and across neigh- bourhoods and communities that have been unevenly affected by fare hikes and inadequate services. Questions of tactics and strategy cannot be divorced from the process of identifying, developing, and strengthening the complex connections between the people who need and use public goods and services and the work- ers who provide them. We will need to recognize the different ways in which our various constituencies are powerful and vulnerable and learn how to defend and protect each other. The free transit campaign lends itself to the kind of intensely local organizing through which honest dialogue, trust, and long-term relationships can be developed and nurtured—within and across neighbourhoods and among transit riders and workers. And of course, without these things, the campaign will go nowhere.

#### Subsidizing a fare-free system encourages free movement and mobility

Olsen 07 [Dave, Journalist for The Tyee, “Fare-Free Public Transit Could Be Headed to a City Near You”, [http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree\_public\_transit\_could\_be\_headed\_to\_a\_ city\_near\_you](http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree_public_transit_could_be_headed_to_a_%20city_near_you), 7/26/07, Accessed: 7/12/12] JDO

Recently I met the people who run Island Transit in Whidbey Island, Wash., and rode their fare-free bus system. It's a serious operation with 56 buses and 101 vans. Ridership tops a million a year. Its operating budget is $8,392,677 -- none of it from fares, all from a 0.6 percent sales tax collected in Island County. Despite the pressure to conform, the pressure to make users pay and the pressure from conservative politicians at all levels, Island Transit has been fare-free from day one and is proudly so 20 years later. Not one Island Transit bus, shelter or van has advertising on it. All of Island Transit's buses are bike rack equipped and wheelchair accessible. For folks with disabilities, Island Transit also offers a paratransit service with door-to-door service. Island Transit has developed a simple policy around dealing with behavior that is unruly or disturbing to others: "The operator is the captain of their own ship." This is backed up by a state law regarding unlawful bus conduct. A bothersome rider first gets a written warning. The next time, his or her riding privileges are revoked. These privileges are only restored after completing a Rider Privilege Agreement. Island Transit has further protected its employees by installing a camera system in every vehicle. The big brotherness of it is acknowledged, but the safety of their operators simply takes priority. "Show me another transit system in Washington state," said Island Transit operator Odis D. Jenkins, "where the teenagers more often than not say 'thank you' when they get off." Done right, fare-free transit can transform society, says Patrick Condon, an expert on sustainable urban development who knows the system in Amherst, Mass. "Free transit changed the region for the better. Students, teens and the elderly were able to move much more freely through the region. Some ascribed the resurgence of Northampton, Mass, at least in part, to the availability of free transit. Fares in that region would have provided such a small percentage of capital and operating costs that their loss was made up for by contributions by the major institutions to benefit: the five colleges in the region," says Condon, a professor at the University of British Columbia. Another success story, a decade old, can be found in Hasselt, Belgium. This city of 70,000 residents, with 300,000 commuters from the surrounding area, has made traveling by bus easy, affordable and efficient. Now, people in Hasselt often speak of "their" bus system and with good reason. The Boulevard Shuttle leaves you waiting for at most five minutes, the Central Shuttle has a 10-minute frequency, and systemwide you never have to wait more than a half an hour. A prime lesson offered by Hasselt is the fact that it radically improved the bus system as well as its walking and cycling infrastructure before it removed the fareboxes. In 1996, there were only three bus routes with about 18,000 service hours/year. Today, there are 11 routes with more than 95,000 service hours/year. The transit system in Hasselt cost taxpayers approximately $1.8 million in 2006. This amounts to 1 percent of its municipal budget and makes up about 26 percent of the total operating cost of the transit system. The Flemish national government covered the rest (approximately $5.25 million) under a long-term agreement. Hasselt City Council's principal aim in introducing free public transport was to promote the new bus system to such a degree that it would catch on and become the natural option for getting around. And it did -- immediately. On the first day, bus ridership increased 783 percent! The first full year of free-fare transit saw an increase of 900 percent over the previous year; by 2001, the increase was up to 1,223 percent, and ridership continues to go up every day.

#### Free mass transit is the key to abolishing neoliberalism everywhere; its tangibility to the everyman is unmatched

Schein, assistant professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 11 (Rebecca, 2011, “Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing the Political Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign,” Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research, Volume: 22, p. 115, EBB)

Mass transit is an essential pillar of Toronto’s public infrastructure, yet its transit system is among the least “public” public systems in the world. Estimated at between 70 and 80 percent, Toronto’s “fare-box recovery ratio”—the percentage of the system’s operating budget paid for by individual riders at the fare-box—is among the highest in the North America and more than doubles that of some other large cities around the world (Toronto Environmental Alliance, 2009; Toronto Board of Trade, 2010). Many other transit systems in comparable cities “recoup” less than half of their operating budgets from fares, relying more heavily on subsidies from multiple levels of government. According to the Toronto Board of Trade (2010), “essentially no North American or European transit systems operate in [the] manner [of Toronto]” with respect to transit funding. Riders rarely think about rising “fare-box recovery ratios,” but few have failed to notice that fares have increased from $1.10 in 1991 to $3.00 in 2010—the last fare-hike in January 2010 arriving in the context of high unemployment and rising demand for emergency food and shelter services in the city. The fare-box recovery ratio represents a rough quantification of the efficiency with which neoliberal governments have divested from the public sphere and downloaded costs to the most vulnerable individuals. The failure to invest seriously in mass transit in recent decades has meant, moreover, that many Toronto residents outside the downtown core pay high fares for service that is inconvenient and inefficient. While the operating subsidies that support other transit systems reflect an understanding of mass transit as a public good, yielding benefits to entire communities and ecosystems, Toronto’s system increasingly treats transit as a commodity, consumed and paid for by individual riders. The funding structure of Toronto’s transit system is effectively a form of regressive taxation: although all of Toronto’s residents benefit from transit infrastructure—including the car-owners who never ride a bus—our “public” system is funded disproportionately out of the pockets of the low- and middle-income people who rely on mass transportation in their daily lives. The demand for free and accessible public transit has the potential not only to develop into a broad-based movement, but also to drive the development of the new kind of organization that the Assembly aspires to become. The Assembly is committed to its call for the outright abolition of transit fares, not merely a fare-freeze or fare-reduction. What is exciting to me about the free transit campaign is that the expression of a radical anti-capitalist principle—the outright de-commodification of public goods and services—actually serves in this instance to invite rather than foreclose genuine political dialogue about values, tactics, and strategies. While still in its early stages, the free transit campaign is already pushing us to elaborate both analytical and strategic links between commodification, environmental justice, the limits and capacities of public sector unions, and the interlocking forms of exclusion faced by people marginalized by poverty, racism, immigration status, or disability. Free transit could represent a site of convergence between many distinct activist circles in the city and foster greater integration and collaboration between environmental advocacy, anti-poverty work, and diverse human rights organizations. If the free transit campaign does succeed in bringing diverse and distinct activist cultures into conversation with each other, it will force the Assembly to grapple with strategic questions about its relationship to less radical organizations in the city. Given the marginalization and isolation that have long plagued leftist groups in Toronto and elsewhere, this should be a welcome challenge, particularly if the Assembly hopes to become an effective left pole in a broad alliance. Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is the concreteness of vision. Within the left, efforts to elaborate a broad anti-capitalist vision too often run aground at the level of abstractions, generalities, and platitudes. Most Toronto residents would draw a blank if asked to “imagine a world without capitalism,” but what Torontonian who has ever waited for a bus can’t begin to imagine an alternate future for the city, built on the backbone of a fully public mass transit system? The invitation to imagine free transit is an invitation for transit riders to imagine themselves not simply as consumers of a commodity, but as members of a public entitled to participate in conversations about the kind of city they want to live in. Without devolving into abstract and alienating debates over the meaning of, say, socialism, the call for free transit invokes the things we value: vibrant neighbourhoods; clean air and water; participatory politics; equitable distribution of resources; public space where we are free to speak, gather, play, create, and organize. Even the most skeptical response to the idea of free transit—“how will you fund it?”—is the opening of a productive conversation about taxation and control over public resources. The call for free transit can effectively open a space for an unscripted political dialogue about the meaning of fair taxation, public goods, collective priorities, and public accountability for resource allocation.

#### Mass transit system opens dialogue on the anti-capitalist movement, paves the way for more radical change

Schein, assistant professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 11 (Rebecca, 2011, “Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing the Political Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign,” Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research, Volume: 22, p. 115, EBB)

Without abandoning or compromising its radicalism, the Assembly can push for concrete steps in the direction of de-commodified transit and build productive relationships with individuals and organizations who do not necessarily identify themselves as anti-capitalist. It will be in the process of pushing for interim reforms along the way to a de-commodified transit system that the Assembly will most need to articulate its political principles and its analysis of the spatialization of race and class in Toronto. Free transit in the downtown core may, for instance, be good for Toronto’s tourism industry, but will it benefit the immigrant and working class communities in transit-poor areas of the inner suburbs, who spend proportionately more of their income to access poorer quality services than those available downtown? Proposals to pay for free transit through suburban road tolls will similarly hit hardest those working class communities whose neighbourhoods are so underserved by transit that they have no choice but to drive into the city for work. The process of developing interim priorities will not, in other words, postpone the challenge of articulating and popularizing a class-based and anti-racist argument for public infrastructure. Instead, the Assembly will be forced to pursue its most radical aspirations by cultivating a sustained dialogue about the interim remedies and strategies that will both address real needs in our communities and help build a broad-based movement over the long term. It will be through this process of dialogue, I hope, that a new articulation of a politicized working class identity might emerge. Our earliest discussions of the free transit campaign are already pushing us to think about the social complexities that will need to be navigated if we are to build an effective free transit movement. Success will depend on our capacity to carve out and sustain a space for dialogue and negotiation among transit workers and riders, within unions, and across neighbourhoods and communities that have been unevenly affected by fare hikes and inadequate services. Questions of tactics and strategy cannot be divorced from the process of identifying, developing, and strengthening the complex connections between the people who need and use public goods and services and the workers who provide them. We will need to recognize the different ways in which our various constituencies are powerful and vulnerable and learn how to defend and protect each other. The free transit campaign lends itself to the kind of intensely local organizing through which honest dialogue, trust, and long-term relationships can be developed and nurtured—within and across neighbourhoods and among transit riders and workers. And of course, without these things, the campaign will go nowhere. Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is its potential to foreground and develop an analysis of our collective stake in the protection of public goods. It is not difficult to talk about public goods in the context of mass transportation infrastructure. The shared benefits of public transportation are difficult to deny, particularly in a city as large and as sprawling as Toronto. Even setting aside the obvious ecological imperatives that should be driving public investment in greener infrastructure, there are powerful economic reasons to support a massive re-investment in Ontario’s transportation sector. A serious effort to expand the reach and accessibility of the public transit system would serve not only to ease the burden of Toronto’s most vulnerable residents and reduce the economic and health costs associated with air pollution and traffic congestion: such an investment could re-direct the wasted skills and resources embodied in Ontario’s laid-off auto-workers and silent auto-plants, which could be converted to the production of high efficiency mass transit vehicles. As Sam Gindin and Leo Panitch (2010) argued recently in the Toronto Star, public borrowing to finance such investments represents not a wasteful burden on future generations, but a commitment to securing them a future. The real squandering of our collective resources lies not in public borrowing or benefits packages for public employees, but in our failure to direct existing skills, knowledge, and material capacities into a coherent strategy for building sustainable communities. The idea of a free transit movement immediately foregrounds a number of thorny strategic questions for the left in Toronto: how to build trust, dialogue, and support for a free transit movement within the transit union; how to address and re-focus the widespread anger, mistrust, and resentment directed at the public sector in the current climate; how to sustain and advance anti-capitalist principles while building productive relationships within broader progressive milieux. Navigating these questions will be challenging, and the Assembly is still a long way from a coherent and systematic approach to answering them. But the fact that these questions surface so quickly and urgently is a positive sign of the ambition and seriousness with which the Assembly is approaching the organization of a free transit movement. The free transit campaign will push the Assembly to develop further its internal organizational and decision-making capacities, but it will also demand an outward-looking, inclusive process, in which the Assembly’s role is to open space for debate, dialogue, and collective strategizing. In fact, the transit system itself can provide the venue for us to stage public discussions about our collective resources and to share alternative visions for our city: the transit system is a readymade classroom, theatre, and art gallery, attended every day by people who could come to recognize their stake in the de-commodification of public goods of many kinds. My hope is that Toronto’s buses, streetcars, and subway platforms could be places for experimentation, places to develop the new tactics, organizing skills, and relationships that might permit us to really depart from the prevailing script.

#### Once people switch to transit, they stay there because of high gas prices

APTA 12 (American Public Transportation Association, Nonprofit International Association of Public and Private Transportation Organizations, *Save Money. Take Transit.*, <http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2012/Pages/120620_DumpthePump.aspx>, June 20th 2012, JKE)

With high gas prices, increasing numbers of people are turning to public transportation to save money. Public transportation ridership surged in the first quarter of 2012, as Americans took nearly 2.7 billion trips, an increase of 5.0 percent, as 125.7 million more trips were taken than the first quarter of last year. Some public transit systems saw record ridership including the transit systems in the following cities: Ann Arbor, MI; Boston, MA; Charlotte, NC; Fort Myers, FL; Indianapolis, IN; Ithaca, NY; New York, NY; Oakland, CA; Olympia, WA; San Diego, CA; and Tampa, FL.¶ “Not surprisingly, public transit ridership hit record highs across the nation this spring,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the Sierra Club. “Gas prices go up and down - mostly up - but Americans who try transit tend to stick with it. Instead of being stuck in traffic, they enjoy a book or a quick cat nap on their commute, while saving their families thousands of dollars at the pump, creating jobs, and doing their part to save 37 million metric tons of carbon pollution and 4.2 billion gallons of oil every year.” “Public transportation is popular, with ridership on buses and trains on the rise. Congress should provide consumers what they want by investing more in public transit. More transportation choices mean less pain at the pump," said Deron Lovaas, NRDC Federal Transportation Policy Director.

### Fare Free = Anti Neolib Mvmt

#### Free mass transit is the starting point- plan allows for other projects to expand in a proactive movement

Schein, 2011 (Assistant Prof Human Rights –The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011, Rebecca. "Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing thePolitical Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign", Alternate Routes volume http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421)

The idea of a free transit movement immediately foregrounds a number of thorny strategic questions for the left in Toronto: how to build trust, dialogue, and support for a free transit movement within the transit union; how to address and re-focus the widespread anger, mistrust, and resentment directed at the public sector in the current climate; how to sustain and advance anti-capitalist principles while building productive relationships within broader progressive milieux. Navigating these questions will be challenging, and the Assembly is still a long way from a coherent and systematic approach to answering them. But the fact that these questions surface so quickly and urgently is a positive sign of the ambition and seriousness with which the Assembly is approaching the organization of a free transit movement. The free transit campaign will push the Assembly to develop further its internal organizational and decision-making capacities, but it will also demand an outward-looking, inclusive process, in which the Assembly’s role is to open space for debate, dialogue, and collective strategizing. The Keynesian Revival: a Marxian Critique 121 122 Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research In fact, the transit system itself can provide the venue for us to stage public discussions about our collective resources and to share alternative visions for our city: the transit system is a readymade classroom, theatre, and art gallery, attended every day by people who could come to recognize their stake in the de-commodification of public goods of many kinds. My hope is that Toronto’s buses, streetcars, and subway platforms could be places for experimentation, places to develop the new tactics, organizing skills, and relationships that might permit us to really depart from the prevailing script.

#### The plan will solve – it’s the combination of struggles, we redefine how resources are used, outline the impacts of the order and work to project an alternative vision to overcome the idea that neoliberalism is inevitable. This round is key

Kotz 3 (David M., Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, *Socialism and Global Neoliberal Capitalism*, Economics Department and Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts – Amherst, pg. 6-7, <http://people.umass.edu/dmkotz/Soc_and_Global_NL_Kism_03_03.pdf>, 2003, JKE)

At the end of the 1990s, these various movements, originating in different parts of the world, among different social groups, and around different issues, began to join together in a new global justice movement. This was not an accident. Activists in the various movements gradually realized they were facing a common enemy, namely global neoliberal capitalism. More recently an even larger movement has swept the world against the aggressive imperialist policy of the US and Britain in their determination to wage war to control the Middle East. It seems likely that this massive new antiwar movement is not just about war, or about Iraq, or about the Middle East. It appears to be drawing on several decades of growing dissatisfaction and anger at the tiny privileged elite that has been reshaping the world in ways that make the majority worse off – an elite that is deaf to the opinions of ordinary people. The US-British War against Iraq, launched by the two governments that have been the primary source of neoliberal restructuring in the world, seems to be the final straw that has driven tens of millions of people into the streets to say “enough” and “another world must be possible.” Socialism or the Reform or Capitalism? We seem to be at the start of a new period of major struggle against capitalism, after a long time of relative quiescence and relatively unimpeded action by those constructing the global neoliberal order. Will the new movement now in formation turn out to be a force for another wave of major reform in capitalism, or rather might it lead to the replacement of capitalism by socialism? Advocates of both aims are present in the leadership of this new movement, although the masses of participants are, at this time, undoubtedly largely of reformist inclination. Is it possible that this movement will turn into a force for radical transformation of the world? The above analysis of a vision of socialism and of the contemporary stage of neoliberal capitalism suggest three preconditions for the development of a powerful socialist movement in the current conditions. First, the various movements against the particular ills inflicted by global neoliberal capitalism would have to be transformed into battles over the power to determine how economic resources are used. This would represent a direct challenge to the disempowering of popular groups by neoliberal restructuring. The various particular opposition movements can be thought of as representing, in embryo, the democratic participatory socialism of the future, in which popular groups will make economic decisions. Socialists within these movements should struggle for the principle of the right of popular groups to make the economic decisions that affect them. In this way, socialism can be made real to the participants in those movements, although socialism cannot finally and fully be installed without making a radical break with current property relations and the current allocation of political power. Second, there is a need for mass education about the ways in which capitalism lies at the root of the problems afflicting ordinary people around the world. That is, the anti-capitalist consciousness that has already developed in many social movements would have to spread to a much wider audience. For example, it can be pointed out that the aggressive war launched by the US and British Governments against Iraq is not just the result of a cowboy US president from Texas. This war has deeper sources in the tendency of powerful capitalist states to assert control over as much of the world as possible, in order to gain control over raw materials, as well as to assure markets for exports and obtain cheap labor. Third, the belief that nothing beyond capitalism is possible can be countered by projecting a vision of a workable socialism, based on popular democratic participation in the economic as well as the political institutions of society. The socialist movement can be rebuilt, and socialism can become a real possibility again, only when millions of people become convinced, not only that capitalism does not meet their needs, but that a qualitatively superior alternative system is possible.

#### The plan allows us to imagine free transit outside of private ownership- key to breaking away from neoliberal ideals

Schein, 2011 (Assistant Prof Human Rights –The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011, Rebecca. "Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing thePolitical Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign", Alternate Routes volume <http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421>)

Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is the concreteness of vision. Within the left, efforts to elaborate a broad anti-capitalist vision too often run aground at the level of abstractions, generalities, and platitudes. Most Toronto residents would draw a blank if asked to “imagine a world without capitalism,” but what Torontonian who has ever waited for a bus can’t begin to imagine an alternate future for the city, built on the backbone of a fully public mass transit system? The invitation to imagine free transit is an invitation for transit riders to imagine them- selves not simply as consumers of a commodity, but as members of a public entitled to participate in conversations about the kind of city they want to live in. Without devolving into abstract and alienating debates over the meaning of, say, socialism, the call for free transit invokes the things we value: vibrant neighbourhoods; clean air and water; participatory politics; equitable distribution of resources; public space where we are free to speak, gather, play, create, and organize. Even the most skeptical response to the idea of free transit—“how will you fund it?”—is the opening of a productive conversation about taxation and control over public resources. The call for free transit can effectively open a space for an unscripted political dialogue about the meaning of fair taxation, public goods, collective priorities, and public accountability for resource allocation. But perhaps more fundamentally, the free transit campaign is a rare example of a political project on the left that is not reactive, defensive, nostalgic, or alarmist, but hopeful, proactive, and forward-looking.

#### Public transit reduces economic and environmental costs of current traffic congestion

Schein, 2011 (Assistant Prof Human Rights –The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011, Rebecca. "Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing thePolitical Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign", Alternate Routes volume http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421)

Among the strengths of the free transit campaign is its potential to foreground and develop an analysis of our collective stake in the protection of public goods. It is not difficult to talk about public goods in the context of mass transportation infrastructure. The shared benefits of public transportation are difficult to deny, particularly in a city as large and as sprawling as Toronto. Even setting aside the obvious ecological imperatives that should be driving public investment in greener infrastructure, there are powerful economic reasons to support a massive re-invest- ment in Ontario’s transportation sector. A serious effort to expand the reach and accessibility of the public transit system would serve not only to ease the burden of Toronto’s most vulnerable residents and reduce the economic and health costs associated with air pollution and traffic congestion: such an investment could re-direct the wasted skills and resources embodied in Ontario’s laid-off auto-workers and silent auto-plants, which could be converted to the production of high efficiency mass transit vehicles. As Sam Gindin and Leo Panitch (2010) argued recently in the Toronto Star, public borrowing to finance such investments represents not a waste- ful burden on future generations, but a commitment to securing them a future. The real squandering of our collective resources lies not in public borrowing or benefits packages for public employees, but in our failure to direct existing skills, knowledge, and material capacities into a coherent strategy for building sustainable communities.

