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#### New transportation infrastructure reconstructs space to make labor more mobile – but behind this need for labor flexibility is the endless demand of capital to subject more and more workers to exploitation under the guise of new jobs

Feldman ’77 [Associate Professor of Community Planning – U of Rhode Island. Marshall. “A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF URBAN POLITICAl ECONOMY: THE JOURNEY TO WORK.” Antipode [Volume 9, Issue 2,](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anti.1977.9.issue-2/issuetoc) pages 30–50, September 1977 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1977.tb00709.x/abstract]

Transit provides another hidden form of social expense. To the extent that the "flight to the suburbs" represents a reaction to the social malaise which affects the poorest segments of the central city, transit substitutes for the social expense of controlling this malaise. Physical isolation allows for a lower level of expenditures on police, welfare, etc. than would be necessary in a more accessible spatial structure.¶ Such physical isolation and unequal access provides a graphic illustration of the inequities of capitalist development¶ (National Advisory Commission on Civil Dis- orders 1968: 242-7). Uneven development of the working class leads to the uneven ability to consume transit. Certain groups become "transit-poor" and are unable to afford the subsistence level of transit. Inasmuch as the state provides transit, the state loses legitimacy often to the extent that no consensus on transit policy can be achieved. Hence various token policies aimed at correcting some of the more flagrant inequities are adopted(22). Sophisticated strategies of social control include increased access, especially to employment, for the "transit- poor" as an important component (ibid.: 392- 3). As well-intentioned as these policies might be, they are ideological because they make a number of unfounded assumptions about the role of transit (Campbell and Burkhead ' op.cit.: 203; Gakenheimer op.cit.: 487-9; Marando 1974: 158; Ornati 1969). First, they assume that transportation will lead¶ to employment and, presumably, employment to higher income. Both income and employment are assumed to be "good things" when, in reality, they need not be. If the job is harmful or degrading, the worker may be better off on public assistance(23). Furthermore, unless there are job vacancies, increased access will, at best, result in displacing previously employed workers. Access, per se, cannot create jobs (Hutchinson 1974: 93). Unless increased production pays for the costs of increased access, improved transportation results in a net loss to society(24). At best, transportation redistributes income among workers.¶ Related to this is the fact that most discussions of the subject have largely been concerned with empirical data. As Masters (1974: 506) points out, a major change such as full employment for central city blacks could hardly be expected to occur without a major change in the structure of such empirical data. All discussions of the subject assume that there is no essential reason why a large portion of thin society must be poor --i.e., that the poor somehow "fit' in a larger scheme of things. Marginal corrective policies assume that societal forces will not compensate for any changes in the status quo.¶ These discussions of policy perform important an ideological function, however. On the one hand, they make it seem as if “something is being done.” So that the state appears as an unbiased actor dealing with urban inequality. At the same time, these policies focus attention on a limited range of issues which then seem to be the basis of all political differences. Questions outside the range of this debate are never even considered. There are two effects. First, inasmuch as the framework of decisions is taken as a given, factors potentially subject to conscious change appear to be unquestionable, unchangeable, and not really the products of human¶ actions. For example, the very existence of the journey-to-work and employment as wage labor are such factors. Second, inasmuch as these policies constrain political debate to a discussion of different means for achieving equality of incomes from wage labor for the purpose of consumption of commodities, they make other notions of human purpose appear utopian, irresponsible, and unthinkable. In this sense, these policies create what appears as a de facto ideological consensus on the purpose and meaning of human existence. Whatever the policy's professed purpose, its effect is to legitimize the overall framework of capitalist development. This ideological function is aided when the failure of the policies is ascribed to national psychological traits(25) and evokes cynicism towards further political action.¶ In sum, transit serves a not-so-subtle function of social control. In this sense, transit may be called a form of social expense. This function is manifested by overtly repressive aspects of transit such as transit police, as well as the more subtle social control achieved by spatial isolation. The social expense aspect of transit is also manifested in its "social welfare" role both as a form of access to employment and social services, and as a direct source of "make-work" employment. Additionally, policies directed at partial solutions to transit inequities serve an important ideological function of maintaining hegemony.

#### And, transportation infrastructure is itself a critical element of capitalist growth – new infrastructure is needed to solve the inevitable problems of over-accumulation and falling profit

Feldman ’77 [Associate Professor of Community Planning – U of Rhode Island. Marshall. “A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF URBAN POLITICAl ECONOMY: THE JOURNEY TO WORK.” Antipode [Volume 9, Issue 2,](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anti.1977.9.issue-2/issuetoc) pages 30–50, September 1977 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1977.tb00709.x/abstract]