#### Humans have ethical responsibility to protect nature and the lower class

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

On the other hand, what we are calling the 'Common Good' of the Earth can only be tackled through the mediation of the human species. It is only human intervention that can allow the Earth to regenerate – or prevent it from doing so through our own predatory and destructive activities. This is why the Common Good of Humanity involves the survival of nature - that is, of biodiversity. If we use the expression ‘the rights of nature’ (Eduardo Gudynas, 2009), this can be understood only in a secondary sense, since it is only the human species that can infringe or respect those rights. Neither the Earth nor the animals can claim respect for their rights. It is human beings who are responsible for the destruction of the ecosystems. In this sense, according to the jurist Antonio Salamanca, using the legal categories of droit titulaire or droit vicaire (subsidiary or secondary law) the human community must act on behalf of the ‘incapable’ (animals, newly born babies, handicapped people) who, for the reproduction of their lives require human mediation. Such a position is not anthropocentric, but anthroporesponsabilisante. In this way, by broadening the process of the juridical subject, one can talk of climate justice, without necessarily resorting to the personalization of the earth and its elements. At the same time, it cannot be ignored that there is a link between the relations that human beings have with nature and class relations. All social classes do not behave in the same way vis-à-vis the Earth. It is a case of power relations, put into practice by the logic of capitalism.

### Reclaim Public Sphere Key

#### Privatizing mass transit destroyed its moralizing value; the public must take it back

Yago, professor of Sociology at New York State University, 83 (Glenn, August 1983, “The Sociology of Transportation,” Annual Review of Sociology, Volume: 9, p. 171-190, EBB)

Initial studies in urban transportation history describe how the limitations of horse-drawn trolley systems spurred the rapid innovation of electrified trolley lines in the context of rising public utility investment, land speculation, and rapid population growth (Ward 1971:131-34). Electrification proceeded faster in the United States than in Europe (McKay 1976). The electrification of transit paralleled the growth of both the national electrical supplies manufacturing industry (Passer 1953:250-55) and the local real estate industry (Hoyt 1933; Wilcox 1921; Weber 1974). Moreover, transportation was viewed by transit owners and city planners alike as a "moral influence" in removing people from the deleterious environment of central cities (Tarr 1973; MacShane 1975; Warner 1976). The social function of transportation in reducing social conflict in local politics through spatial dispersion of the urban working population was widely recognized (Gordon 1978; Katznelson 1981). As Cheape (1980:211) notes in his comparative study of US transit systems before World War I, transit expansion in the early 20th century represented a social overhead investment to encourage regional development by private enterprise. The needs of mechanization and transit service were subordinated to these developmental goals. By World War I, this led to a combination of corruption and poor management resulting in a credit collapse and massive private disinvestment in transit (Smerk 1975:135). At the local level, the increased militance of transit unions, some of the first labor organizations in US cities, drove labor costs considerably over the industrial wage average. The lack of extensive service and growing fare levels politicized transit among consumers as well, leading to increased demands for public control. Virtually every US city was the scene of legal battles, referenda over fare hikes, public ownership campaigns, and investigations of transit corruption (Miller 1960; Warner 1968; MacShane 1974; Holli 1969; Crooks 1968; Jackson 1969; Bean 1968; Fogelson 1967). Transit regulation quickly ensued (Jensen 1956; Cheape 1980). Regulation depoliticized transportation, removing it from the public sphere of urban politics to the forums of appointed, business-oriented state regulatory commis- sions. This organizationally insulated transportation decisions from the public by the de facto disenfranchisement of the urban population. Urban historians have often attempted to account for public transit's decline by citing some single cause-corruption (Smerk 1968), poor business practices (Hilton & Due 1968), overcrowded service (Holt 1972), the lack of technolo- gical innovation (Solomon 1971), regulation (Barrett 1975), or the rise of the automobile (Rae 1965). Although all of these factors played a role, they require explanatory linkages to account for the broader social structural shift surround- ing the shift from public to private transportation modes. This change heralded not merely the technological shift from rail to rubber-wheeled vehicles; it also affected basic relations between labor and capital in the production of trans- portation equipment, consumer costs of job-related travel, and the political organization and administration of transportation policy. The shift to private transportation modes allowed the socialization of transportation-infrastructural expenditure through federal and state road building and publicly financed transit, depoliticized transit issues in electoral politics, and released investment capital from public infrastructural requirement.

#### Tangible steps transform society – dismantle neoliberalism through eliminating privatization

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

This brings us to practical measures. They are numerous, and we can give only a few examples here. On the negative side, the predominance of finance capital cannot be accepted, and for this reason tax havens of all kinds must be abolished, as well as bank secrecy, two powerful instruments in the class struggle. It is also necessary to establish a tax on international financial flows (the 'Tobin tax') to reduce the power of finance capital. ‘Odious debts’ must be denounced, after due audits, as has been done in Ecuador. Speculation on food and energy cannot be permitted. A tax on the kilometres consumed by industrial or agricultural goods would make it possible to reduce the ecological costs of transport and the abuse of ‘comparative advantage’. Prolonging the ‘life expectancy’ of industrial products would effect great economies in raw materials and energy, and would diminish the artificial profits of capital resulting purely from the circulation of trade (Wim Dierckxsens, 2011). From a positive viewpoint there are also many examples to be cited. The social economy is built on a logic that is quite different from that of capitalism. It is true that it is a marginal activity at present, compared with the immense concentration of oligopolistic capital, but it is possible to encourage it in various ways. The same goes for cooperatives and popular credit. They must be protected from being destroyed or absorbed by the dominant system. As for regional economic initiatives, they can be the means of a transformation out of economic logic, on the condition that they do not represent simply an adaptation of the system to new production techniques, thus serving as means to integrate national economies into a capitalist framework at a higher level. Restoring the common goods that have been privatized by neoliberalism is a fundamental step to be taken in public services like water, energy, transport, communications, health, education and culture. This does not necessarily mean the State taking them over but rather the setting up of many different forms of public and citizen control over their production and distribution. Redefining the ‘Common Good of Humanity’ in terms of a new definition of the economy is thus a necessary task to be undertaken, confronted as we are by the destruction of our common heritage as a result of forgetting the collective dimension of production for life-needs, and by the promotion of exclusive individualism.

#### Defense of ‘common goods’ key to humanity’s survival

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

It is very important to make the links between the defence of ‘common goods’ like water, and re-establishing priority for the ‘Common Good’ and the vision of a new construction of the ‘Common Good of Humanity’; partly because the holistic vision embodied in the latter concept requires practical implementation - as in common goods for example - if it is to emerge from the abstract and be translated into action. Partly, too, because specific struggles must also take their place in the overall plan in order to identify the role they are playing, not simply as mitigating the deficiencies of a system (thus prolonging its existence), but rather as contributing to a profound transformation - one that requires the coming together of the forces for change in order to establish the bases for the survival of humanity and the planet.

#### Nationalization of resources is key to abolishing capitalism – Marx recognized the evil of private property

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

We have already referred to the contribution of Karl Marx. He considered that capitalism had provoked an artificial and mechanical separation between nature and the human being. The rupture in the metabolism, that is the material exchange between the earth and the satisfaction of the needs of human beings, such as defined by the capital accumulation process, has ended up in irrational practices, wastage and destruction (Capital, Vol. 1, 637-638, cited by Gian Delgado, 2011). For this reason, according to Marx, it is necessary to reduce the material energy flows in a way that is socially fair, so as to ameliorate the quality of life. According to him, only socialism can re-establish the metabolic balance and put an end to the destruction of nature. Calling for a new concept of our relationship with nature brings with it many practical consequences. We shall cite some examples, grouping them into: necessary prohibitions and constraints; positive initiatives; and then discussing their implications for international policy. First, we must outlaw the private ownership of what are called ‘natural resources’: i.e. minerals, fossil energies and forests. These are the common heritage of humanity, and cannot be appropriated by individuals and corporations, as happens now in the capitalist market economy – in other words, by private interests that ignore externalities and aim at maximizing profits. A first step in a transition, then, is for countries to recover sovereignty over their resources. Of course this does not necessarily ensure the desired result of a healthy relationship with nature: national enterprises often operate with the same capitalist logic, so that State sovereignty would not necessarily imply a philosophy of respect for nature rather than its exploitation. The internationalization of this sector would be the next step, but only on condition that the relevant institutions (like the United Nations and its agencies) are made really democratic: in many cases they are still under the influence of the dominant political and economic powers. The introduction of ecological costs of all human activities into economic calculations is also a necessity, making it possible to reduce these and to counter the utilitarian rationale that excludes "externalities": one of the reasons for the destructive nature of capitalism.

### Reclaim Public Solves Inequality

#### Generalized access to infrastructure is key to reduce income inequality

César Calderón Teaching at University of Alcalá and Managing Partner in consulting autoritas, Luis Servén, Research Manager for Macroeconomics and Growth in the Development Research Group, September 2004 (THE EFFECTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ON GROWTH AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION, Central Bank of Chile Working Papers N° 270, <http://www.bcentral.cl/estudios/documentos-trabajo/pdf/dtbc270.pdf>) TM

It has long been recognized that an adequate supply of infrastructure services is an essential ingredient for productivity and growth.1 In recent years, however, the role of infrastructure has received increased attention. From the academic perspective, a rapidly growing literature – starting with the seminal work of Aschauer (1989) – has sought to quantify the contribution of infrastructure to income and growth.2 From the policy perspective, the renewed concern with infrastructure can be traced to two worldwide developments that took place over the last two decades. The first one was the retrenchment of the public sector since the mid 1980s, in most industrial and developing countries, from its dominant position in the provision of infrastructure, under the increasing pressures of fiscal adjustment and consolidation. The second was the opening up of infrastructure industries to private participation, part of a worldwide drive toward increasing reliance on markets and private sector activity, which has been reflected in widespread privatization of public utilities and multiplication of concessions and other forms of public-private partnership. While this process first gained momentum in industrial countries (notably the U.K.), over the last decade it has extended to a growing number of developing economies, particularly in Latin America. Infrastructure has become an ubiquitous theme in a variety of areas of the policy debate. For example, there is persuasive evidence that adequate infrastructure provision is a key element in the “behind the border” agenda required for trade liberalization to achieve its intended objective of efficient resource reallocation and export growth. Also, a number of studies have argued that generalized access to infrastructure services plays a key role in helping reduce income inequality.3 Against this background, there is a growing perception that in many countries the pressures of fiscal consolidation have led to a compression of public infrastructure spending, which has not been offset by the increase in private sector participation, thus resulting in an insufficient provision of infrastructure services with potentially major adverse effects on growth and inequality.4

### Urban Areas Key

#### Capital is the core of neoliberalism- urbanization is key to the absorption of surplus

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

Capitalists have to produce a surplus product in order to produce surplus value; this in turn must be reinvested in order to generate more surplus value. The result of continued reinvestment is the expansion of surplus production at a compound rate—hence the logistic curves (money, output and population) attached to the history of capital accumulation, paralleled by the growth path of urbanization under capitalism. The perpetual need to find profitable terrains for capital-surplus production and absorption shapes the politics of capitalism. It also presents the capitalist with a number of barriers to continuous and trouble-free expansion. If labour is scarce and wages are high, either existing labour has to be disciplined—technologically induced unemployment or an assault on organized working-class power are two prime methods—or fresh labour forces must be found by immigration, export of capital or proletarianization of hitherto independent elements of the population. Capitalists must also discover new means of production in general and natural resources in particular, which puts increasing pressure on the natural environment to yield up necessary raw materials and absorb the inevitable waste. They need to open up terrains for raw-material extraction—often the objective of imperialist and neo-colonial endeavours.

#### Urbanization key- Capitalists are perpetually using coercion to manipulate urban areas to absorb surplus product

Harvey, PhD Cambridge 1962; Distg Prof, 2008 (David, September-October, “The Right to the City,” New Left Review, Volume: 53, <http://www.newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>, JS)

The coercive laws of competition also force the continuous implementation of new technologies and organizational forms, since these enable capitalists to out-compete those using inferior methods. Innovations define new wants and needs, reduce the turnover time of capital and lessen the friction of distance, which limits the geographical range within which the capitalist can search for expanded labour supplies, raw materials, and so on. If there is not enough purchasing power in the market, then new markets must be found by expanding foreign trade, promoting novel products and lifestyles, creating new credit instruments, and debt-financing state and private expenditures. If, finally, the profit rate is too low, then state regulation of ‘ruinous competition’, monopolization (mergers and acquisitions) and capital exports provide ways out. If any of the above barriers cannot be circumvented, capitalists are unable profitably to reinvest their surplus product. Capital accumulation is blocked, leaving them facing a crisis, in which their capital can be devalued and in some instances even physically wiped out. Surplus commodities can lose value or be destroyed, while productive capacity and assets can be written down and left unused; money itself can be devalued through inflation, and labour through massive unemployment. How, then, has the need to circumvent these barriers and to expand the terrain of profitable activity driven capitalist urbanization? I argue here that urbanization has played a particularly active role, alongside such phenomena as military expenditures, in absorbing the surplus product that capitalists perpetually produce in their search for profits.

# Ontology First

### Political Questions of Econ First

#### Ontology first- challenging the metaphysical assumptions of the relationship between humans and economic policy is key to political investigation and resistance

Oksala, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project is Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, 2011 (Johanna, November 3rd, “Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality,” Constellations, Volume: 18, Pages 482 and 483, JS)

If we accept my analysis of the relationship between neoliberalism and political violence, however, irrational violence appears to become the only meaningful form that violent resistance against neoliberalism can take. The implication of the specific relationship between neoliberalism and political violence is, paradoxically, that there can be no cost-effective and, in this sense, rational practices of violence that could function as genuine resistance against it. Burning cars in rich neighbourhoods instead of poor ones would mean adopting the very political ontology one is attempting to question and transform: all human behavior should not be reduced to cost-effective means, to an end. If we want to oppose neoliberalism not just as an economic policy, but also as a socio-political matrix, we have to challenge the ontological framework that explains all human behavior through the economic analysis of its costs and effects. Some forms of behavior, such as violence, must retain an irreducibly moral and political meaning. The paradoxical relationship between neoliberalism and violent resistance does not obviously imply that the only meaningful form of protest against neoliberalism is irrational violence. On the contrary, it should constitute a strong reason not to engage in violence, but to seek other ways of resisting. While we have to accept that practical forms of resistance against neoliberalism have to consider the efficaciousness of their strategies and even apply strictly economic, cost-benefit analysis to some of their actions, economic rationality should not form the framework for assessing violence as a form of resistance. We should question neoliberalism’s exclusive stake to rationality and introduce alternative means and ends to the political arena: justice, compassion, creativity and solidarity, for example. Many of the peaceful protests against neoliberal hegemony – demonstrations, public performances and the occupation of public spaces – provide good examples of this. I am thus not promoting mindless, irrational violence, but I contend that the economic irrationality of violence does not amount to its meaninglessness, not unless we have lost all frameworks other than the neoliberal for understanding social reality. The expressive and disruptive forces of violence are a genuine and sometimes appealing alternative to people disenchanted with the all-encompassing framework of cost-benefit analysis and the systemic, “rational” forms of violence compatible with it. I also disagree with Zˇizˇek’s claim that advanced capitalism is worldless in the sense that it contains no worldview. Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism contains an explicit worldview: it holds metaphysical assumptions about what human beings and societies are essentially like by maintaining a belief that human beings are always rational beings driven by natural self-interest. This is not a problem, a lamentable manifestation of the human condition, but something to be affirmed because it is ultimately the engine for economic growth. Neoliberalism also advances values and political ideals for the optimal organisation of human societies: the maximal material wellbeing of the population must be the undisputed goal of all societies and it is achieved only by continuous economic growth. The importance of free competition and the privileging of market mechanisms is thus not based solely on their economic rationality. They are understood as the means for a good life where good life is understood to include both maximal wealth and freedom. Free markets guarantee that people have maximal choice in cheap products and services and are thus not only maximally wealthy, but also free. The prevalent characteristic of neoliberalism is not just the conviction that free markets provide the optimal organising mechanism for capitalist economies. More fundamentally, the conviction is that they provide the optimal organising mechanism for the entirety of human life and social interaction: the necessary conditions for political freedom and a morality based on individual responsibility.33 The free market is thus not just an economic, but also a moral and political force. It does not function simply as the most efficient means for allocating resources: it is the optimum context for achieving human freedom and happiness. Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism maps a cognitive space for individuals with very clear objectives and the means of achieving them. Some would express the objective by saying that it is quite simply wealth – whoever dies with the most toys wins. Some would say that the ultimate objective of any form of liberalism is freedom. That ultimately amounts to the same things, however, because “money is. . .the greatest instrument of freedom ever invented by man.”34 And the best means for achieving wealth is unlimited competition in the free market. As Foucault saw it, the art of government developed by the Ordoliberals in and around the 1930s had become the programme of most governments in capitalist countries by 1979 when he delivered his lectures. Since then this political ontology has become even more expansive and deeply ingrained. It has circumscribed our everyday life in the last 30 years to the extent that it has not just been the dominant economic theory, it has been constitutive of our life-world and ultimately of ourselves. Its triumph does not mean that we have become a standardised, mass society of consumption and spectacle, as some social critics have insisted. It rather means that we live in a society that is oriented towards the multiplicity and differentiation of enterprises. We have become entrepreneurs of our lives, competing in the free market called society. We compete in an ever-expanding range of fields, and invest in ourselves by enhancing our abilities and appearance, by improving our strategies of life coaching and time management. Our life has become an enterprise that we must lead to success. Within this framework irrational violence does not appear morally wrong or politically compromised: it is simply a losing strategy, and this, paradoxically, remains its appeal and its significance.

### Ontology Key / A2: Neolib Inevitable

#### Neoliberalism is able to sustain itself because its embedded conceptual apparatus on the individual- this leads to the ontological hold that allows deregulation to become common practice

Hofmeyr, Department of Philosophy, University of Pretoria, 2008 (Dr. A. B. (Benda), “Behind the Ivory Tower: The Public Role of the Intellectual Today,” Phronimon, Volume: 9, 79-81 JS)

But what exactly is neo-liberalism and how did it conquer the world in just three short decades? According to David Harvey (2005: 2), “[n]eoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade”. Since the 1970s there has been a decisive turn to neo-liberalism in political- economic practices and thinking everywhere. Deregulation, privatisation, and withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision have become common practice. Almost all states, from those rising from the ashes of the Soviet Union to entrenched old-style social democracies and welfare states such as New Zealand and Sweden have succumbed – either voluntarily or in response to coercive pressures – to the neo-liberalising trend. Post-apartheid South Africa continues fervently along the neo-liberal path carved out by the Apartheid government of the late 1980s, and even present-day China is towing the line. Neo-liberalism is making its coercive influence felt everywhere from corporate boardrooms, financial, state and international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) responsible for regulating global finance and trade, but also in universities and the media. As the dominant mode of contemporary discourse and thought, it has infiltrated not only our politics and our economy, but also our commonsensical way of interpreting, understanding and relating to the world encompassing every sphere of life – the private as well as the public (Harvey 2005: 3). But what accounts for the pervasive success and avid global implementation of the neo-liberal ideology? The widespread prevalence of neo-liberalism might be best explained with the aid of Plato’s wisdom who proclaimed in The Republic that “the best guardians” are “those who have the greatest skill in watching over the interests of the community” (Plato 1955: 156-165 [412-421c]). In order to be able to lead successfully, a leader does not propose what is useful for himself, but what is useful for the one he commands. According to Plato, then, to command is to be in accord with the will of one’s subjects. In his commentary on Plato, Levinas (1953: 15) explains this as follows: [t]he apparent heteronomy of a command is in reality but an autonomy, for the freedom to command is not a blind force but a rational act of thought. A will can accept the order of another will only because it finds that order in itself... If the will is contrary to reason, it will come up against the absolute resistance of reason. For a rule, ideology or form of government to be imposed successfully, in other words, it must coincide with the interests of those on which it is imposed. To command, in short, is to do the will of the one who obeys! This holds not just for the commands of the philosopher-king, however, but also for those of the tyrant and therefore harbours the danger of slavery. The despotism of the senses – what Plato calls the animality with which we are infected from within – constitutes the source of tyranny. This is when obedience no longer follows from a free and rational consciousness, but from inclination; when supreme violence becomes supreme gentleness, and we accept it as though it came from ourselves (ibid., p. 16). Herein lies the secret of neo-liberalism’s success. Harvey (2005: 5) explains it as follows: For any way of thought to become dominant, a conceptual apparatus has to be advanced that appeals to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the possibilities inherent in the social world we inhabit. If successful, this conceptual apparatus becomes so embedded in common sense as to be taken for granted and not open to question. The founding figures of neoliberal thought took political ideals of human dignity and individual freedom as fundamental, as ‘the central values of civilization’. In so doing they chose wisely, for these are indeed compelling and seductive ideals. These values, they held, were threatened not only by fascism, dictatorships, and communism, but by all forms of state intervention that substituted collective judgements for those of individuals free to choose (my emphasis). This is, of course, exactly what Gramsci meant by hegemony, which refers to the reign of a certain system of values that derive its force from consent and consensus rather than force or enforcement. This leads to the maintenance of the status quo in power relations through the permeation throughout society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality (think, for example, of neoconservatism), which affords it popular support and legitimacy. To the extent that this prevailing consciousness is internalised by the population, it becomes part of what is generally called “common sense” so that the philosophy, culture and morality of the ruling elite comes to appear as the natural order of things (Boggs 1976: 39). The neo-liberal conviction that individual freedoms are guaranteed by freedom of the market and of trade, is deceptive, however. The freedoms attached to profitable capital accumulation – the fundamental goal of neo- liberal regimes – reflect the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital (Harvey 2005: 7) instead of what Plato calls “the interests of the community”.

#### Neoliberal govern mentality encourages and endorses the individual to neglect the public sphere- this betrays the ontological foundation of human community

Hofmeyr, Department of Philosophy, University of Pretoria, 2008 (Dr. A. B. (Benda), “Behind the Ivory Tower: The Public Role of the Intellectual Today,” Phronimon, Volume: 9, 87-88 JS)

The thought of Levinas goes to the very heart of the critico- philosophical question of why. It is closely aligned with Horace’s insistence that character is determined by one’s connection to the world, as being necessary for others, but Levinas focuses specifically on the relationship between the Self and the Other.13 As we have seen, the individualisation and self-responsibilisation characteristic of neo-liberalism lead to an increasing turn towards the self and away from the public sphere. This form of “privatisation” is encouraged in the name of political ideals such as human dignity and individual freedom. In this way, our own common sense – and thus our goodwill and inclination – becomes the very source of our enslavement. Neo-liberal governmentality ís enslavement, a form of enslavement in which we actively and willingly participate in the name of freedom, but it is this very hankering after personal freedom – that Foucault fought so hard to safeguard – that is betrayed by the new political economy. What is at stake, therefore, is the self itself. According to Levinas, however, fidelity to the self is not secured through the excessive pursuit of individual freedom, although our freedom is undeniably at stake in the present neo-liberal global order. Fidelity to the self has a social dimension and it is precisely this social dimension that is radically attenuated by the “privatisation” and thus corrosive effect of neo- liberalism on personal character and consequently on the public sphere. Levinas defines the social dimension in terms of being responsible for other people. This, as we know, is at once a very simple and a very complicated notion. Simple because it asserts that my sense of self-worth depends on whether others can rely upon me. Complicated because I need to act responsibly, even if I do not know myself, and no matter how confused or indeed split my own sense of identity (cf. Levinas 1991: 180ff; Sennett 1998: 146). Levinas conceives of the subject in terms of a radically inscrutable and inaccessible foreign kernel nestled within the self. In his early works, the pre- ethical existent is “occupied with itself” [s’occuper de soi]. Identity is not “an inoffensive relationship with itself, but an enchainment to itself”, that constantly drives the self beyond itself in an attempt to escape the unbearably heaviness of Being – the uneasiness that is its being (TA, 146- 147/55). The self does not coincide with itself, but is constantly driven beyond itself by the weight of the inescapable responsibility for self amidst the insecurity of the future. This insecurity therefore creates a new dimension of openness or receptivity within the interiority of the existent through which the self-enclosed self is able to await and welcome the other (TI, 124/150). In his later works, the encounter with the other person takes on a definitive significance for Levinas. Through the encounter with the other person, the self is out of phase with itself, an identity in “diastasis”14 or a subject that is internally divided (AE, 114-115/145-147). That means that I have to act responsibly no matter how split my own subject identity is. But it also means that I can act responsibly – I am capable of opening up to and meeting the other – precisely because my own identity is not a matter of seamless self- coincidence, but an uncanniness or homelessness. The inaccessible other “with-in” opens me up, thereby making the other “with-out” accessible. Fidelity to the self is therefore ontologically founded upon a social dimension. The social dimension is not based on some sort of communitarian ideal or a substantive conceptualisation of what the perfect community would entail. We can meet the other only through the inscrutable uncanniness within the self, which leads us via the social to the public and ultimately to the political. It is this ontological foundation that is betrayed by neo-liberalism.

### Must retake Public Sphere

#### City infrastructure must be returned to the control of inhabitants – challenges neoliberalism’s monopoly on public space

Purcell 2 (Mark, 2002, “Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant,” GeoJournal, Volume: 58, p. 99-108, EBB)

Lefebvre gives some idea of what he sees as the agenda of citadins in making decisions that produce urban space. That agenda is embedded in the second aspect of the right to the city, the right to appropriation. Appropriation includes the right of inhabitants to physically access, occupy, and use urban space, and so this notion has been the primary focus of those who advocate the right of people to be physically present in the space of the city (Capron, 2002; Isin and Wood, 1999; Lamb, 2002; Salmon, 2001; Mitchell and Staeheli, 2002). However, Lefebvre imagines appropriation to have a much broader and more structural meaning. Not only is appropriation the right to occupy already-produced urban space, it is also the right to produce urban space so that it meets the needs of inhabitants. Because appropriation gives inhabitants the right to ‘full and complete usage’ of urban space in the course of everyday life (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 179), space must be produced in a way that makes that full and complete usage possible. The use value aspect of urban space must therefore be the primary consideration in decisions that produce urban space. The conception of urban space as private property, as a commodity to be valorized (or used to valorize other commodities) by the capitalist production process, is speciﬁcally what the right to appropriation stands against. Taken together, Lefebvre’s vision of the right to the city is therefore one of radical transformation of urban social and spatial relations. It would transform both current liberal-democratic citizenship relations and capitalist social relations. First, the dominant model of citizenship is entirely upended by the right to participation. Lefebvre’s idea entails much more than simply returning to or enlarging the established liberal-democratic citizenship structures in the face of governance change. Rather urban inhabitance directly confronts national citizenship as the dominant basis for political membership. Because citizens of Vietnam, Mexico, and the United States can all equally be inhabitants of a particular city, inhabitants must have a right to participation regardless of nationality. Therefore, the right to participation rejects the Westphalian notion that all political loyalties must be hierarchically subordinate to one’s nationstate membership (Hettne, 2000; Krasner, 2000). It proposes a political identity (inhabitance) that is both independent of and prior to nationality with respect to the decisions that produce urban space. Moreover, as we saw above, the right to participation opens up decisions beyond the state. Unlike conventional enfranchisement, the right to participation expands the decision-making reach of inhabitants to all decisions that produce urban space. Lastly, the right to participation insists that inhabitants participate centrally and directly in decision-making. In place of the current regime in which capital and state elites control the decisions that produce urban space, Lefebvre imagines inhabitants as the majority and hegemonic voice. The right to appropriation, for its part, constitutes an explicit and direct challenge to the social relations of capitalism. Over the past two centuries, the valorization of urban space has been a key accumulation strategy for capital (Castells, 1977; Harvey, 1981) and property rights have given capitalist ﬁrms relatively free reign to produce urban space to maximize its exchange value. The right to appropriation confronts capital’s ability to valorize urban space, establishing a clear priority for the use value of urban residents over the exchange value interests of capitalist ﬁrms. In addition, appropriation reworks control over urban space, resisting the current hegemony of property rights and stressing the primacy of the use-rights of inhabitants. Challenging property rights, of course, means challenging the foundation of capitalist class relations. When coupled with a central role for inhabitants in decision-making, appropriation poses a direct challenge to a set of political-economic relationships that have been critical to the valorization of urban space and the accumulation of capital in the modern era. The radical way the right to the city challenges the established structures of both conventional liberal citizenship and capitalism suggests it holds particular promise for resisting the disenfranchisement associated with urban neoliberalism. However, this promise must be tempered by two signiﬁcant concerns: (1) Lefebvre’s right to the city raises more questions than it answers, and (2) this indeterminate character leaves open the possibility that the right to the city could have signiﬁcant negative impacts on cities. In other words, Lefebvre’s urban politics of the inhabitant would not lead necessarily to any particular outcomes. In order to give a sense of the political openness the right to city would entail, in the next section I develop some aspects of the contingent politics of scale that the right to the city would initiate.

# A2: Neolib Good

### Neolib unsustainable

#### Neoliberalism is an unsustainable economic system – empirical evidence proves

Loranger ‘95 (Jean-Guy, Department of Economics at University of Montreal, “Neoliberalism and the Overwhelming Influence of Financial Markets: a Comparative Analysis between NAFTA Countries and Other G-& Countries," http://hdl.handle.net/1866/2004.) NT

Our main hypothesis to be tested is that the neoliberal regime, which succeeded to the fordist regime since the mid-seventies, has placed the global economy into a worse situation than the previous one that it was supposed to correct. Our empirical evidence shows that, outside the US which are the core of NAFTA and the world economy, the other 5 countries which were under examination have witnessed a worsening of their macroeconomic indicators between the fordist period and the neoliberal period. This is illustrated in particular by a significant slowdown of the growth rate, of the final demand and each of its components, of the real wage and the rate of employment. Since neoliberalism is based on neo-monetarism, all countries have adopted an austere monetary policy, the aim of which is to fight inflation. The battle against inflation has been won but at the same time has created a serious bias of income inequality in favor of the rentier class. Short-run as well long-run real interest rates have reached an unprecedented level with the consequence of creating a negative gap between the growth rate of the economy and the real interest rate. This situation is leading to an unsustainable economic development, because, at the micro level, it forces the other social groups to pay an ever increasing surplus value to the rentier class and, at the macro level, it places the US economy as the only winner and all the other countries as losers. This is illustrated in particular by the negative gap between the growth rate and the interest rate, the increased indebtedness which compels national governments to make drastic cuts in their spending programs in order to create a larger operation surplus which will pay for the ever increasing debt service. A similar situation prevails for external indebtedness which applies for three countries: Mexico, Canada and Italy. Mexico was shaken this year by one of the most severe crisis that ever occurred in this country. Canada and Italy, both facing an unstable political situation, could be next on the list for a major crisis.

#### Neoliberalism is a self-destructing system that destroys its working class

Pramono 2 (Siswo, School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, <http://www.fatihun.edu.tr/~jesr/Neoliberalism.pdf>, pg. 121-122) JDO

If genocide relates to policy that gives effect to the destruction of particular group(s), leading to the collapse of the whole societies, then a discussion focusing on how neoliberalism destroys the working class might help reveal its genocidal mentality. Neoliberalism is by nature genocidal (and suicidal) because in order to survive, it has to eat its own tail. In other words, by 'killing' the working class, capitalism is digging its own grave. When the working class is dying, society is dying, which at the end will lead to the death of capitalism itself. But what or who is the working class? The working class, which is condemned to extinction by neoliberalism, should be viewed as socio-cultural, rather than solely an economic institution (Polanyi, 1944; see also Block and Somers, 1984). The working class, therefore, is a socio-cultural institution of workers —blue and white collars— for whom "employment is far more than a measure of income: … it is the essential measure of self-worth" of individuals in a society based on work (Rifkin, 1995: 195). The emphasis on class is nevertheless significant because this working class represents an important segment of human society that is threatened by the integrated mode of global production. The end of history in fact has led the world to the end of work: the alienation of the concept of work from its socio-cultural environment. As the world is now entering the Third Industrial Revolution —the era of the information super highway— technology has caused productivity to be uncoupled from mass labour (Rifkin, 1995). Economic neoliberal creed, then, dictates rationalisation and efficiency in all lines of production through job killing methods like downsizing, out sourcing, and re-engineering production (Martin and Schumann, 1997). The result is an alarming massive unemployment that has already led to global upheavals as symbolically expressed in various protests in Seattle in 1999, Washington DC in 2000, Quebec and Genoa in 2001. Thus, the end of work, in the sense described above, means a ‘requiem for the working class’ (Rifkin, 1995).

#### Neoliberalism is an unsustainable system

**Farmer 9** (Stephanie, B.A. from Kansas State University, a M.A. from the University of Illinois at Chicago and a PhD from Binghamton University, State University of New York. “Chicago’s public transportation system: The contradictions of neoliberalism in the global city,” ProQuest Dissertations for SUNY Binghampton, publication number 3366108. P. 1-2) NT

October 11, 2008 – As I sit to write this introduction, the credit markets and their speculative scaffolding have collapsed under the weight of the contradictions of neoliberal financialization. Much of the growth experienced by the neoliberal economy was based on an expansion of credit with little productive gains to back it up. Simply, neoliberal accumulation was propped up by borrowing on the future and the future has arrived. We are witnessing the beginning of the end of the neoliberal accumulation regime. In tandem to the collapse of the financial markets, other trends likewise are projecting neoliberalism’s downfall. The physical infrastructure of the United States is also crumbling under the weight of neoliberal contradictions. Rather than investing to maintain their physical infrastructure, the United States government has been forming policy for restoring profitability for capital. With neoliberal policies aiming to provide a good business climate and stimulate the supply side economy through such practices as low taxation, reducing the state’s role in public services, and marketizing public services, the state skirted its responsibilities for maintaining the most basic forms of physical infrastructure. With state retrenchment from investment in physical infrastructure, the roads, trains, bridges and building of America have deteriorated, prompting critics to characterize this physical infrastructure as ‘made of sugar’. The deterioration of American physical infrastructure has created an obstacle course for accumulation. Physical infrastructure is the most basic form of organizing and efficiently circulating goods and labor, i.e. capital, in the built environment. As my case study of Chicago’s public transportation system reveals, as the efficiency of the built environment is undermined by disinvestment, so too will the circulation of capital, and thereby the conditions for accumulation, will be undermined as well.

#### **Neoliberalism is manipulative in false ideology**

Saunders, Professor of Social Work at University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, 2002

Daniel B., 8/1/2, “Neoliberal Ideology and Public Higher Education in the United States,” Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies

A powerful tactic used by proponents of any ideology is to exclude rival forms of thought (Eagleton, 1991). Such exclusion limits perceived alternatives and enables a specific set of beliefs to define the common sense approaches to and understandings of the world. Neoliberalism has risen to a dominant position partly because its supporters have been so successful at excluding rival forms of thought and claiming that it is the only possible social and economic system (Harvey, 2005). This is best exemplified through one of the signature phrases of neoliberalism often attributed to Margaret Thatcher: “There is no alternative” or TINA (Apple, 2004; Munck, 2005). TINA became the slogan for radical changes to U.S. and British economic policies, including severe cuts to social programs, attacks on organized labor, and the privatization of public services and resources. The economic stagflation of the 1970s provided an opportunity for proponents of neoliberalism to declare that Keynesian economic policies have and will always fail (O‟Connor, 2002). They claimed that the only option to revitalize the economy and return prosperity to the U.S. and Britain economies was an orthodox return to classic liberal economic policies (Harvey, 2005). Aided by the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989, proponents of neoliberalism proclaimed that in a free world there was no plausible alternative to neoliberalism (Munck, 2005).

#### Neoliberalism unsustainable

Gérard Duménil and Dominique Lévy 2009 (<http://www.beigewum.at/kurswechsel/> The Crisis of Neoliberalism and U.S. Hegemony pg 8-9)

There are two strands of determinants to the crisis of neoliberalism. A first set of factors refers to the »unchecked quest for high income« typical of neoliberalism. Besides the pressure placed on workers, regulations were lifted, notably financial regulations, and all barriers to globalization were suppressed. The consequence was the new configuration of financial-global mechanisms around the globe, a fragile and unwieldy structure. In this context, the quest for high income reached tremendous degrees. The appropriation of an increasingly »fictitious surplus« led to the payment of large and quite »real« flows of income: dividends to shareholders and very high »wages« to management, in particular within financial corporations, encroaching on their own funds. These trends underwent a sharp acceleration during the 2000s. The second set of factors is typical of the U.S. economy. It is the unsustainable macro trajectory of this economy. Involved are the declining trend of capital accumulation within nonfinancial corporations, the rising consumption of households (notably on the part of high income brackets), the upward trend of the debt of households and Government (Government during the 1980s and early 1990s, and then households during the 2000s), the rising deficit of foreign trade, and the increasing financing of the U.S. economy by the rest of the world. The two sets of determinants combined their effects, and this explains why the crisis began in the United States. Year after year, more loans had to be granted to domestic agents to support the use of productive capacity in the U.S. economy, while a growing fraction of the resulting demand was imported from the rest of the world. During the 2000s, mortgage loans to households were the main component of this rising indebtedness, financing residential investment and consumption in general. A fraction of households were enticed into perilous indebtedness. The debt was sup- ported by the development of securitization (the issuance of Asset-Backed Securities, ABSs, and, in particular, Mortgage-Backed Securities, MBSs) and the purchase of a rising fraction of these securities by the rest of the world. These mechanisms culmi- nated in innovative procedures such as Collateralized Debt Obligations (CDOs) in which large amounts of dubious assets were pooled and transformed into pseudo- The consequence was the downturn of output in the United States and other countries, in turn adding to the financial turmoil.

#### Neoliberalism leads to collapse, Russia proves

Kotz 98 (Daniel University of Massachusetts. Professor of Economics. Russia's Financial Crisis: The Failure of Neoliberalism? Pg 4.)

The result of the neoliberal experiment in Russia has been nearly seven years of economic devastation on a scale unseen anywhere else in peacetime in this century. As of the end of 1997, according to official statistics Russia’s gross domestic product had fallen by half since 1991 and its investment in new plant and equipment by three-fourths. The only relatively bright spot has been the raw materials and metals sector of Russia’s economy, which has declined less than the rest. In a few years what had been a diversified industrial economy has been transformed into a raw materials exporting appendage of Western capitalism. Russia has grown dependent on imported Western consumer goods and even imports more than 40% of its food. The IMF-inspired tight monetary policy has made money so scarce that 70-80% of transactions are conducted via barter.

#### Neoliberalism leads to collapse; Argentina proves

Miguel Teubal 2004 (Univeristy of Buenos Aires, Argentina. Rise and Collapse of Neoliberalism in Argentina pg 1-2\_

The recent crisis in Argentina, one of the first major economic crises of the new millennium, has been dubbed a crisis of neoliberalism (Giarracca and Teubal, 2004); a crisis that reflects the collapse of the neoliberal model drastically imple- mented in the 1990s. In many ways this sets aside the Argentine case from the Brazilian, Asian or Russian crises of the decade, all of which occurred in the wake of state-led ‘developmentalist’ and/or export-oriented economic strategies. In Argentina, the Convertibility Plan of 1991 was a response to the economic coup and crisis that induced the hyper-inflationary spurts of 1989–91. It marked the beginning of a new era in the political economy of Argentine society with the implementation of a severe structural adjustment program (SAP) that was to become an important showcase for international financial interests thereafter (Teubal, 2000/2001, 2001). Different aspects of the policies adopted in the 1990s by the Argentine government as well as some of their consequences have been analyzed else- where. Succinctly, some of the main aspects of the structural adjustment program included: an extreme privatization program; deregulations of all kinds, in particular with regard to the ‘flexibilization’ of labor markets; and a new ‘opening’ to the world economy, in particular concerning financial interests. As pointed out in this article, the SAP was preceded in the 1970s and 1980s by policies and mechanisms enhancing international and local financial interests next to reducing wages and worsening income distribution, all of which were associated in one way or another with the increased foreign debt contracted mainly by the elite economic establishment and which thereafter was transferred to the state and society at large.

### A2: Neoliberalism and Violence Inevitable

#### Neoliberalism and violence are not inevitable, rather imperialist, exploitative violence is the only possible way to hold up the neoliberal order

Brie 9 (Michael, Director of the Institute for Social Analysis of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation, *Ways out of the Crisis of Neoliberalism*, Development Dialogue No. 51, pg. 24-25, <http://www.dhf.uu.se/pdffiler/DD2009_51_postneoliberalism/Development_Dialogue_51-art3.pdf>, 2009, JKE)

Fundamentally more probable is that at least at the moment this voyage into barbarism will once again be stopped, just as it was stopped in the decades before 1914 or before 1933. But precisely in order to stop this tendency, one must be conscious of its real possibility, for neither WWI in its true dimensions, to say nothing of Auschwitz, was thought possible by large sections of the elites. It was precisely for this reason that they could happen. There was no linear causal connection between the elements of barbarism that emerged in ‘normal’ liberal capitalism and the system of barbarism of German National Socialism. This system was in no way inevitable. The capitalist classes could have managed the crisis differently in Germany, too, if large sections of the economic and political elites had not been convinced of the advantage of a temporary ‘alliance’ with Hitler’s National Socialists as a way out of the crisis. Even more importantly: neither before 1914 nor after 1933 was a real way out found; the imminent fall into the abyss was prevented in a way that only made possible an even worse future. Even if it did not immediately fall into catastrophe, elements of barbarism nevertheless accumulated under the surface of an increasingly endangered civilisation. The balance between the protection of the achievements of neoliberalism for the rulers and the threats from the five named crises can consist of a neoconservative strategy of ‘sympathetic conservatism’ within the nation state and ‘enlightened’ imperialism abroad. This is the second option of postneoliberal politics. The centres of power will seek an alliance with the ‘little people’; these centres will continue to be open only selectively for ‘useful’ and cheap labour-power; the market chances for the insiders will be heightened through active state support (above all in the educational sector) and repressive exclusion of ‘excess’ people of all types and a welfare state policy that forces the individual to transform him- or herself into the ‘entrepreneur of his or her own labour power and affective labour’ (Meinhard Miegel). A ‘common foreign and security politics’ should flank this with a mixture of partial integration and build-up of military intervention power, division of spheres of influence and coordinated security of Western hegemony. Foreign politics will be subordinated to global competition. The Lisbon strategy of the European Union aims in this direction. European leaders of this process are currently the French president, Sarkozy, and Italy’s’ prime minister, Berlusconi.

# 2AC

### A2: Framework/Cede the Political

#### **Capitalism must be discussed; central to IR politics**

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

There was a reaction against this model, expressed in ‘post-modernism’. However, this mode of thinking, which developed in the second half of the twentieth century, also incorporated a particularly ambiguous critique of modernity, which was generally limited to the cultural and political fields (M. Maffesoli, 1990). The idea of history as something constructed here and now by individual actors, the refusal to acknowledge the existence of structures and the denial of the reality of systems - defined exclusively in vertical terms - as well as the explicit desire not to accept theories in human sciences, has turned this current of thinking into the bastard child of modernism itself, so that people have become depoliticized. Post-modernism has transmuted itself into an ideology that is pretty convenient for neoliberalism. At a time when capitalism was building the new material basis of its existence as a ‘world-system’, as Immanuel Wallerstein has termed it, the denial of the very existence of systems is most useful for the advocates of the ‘Washington Consensus’. It is important to criticize modernity, but with a historical and dialectical approach (actors interacting who have different degrees of power) and with the desire to recover the emancipatory nature that characterized one moment of European history. It is not possible to identify modernity with capitalism, but neither can one talk of modernity without alluding to capitalism. This is the reason why it is imperative that we reconstruct a consistent, theoretical framework, benefiting from the contributions of various currents in human thought, including those of a philosophical nature, as well as the physical, biological and social sciences. It is important to situate each new initiative within the whole, thus giving coherence to what could seem a series of separate actions, without much connection with each other (empiricism). This is also valid for international politics.

#### Neoliberalism punishes those who attempt to engage in critical education about its principles and social consequences- attempting to exclude the discussion of the 1AC justifies eliminating individual agency

Giroux**,** Global TV Network Chair in Communications at McMaster University in Canada, author of The Abandoned Generation: Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear, 2004 (Henry A., “Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-liberalism: making the political more pedagogical,” Policy Futures in Education, Volume: 2, p. 494 and 495, JS)

The ascendancy of neo-liberal corporate culture into every aspect of American life both consolidates economic power in the hands of the few and aggressively attempts to break the power of unions, decouple income from productivity, subordinate the needs of society to the market, and deem public services and goods an unconscionable luxury. But it does more. It thrives on a culture of cynicism, fear, insecurity, and despair. Defined as the paragon of modern social relations by Friedrich A. von Hayek, Milton Friedman, Robert Nozick, Francis Fukuyama, and other market fundamentalists, neo-liberalism attempts to eliminate an engaged critique about its most basic principles and social consequences by embracing the ‘market as the arbiter of social destiny’.[1] Not only does neo-liberalism bankrupt public funds, hollow out public services, limit the vocabulary and imagery available to recognize anti-democratic forms of power, and produce narrow models of individual agency, it also undermines the critical functions of any viable democracy by undercutting the ability of individuals to engage in the continuous translation between public considerations and private interests by collapsing the public into the realm of the private. As Bauman observes, ‘It is no longer true that the “public” is set on colonizing the “private”. The opposite is the case: it is the private that colonizes the public space, squeezing out and chasing away everything which cannot be fully, without residue, translated into the vocabulary of private interests and pursuits.’[2] Divested of its political possibilities and social underpinnings, freedom offers few opportunities for people to translate private worries into public concerns and collective struggles. Central to the hegemony of neo-liberal ideology is a particular view of education in which market-driven identities and values are both produced and legitimated. Under such circumstances, pedagogy both within and outside of schools increasingly becomes a powerful force for creating the ideological and affective regimes central to reproducing neo-liberalism.In the current historical moment, critical education and the promise of global democracy face a crisis of enormous proportions. It is a crisis grounded in the now common-sense belief that education should be divorced from politics and that politics should be removed from the imperatives of democracy. At the center of this crisis, particularly in the United States, is a tension between democratic values and market values, between dialogic engagement and rigid authoritarianism. Faith in social amelioration and a sustainable future appears to be in short supply as neo-liberal capitalism performs the dual task of using education to train workers for service sector jobs and produce life-long consumers. At the same time, neo-liberalism feeds a growing authoritarianism steeped in religious fundamentalism and jingoistic patriotism, encouraging intolerance and hate as it punishes critical thought, especially if it is at odds with the reactionary religious and political agenda being pushed by the Bush administration. Increasingly, education appears useful to those who hold power, and issues regarding how public and higher education might contribute to the quality of democratic public life are either ignored or dismissed. Moral outrage and creative energy seem utterly ineffective in the political sphere, just as any collective struggle to preserve education as a basis for creating critical citizens is rendered defunct within the corporate drive for efficiency, a logic that has inspired bankrupt reform initiatives such as standardization, high stakes testing, rigid accountability schemes, and privatization. Cornel West has argued that just as we need to analyze those dark forces shutting down democracy, ‘we also need to be very clear about the vision that lures us toward hope and the sources of that vision’.[3] In what follows I want to recapture the vital role that critical and public pedagogy might play for educators, cultural studies advocates, and other cultural workers as both a language of critique and possibility by not only addressing the growing threat of free-market fundamentalism and rigid authoritarianism, but also the promise of a cultural politics in which pedagogy occupies a formative role.

### A2: Privatization CP

#### Privatization CP links to the Politics DA – politicians won’t support private companies because voters don’t want it

Ronald J. Daniels July 1996 (Ronald J. Daniels, LLM and JD from Yale University, BA from the University of Toronto, president of The Johns Hopkins University, Michael J. Trebilcock, The University of Toronto Law Journal, Vol. 46, No. 3. (Summer, 1996), pp. 375-426. pp. 407-409)

Distributional considerations arising from the privatization of infrastructure services are likely to vary widely, depending upon the nature of the service in question. Where the services have previously entailed substantial cross-subsidies under public provision, for example to rural or low income users, these are likely to disappear under an unconstrained, fully vertically integrated private provision model, and thus will provoke resistance to the adoption of this model. Indeed, under such a model adverse distributional effects may be exacerbated if the elasticity of demand by these groups is low, reflecting the absence of choices, thus permitting monopoly pricing or price discrimination. The private sector provider may, of course, be required to maintain these cross subsidies through ongoing contractual or regulatory constraints. However, these constraints are likely to make it less attractive for private sector operators to invest in such projects and, even where investment is feasible, will entail the government in complex, ongoing contractual or regulatory oversight. The empirical evidence suggests that at some point detailed regulatory oversight of a private utility or other infrastructure facility operator is likely to yield performance characteristics not sharply different from those of a public enterprise. Thus, privatization may offer few advantages where the government is committed to maintaining existing subsidy policies (other than through direct transfers). Other constituencies whose interests may be jeopardized by privatization of infrastructure services are members of public sector labour unions who have been employed in the operation of existing infrastructure facilities that are to be privatized. After privatization, they may face lay-offs, lower remuneration, less job security, and more flexible or more demanding job assignments. Other constituencies that may be at risk from privatization are both commercial and retail customers, who face the risk of monopolistic pricing of user charges by the private sector service provider if not otherwise constrained either in the initial contract between the government and the provider or by ongoing regulation. Given the essential nature of many infrastructure services, demand for these services is often inelastic and is likely to support a significant degree of monopoly pricing. Still another constituency that may perceive itself as prejudiced by the privatization of infrastructure services is environmental and related groups who may see private sector developers and operators of certain kind of infrastructure facilities, for example toll roads or airports, as being more likely than public sector providers to discount environmental and related negative externalities. A more general and amorphous constituency that may be opposed to the privatization of existing infrastructure facilities accompanied by the imposition of user charges are present users who perceive themselves as having already paid for the facility through various kinds of taxes and are unlikely to be impressed by arguments as to the efficiency of the price mechanism in rationing access to scarce or over-utilized resources. All of these constituencies are likely to translate the distributional and other impacts that they are likely to bear from privatization into political resistance to the process. With a number of these constituencies (labour or users) the resistance is likely to be less in the case of the privatization of new infrastructure facilities than with existing infrastructure facilities. This is particularly likely to be the case where the government is able to persuade voters and interest groups that the facilities are unlikely to be built at all in the absence of privatization. However, the opportunities for profitable private development and operation of new infrastructure (highways, for example), especially in developed economies where most essential infrastructure already exists, may be very limited.64 As well, development of new infrastructure facilities is likely to exacerbate the concerns of environmental and similar groups, relative to the privatization of existing facilities, given the incremental negative environmental impacts or at least 'Nimby' effects that additions to infrastructure are likely in many cases to generate.

### A2: State CP

#### States CP won’t solve because of suburban biased- the government can be the only actor.

Grengs 4. "The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA" in City 9.1 (April 2004) pp 51-66. http://communitylearningpartnership.org/share/docs/Grengs.Abandoned\_Social\_Goals\_of\_Public\_Transit.pdf Joe Grengs’s research focuses on transportation planning and how metropolitan urban form contributes to uneven economic development and social disparities.Ph.D., City and Regional Planning, Cornell University (2002) MURP, Master's Degree in Urban and Regional Planning, University of Minnesota, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs (1997) Bachelor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota, Institute of Technology (1985) ALG

Finally, regional politics are disproportionately biased in favour of suburban interests, undermining participation in democratic decision making. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) required that a wider range of factors be considered, including social equity. The law shifts unprecedented funding discretion to local levels of government, increasing the transparency of political decisions. It introduced stronger public participation rules. And it shifted power away from state departments of transportation toward metropolitan planning organizations (Dittmar, 1995). ISTEA undermined traditional political attachments and introduced openings in a decision-making process that was previously dominated by state transportation engineers. The openings have elevated non-traditional political interests to new prominence in planning and have redistributed federal transportation resources among a much broader range of constituents. To illustrate the rise of new constituencies following ISTEA, consider that annual federal funds for bicycle projects soared by nearly 800%, steadily increasing each year from $30 million in 1990 to $260 million in 1997 (Surface Transportation Policy Project, 1998). Examples of a broadened range of constituents after ISTEA include environmentalists who fund new air quality programmes through the highway trust fund, preservationists who save precious landmarks with federal support and community activists who revitalize neighbourhoods with transportation “enhancement” projects. Unfortunately, not all interest groups are equally capable of adjusting to new political openings. So although ISTEA would appear on the surface to benefit vulnerable households, this new reliance on a more open bargaining process may disproportionately burden inner-city bus riders. Voter turnout is significantly lower in central cities. Many residents of high-poverty neighbourhoods, furthermore, are deprived of any political participation by their social isolation. And metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs)—the agencies that allocate millions of dollars of transportation funds—tend to underrepresent central city interests (Lewis and Sprague, 1997, p. 12). By successfully promoting a broader distribution of transportation resources, these welcome revisions in federal policy may be distorting participation and thus intensifying the damaging trends that threaten to deprive low-income people from good job access over the long term.

### A2: Econ DA

#### Government plans for mass transit produce better results than states and are geared towards explicit social and economic goals.

Grengs 4. "The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA" in City 9.1 (April 2004) pp 51-66. http://communitylearningpartnership.org/share/docs/Grengs.Abandoned\_Social\_Goals\_of\_Public\_Transit.pdf Joe Grengs’s research focuses on transportation planning and how metropolitan urban form contributes to uneven economic development and social disparities.Ph.D., City and Regional Planning, Cornell University (2002) MURP, Master's Degree in Urban and Regional Planning, University of Minnesota, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs (1997) Bachelor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota, Institute of Technology (1985) ALG

Government support for mass transit has always carried with it explicit social goals, with surprisingly broad support. “Though its direct constituency was relatively small, its ideological appeal proved to be extremely broad. Whether one’s concern was the economic vitality of cities, protecting the environment, stopping highways, energy conservation, assisting the elderly and handicapped and poor, or simply getting other people off the road so as to be able to drive faster, transit was a policy that could be embraced” (Altshuler et al., 1979). Public officials back their support for transit by citing the economic and social benefits it brings (Jones, 1985; Adler, 1993; Fielding, 1995; Taylor and Samples, 2002). Public subsidies are often justified on the rationale that transit promotes economic development. The economic benefits frequently cited include improved mobility, reduced road congestion and travel time, linkages among different transportation modes, and reduced household transportation costs (Pucher and Lefevre, 1996; Vuchic, 1999). One study claims that investing in public transit creates new jobs: 314 jobs are created for every $10 million of transit capital investment, that 570 jobs are created for every $10 million of spending on operating transit services (Cambridge Systematics, 1999). Business leaders are often the driving force behind local efforts to increase public transportation investment because good transit expands the labour pool available to firms (Whitt, 1982; Yago, 1984; Adler, 1987). Some claim that transit investment helps revitalize business districts and creates new activity centres, which in turn helps increase the tax base and public revenues in those communities (Cervero, 1994, 1998; Vuchic, 1999). In addition to direct economic benefits the claims of social benefits of transit are numerous. Transit serves a broader purpose than merely diverting drivers from their cars: transit systems can also “influence land development, generate new activities, increase mobility for people without cars, and enhance the livability of areas they serve” (Vuchic, 1999, p. 124). Public transportation provides choice and is the only means of transportation for a substantial share of current riders. Indeed, federal legislation requires that local governments give special attention to meeting the social goal of mobility for people unable to drive (Fielding, 1987; Weiner, 1999). Transit reduces road congestion, and it connects and extends transportation networks. Transit provides a vital link for people with disabilities, ensuring that they remain actively involved in the community and maintain productive roles in the economy. Senior citizens are very important riders. By 2050, the number of people over age 65 will double from the number in 1996, from 34 million to 76 million (Rosenbloom, 2004), many of whom will be unable to drive. Transit service can also reduce costly duplication in healthcare-related transportation services. Public transit systems also serve schools and universities. In urban and rural communities throughout the country, transit is an important option that benefitspublic programmes and community services (Vuchic, 1999). Government officials supported mass transit to ensure a minimal level of urban transportation for everyone. A well-known advisory commission report found inadequate transportation to be one of the causes of social unrest. The McCone Commission report on the causes of the 1964 uprisings in Los Angeles found that “The inadequate and costly public transportation currently existing throughout the Los Angeles area seriously restricts the residents of the disadvantaged areas such as south central Los Angeles. This lack of adequate transportation handicaps them in seeking and holding jobs, attending schools, shopping, and fulfilling other needs.” (Governor’s Commission on the Los Angeles Riots, 1965, p. 65) The McCone Commission was explicit about the lack of transportation as a contributing factor in the Watts riots. The Kerner Commission, while placing less emphasis on transportation policy itself, focused its recommendations on resolving the problems that contribute to spatial mismatch, such as inadequate education, lack of jobs in the urban core, housing discrimination, racial segregation and concentrated poverty (Kerner *et al*., 1968).

### A2: Politics DA

#### Struggles against neoliberalism must address the discourse of political agency, civic education, and cultural politics as part of a broader struggle over the relationship between democratization and the global public sphere

Giroux 05 (Henry A., American cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, cultural studies, youth studies, higher education, media studies, and critical theory, 2005, “The Terror of Neoliberalism: Rethinking the Significance of Cultural Politics” TM)

Just as the world has seen a more virulent and brutal form of market capitalism, generally referred to as neoliberalism, develop over the last thirty years, it has also seen "a new wave of political activism [which] has coalesced around the simple idea that capitalism has gone too far"(Harding 2001, para.28). Wedded to the belief that the market should be the organizing principle for all political, social, and economic decisions, neoliberalism wages an incessant attack on democracy, public goods, and non-commodified values. Under neoliberalism everything either is for sale or is plundered for profit. Public lands are looted by logging companies and corporate ranchers; politicians willingly hand the public's airwaves over to powerful broadcasters and large corporate interests without a dime going into the public trust; Halliburton gives war profiteering a new meaning as it is granted corporate contracts without any competitive bidding and then bills the U.S. government for millions; the environment is polluted and despoiled in the name of profit-making just as the government passes legislation to make it easier for corporations to do so; public services are gutted in order to lower the taxes of major corporations; schools more closely resemble either malls or jails, and teachers, forced to get revenue for their school by adopting market values, increasingly function as circus barkers hawking everything from hamburgers to pizza parties—that is, when they are not reduced to prepping students to take standardized tests. As markets are touted as the driving force of everyday life, big government is disparaged as either incompetent or threatening to individual freedom, suggesting that power should reside in markets and corporations rather than in governments (except for their support for corporate interests and national security) and citizens. Citizenship has increasingly become a function of consumerism and politics has been restructured as "corporations have been increasingly freed from social control through deregulation, privatization, and other neoliberal measures" (Tabb 2003, 153). Corporations more and more design not only the economic sphere but also shape legislation and policy affecting all levels of government, and with limited opposition. As corporate power lays siege to the political process, the benefits flow to the rich and the powerful. Included in such benefits are reform policies that shift the burden of taxes from the rich to the middle class, the working poor, and state governments as can be seen in the shift from taxes on wealth (capital gains, dividends, and estate taxes) to a tax on work, principally in the form of a regressive payroll tax (Collins, Hartman, Kraut, and Mota 2004). During the 2002-2004 fiscal years, tax cuts delivered $197.3 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest 1% of Americans (i.e., households [End Page 2] making more than $337,000 a year) while state governments increased taxes to fill a $200 billion budget deficit (Gonsalves 2004). Equally alarming, a recent Congressional study revealed that 63% of all corporations in 2000 paid no taxes while "[s]ix in ten corporations reported no tax liability for the five years from 1996 through 2000, even though corporate profits were growing at record-breaking levels during that period" (Woodard 2004, para.11). Fortunately, the corporate capitalist fairytale of neoliberalism has been challenged all over the globe by students, labor organizers, intellectuals, community activists, and a host of individuals and groups unwilling to allow democracy to be bought and sold by multinational corporations, corporate swindlers, international political institutions, and those government politicians who willingly align themselves with multinational, corporate interests and rapacious profits. From Seattle to Genoa, people engaged in popular resistance are collectively taking up the challenge of neoliberalism and reviving both the meaning of resistance and the sites where it takes place. Political culture is now global and resistance is amorphous, connecting students with workers, schoolteachers with parents, and intellectuals with artists. Groups protesting the attack on farmers in India whose land is being destroyed by the government in order to build dams now find themselves in alliance with young people resisting sweatshop labor in New York City. Environmental activists are joining up with key sections of organized labor as well as groups protesting Third World debt. The collapse of the neoliberal showcase, Argentina, along with numerous corporate bankruptcies and scandals (notably including Enron), reveals the cracks in neoliberal hegemony and domination. In addition, the multiple forms of resistance against neoliberal capitalism are not limited by a version of identity politics focused exclusively on particularized rights and interests. On the contrary, identity politics is affirmed within a broader crisis of political culture and democracy that connects the militarization of public life with the collapse of the welfare state and the attack on civil liberties. Central to these new movements is the notion that neoliberalism has to be understood within a larger crisis of vision, meaning, education, and political agency. Democracy in this view is not limited to the struggle over economic resources and power; indeed, it also includes the creation of public spheres where individuals can be educated as political agents equipped with the skills, capacities, and knowledge they need to perform as autonomous political agents. I want to expand the reaches of this debate by arguing that any struggle against neoliberalism must address the discourse of political agency, civic education, and cultural politics as part of a broader struggle over the relationship between democratization [End Page 3] (the ongoing struggle for a substantive and inclusive democracy) and the global public sphere. We live at a time when the conflation of private interests, empire building, and evangelical fundamentalism brings into question the very nature, if not the existence, of the democratic process. Under the reign of neoliberalism, capital and wealth have been largely distributed upwards, while civic virtue has been undermined by a slavish celebration of the free market as the model for organizing all facets of everyday life (Henwood 2003). Political culture has been increasingly depoliticized as collective life is organized around the modalities of privatization, deregulation, and commercialization. When the alleged champions of neoliberalism invoke politics, they substitute "ideological certainty for reasonable doubt," and deplete "the national reserves of political intelligence" just as they endorse "the illusion that the future can be bought instead of earned" (Lapham 2004a, 9, 11). Under attack is the social contract with its emphasis on enlarging the public good and expanding social provisions—such as access to adequate health care, housing, employment, public transportation, and education- which provided both a safety net and a set of conditions upon which democracy could be experienced and critical citizenship engaged. Politics has been further depoliticized by a policy of anti-terrorism practiced by the Bush administration that mimics the very terrorism it wishes to eliminate. Not only does a policy of all-embracing anti-terrorism exhausts itself in a discourse of moral absolutes and public acts of denunciation that remove politics from the realm of state power, it also strips community of democratic values by defining it almost exclusively through attempts to stamp out what Michael Leeden, a former counter-terror expert in the Reagan administration, calls "corrupt habits of mind that are still lingering around, somewhere"(qtd. in Valentine 2001, para.33). The appeal to moral absolutes and the constant mobilization of emergency time coded as a culture of fear configures politics in religious terms, hiding its entanglement with particular ideologies and diverse relations of power. Politics becomes empty as it is reduced to following orders, shaming those who make power accountable, and shutting down legitimate modes of dissent (Giroux 2004).

#### Neoliberalism sustains authoritarianism that is antithetical to nurturing democratic identities, values, public spaces, and institutions- only a new political language rejecting neoliberalism solves

Giroux 05 (Henry A., American cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, cultural studies, youth studies, higher education, media studies, and critical theory, 2005, “The Terror of Neoliberalism: Rethinking the Significance of Cultural Politics” TM)

Neoliberalism has indeed become a broad-based political and cultural movement designed to obliterate public concerns and liquidate the welfare state, and make politics everywhere an exclusively market-driven project (Leys 2001). But neoliberalism does more than make the market "the informing principle of politics" (Duggan 2003, 34), while allocating wealth and resources to those who are most privileged by virtue of their class, race, and power. Its supporting political culture and pedagogical practices also put into play a social universe and cultural landscape that sustain a particularly barbaric notion of authoritarianism, set in motion under the combined power of a religious and market fundamentalism and anti-terrorism laws that suspend civil liberties, incarcerate disposable populations, and provide the security forces necessary for capital to destroy those spaces where democracy can be nourished. All the while, the landscape and soundscape become increasingly homogenized through the spectacle of flags waving from every flower box, car, truck, and house, encouraged and supplemented by jingoistic bravado being broadcast by Fox Television News and Clear Channel radio stations. As a cultural politics and a form of economic domination, neoliberalism tells a very limited story, one that is antithetical to nurturing democratic identities, values, public spaces, and institutions and thereby enables fascism to grow because it has no ethical language for recognizing politics outside of the realm of the market, for controlling market excesses, or for challenging the [End Page 13] underlying tenets of a growing authoritarianism bolstered by the pretense of religious piety. Neoliberal ideology, on the one hand, pushes for the privatization of all non-commodified public spheres and the upward distribution of wealth. On the other hand, it supports policies that increasingly militarize facets of public space in order to secure the privileges and benefits of the corporate elite and ultra-rich. Neoliberalism does not merely produce economic inequality, iniquitous power relations, and a corrupt political system; it also promotes rigid exclusions from national citizenship and civic participation. As Lisa Duggan points out, "Neoliberalism cannot be abstracted from race and gender relations, or other cultural aspects of the body politic. Its legitimating discourse, social relations, and ideology are saturated with race, with gender, with sex, with religion, with ethnicity, and nationality"(2003, xvi). Neoliberalism comfortably aligns itself with various strands of neoconservative and religious fundamentalisms waging imperial wars abroad as well as at home against those groups and movements that threaten its authoritarian misreading of the meaning of freedom, security, and productiveness. Neoliberalism has to be understood and challenged as both an economic theory and a powerful public pedagogy and cultural politics. That is, it has to be named and critically understood before it can be critiqued. The commonsense assumptions that legitimate neoliberalism's alleged historical inevitability have to be unsettled and then engaged for the social damage they cause at all levels of human existence. Such a recognition suggests identifying and critically examining the most salient and powerful ideologies that inform and frame neoliberalism. It also suggests a need on the part of progressives to make cultural politics and the notion of public pedagogy central to the struggle against neoliberalism, particularly since education and culture now play such a prominent political and economic role in both securing consent and producing capital (Peters 2002). In fact, this implies as Susan Buck-Morss has insisted that "[t]he recognition of cultural domination as just as important as, and perhaps even as the condition of possibility of, political and economic domination is a true 'advance' in our thinking" (2003, 103). Of course, this position is meant not to disavow economic and institutional struggles but to supplement them with a cultural politics that connects symbolic power and its pedagogical practices with material relations of power. Engaging the cultural politics and economics of neoliberalism also points to the need for progressives to analyze how neoliberal policies work at the level of everyday life through the language of privatization and the lived cultural forms of class, race, gender, youth, and ethnicity. Finally, such a project must employ a language of critique and possibility, engagement and hope as part [End Page 14] of a broader project of viewing democracy as a site of intense struggle over matters of representation, participation, and shared power. Central to the critique of neoliberalism is the belief, as Alain Touraine argues, that neoliberal globalization has not "dissolved our capacity for political action" (2001, 2). Such action depends on the ability of various groups—the peace movement, the anti-corporate globalization movement, the human rights movement, the environmental justice movement—within and across national boundaries—to form alliances in which matters of community and solidarity provide a common symbolic space and multiple public spheres where norms are created, debated, and engaged as part of an attempt to develop a new political language, culture, and set of relations. Such efforts must be understood as part of a broader attempt not only to collectively struggle against domination, but also to defend all those social advances that strengthen democratic public spheres and services, demand new rights, establish modes of power sharing, and create notions of social justice adequate to imagining and sustaining democracy on a global level. Consider, for example, the anti-corporate globalization movement's slogan "Another World is Possible!" which demands, as Alex Callinicos insightfully points out, a different kind of social logic, a powerful sense of unity and solidarity. Another world—that is, a world based on different social logic, run according to different priorities from those that prevail today. It is easy enough to specify what the desiderata of such an alternative social logic would be—social justice, economic efficiency, environmental sustainability, and democracy—but much harder to spell out how a reproducible social system embodying these requirements could be built. And then there is the question of how to achieve it. Both these questions—What is the alternative to capitalism? What strategy can get us there?—can be answered in different ways. One thing the anti-capitalist movement is going to have to learn is how to argue through the differences that exist and will probably develop around such issues without undermining the very powerful sense of unity that has been one of the movement's most attractive qualities. (Callinicos 2003, 147) Callinicos's insight suggests that any viable struggle against neoliberal capitalism will have to rethink "the entire project of politics within the changed conditions of a global public sphere, and to do this democratically, as people who speak different political languages, but whose goals are nonetheless the same: global peace, economic justice, legal equality, democratic participation, individual freedom, mutual respect" (Buck-Morss 2003, 4-5). One of the most central tasks facing intellectuals, activists, educators, and others who believe in an inclusive and substantive democracy is the need to use theory to rethink the language and possibilities of politics as a way to imagine a future outside the powerful grip of neoliberalism and the impending [End Page 15] authoritarianism that has a different story to tell about the future, one that reinvents the past in the image of the crude exercise of power and the unleashing of unimaginable human suffering. Critical reflection and social action in this discourse must acknowledge how the category of the global public sphere extends the space of politics beyond the boundaries of local resistance. Evidence of such actions can be found in the World Social Forums that took place in 2003 in Porto Alegre, Brazil and in Hyderabad, India in 2004. Successful forms of global dissent can also be observed in the international campaign to make AIDS drugs affordable for poor countries as well as in the international demonstrations against multinational corporations in cities from Melbourne and Seattle to Genoa and New York City. New alliances among intellectuals, students, labor unions, and environmentalists are taking place in the streets of Argentina, the West Bank, and in many other places fighting globalization from above. At the same time, a new language of agency and resistance is emerging among many activists and is being translated into new approaches to what it means to make the pedagogical more political as part of a global justice movement. Politics can no longer exclude matters of social and cultural learning and reproduction in the context of globalization or ignore the ways in which, as Imre Szeman asserts, globalization itself constitutes "a problem of and for pedagogy" (2002, 4). The slogan,"Another World is Possible!" reinforces the important political insight that one cannot act otherwise unless one can think otherwise, but acting otherwise demands a new politics in which it is recognized that global problems need global solutions along with global institutions, global modes of dissent, global intellectual collaboration, and global social movements.

#### Neoliberal politics misconstrues freedom as need-satisfaction that opens up space for authoritarianism and tyranny- rejection key

Brown 06 (Wendy, First Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley where she is also affiliated with the Department of Rhetoric and Gender and Women's Studies, December 06, “American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-Democratization” Political Theory , Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 690-714 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20452506> TM)

As neoliberalism eliminates political autonomy and the independent value of political participation from its table of values, it jettisons the democratic principle of sharing power and governance among the demos, or even the more modest democratic value of self-legislation or political participation. Habermas writes that the neoliberal conception of freedom is linked with a normatively diminished conception of the person. The concept of the person as a 'rational decider' is not only independent of the idea of the moral person who determines her will through an insight into what is in the equal interests of all those affected; it is also independent of the concept of the citizen of a republic, who participates in the public practice of self-legislation.28 Instead, democracy is equated with the existence of formal rights, especially private property rights; with the market; and with voting. Its practice among the people, whether in choosing political representatives, social policies, or political parties, is effectively reduced to an individual con sumer good, little different in kind or importance from other consumer goods. "Neoliberalism also calculates that the use-value of civil liberties is consumed in the enjoyment of private autonomy.... [I]t does not add polit ical autonomy as a further dimension of freedom."29 This means not only that neoliberalism "closes itself off from the intuition that citizens can be free only if they can regard themselves as ... authors and addressees of the law at the same time," but also that civil liberties are easily set aside in the pursuit of a national moral project or whenever private autonomy is judged imperiled by issues of security.30 As neoliberalism converts every political or social problem into market terms, it converts them to individual problems with market solutions. Examples in the United States are legion: bottled water as a response to con tamination of the water table; private schools, charter schools, and voucher systems as a response to the collapse of quality public education; anti-theft devices, private security guards, and gated communities (and nations) as a response to the production of a throwaway class and intensifying economic inequality; boutique medicine as a response to crumbling health care provi sion; "V-chips" as a response to the explosion of violent and pornographic material on every type of household screen; ergonomic tools and technologies as a response to the work conditions of information capitalism; and, of course, finely differentiated and titrated pharmaceutical antidepressants as a response to lives of meaninglessness or despair amidst wealth and freedom. This conversion of socially, economically, and politically produced problems into consumer items depoliticizes what has been historically produced, and it especially depoliticizes capitalism itself. Moreover, as neoliberal political rationality devolves both political problems and solutions from public to private, it further dissipates political or public life: the project of navigating the social becomes entirely one of discerning, affording, and procuring a personal solution to every socially produced problem. This is depoliticization on an unprecedented level: the economy is tailored to it, citizenship is organized by it, the media are dominated by it, and the politi cal rationality of neoliberalism frames and endorses it. Thus, the much-discussed commitment of neoliberalism to "privatiza tion" has ramifications that exceed the outsourcing of police forces, prisons, welfare, militaries, and schools on one side, and the corporate buyout of public endeavors and institutions on the other. Privatization as a value and practice penetrates deep into the culture and the citizen-subject. If we have a problem, we look to a product to solve it; indeed, a good deal of our lives is devoted to researching, sharing, procuring, and upgrading these solutions. At the same time, as a quick tour of any "public" university or an hour of lis tening to "public" radio makes clear, distinct thresholds between the corpo rate and public domains are eroding, leaving only occasional conflict of interest violations, fought out at relatively legalistic levels, in their wake. As neoliberalism produces the citizen on the model of entrepreneur and consumer, it simultaneously makes citizens available to extensive gover nance and heavy administrative authority. We have already seen that neolib erals themselves have a keen appreciation of the production of certain kinds of subjects and behaviors through market incentives and deterrents. But apart from express governance aims, there is the basic critical theoretical insight that the choosing subject and the governed subject are far from opposites; indeed, individual rational action on one side and state or religious authority on the other, while operating in different semiotic registers, are quite compatible. Frankfurt school intellectuals and, before them, Plato theorized the open compatibility between individual choice and political domination, and depicted democratic subjects who are available to political tyranny or authoritarianism precisely because they are absorbed in a province of choice and need-satisfaction that they mistake for freedom.3" From a different angle, Foucault theorized a subject at once required to make its own life and heavily regulated in this making-this is what biopower and discipline together accomplish, and what neoliberal govern mentality achieves.

### **A2: Spending DA**

#### A fare-free transit system would avoid much of the cost of a transit system with fares.

Olsen 07 [Dave, Journalist for The Tyee, “Fare-Free Public Transit Could Be Headed to a City Near You”, [http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree\_public\_transit\_could\_be\_headed\_to\_a\_ city\_near\_you](http://www.alternet.org/story/57802/farefree_public_transit_could_be_headed_to_a_%20city_near_you), 7/26/07, Accessed: 7/12/12] JDO

A prime reason to quit charging people to take the bus is that collecting bus fares costs a lot of money. It takes both machines and people to sell, make and distribute tickets and collect, count and deposit cash. King County's Metro Transit System, which includes the city of Seattle and an estimated population of just under 2 million, concludes, after a comprehensive assessment, that the cost of collecting fares will hit about $8 million this year -- enough to buy 18 new buses. A major analysis of U.S. public transit systems found that for larger systems, fare collection costs can be as high as 22 percent of the revenue collected. Another study showed that New York City's Metropolitan Transportation Authority spends roughly $200 million a year just to collect money from transit riders. What about switching to "smart card" technology? Wouldn't that save money? In Toronto, the city's Transit Commission estimates the switch will cost almost $250 million (or about 520 new buses) for card readers, vending machines and retrofits, and over $10 million a year (22 new buses) after that, which has some transit authorities saying the money could be better used in improving service. For similar reasons, some cities have decided it just doesn't pay to police people who don't pay fares. In 1996, the Maryland Mass Transit Administration (MTA) wanted to figure out how to stop those few riders that cheat; its Central Light Rail Line was "barrier free." MTA wanted to know whether it should start using barriers in order to force people to pay their fares. The study found that more people would pay, yes, but the cost of making them pay would be higher than the revenue from extra fares collected. Much higher. The least expensive alternative would cost the MTA $18.54 for each potential fare dollar recovered over a 10-year period. In other words, if $1 million is currently lost to fare evasion, it would cost at least $18.5 million to collect that money. Spread the burden and benefit All of which brings us back to the logic of fare-free transit. Whidbey Island's transit planners did their own studies two decades ago. In 1986 they did an extensive cost-benefit analysis of collecting fares and found that either no significant revenue would be generated for Island Transit, or that the costs of collecting fares would exceed the revenue generated.

### A2: State Bad K

#### Formation of ideal state can be achieved through recognition of diversity, equal treatment

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

Our third central theme, in revising the paradigm of collective life and the Common Good of Humanity, is the generalizing of democracy, not only in the political field but also in the economic system, in relationships between men and women and in all institutions. In other words, the mere forms of democracy, which are often used to establish a fake equality and to perpetuate unacknowledged social inequalities, must be left behind. This involves a revision of the concept of the State and the reclamation of human rights in all their dimensions, individual and collective. It is a matter of treating every human being, with no distinction of race, sex, or class, as partners in the building of society, thus confirming their self-worth and participation (Franz Hinkelammert, 2005). The concept of the State is absolutely central in this field. The model of the Jacobin centralized state of the French Revolution, erasing all differences in order to construct citizens who were in principle equal, is not enough to build a real democracy. Such a state was without doubt a step forward when compared to the political structures of the European ancien régime. But it is now necessary not only to take into account the existence of opposing classes, and to realize that any one class, or a coalition of them, can take possession of the State to ensure that their own interests dominate; but also to acknowledge the existence of all the various nationalities that live in a territory and who have the right to affirm their cultures, their territorial reference points and their social institutions. This is not a matter of falling into the kind of communitarianism that weakens the State, as has happened in certain European countries in the neoliberal era or of accepting the neo-anarchism of certain legitimate and massive protests. Neither is it a matter of retreating into nostalgia for a romantic past, like certain politicoreligious movements, nor of falling into the clutches of powerful economic interests (transnational enterprises or international financial institutions) that prefer to negotiate with small-scale local bodies. The aim is to reach equilibrium between these different dimensions of collective life, international, regional and local, recognizing their existence and setting up mechanisms for participation. The role of the State cannot be formulated without taking into account the situation of the most marginalized social groups: landless peasants, lower castes and the dalits (the former untouchables), who have been ignored for thousands of years, as well as the indigenous peoples of America and those of African descent who have been excluded for over 500 years and, within these groups, the women who are doubly marginalized. Juridical processes, even constitutional ones, are not enough to change the situation, necessary though these are. Racism and prejudice will not rapidly disappear in any society. In this field the cultural factor is decisive and can be the subject of specific policies to protect people against aggression by the ‘all market’ and which provide the basic necessities constitute an important step in the transition process, as long as they are not just ‘band-aids’, detached from structural reform.

#### Plan achieves utopia by advancing society in favor of collective humanity

Houtart, Belgian Marxist Sociologist, serves as an advisor to CETRI, was awarded the UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence, 2011

(Francois, 11/26/11, “From ‘Common Goods’ to the ‘Common Good of Humanity,” HAOL, Volume: 26, p. 87-102, EBB)

It therefore follows that the ‘Common Good of Humanity’ will result from successfully achieving all these four goals, each of which is fundamental to the collective life of human beings on the planet. The goals defined by capitalism, guaranteed by political forces and transmitted by the dominant culture, are not sustainable, and so cannot ensure ‘the Common Good of Humanity’. On the contrary, they work against the continuance of life (François Houtart, 2009). There has to be a change of paradigms, to permit a symbiosis between human beings and nature, access of all to goods and services, and the participation of every individual and every collective group in the social and political organizing processes, each having their own cultural and ethical expression: in other words to realize the Common Good of Humanity. This will be a generally long-term process, dialectic and not linear, and the result of many social struggles. The concept of Common Good as used in this work goes well beyond the classical Greek conception, taken up by the Renaissance (J. Sanchez Parga, 2005, 378-386), and beyond the social doctrine of the Catholic Church, based on the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. It is for this reason that a complete theoretical rethinking is necessary, on the one hand dealing with all the elements that have led the world into a systemic crisis situation and with the wearing out of a historical model; and on the other hand, redefining the objectives of a new social construct that is respectful of nature and capable of ensuring human life as a shared endeavour. As Enrique Dussel (2006) has said, what must be ensured are the production, reproduction and development of the human life of each ethical subject (each human being). This is what the Common Good of Humanity means. The ultimate reference of all paradigms of human development is life in its concrete reality, including relations with nature, which is, in fact, negated by the logic of capitalism. There may be objections that this is a fanciful utopia. The fact is that human beings need utopias, and capitalism has destroyed utopian thinking, announcing the end of history ('there are no alternatives'), so that the search for the Common Good of Humanity is indeed a utopia, in the sense of a goal that does not exist today, but that could exist tomorrow. At the same time utopia also has a dynamic dimension: there will always be a tomorrow. All political and religious regimes that claim to embody utopia end up in catastrophe. Utopia is a call to advance. 3 It is for this reason that it is not simply a ‘harmless utopia’ (Evelyn Pieiller, 2011, 27). The need for it is felt by hundreds of thousands of social movements, citizen organizations, political groups, all in their own way struggling for better relations with nature and for its protection, for peasant and organic agriculture, for a social economy, for the abolition of illicit debts, for the collective taking over of the means of production and for the primacy of work over capital, for the defence of human rights, for a participatory democracy and for the recognition of the value of different cultures. The World Social Forums have made it possible to visualize this reality, which is gradually creating a new global social consciousness.

### **A2: Elections DA**

#### **The 2012 campaign is an instance of the “money-and-media election complex” that prioritizes corporate and individual spending to TV political advertisements- a “nuclear weapon” to gaining votes**

McChesney and Nichols 12 (Robert W., American professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Gutgsell Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication, John, American journalist and author; Washington correspondent for The Nation and associate editor of The Capital Times, April, “The Bull Market” Monthly Review Volume 63, Number 11 TM)

The United States is in the midst of its quadrennial presidential election, a process that now extends so long as to be all but permanent. The campaign is also drenched in more money given by a small handful of billionaires than has been the case in the past. Since the 1970s the amount spent on political campaigns has increased dramatically in almost every election cycle. It has led to the formation of what we term the “money-and-media election complex,” which has a revenue base in the many billions of campaign dollars donated annually, and has effectively become the foundation of electoral politics in the United States. Moreover, the rate of increase in campaign spending from 2008 to 2010, and especially from 2008 to 2012, is now at an all-time high. American elections are being transformed and supercharged by the Supreme Court’s January 2010 Citizens United ruling. But the changes, even at this early stage of the 2012 campaign, have proven more dramatic and unsettling than all but the most fretful analysts had imagined. Citizens United’s easing of restrictions on corporate and individual spending, especially by organizations not under the control of candidates, has led to the proliferation of “Super PACs.” These shadowy groups do not have to abide by the $2,500 limit on donations to actual campaigns, and they can easily avoid rules for reporting sources of contributions. The two logical questions then are where does all this money get spent and what are the effects of this spending on elections and the political system? The short answer to the first question is known by all participants in and observers of American elections: the majority of the money goes to political advertising, and within political advertising the vast majority goes to television ads. The percentage of campaign spending that goes to TV ads has increased sharply over the past forty years. If there is a rule it is that the closer a race, the more money will be spent on the campaigns, and the higher the proportion that will go to paid TV political advertisements. “We spent the vast majority of our money last time on broadcast television,” Obama campaign advisor David Axelrod told attendees at a 2011 cable convention. “It’s still the nuclear weapon.”1 This year, according to a fresh report to investors from Needham and Company’s industry analysts, television stations will reap as much as $5 billion—up from $2.8 billion in 2008. As for the second question, there is a range of effects. That is what we turn to in this Review of the Month. For Americans born after 1950, and for those born before 1950 but with faltering memories, the televised commercial deluge that now defines American political campaigns likely seems the natural order of things, for better or for worse.2 But American campaigns were significantly different in the 175 years before political advertising, specifically television political advertising, became the order of the day. When one reads Theodore White’s epic The Making of the President series, especially for 1960 and 1964, the emerging role of television is a recurring theme—but TV political advertising is barely present in the early 1960s volumes. By White’s account, Nixon paid virtually no attention to his Madison Avenue advisors throughout his unsuccessful 1960 presidential campaign.3 Joe Klein recounts how his research shows that in the 1950s and ‘60s candidates routinely hired advertising experts and pollsters, “But these were peripheral advisers; they didn’t run the campaigns.”4 This quickly changed. In 1969 Joe McGinniss published his groundbreaking The Selling of the President, to chronicle what he termed “a striking new phenomenon—the marketing of political candidates as if they were consumer products.” The book, which involved McGinniss spending time with Nixon’s television advertising advisors including Roger Ailes during the 1968 presidential campaign, seemed shocking and a sharp departure from the political-driven campaign narratives provided by the likes of White. McGinniss documented how Nixon came to rely upon TV political commercials, based on Madison Avenue marketing principles, as the foundation of his campaign. In the book Ailes presciently concludes immediately after the November victory, “This is the beginning of a whole new concept. This is it. This is the way they’ll be elected forevermore.”5 It is ironic that today, when one reads the book, it seems downright quaint, even homespun, in comparison to subsequent elections. The liberal McGinniss is able to wander through the corridors of power in Nixon’s campaign like a serendipitous hippie roaming around at Woodstock. The narrative reminds one of the Dr. Evil character in the Austin Powers film who returns to life in 1997 after being frozen for thirty years, and then threatens to blow up the world unless he is given his ransom demand of…one million dollars. Consider also The Candidate, a 1972 film about a young idealistic California candidate for a U.S. Senate seat, starring Robert Redford. The film, with a screenplay by a former Eugene McCarthy speechwriter, dealt with the phoniness and superficiality that marketing and television had brought to political campaigns. It was provocative and controversial and contributed to subsequent debates about the role of money in politics. TV political advertising plays an important role in the piece and is cast in a negative light. But what is ironic is that the TV ads Redford’s character airs in the fictional campaign are closer to Lincoln’s Gettysburg address in tone and substantive content than they are to the asininity that typifies political ads of more recent vintage. Ads of that caliber today would have political scientists and pundits shouting from the mountaintops that we were free at last. But in 1972 such ads were considered highly suspect and part of the problem. As it was, by 1972 the total amount spent for all races on television political advertising, and that so alarmed McGinniss, Redford, and the nation—from President and House and Senate to governorships, mayors, state legislatures, referenda, initiatives and city council, the works!—had increased almost fourfold from 1960 to reach $37 million.6 That would amount to approximately $200 million in 2012 dollars; so, factoring for inflation, the 1972 election spent less than 3 percent of what will be spent on TV political ads in the 2012 election cycle. For a concrete example, in 1972, a little-known Colorado Democrat, Floyd Haskell, spent $81,000 (roughly $440,000 in 2010 dollars) on television advertising for a campaign that unseated incumbent Republican U.S. Senator Gordon Allott. The figure was dramatic enough to merit note in a New York Times article on Haskell’s upset win. Fast-forward to the 2010 Senate race, when incumbent Colorado Democrat Michael Bennet defeated Republican Ken Buck. The total spent on that campaign in 2010 (the bulk of which went to television ads) topped $40 million, more than $30 million of which was spent by Super PAC-type groups answering only to their donors. In the last month of the election, negative ads ran nearly every minute of every day. The difference in spending, factoring in inflation, approached one hundred-to-one. The 2010 Colorado Senate race is generally held up by insiders as the bellwether for 2012 and beyond. As Tim Egan puts it, “This is your democracy on meth—the post–Citizens United world.” The total number of TV political ads for House, Senate, and Gubernatorial candidates in 2010 was 2,870,000. This was a 250 percent increase in the number of TV ads as there were for the same category of races in 2002. In terms of spending, and compared strictly to 2008, just two years earlier, House race TV ads cost 54 percent more in 2010 and the cost of Senate race TV ads was up 71 percent.7 By the end of 2011 it was already clear that 2012 would have a quantum leap in campaign spending from 2008, the greatest increase in American history, and much of this would go to TV political ads. “In 2010, it was just training wheels, and those training wheels will come off in 2012,” says Kenneth Goldstein, president of Kantar Media’s Campaign Media Analysis Group. “There will be more bigger groups spending, and not just on one side but on both sides.”8 This is not a commercial market where a speculative boom leads to an eventual bust. This is a political market and it is going in one direction, quickly. The federal and state budgets are enormous multi-trillion-dollar troughs and there is no sign that corporate interests are anywhere near their upward limit of what they will pay to have access to them and control the laws, policies, subsidies, and regulations that affect their profitability. Indeed, it is possible that 2012 may one day appear to be a democratic panacea compared to what lies ahead, much like 1968 or 1972 looks to us today. Any way you slice it, to mix metaphors, we are not in Kansas anymore.

#### Political advertisements influence election votes- makes elections a competition between elites that fail to address real issues and focus using “market power” to deceive politically uninformed citizens

McChesney and Nichols 12 (Robert W., American professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Gutgsell Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication, John, American journalist and author; Washington correspondent for The Nation and associate editor of The Capital Times, April, “The Bull Market” Monthly Review Volume 63, Number 11 TM)

When television political advertising first became prominent in American campaigns, by the 1960s and early ‘70s, the common criticism of the practice was that political advertising was bad because it was advertising, that it substituted the hustle and chicanery of a Madison Avenue sales job for the meat and potatoes of political debate and democratic governance. Lincoln and Douglas were replaced by Procter & Gamble. “Madison Avenue sells politicians like soap,” the lament went. The very term Madison Avenue provided a shorthand critique of advertising’s lack of ethics, sincerity, and integrity, and it encapsulated much of what people felt they were subjected to with TV political commercials. In 1960, for example, Richard Nixon so feared the tag “Madison Avenue” that he moved his campaign’s television advisers—according to White, “the finest brains of New York’s advertising agencies”—from their ad agency offices on that (in)famous street to new offices on nearby Vanderbilt Avenue.9 Back in this era, before it became a multi-billion dollar industry, stalwarts in the advertising industry were often offended by the comparison of political advertising to commercial advertising, as they regarded the latter as having vastly greater integrity and social value. Advertising icon David Ogilvy called political spots “the most deceptive, misleading, unfair and untruthful of all advertising.”10 At another point, Ogilvy stated, “Political advertising ought to be stopped. It’s the only really dishonest kind of advertising that’s left. It’s totally dishonest.”11 When advertising executive Robert Spero was told that TV political advertising sold politicians like soap, he responded that unfortunately that was not the case, because soap advertising was so superior as a source of consumer information. Spero was so appalled by political advertising that he took leave from his position at Oglivy & Mather in the late 1970s to do a comprehensive analysis of every available presidential television political commercial from 1952 through the 1976 election. In Spero’s mind, the key distinction between commercial ads and political ads was that political advertising, unlike commercial advertising, had First Amendment protection from regulation for fraud and misleading content. This point is indeed crucial and cannot be exaggerated: political advertising can pretty much say whatever it wants without fear of regulatory reprisal. Spero’s book, The Duping of the American Voter, demonstrated in a meticulous and engaging case-by-case study that political ads for all varieties of candidates routinely had fraudulent traits that would have been impossible for a commercial advertiser facing the Federal Trade Commission and other forms of government regulation at that time. “Corporations and their advertising advisers have not become simon-pure in their evolvement from street hucksters. Historically, bending the truth has been inseparable from selling,” Spero wrote. “What has prevented the truth from being bent out of all proportion by corporations and their advertising agents is the phenomenal growth of advertising regulation over the past decade.”12 The arguments against political advertising from industry figures like Ogilvy and Spero have receded over the years, though grousing remains on the edges. To some extent it may be that the high-water mark of commercial advertising regulation faded after the 1970s as neoliberalism worked its magic through the regulatory system, so that argument was less compelling. To a larger extent it was that the emergence of the money-and-media election complex meant there was a massive piece of the action for Madison Avenue (and, as we discuss below, commercial media) so there was great incentive to accept the status quo, for better or for worse, and go with the flow. After all, can political advertising really be worse than junk food or pharmaceutical or tobacco advertising? What is clear is that any change of heart from Madison Avenue had little or nothing to do with the integrity or quality of the political ads themselves. A recent study of political spots cited by reputable sources found “roughly half of all ads to be unfair, misleading or deceptive.”13 In fact, Ogilvy and Spero were too quick to regard political advertising and product advertising as being distant relations, though their approach has been widely internalized among scholars. Political advertising is generally understood by political scientists and political communication scholars first and foremost as an outgrowth of political campaigning—understandably, as that is the tradition they come from—and particular attention is paid to identifying the common themes that link the present to earlier eras. Because blarney, bluster, deception, character assassination, showmanship, manipulation, idiocy, baby-kissing, superficiality, overstatement, ridicule, hypocrisy, and hyperbole have always been present in popular politics, the argument goes, Americans should not be so alarmed that these traits now come packaged as candidate TV ads. In the past the American democratic system always ended up working effectively, and voters were able to cut through the crap and use the system to accurately convey their core political values and concerns; there is little reason to think that will not remain the case in the era of political advertising. The system works; the more things change the more they stay the same. This approach underplays or misses the decisive differences in the current nature of political campaigns wrought by TV political advertising. There is the matter of the enormous increase in funds necessary to successfully participate as a candidate, and the strings that come attached to these funds. There is also the matter of the power, sophistication, and ubiquity of political advertising, to the point where it replaces virtually everything else in the campaign, including all the forces that in theory could counteract the power of money and advertising. There is also the matter that people—to a significant extent, and rationally—detest political advertising in a manner that has no true precedent in American political campaigns. In our experience it is common to have conversations on the matter where we have been left with the impression that people—whatever their age, background, political position, or whether they loved or hated or were disinterested in electoral politics—looked favorably upon the prospect of living in a world where TV political advertising did not exist. Praise from the random citizen for the contributions of TV political advertising to our democracy in our experience has been about as frequent as unprovoked enthusiasm for the prospect of an IRS audit or emergency root canal work conducted by an amateur sans pain killer. In our view, a more accurate appreciation of our current political campaigns can be generated by also understanding political advertising as a subset of commercial advertising. This approach has received too little attention from scholars, probably because so few of them have given much consideration to the matter, or seem to know much about it. Modern commercial advertising is not a function of what economists term “competitive markets,” meaning new businesses can easily enter existing profitable markets, increase output, lower prices, and make the consumer live happily ever after. Such markets tend to have relatively little advertising, if only because producers can sell all that they produce at the market price, over which they have little or no control. (Think of a wheat farmer in 1875.) This is why the largely local and competitive U.S. economy prior to the late nineteenth century had little advertising by the standards of the past one hundred years. Modern persuasion advertising blossomed as a function of markets that were less competitive by economists’ standards, and are generally referred to as oligopolies. These are markets where a handful of firms dominate output or sales in the industry, and where they have sufficient market power that they can set the price at which their product sells. The key to an oligopoly is that it is very difficult for newcomers to enter the market, no matter how profitable it may be, because of the power of the existing players. Under oligopoly there is strong disincentive to engage in price warfare to expand one’s market share, because all the main players are large enough to survive a price war and all it would do is shrink the size of the industry revenue pie that the firms are fighting over. Indeed, the price in an oligopolistic industry will tend to gravitate toward what it would be in a pure monopoly so the contenders are fighting for slices of the largest possible revenue pie.14 At first blush, this is a pretty accurate picture of the U.S. economy of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The economy has become far more monopolistic over the past thirty years.15 It is also a good way, though by no means the only way, to understand the emergence and dominance of advertising. Although firms are not in what economists term competitive markets, they are most definitely engaged in monopolistic competition with each other to maximize their profits. Advertising emerges front and center as a major way to increase market share (and protect market share) without engaging in destructive profit-damaging price competition. The election realm is similar to the economy in that it tends to be a duopoly in general elections, meaning there are usually only two options that could conceivably win, and, as in an oligopoly, these duopolists have used their “market power”—in this case control over election laws—to make it all but impossible for a third party to successfully establish itself as a legitimate contender. Even primary elections are almost always a matter of no more than two or three viable entrants except in a very small number of races. In economic theory this leads to an interesting conclusion: as Juliet Schor has put it, the smart play for a firm in a duopoly is to act like the other firm, not to differentiate itself. C.B. Macpherson was among the first to understand modern electoral politics—the two-party system—in terms of oligopolistic and duopolistic market practices. “Where there are so few sellers,” Macpherson wrote concerning political parties, “they need not and do not respond to buyers’ demands as they must do in a fully competitive system.” This means the parties, like oligopolistic firms, can “create the demand for political goods” and largely dictate the “demand schedule for political goods.” In Macpherson’s argument, a duopolistic party system in a modern capitalist society like the United States will tend to gravitate to providing a “competition between elites,” which are the driving force and “formulate the issues.”16 The basics in the political economy are agreed upon by the two parties and off the table for public debate or discussion. In Macpherson’s view, the two-party system was ideal for the production of citizen apathy and depoliticization—especially among those at the bottom end of the economic spectrum—and for the maintenance of elite rule; i.e. what would be called a “weak democracy.” For supporting evidence, V.O. Key’s trailblazing research in the 1950s demonstrated the class bias in voting turnout—rich people often voted at nearly twice the rate of poor people—in the first half of the twentieth century.17 Macpherson provided these insights in the 1970s, before political advertising nudged the Richter scale in political science. If anything, the linkage of the two parties to elite economic interests is stronger today than it was in his era. But the economic analogy is only good for a broad brush stroke, because elections are not commercial marketplaces and duopolistic elections existed a very long time before the emergence of political advertising. For political advertising to emerge as a major factor required a number of developments, especially the establishment of commercial broadcasting. Those nations with limited or seriously regulated commercial broadcasting have less political advertising, and little political pressure to encourage it. Where the oligopoly/persuasive advertising analogy is crucial to understanding political advertising is when we look at the content of the ads. Under conditions of oligopoly firms tend to produce similar products and sell them at similar prices. Therefore advertising that emphasizes price and product information can be ineffectual, if not counterproductive. (That type of price and product information advertising can be found in more competitive retail markets, or in classified advertising.) An ad campaign based on “Hey, buy our soft drink because it costs the same and tastes the same as our competitor” probably will not lead to awards, a promotion, or a long career. Firms put inordinate effort to create brands that are perceived as different from competitors and advertising is crucial in creating the aura surrounding these brands. To be fair, there are occasionally meaningful differences between products and ad agencies love nothing more than to have a product with something meaty they can build a campaign around. But as often as not that is not the clear case. The legendary adman Rosser Reeves—said to be the professional model for the Don Draper character in the TV program Mad Men—was reputed to have repeated the same presentation for years for newly hired copywriters at his Ted Bates advertising agency in the 1960s. He would hold up two identical shiny silver dollars, one in each hand, and would tell his audience in effect: “Never forget that your job is very simple. It is to make people think the silver dollar in my left hand is much more desirable than the silver dollar in my right hand.”18 Reeves was an advocate of such deceptive advertising stratagems as presenting as new and unique what was actually old and ordinary in a given product. Moreover, much of the product differentiation built into a brand is superficial and not truly related to the utility provided by the product itself, but it provides the grist for an ad campaign. As advertising historian Stephen Fox observes, today’s cars, for example, are “two-ton packaged goods, varying little beneath the skins of their increasingly outlandish styling.”19 “Since most brands are basically not that different,” William Greider writes, “advertising’s fantasies provide as good a reason as any to choose one brand over another.”20 What this means for advertising content is that there is an endless search for ways to capture attention and differentiate products that exploit possibilities that may have little or nothing to do with the actual product and the utility it might render to the consumer. It also leads to ads that attempt to make a product virtue out of something that is insignificant, or not specific to the product, or irrelevant. Take a look at endless beer ads or soap ads or oil company ads or countless other products to see the inanity and absurdity of much of what passes for advertising. Pabst beer, for example, simultaneously markets itself as a downscale working-class brew, an ironic cool brew for urban hipsters, and as a champagne substitute and signifier of conspicuous consumption in China. “The same beverage means very different things to different people,” as Eli Pariser puts it.21 Likewise, advertising tends to be expert at playing upon emotions and using fear as a motivational weapon. Television advertising, in particular, uses cultural cues to communicate fairly complex messages in less than thirty seconds, and exploiting stereotypes and cultural references to pack a lot of meaning into a few fleeting seconds. It uses visuals in such a way that if one only reads the text or listens to the words, they will miss the heart of what is being communicated.22 Humor is used on occasion, as well as sexuality whenever possible, and then some. Advertising is, in short, arguably the highest grade and most sophisticated system of applied propaganda in the world. The nature of oligopolistic advertising leads to two paradoxes. First, it is said that the more products are alike and the more the prices are similar, the more the firms must advertise to convince people they are different. The second paradox of advertising is that the more firms advertise to distinguish themselves from their competition, the more commercial “clutter” there is in the media and culture. As a result firms are forced to increase their advertising that much more to get through the clutter and reach the public.23 If there is anything close to an iron law in advertising, it is this: repetition works; the more exposure to a brand’s advertising the better. This follows from the conclusion drawn from social science research: people are more inclined to believe what they have heard before.24 It does not guarantee success, but it increases the odds considerably. This, we submit, is a good and necessary way to understand the practices of the money-and-media election complex and the content of much of political advertising. As its role has grown, an industry has emerged with experts who refine its use strategically and tactically. Research is done to determine what appeals will work with the target audience to get the desired results, and advertising is produced to generate the appeal.25 Sophisticated research breaks voters into minuscule niches that can be better exploited. The basics of how the corporate economy is structured or U.S. foreign policy are pretty much off the table, much like price and product information in beer advertising, because the two parties largely concur on the most important matters of governance. To the extent those subjects are broached it is largely done in an opportunistic and manipulative manner, based upon buzzwords fire tested by research on the target audience. In short, one should start with the premise that the content of political advertising will have all the value of a commercial for beer or soft drinks. That the material in the ads may be factually inaccurate or, more likely, may be decontextualized half-truths is not a surprise, nor a pressing concern to those producing the ads. According to the most comprehensive research on the topic, nearly all political ads “make at least a limited appeal to emotions,” particularly enthusiasm and fear, “and a substantial majority make a strong emotional appeal.”26 Julian Kanter, curator of the Political Commercial Archive of the University of Oklahoma, observes that in TV political ads “the most important messages are those that are contained in the visual imagery.” That imagery, he points out, “can be used to create impressions that are untrue.” Through such visual tricks, campaigns duck the scrutiny they might face when only the words in the script are read.27 That the material in the ads may not be pertinent to the real issues the candidate will be addressing once in office or what they might do on the real issues they might face is beside the point. The point is to win elections by any means necessary. No one understood this better than Lee Atwater, the political mastermind who guided George H.W. Bush’s successful 1988 presidential campaign. Atwater explained that the battle between the two parties was always about winning the “populist vote.” “It is always the swing vote,” he said. This was all done through political marketing, and, as Atwater conceded, had little to do with how either party would actually govern.28 By the 1990s research demonstrated that most candidates had little or nothing to do with the marketing of their campaigns and the content of the advertising. This became the domain of the professional consultant, whose job is to win elections, period.29 Moreover, the two paradoxes of commercial advertising apply as well. Candidates with less tangible records to distinguish themselves from their opponents have to spend more to create the sense that there is a meaningful difference. Ron Paul and Dennis Kucinich, for example, need less spending to make clear they stand in fundamental opposition to their competition even within their own party. Second, when one’s competition spends a great deal on advertising, that puts extreme pressure on a candidate to match the advertising and, ideally, up the ante. This applies to the Pauls and Kuciniches as well as everyone else, if they are serious about winning. As the clutter increases, the only course is to push down harder on the political advertising accelerator, not hit the brakes. Indeed, recent research confirms that while TV ads are clearly effective, their positive effect decays quickly, so it is important once one goes on the air to stay full throttle until election day.30 The iron law applies: everything else being relatively equal, the candidate with a decisive TV advertising war chest will win. Perhaps no campaign exemplifies the logic of commercial advertising better than that of Barack Obama’s presidential run in 2007–08. “I serve as a blank screen,” he wrote in his 2006 The Audacity of Hope, “on which people of vastly different political stripes project their own views.”31 “By the time he won the presidential election, the Barack Obama brand had become a worldwide wonder,” the media scholar Leonard Steinhorn writes. “He had become an icon, someone who seemed to embody our most personal aspirations and hopes, a larger-than-life figure who exceeded the powers and abilities of any mere mortal.”32 Obama’s marketing team put together such an extraordinary advertising campaign—“Change You Can Believe in”—that it was awarded Advertising Age’s “Marketer of the Year” for 2008. To win the award Team Obama needed to get the most votes from the attendees at the annual conference of the Association of National Advertisers, people who know a good sales job when they see one. The runners-up included Nike and Coors beer.33 In retrospect Obama’s advertising campaign was ambiguous, if not vacuous or deceptive, in terms of governance and policy—though that is now accepted as par for the course. Everyone else does it, the conventional wisdom goes, so why should Obama be held to a different standard? McCain’s campaign slogan was “Country First.” The candidates could have easily swapped campaign slogans in the summer of 2007 and it would have had no effect on their actual policy positions. This is not a bull market for nothing. The Obama campaign underlined another aspect of commercial advertising that applies full force to political advertising: it works! “We can say confidently that ads are persuasive, especially if you have more ads than your competitor,” Travis Ridout and Michael Franz, two leading researchers who have devoted careers to the subject, wrote in 2011, noting that leading research confirmed “ad effects were also more widespread than we had predicted.” “We have found that televised political advertising influences people’s voting choices, and more specifically, we have shown that ads are having their greatest influence on those who are the least informed about politics.” “Ads have greater influence,” they added, “in highly competitive races.”34 The most comprehensive examination of the 2008 presidential race—Kate Kenski’s, Bruce Hardy’s and Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s award-winning The Obama Victory—confirms that Obama’s ability to greatly outspend McCain for television political advertising in battleground states, as well as nationally, was significant. Controlling for other variables, “We find that weeks in which Obama outspent McCain on national ads are significantly related to an Obama vote ‘if the election were held today.’” Specifically, in battleground states, the research determined that Obama’s ability to put far more advertising on the air all but destroyed McCain’s hopes for victory. “Whenever we grabbed a lead, a little toehold in a state,” a McCain media person stated, Obama would dump in a wave of new TV advertising “and explode the whole thing out for us.” The authors did not claim that Obama’s advertising necessarily won him the election, but, at the very least, it may well have been decisive in traditionally Republican-leaning states like Indiana, North Carolina, Florida, and Virginia where the spending advantage was large and the vote tally was close.35 Likewise in 2010, the new wave of Republican outside groups outspent Democratic ones two-to-one, largely in tight battleground races, and accordingly, as one commentator noted, “annihilated them at the polls.”36 Crucially, research also suggests that television political advertising is even more effective in House and Senate races, not to mention other races further down the political food chain. “In presidential campaigns, voters may be influenced by news coverage, debates, or objective economic or international events,” Darrell M. West wrote in a report for the Congressional Quarterly in 2010. “These other forces restrain the power of advertisements and empower a variety of alternative forces. In congressional contests, some of these constraining factors are absent, making advertisements potentially more important. If candidates have the money to advertise in a congressional contest, it can be a very powerful force for electoral success.”37 Of course not all advertising works, and this is a matter that has driven business executives stir crazy for a century. “I know half of my advertising does not work,” goes the urban legend of an exasperated businessman, “but I do not know which half.” Only on the rarest of occasions have major advertisers actually curtailed their practices sharply absent their competitors doing the same, and it has been met with declining sales, and no enthusiasm by other advertisers to pursue a similar course. The same is true with political advertising. “So much of presidential advertising is wasted money,” says Mark McKinnon, who made ads for George W. Bush in 2000 and 2004, and worked for McCain in the 2008 primaries. “The ads become just background to a broad architecture the campaigns are trying to create…. Easily half of the money spent on TV ads in presidential campaigns is a complete waste and would be better spent online or on other activities.”38 The fact remains, though, that TV political spending is not optional; it is necessary for political survival, not to mention success, in the contemporary United States as much as it is for a commercial advertiser like Coca-Cola or Coors beer or Nike shoes in an oligopolistic industry. Back in the 1990s there were a handful of major candidates in statewide races who made a virtue of their unwillingness to accept large campaign donations, which meant they could not run anywhere near as many television ads as their opponents. Ed Garvey’s 1998 race for Wisconsin Governor or Russ Feingold’s 1998 Senate reelection campaign in Wisconsin are the most recent and striking examples; the consequences of those campaigns—Garvey lost in a landslide and Feingold barely won a race he by all rights should have won handily—sent a loud and clear message that such a course greatly increases chances of electoral failure. Since then, no major party candidate, not a single solitary one, has dared to emulate them with what is known derisively as “unilateral disarmament.”

#### Negative advertising used in American electoral politics is a method of depoliticization demobilizing citizens from electoral politics, public, and civic life
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There is one crucial area where political advertising differs sharply from commercial advertising, and it is here that the blood boils for the likes of Ogilvy and Spero. This is negative advertising, where the purpose of the advertising is to attack and denigrate the competition. In a commercial marketplace such advertising is of little value; although there can be some benefit in rare instances to devoting a campaign to attacking a major competitor, in general it is a waste of time. The point of commercial advertising is to protect and promote sales for the advertiser’s product, and ultimately increase profitability. There are no bonus points for simply decreasing a competitor’s sales, and in fact it might just take consumers away from the product category altogether, which would be counterproductive. So it is unlikely there will ever be an ad produced by Coors (or a front group bankrolled by Coors) to the effect that rumors have it employees at the Budweiser plant sometimes may urinate into the vats. Not so with political advertising. Negative advertising can be tremendously effective, a smashing over-the-top boffo success, even if it does not generate a single new voter for the candidate (or supportive independent group) placing the ad. If it simply takes voters leaning toward the opponent and makes them less likely to vote for the opponent, maybe not vote at all, that is a victory. After all the point is to get the most votes and if you lower the number for the opponent, that has the same effect as increasing your own total. Moreover negative advertising can have the delicious side effect of forcing an opponent to respond to charges, no matter how spurious. Negative advertising can amplify spectacularly the classic political move captured by the story of the politician who told his campaign manager to start a rumor that his opponent was a child molester. “But he isn’t a child molester, is he?” responded the aide. “Of course not,” said the candidate, “but I want to hear him deny it.” For these reasons negative ads have been a significant percentage of TV political ads since records have been kept, and have gradually increased in prominence to where they now account for a majority of all TV political ads.39 The most comprehensive research to date concludes that between 2000 and 2008 the overall percentage of TV political ads that were negative increased from 50 percent to 60 percent.40 And 2008 is already beginning to look like a tea party at the summer home of the Marquess of Queensbury. The percentage and amount of negative attack ads in 2010 was “unprecedented” and will increase sharply again in 2012 for a simple reason: the new independent groups formed with anonymous money following Citizens United—unencumbered by identification with candidate, party or even funding source—devote their resources primarily to negative attack ads.41 If political advertising is effective, negative political advertising can be especially effective. Obviously, it needs to be deployed with tactical and strategic considerations and there is always an element of risk that it could backfire.42 Even then, research from the 2008 primary campaigns suggests that negative ads that are widely regarded in exit polls as having been unfair can still be effective, and candidates can still get the votes of the people regarding their ads as unfair. Such advertising can sow doubt in people’s “guts,” and that can determine how a person votes.43 So it is not clear how damaging an “unfair” negative ad campaign can be to a campaign. The ones that are usually cited, like Jack Conway’s accusation in Kentucky’s 2010 U.S. Senate race that Rand Paul had acted weirdly when he was a college student, are done by candidates who are almost hopelessly behind in the polls and are akin to a “Hail Mary” pass. But when done smartly and when fueled by piles of cash it can drive the talking points in a campaign like nothing else. When one thinks of the election-changing political ads in recent American history, they have usually been negative and more often than not entirely bogus. In Wisconsin, the 1986 U.S. Senate race provided a chilling example. Democratic challenger Ed Garvey had a solid lead over incumbent Republican Senator Robert Kasten two weeks out from election day. Kasten then ran a series of TV ads charging Garvey with embezzling money from his days as head of the National Football League Players Association. Garvey was low on money and there were no available TV spots, so he could not effectively respond—although the news media emphasized the charges were unproven, and probably bogus. Garvey lost the election by a hair, and shortly thereafter Kasten’s campaign apologized for the misleading and inaccurate ads. But Kasten, not Garvey, went to Washington for a six-year term. Probably the most famous example came two years later in the 1988 presidential race between Democrat Michael Dukakis, the Governor of Massachusetts, and then-Vice President George H. W. Bush. In late summer Dukakis held a seventeen-point lead and was doing especially well with women voters and traditional Democrats. Under the aegis of Lee Atwater along with his staff that included Roger Ailes, the Republicans test-marketed attack ad ideas with a focus group of “Reagan Democrats” i.e. traditional white working-class Democrats who could be pried away if the discussion got away from economics and core government programs like Social Security and Medicare. The research hit the mother lode when Atwater saw how negatively the focus group responded to the story of how Governor Dukakis had provided a weekend furlough to Willie Horton, a black man who jumped his furlough and went on to rape a white woman. Atwater boasted, “By the time this election is over, Willie Horton will be a household name.”44 “The only question,” remarked Ailes during the campaign, “is whether we depict Willie Horton with a knife in his hand or without it.”45 Willie Horton did indeed become a household name.46 It is unclear how decisive the Willie Horton TV ad was to sandbagging the Dukakis campaign, but by all accounts it played an important role. What is also noteworthy is that the story about Dukakis was entirely decontextualized. The story conveyed nothing distinct about Dukakis that would have bearing on his conduct as President, and the policies he would have pursued. What came through was a scary black guy was raping white women and Dukakis seemed to be his unapologetic wingman; it was directly out of Rosser Reeves’ playbook, and it worked. (Shortly before the forty-year-old Atwater, an amateur blues musician from South Carolina, died of brain cancer in 1991, he is reported to have apologized for the Horton ad, and the racist flames it so triumphantly stoked.) The most recent example comes in the 2004 presidential race between Senator John Kerry and President George W. Bush. Kerry held a lead over Bush in the polls coming out of the conventions. Kerry made a big deal out of his record as a decorated soldier in Vietnam, and campaigned with his “band of brothers,” the term for his fellow Vietnam veterans. The contrast with Bush, who had ducked military combat in the Vietnam era, was expected to work to Kerry’s advantage. Then a shadowy independent group—Swift Boat Veterans for Truth—ran a series of TV ads asserting that Kerry was actually a coward who had betrayed his “brothers” while in Vietnam. The ads were bogus, and repudiated by the likes of Senator John McCain, but the issue became the hot topic of the campaign for weeks. The Kerry campaign was staggered by the charges and eventually lost a nail-biter in November. “For Republicans a swift boat was a very good thing,” columnist Robert Novak stated about the 2004 election. It “kept John Kerry from being president.”47 Defenders of negative TV political advertising acknowledge it has a seamy underside. Their response, however, is that the solution is to return fire with fire. “Responding to ads with ads,” Glenn Richardson writes, “is perhaps the most appropriate redress to distorted charges.”48 “Any ad from one candidate or party can always be countered with an ad by the opposing candidate or party,” Travis Ridout and Michael Franz state, adding that “This is a particular strength of television compared with other forms of campaigning.”49 “Advertising provides a visible and relatively effective way to respond to attacks,” another team of researchers led by Franz argues. “For every thirty-second distortion, there can be a thirty-second clarification; every accusation can be met, every charge responded to in an effective, efficient way.” They chastise John Kerry for failing to respond to the swift boat attack ads immediately and with full fire, much as others criticized Dukakis for failing to answer the Willie Horton charges in 1988.50 Franz and his colleagues, to their credit, acknowledge that the amount of money it would take to respond to attack ads has become more than a little daunting, but they appear reluctant to follow this through to what would be uncomfortable conclusions. It allows those with the most money to set the agenda for the campaign with bogus and/or irrelevant negative charges and forces the opponent to respond with their own gobs of money, or let the charges appear legitimate. Psychological research indicates that there is a great advantage to playing offense, not defense, and to be the first to levy charges against the opponent.51 By this logic, the offended party would be wise to shoot first and force the other candidate to respond to their negative ad blitz. “Even principled politicians are under enormous competitive pressure to succumb to a manipulative politics of unreason,” Bruce Ackerman writes. “After all, if your opponents will batter you with hot-button sound bites, it won’t do your principle much good if you lose the election. The only good defense is a sound-bite offense!”52 In our view, that is more than a minor drawback to an otherwise functional democratic election system. It is absurd, and disastrous. It is eerily close to embracing the “mutual assured destruction” of nuclear war games. It is American electoral politics. And, tragically, that is not the worst aspect of negative political advertising. What is most striking about negative television political advertising is that it accentuates the tendency toward depoliticization. It extends and enhances the problem of citizen apathy that is a recurring problem in an inegalitarian society and aggravated in a society with a fixed two-party system. It logically follows from the clear purpose of negative advertising: to turn prospective voters off from the candidates they are most likely to support. Depoliticization is an eminently rational, if ultimately self-defeating, response to the asininity of a political universe where negative political advertising is the lingua franca. The trailblazing experimental research of Stephen Ansolabehere and Shanto Iyengar has been invaluable in this regard. They demonstrate that the main consequence of negative ads is that it demobilizes citizens and turns them off from electoral politics, if not public and civic life altogether. As Ansolabehere and Iyengar put it, “the demobilizing impact of negative advertising has been a well-kept secret, and a tacit assumption among political consultants.” The trend is toward “a political implosion of apathy and withdrawal.”53 Even those scholars who otherwise defend TV political advertising acknowledge that the research establishes that “exposure to negativity is likely to increase cynicism, especially among nonpartisans.”54

#### The 2012 presidential election will inundate voters at record levels- rejection now is key to providing solutions

McChesney and Nichols 12 (Robert W., American professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Gutgsell Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication, John, American journalist and author; Washington correspondent for The Nation and associate editor of The Capital Times, April, “The Bull Market” Monthly Review Volume 63, Number 11 TM)

It is time to complete the discussion of political advertising by introducing a cornerstone of the money-and-media election complex, and the main immediate beneficiary of political adverting: the commercial broadcasting industry. As we mentioned above, political advertising as it is known in the United States would be impossible without a commercial TV system that benefits from and encourages paid candidate advertising. Back in the 1960s and ‘70s TV candidate advertising constituted an almost imperceptible part of total TV advertising revenues. By the early 1990s the figure nudged up to around 2 percent—the National Association of Broadcasters put it at 1.2 percent for 199655—and a decade later TV political advertising was between 5 and 8 percent of total TV ad revenues. In 2012, political advertising will account for over 20 percent of TV station ad revenues.56 As New Jersey Senator Bill Bradley put it, election campaigns “function as collection agencies for broadcasters. You simply transfer money from contributors to television stations.”57 In short, political advertising has become a staple of the commercial broadcasting industry, and a foundation for its profitability. It is a dream business as it requires little or no sales force to shake the tree and the money is paid in advance. Wall Street stock analysts can barely contain themselves as they envision the growing cash flow. “Voters are going to be inundated with more campaign advertising than ever,” one investor service wrote in 2011. “While this may fray the already frazzled nerves of the American people, it is great news for media companies.”58 “No one loves a good political brawl like a U.S. broadcast company. The fiercer the fight, the more money broadcasters can expect from campaign advertising—particularly in an era when political rhetoric grows more heated every day,” Moody’s Investors Service wrote in a special 2011 report touting media stocks as a good buy. “There are good political years, and then there are years like 2012, when speculative-grade, pure-play television broadcasters expect an unprecedented frenzy of political advertising amid an intense battle for control of both the White House and a closely divided Congress.”59 As Carl Salas of Moody’s put it, “Virtually all U.S. broadcasters will benefit from spending on political ads in 2012.”60 The matter was probably put best by Eric Greenberg, a partner of Paul Hastings Janofsky & Walker LLP, who regularly represents broadcasters in the buying and selling of television stations. A twenty-year veteran industry insider, Greenberg is blunt about the business model of commercial television: “Political advertising and elections are to TV what Christmas is to retail.” He anticipates that due to political advertising being so “huge,” there will likely be another wave of mergers and acquisitions among TV stations.61 This will drive ever further the trend toward industry consolidation that began in earnest in the 1980s. In addition to the increase in the percentage of TV ad revenues coming from political advertising, the number of media firms receiving the lion’s share of this bounty has shrunk considerably due to the massive wave of media consolidation over the past three decades. This is of particular importance because these media firms form a very powerful lobby in Washington to protect their interests, and the larger they get, the more politically powerful they become. The corporate media giants, spearheaded by the trade association the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), have determined that nothing can be done to tamper with the golden spigot of TV political advertising. By the mid–1990s there was a concerted effort to require commercial broadcasters to provide free time to candidates so as to de-emphasize the role of big money in corrupting the election system. Legislation was introduced and public interest groups formed to organize on behalf of free airtime. This effort had widespread popular support, and no known popular opposition that was unaffiliated with the money-and-media election complex. Free airtime for candidates was a reasonable and modest demand; the commercial broadcasters received their monopoly licenses and rights to the scarce air channels at no charge in return for serving the public interest. The pertinent law assumes that these are firms that must go beyond just maximizing their own profits to justify their getting these lucrative monopoly licenses over other prospective licensees. Those broadcasters that refused to make concessions to the public interest would see their monopoly licenses turned over to a different firm when the term expired. (That this was the case in the letter and spirit of the law, but not in the application of the law, attests to the power of the commercial broadcasting lobby over the years.)62 In legislation and rulings, both Congress and the Supreme Court explicitly stated that providing campaign coverage was a definitional component of the public service requirements for a broadcaster. The FCC even has a formal expectation that local broadcasters would cover state and local races, and until 1991 candidates in such races had an affirmative right of access, to the extent the race could be considered significant.63 As political advertising and the costs of campaigns mushroomed in the 1980s and ‘90s, the amount and quality of commercial television’s campaign coverage seemed woefully inadequate, and, on the whole, television’s contribution to electoral democracy was regarded by more than a few Americans as increasingly destructive. By 1997 the matter reached its apogee as a viable public issue. President Bill Clinton came out publicly for free airtime with the formation of the Gore Commission. This was a body recommended by the FCC and appointed by the White House in 1997 to determine the public service obligations of commercial broadcasters in exchange for having received lucrative digital broadcasting spectrum for free—valued by some as worth as much as $70 billion—in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. The President noted upon forming the Gore Commission that, although the move from analog to digital signals would give broadcasters “much more signal capacity than they have today,” broadcasters had “asked Congress to be given this new access to the public airwaves without charge”—an end result the President found inadequate: “I believe, therefore, it is time to update broadcasters’ public interest obligations to meet the demands of the new times and the new technological realities. I believe broadcasters who receive digital licenses should provide free air time for candidates, and I believe the FCC should act to require free air time for candidates.”64 The Federal Communications Commission Chair at the time, William Kennard, was a strong proponent of free airtime. No radical—he followed the FCC pattern and went on to become a multi-millionaire in a lucrative career as a wheeler-dealer in the telecommunication industry following his tenure—Kennard hoped that the Gore Commission would adhere to the President’s wishes. But with several commercial broadcasters among its members, the Gore Commission proved next to worthless. “At the end of the day,” Kennard said, “the broadcast industry was fundamentally unwilling to accept any requirements that they broadcast more public interest programming.” “When President Clinton asked that broadcasters set aside free television time for candidates,” the columnist Jeff Cohen wrote at the time, the “NAB reacted with the indignation one might expect from the National Rifle Association if the president had proposed banning not only assault weapons, but hunting rifles, handguns and toy guns.”65 Kennard understood the core problem. “The Gore Commission report came after the spectrum had been given away. And so the leverage was lost.” Although Clinton let the matter drop, Kennard persisted in his efforts to get free airtime for political candidates. He knew from getting out on the road that the idea was popular everywhere, across the political spectrum. “I’d go out to talk to groups, grassroots groups, and I’d say, ‘Well, what about breaking some of this dependency of politicians on money by requiring broadcasters to give away some of their time for free?’, and people would say ‘Yeah, that’s a great idea,’ and we’d talk about how to do it.” He quickly learned that popular sentiment notwithstanding, the range of discussion was far narrower in Washington. “You say the same thing at a cocktail party in Washington and people would look at you like you were crazy.” Congress hardly made things better. In fact, when Kennard broached the idea of free airtime for candidates, key members of Congress made it clear that Kennard should drop the matter or risk seeing the FCC’s budget cut severely. “The job has been made much harder because of the influence of money in politics.” Kennard explained what happened behind the scenes: “When I first started talking to people about free air time for political candidates, some of my oldest and closest friends in Washington took me to breakfast, and they said, ‘Bill, don’t do this, it’s political suicide, you know. You’re just going to kill yourself.’ And, you know, they were right. I thought it was so sad that we have so distorted the concept of what it means to be a public trustee that you can’t even talk about these issues as an independent regulator without people castigating you. It’s really sort of outrageous.”66 No regulator or politician close to the levers of power has dared to expend political capital advancing Kennard’s cause subsequently—the issue has been all but abandoned since 2000, even by staunch progressives on the FCC like Michael Copps. The corporate media lobby has only grown in strength, if that is possible. The corporate media giants lobby on many issues and many fronts, but when it comes to protecting unlimited TV political advertising, and unlimited campaign spending, their relationship to any reform effort is, as Jeff Cohen observed, comparable to the National Rifle Association’s relationship to movements for gun control. They control the board in Washington. The corruption goes far beyond the flexing of lobbying muscle. Perhaps coincidentally, precisely as political advertising arrived as manna from heaven for commercial broadcasters, they began to lessen or even discontinue the manners in which they had covered political campaigns previously. The average number of free presidential messages fifteen minutes or longer that broadcasters gave to candidates, for example, fell from sixty in 1952 to twenty in 1972 to five in 1988 and, as far as we can tell, zero thereafter.67 Party convention coverage has shrunk; what were once often major civics lessons for Americans from the 1950s through the ‘70s have become mindless scripted events. Candidate debates are less frequently presented now on commercial television, and commercial stations increasingly do not even carry debates except for three presidential and one vice-presidential debates.68 Consider the 2010 U.S. Senate race in Wisconsin. Incumbent Russ Feingold offered to debate his millionaire opponent in forums across the state, but Republican Ron Johnson, who had no record in public life and who even avoided interviews with newspaper editorial boards, refused. Instead, Johnson let his advertisements and those paid for by the Chamber of Commerce, American Action Network, and sundry organizations that flooded the state with anti-Feingold ads do his talking. Even when Johnson did participate in the three traditional candidate debates available for broadcast by the state’s TV stations, some stations avoided airing them in prime time. These same stations were broadcasting Johnson ads around the clock, including during the period in which the debate was taking place. Wisconsin lawyer Ed Garvey, a former Democratic nominee for governor, tried to tune in to a much-anticipated Feingold-Johnson debate, only to find it was not being aired. He called the station and was told he could track it down on a website. “As a citizen, I was left with no option but the ads. I got nothing of substance from television stations,” griped Garvey. “I thought they were supposed to operate in the public interest.”69 Most ominously, the amount of news coverage of political campaigns on commercial television, never much to write home about, has fallen precipitously over the past three decades.70 Thomas Patterson notes that the amount of network TV news coverage of campaigns plummeted from 1992 to 2000 alone.71 The average commercial television station provides far more political advertising during a political campaign than it does news coverage of the campaigns. This is not only true when one looks at the broadcast day as a whole, but it is even true when one looks strictly at TV news programs. In a hotly contested U.S. Senate primary race in New Jersey in 2000, $21 million was spent on TV ads, but the stations receiving the ads averaged thirteen seconds per day in news time on the race.72 One study showed that in states with competitive Senate races in 2004, there were four times as many hours given to ads for the race than there was news coverage of the races. Another study of the 2006 election found a similar pattern.73 “Local television news in most communities is unashamedly show business, not journalism,” communication scholar Michael Schudson wrote in 1995, “and devotes only the slightest amount of airtime to local electoral candidates and issues.”74 A study of eleven local media markets in 2004 determined that only eight percent of the 4,333 news broadcasts in the month preceding the election had even mentioned a single local race. The same newscasts had eight times as many stories about accidental injuries than they did local races during this month.75 It applies to all races, regardless of their importance. Researcher Barbara Osborn studied local TV news coverage of the last weeks of the 1997 Los Angeles municipal election, including a mayoral race. She found very little coverage on the 11 PM newscasts on network-owned stations; for every minute of election news, there were more than three minutes of election ads. In the second from last week of the campaign, KCBS’s 11 PM newscast did not devote even a second to the election, but did find time for a report on skateboarding dogs and another report on Easter egg-hunting chimpanzees.76 It has gotten to where the pathetic and appalling state of broadcast campaign coverage no longer requires academic research to be established; it is on a par with stating that people no longer tend to use the telegraph to communicate. One acquaintance we know who was running for governor of a Midwest state as a Democrat in a general election complained to a TV station manager that his campaign was not getting any news coverage. “You want to get on the air?” the broadcaster replied. “Buy an ad.” Whether intentional or not, commercial broadcasters have little incentive to give away for free what has become a major profit center for them. Increasingly what has happened is that what remains of TV news coverage of campaigns uses political ads as the basis of news stories. By this we do not mean that TV news reporters and pundits rigorously fact check the ads their stations run and expose the flaws in the ads, any more than the stations’ news divisions examine the claims of their commercial advertisers and expose their deceptive practices. (One of the studies mentioned above determined that less than 1 percent of TV news campaign stories critique any political advertising.) To the contrary, TV news increasingly publicizes TV ads, especially controversial ones, and assesses how much political impact the ads are having as the basis of their political journalism. It is a cheap and easy way to cover politics, reaffirms that the Commercial is King, and reminds candidates that the path to news coverage goes through the ad sales department. Indeed, each of the examples of negative presidential ads in the last section—from Willie Horton to swift boats—gained far more attention from the TV news coverage of the matter than from the ads themselves. It is now part of the strategy in the money-and-media election complex to use ads strategically to drive or shift news coverage. The discussion in this chapter leads to two questions. First, why does television get the preponderance of political advertising in an era when people are spending more and more time online? “Online is how you preach to the converted,” Goldstein explains. “TV is how you reach the undecided, the passive viewers of politics.”77 “When it comes to political advertising,” AdWeek writes, “digital is still just a sideshow.” As Eli Pariser puts it, with regard to the Internet, “the state of the art in political advertising is half a decade behind the state of the art in commercial advertising.”78 Goldstein says one of digital’s main functions at present is for “fundraising so that a lot of money can be spent on TV.”79 At some point, however, the audience for television almost certainly will decline sufficiently that the money will begin to flow in different directions. Whether this will lead to a weakening of the money-and-media election complex, or, as with commercial advertising, the money will simply flood whatever new arena emerges, possibly in a more insidious manner, is another matter altogether. Second, nearly every scholarly treatment of political advertising acknowledges many or most of the defects we highlight in this article; indeed, we draw much of our critique from this research. Many of these scholars, however, are sanguine about political advertising’s role in American democracy. Their defense of political advertising invariably assumes there will be a credible political journalism—a viable Fourth Estate if you will—that will provide an effective counterbalance to political advertising, if not provide the preponderance of political information to the citizenry. This article has demonstrated the record of how television journalism has all but abandoned its duty to provide some sort of balance or corrective to political advertising. What little print or online media remain are more obsessed with pointless prognostication and assessing campaign spin than anything else. They are part of the problem, not the solution. The U.S. electoral system is wallowing in a sea of money, idiocy, and corruption precisely at the moment the nation’s growing problems demand solutions that work to the benefit of the vast majority of Americans—the 99 percent—who have no role in the current regime except to be manipulated and exploited. This is going to be a defining political struggle going forward, until it is resolved.

### Plan Popular

#### Plan Popular with the public – gas prices and increased ridership prove

APTA 12 (American Public Transportation Association, Nonprofit International Association of Public and Private Transportation Organizations, *Save Money. Take Transit.*, <http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2012/Pages/120620_DumpthePump.aspx>, June 20th 2012, JKE)

With high gas prices, increasing numbers of people are turning to public transportation to save money. Public transportation ridership surged in the first quarter of 2012, as Americans took nearly 2.7 billion trips, an increase of 5.0 percent, as 125.7 million more trips were taken than the first quarter of last year. Some public transit systems saw record ridership including the transit systems in the following cities: Ann Arbor, MI; Boston, MA; Charlotte, NC; Fort Myers, FL; Indianapolis, IN; Ithaca, NY; New York, NY; Oakland, CA; Olympia, WA; San Diego, CA; and Tampa, FL.¶ “Not surprisingly, public transit ridership hit record highs across the nation this spring,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the Sierra Club. “Gas prices go up and down - mostly up - but Americans who try transit tend to stick with it. Instead of being stuck in traffic, they enjoy a book or a quick cat nap on their commute, while saving their families thousands of dollars at the pump, creating jobs, and doing their part to save 37 million metric tons of carbon pollution and 4.2 billion gallons of oil every year.” “Public transportation is popular, with ridership on buses and trains on the rise. Congress should provide consumers what they want by investing more in public transit. More transportation choices mean less pain at the pump," said Deron Lovaas, NRDC Federal Transportation Policy Director.

### Plan Unpopular

#### Their arguments for infrastructure, including mass transit, being popular are passed on a flawed model – GOP hate magnifies the unpopularity

Baltimore Sun 12 (Editorial, *Transportation Bill: Do Republicans Want to Sabotage the Economy*, <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-06-10/news/bs-ed-transportation-20120610_1_transportation-bill-transportation-projects-transportation-spending>, June 10th 2012, JKE)

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid recently said aloud what many Americans must be thinking these days -- that at least some Republicans in Congress would like to see the U.S. economy worsen in order to boost their chances of success in the November election. The evidence? The GOP's continued resistance to approving a multiyear transportation authorization bill. Senator Reid told The Hill that he's heard House Majority Leader Eric Cantor is leading the charge to delay the Senate bill -- and the tens of thousands of jobs it would create. House Speaker John Boehner denies the allegation, but he has also announced that he's ready to pull the plug on negotiations over the measure until after the election if the two sides fail to work out an agreement before June 30. That gives negotiators less than three weeks to shake hands on something that's had them at odds for years. What's frustrating is that the bill -- which has been whittled down to a mere 15-month extension (and might even be trimmed to six months, according to Mr. Boehner) -- should be a fairly routine matter. That has been the case in years past, when preserving and expanding U.S. transportation infrastructure, including roads, bridges, mass transit, ports and airports was seen as too important to the national interest to be derailed by partisan bickering. But that was then. The problem now is that too many extraneous issues have been tied to the measure, including various "offsets" and "pay-fors" to finance the bill instead of merely updating the federal gasoline tax to allow for inflation over the last two decades. In reality, there's a lot of accounting gimmickry involved.

#### There is opposition to funding transportation bills, even if they support the economy

Pye 7-12 (Jason, Legislative Director for the Libertarian Party of Georgia, "An Open Letter to Georgia Voters: Vote “NO” on July 31st," http://www.unitedliberty.org/articles/10476-an-open-letter-to-georgia-voters-vote-no-on-july-31st)

Assuming all 12 regions pass the referendum later this month, the TSPLOST is projected to bring some $19 billion in new tax revenues to the state. In most regions, the split between regional and local projects will be 75-25. However, in the Metro Atlanta region, 85% of the $7.2 billion in expected revenues will go to regional projects. Fifteen percent will go for local projects. If passed in every region, this would be the largest tax hike in Georgia history. Advocates of the TSPLOST have spent a substantial sum of money trying to convince Metro Atlanta residents that the tax hike is needed in order to “untie” the region. That may sound like music to the ears of many Metro Atlanta drivers, but this tax hike is still struggling to gain steam despite a bipartisan push from many of Georgia’s most prominent elected officials, including Gov. Nathan Deal and Atlanta Mayor Kasim Reed. Interestingly, the opposition is equally diverse, with the Sierra Club, NAACP, and various Tea Party groups all pushing a “no” vote. Supporters of the tax hike are trying to paint its opponents out to be ideologues who are opposed to any tax increase. There is some truth that in some cases, but there is also a practical case to be made against the TSPLOST. There is no denying that Atlanta has one of the worst traffic commute times in the country. Anyone that has had to drive across town during morning or afternoon traffic knows this. TSPLOST supporters tell us that the 1-cent tax hike will ease congestion, get people to work quicker and reduce losses in productivity. They also say says that the measure will also create jobs, improve public safety, and promote economic development. Of course, what Georgians don’t hear from groups promoting the TSPLOST is, as the Georgia Public Policy Foundation (GPPF) noted in its study on the referendum (p.16), a little more than half of money would be doled out for mass transit. Expanding mass transit in Metro Atlanta has long been a goal of many of the groups pushing the tax hike. However, it’s difficult to explain why this particular mode of transportation will receive a majority of the funding — approximately $3.2 billion — when, according to Census statistics, only 3.36% of commuters in the region use mass transit. Some may say that Atlanta is simply “behind the times” in “investment” and more money will bring more ridership. But only a handful of metropolitan areas manage to break the 10% threshold, and those tend to have a higher population density than Metro Atlanta. By placing such a heavy emphasis on mass transit, TSPLOST advocates are ignoring the primary method of transportation used in the region and largely dismissing other innovative ideas that could be used to move commuters around Metro Atlanta. That’s both a detriment to the region and, frankly, very poor public policy.

# Topicality

### Fares

#### Existing infrastructure costs include maintenance and operating costs

Link & Maibach 99 [Heike, Mathematical methods in studies of the economy, degree in economics, Markus, Studies of Economics and Economic Geography at the University of Zurich, “CALCULATING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS”, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/doc/infrastr-cost.pdf, 4/28/99, Accessed: 7/12/12] JDO

The basic assumption and starting point of the whole exercise was to consider the marginal costs of the use of existing infrastructure. The group analysed the nature and causation of the different types of infrastructure costs as defined currently by Member States and agreed on the following distinction: Fixed costs are those that, for a given capacity, do not vary with traffic volume. Variable costs are those that (over a certain, short time horizon e.g. one year) vary with traffic volume, and to a lesser extent, with weather or other cyclical conditions. Within the variable costs category some variable costs are only vaguely related to traffic volume - for instance they may increase stepwise (eg. lighting, snow clearance) with certain thresholds. Others vary directly with the level of traffic and can be attributed to vehicles (eg. filling potholes). These costs which vary directly with use are relevant for estimating the short run marginal costs of infrastructure use. They can be classified under certain broad categories, such as maintenance and repairs, operations and some services.

#### Operation and maintenance are part of transportation infrastructure-public subsidies are a key component

Rodrigue 09[Jean-Paul, Department of Global Studies and Geography at Hofstra University, PhD in transport geography from the Université de Montréal, “The Financing of Transportation Infrastructure”, The Geography of Transport Systems, Second Edition, 2009, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/>ch7en/appl7en/ch7a2en.html Accessed: 7/12/12] JDO

Facing the growing inability of governments to manage and fund transport infrastructure, the last decades has seen deregulation and more active private participation. Many factors have placed pressures on public officials to consider the privatization of transport infrastructure, including terminals: Fiscal problems. The level of government expenses in a variety of social welfare practices is a growing burden on public finances, leaving limited options but divesture. Current fiscal trends clearly underline that all levels of governments have limited if any margin and that accumulated deficits have led to unsustainable debt levels. The matter becomes how public entities default on their commitments. Since transport infrastructures are assets of substantial value, they are commonly a target for privatization. This is also known as “monetization” where a government seeks a large lump sum by selling or leasing an infrastructure for budgetary relief. High operating costs. Mainly due to managerial and labor costs issues, the operating costs of public transport infrastructure, including maintenance, tend to be higher than their private counterparts. Private interests tend to have a better control of technical and financial risks, are able to meet construction and operational guidelines as well as providing a higher quality of services to users. If publicly owned, any operating deficits must be covered by public funds, namely through cross-subsidies. Otherwise, users would be paying a higher cost than a privately managed system. This does not provide much incentives for publicly operated transport systems to improve their operating costs as inefficiencies are essentially subsidized by public funds. High operating costs are thus a significant incentive to privatize. Cross-subsidies. Several transport infrastructures are subsidized by revenues from other streams since their operating costs cannot be compensated by existing revenue. For instance, public transport systems are subsidized in part by revenues coming from fuel taxes or tolls. Privatization can thus be a strategy to end cross-subsidizing by taping private capital markets instead of relying on public debt. The subsidies can either be reallocated to fund other projects (or pay existing debt) or removed altogether, thus reducing taxation levels. Equalization. Since public investments are often a political process facing pressures from different constituents to receive their “fair share”, many investments come with “strings attached” in terms of budget allocation. An infrastructure investment in one region must often be compensated with a comparable investment in another region or project, even if this investment may not be necessary. This tends to significantly increase the general cost of public infrastructure investments, particularly if equalization creates non-revenue generating projects. Thus, privatization removes the equalization process for capital allocation as private enterprises are less bound to such a forced and often wasteful redistribution. One of the core goals of privatization concerns the derived efficiency gains compared to the transaction costs of the process. Efficiency gains involve a higher output level with the same or fewer input units, implying a more productive use of the infrastructure. Transaction costs are the costs related to the exchange (from public to private ownership) and could involve various buyouts, such as compensations for existing public workers. For public infrastructure, they tend to be very high and involve delays due to the regulatory changes of the transaction.

#### Passenger fares are used to cover operational costs – defined in a Congressional bill

Braun 11 (Ken, 05-03-11, Michigan Capitol Confidential, “Michigan’s Most Expensive Mass Transit Agencies,” http://www.michigancapitolconfidential.com/14989, accessed 07-12-12, EBB)

Even at a price now above $4, a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline will move the typical personal car and its passengers at least 20 miles — and often much further. But according to the most recent data available from the federal government's National Transit Database, two of Michigan’s public transit agencies report that $4 isn’t enough spending for them to move just a single rider even a single mile. In both cases, NTD data shows that the agencies charge riders less than 10 percent of the operating cost spent to move them around, with state and local taxpayers picking up at least two-thirds of the rest. House Bill 4023, sponsored by GOP state Rep. Dave Agema of Grandville, would make it harder for these transit agencies to offload their costs onto the general public. The bill would require that the state’s transit riders pay average fares high enough to bring in at least 20 percent of the system’s operating expenses. For 2009, the last year of data reported online for NTD, just four of the state’s 15 largest transit and bus systems reached this level of user support. For those systems that do not hit the 20 percent level of user support, the proposal would penalize them by reducing their funding from the state’s Comprehensive Transportation Fund. The CTF is funded by taking a portion of the gas tax revenue and other road tax money paid by motorists.

#### Government investment in public transportation builds and maintains infrastructure

Weisbrod and Reno 9 (Glen and Arlee, October 2009, American Public Transportation Association, “Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment,” http://www.apta.com/resources/reports andpublications/Documents/economic\_impact\_of\_public\_transportation\_investment.pdf accessed 7-12-12, EBB)

Definition. Capital investment in public transportation supports purchases of equipment and facilities (including rolling stock, tracks, other guideways, rightsof-way, control equipment, and construction of terminals, stations, parking lots, maintenance facilities and power generating facilities). Operations of public transportation services supports associated jobs (drivers, maintenance workers, administrative and other transportation agency workers) as well as purchases of supplies needed for continuing operations (including motor fuel, electric power, maintenance parts and materials, etc.) Thus, investment in public transportation projects and services can directly support short-term construction jobs and longerterm operations jobs, as well as purchases of products that lead to further indirect impacts on industry activity and jobs.

#### Passenger Fare Revenue goes into the Operational Budget.

APTA accessed 7/11/12 [American Public Transportation Association, <http://www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Pages/glossary.aspx>, Accessed: 7/11/12] JDO

Passenger Fare Revenue is revenue earned from carrying passengers in regularly scheduled and paratransit service. Passenger fares include: the base fare; zone premiums; express service premiums; extra cost transfers; and quantity purchase discounts applicable to the passenger's ride. Passenger Fare Revenue is listed only for operating revenue sources.

#### Operational expenditures are Infrastructure Costs

ECORYS 05 [ECORYS Research and Consultancy, “Infrastructure expenditures and costs Practical guidelines to calculate total infrastructure costs for five modes of transport”, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/studies/doc/2005\_11\_30\_guidelines\_infrastructure\_report\_en.pdf, 11/30/05, Accessed: 7/11/12] JDO

Infrastructure costs The general categorization of expenditures as mentioned previously can be used for roads, i.e. • Investment expenditures; • Renewal expenditures; • Maintenance expenditures; Infrastructure expenditures and costs 14 • Operational expenditures. Investment expenditures concern expenditures on new road construction and extension of capacity of existing road infrastructure. Operational expenditures concern for example staff expenses, overhead expenses, expenses for buildings. With regard to maintenance and renewal expenditures, many European countries distinguish ‘regular’ and ‘non-regular’ costs. For example in The Netherlands the terms fixed and variable maintenance expenditures are applied, structural and operational maintenance in Austria, routine and periodic maintenance in Sweden and routine and special maintenance in Spain. We propose to categorize ‘non-regular’ costs as renewal expenditures, prolonging the lifetime without adding new functionalities and ‘regular costs’ as maintenance expenditures, for maintaining the functionality of existing infrastructure within its original lifetime. The average life time expectancy of road infrastructure differs between the distinguished countries. For the time being it is therefore advised to follow the conclusion of Eurostat regarding the life time expectancy for roads, i.e. 55 years. Depreciation is advised to be linear and the interest rate 5%. Fixed and variable infrastructure costs In none of the countries a division is made between fixed and variable costs 7 . For the moment a feasible and ‘easy’ application would be to classify all investment and operational expenditures as fixed infrastructure costs. Subsequently variable infrastructure costs include renewal and maintenance expenditures.

### Public Transit

#### Public Transportation is Mass Transit

APTA 1994 [American Public Transit Association, “Glossary of Transit Terminology”, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/Transit\_Glossary\_1994.pdf, July 1994, Accessed: 7/11/12] JDO

Transportation by bus, rail, or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, which provides to the public general or special service on a regular and continuing basis. Also known as “mass transportation,” “mass transit” and “transit”.

### Farebox recovery ratio

#### Farebox recovery ratio compares ticket purchases to operation costs

New Zealand Transport Agency 10 (no author, 05-10-12, NZ Transport Agency, “National farebox recovery policy,” <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/national-farebox-recovery-policy/q-and-a.html>, accessed 07-11-12, EBB)

1. What do you mean by a farebox recovery policy? The term ‘farebox’ is used to describe the revenue collected from tickets (cash, prepaid, passes and electronic purses) purchased by those who use a public transport system. In a literal sense, a farebox was where users placed their cash for fares charged on buses, trains and ferries. An approved organisation's farebox recovery policy sets out the contribution public transport users are expected to make to the operating cost of providing public transport services in their region. Deciding on what contribution users make needs to take into account the benefits to the user as well as the wider benefits to society, such as less congestion and having access to an affordable, alternative mode of transport. 2. What is a farebox recovery ratio? A farebox recovery ratio measures the contribution fares make to the operating cost of providing public transport services, and is typically expressed as a percentage. Few public transport systems’ costs are completely covered by fare revenue, so subsidies (and other revenue such as advertising, parking fees and contributions from businesses/organisations) are usually required to cover the shortfall.

#### Farebox recovery policy encourages shared funding for transit – contextual definition

New Zealand Transport Agency 10 (no author, 05-10-12, NZ Transport Agency, “National farebox recovery policy,” <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/national-farebox-recovery-policy/q-and-a.html>, accessed 07-11-12, EBB)

5. Why has the NZTA developed a farebox recovery policy? The NZTA's national farebox recovery policy has been developed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public transport in New Zealand by: ensuring that public transport users, ratepayers and road users are contributing their fair share towards the costs of providing services preventing further decline in the national farebox recovery ratio addressing the wide variation in regional authority approaches to farebox recovery policy addressing concerns about whether some regional authorities are being subsidised fairly based on their public transport performance. 6. What will the policy do? The policy is designed to: encourage efficiency in the provision of public transport services in an environment where there is likely to be only small increases in central government funding for public transport services (ie funding to cover operating costs) over the next six years ensure that the costs of providing public transport services are, over time, shared equitably between public transport users, ratepayers and road users prevent any further decline in public transport users' contribution to the cost of providing public transport services, while aiming to increase that contribution where feasible. The user contribution has declined from 58 percent of the operating costs in 2001/02 to 46 percent in 2008/09 improve the transparency, accountability and consistency of the approach to farebox recovery implemented by approved organisations throughout the country enable the NZTA to undertake better benchmarking and monitoring of farebox recovery performance throughout New Zealand.

#### Farebox recovery ratio – definition by Maryland General Assembly

Mock 2/27 (Amanda, 2-27-12, Department of Legislative Services: Maryland General Assembly, “Fiscal and Policy Note,” <http://mlis.state.md.us/2012rs/fnotes/bil_0009/sb0699.pdf>, accessed 7-11-12, EBB)

The farebox recovery ratio is the ratio of public transit operating revenues compared to

operating expenditures. To the extent expenditures are not covered by fares, the

operating deficit for public transit is paid from TTF. Farebox revenue is impacted by

both the level of fare assessed as well as ridership. To the extent ridership growth and

corresponding fare revenue do not keep pace with expenditure growth, the farebox

recovery ratio declines.

#### Farebox recovery ratio describes percent of operation cost paid by fares

Metro Transit accessed 7/12 (no date, Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority, “Transit Funding,” <http://www.gometro.org/transit-funding>, accessed 7-12-12, EBB)

Many people believe the costs of running a public transit system are recovered by passenger fares. While passenger fares don’t cover the operating cost of the transit service, they’re an important source of revenue. The ratio between the passenger fares paid and the operating cost is called the “farebox recovery” ratio. Bus transit agencies typically have a farebox recovery ratio less than 15%, which means that 15% of the operating cost comes from passenger fares, and 85% is funded by other sources.