Whether produced privately or by the state, capitalist transit is generally a commodity. As such, it is subject to the laws of capitalist commodity production. Certain special features of transit must be pointed out to see how these laws apply. Capitalist transit, as will be seen below, involves the integration of large spatial areas. Therefore, transit requires a large amount of investment and presupposes a certain level of prior accumulation, the bulk of which must go into fixed capital¶ (roads or tracks, rolling stock, etc.). Because of this huge investment in physical infrastructure, according to the normal workings of the law of value, transit cannot be sold at the average rate of profit without greatly depressing the overall rate. Therefore, it is usually impossible to produce capitalist transit profitably unless it is subsidized. This subsidy can take several forms: governmental transfers, super- normal profits linked to other commodities such as land, super-exploitation of captive labor, etc.(7). The same reasoning partially explains why automobile transit is generally more viable, under capitalism, than other forms of transit. An automobile is a "consumer durable," it is purchased and consumed over a period of time. Rail or bus transit, on the other hand, are produced and consumed as "services," i.e., consumption and production occur simultaneously. In automobile production a large part of constant capital circulates with the commodity, whereas in most other forms of transit the vehicle is owned by the firm, this constant capital remains fixed and does not circulate with the commodity. Similarly, non-auto transit requires an employee to drive, whereas in auto transit this is part of the "work" of consumption (Weinbaum and Bridges 1976) and is essentially unpaid labor. Hence, automobile transit (or any other form of "private" transit) entails a rate of profit computed on a relatively smaller capital in- vestment and given an average rate of profit, is more likely to attract investment (8)• How state transit investment affect the rate of profit depends on particular factors such as tax structure, method of finance, nature of transit expenditure, political relations of classes and fractions within a conjuncture, etc. If transit not only shifts costs to the state, but also increases the rate of surplus value, then such transit may be considered a social investment (O'Connor op.cit.: 105ff). Inasmuch as transit technically overlaps with non-transit forms of transportation (e.g., highways are used by both trucks and autos), transit investments are directly forms of social investment which can directly increase the productiveness of labor. Insofar as transit investments remove commuters from streets and highways and thereby lower travel times in the productive process indirectly, transit investments are indirectly forms of social capital. Finally, to the extent that transit investments enable travel to commercial outlets, transit investments directly reduce the circulation time of capital. All three effects accomplish a reduction in the socially necessary labor required to produce and sell commodities for final consumption. This outcome is accentuated to the extent that transit is used directly in the productive process (e.g., to transport engineers from one plant location to another) and indirectly by structuring space so as to increase propinquity.¶ The overall effect of these transit investments is to increase the physical productivity of society. To the extent that these increases do not increase real wages, the overall rate of surplus value increases. Hence, accumulation also increases, resulting in increased concentration (Marx 1967 edn. I: 621ff). Such transit investments are in direct contradiction with the problems associated with surplus absorption (see below). However, it is true that, by increasing the rate of surplus value without increasing private investment (assuming transit is supplied by the state), transit investments can counteract a falling rate of profit and open up new areas for investment, especially in those areas most dependent on transit (e.g., commercial centers) (9). The extent to which the two effects counteract each other also depends on specific circumstances. .¶ The concept of surplus absorption is important to Baran and Sweezy’s (1966) theory of monopoly capital. In this theory, monopoly firms accumulate surplus value faster than it can either be consumed or invested. This inability to find profitable outlets for the surplus leads to stagnation throughout the economy. These depressive tendencies can be offset in part by-the sales effort- and the growth of governmental expenditures(10). However, according to Baran and Sweezy, the major counteracting forces have been wars and their aftermaths' and epoch-making innovations.¶ Baran and Sweezy explicitly identify the railroad and automobile as such innovations. Not only do these innovations attract investment themselves, but they also open up new outlets for the investment of capital in physical infrastructure, new buildings, etc. This seems to be a feature especially prevalent in transit innovations, which necessarily change the geographical landscape. Furthermore, there are multiplier effects in the form of new support industries (e.g., auto repair shops) and industries predicated on the transit innovation (e.g., drive-in movies). Therefore, one of the major effects of transit is to provide effective demand for capital and prevent further stagnation. This role is independent of the eventual use to which the transit is put.¶ Baran and Sweezy identify this tendency to stagnate as a secular one. Yet, there are also indications that such stagnation is cyclical and that transportation plays a crucial role in these cycles. Admittedly, when dealing with long time periods it is difficult to distinguish between cycles and stages (Day 1976), but on the basis of ¶ shorter time periods there is a clear relation between "Kuznet's" cycles and transit investment. Thus Isard (1942) identifies a "transport-building cycle" of roughly twenty-five years duration. Each cycle seems to lead a boom in building activity. As mentioned previously, transit construction has often been tied to land speculation, so it is difficult to argue that transit investment "causes" building investment. What does seem to be true is that such cycles are related to declining profit rates in other sectors and that transit investment is undertaken with capital made available via private and public financial institutions(ll). Isard's work identifies qualitative differences between transportation cycles characterized by the nature of transportation supplied: canals, railways, electric streetcars, autos, etc. Furthermore, there is very fragmentary, evidence of cycles in transit demand. This is true both in terms of the volume of trips made to central business districts (Foley 1952) and distances traveled (Adams and MacKesey 1955, American Society of Planning Officials 1951, Gerard 1958). Bottiny (1966) observes stagnation in transportation demand as of the early 1960s. However, it is not clear that this stagnation is secular rather than cyclical. In sum, the provision of transit as a commodity subjects it to the laws of commodity production. These laws have their effects particularly in terms of the rate of profit and transit's high (joint) organic composition. Because transit links productive and unproductive land uses it has a particular place in the cycles that characterize capitalist production as capital shifts from productive to speculative uses. Possession of transit is not confined to a particular capital. This “public goods" aspect combines with transit's diverse functions to make it a "complex use-value-¶ (Preteceille, op.cit.) produces as a commodity in a complex system of commodities.¶ In the next section we will examine another complex commodity.

#### The impact is exploitation on a massive scale – American capitalism exploits workers more than anywhere else in the world

Zafirovski ’03; Milan Zafirovski, Professor of Sociology, University of North Texas; Fall 2003; “Measuring and Making Sense of Labor Exploitation in Contemporary Society: A Comparative Analysis;” Review of Radical Political Economics, Volume 35, No. 4, Fall 2003, 462-484

This second failure of capitalism is further amplified by most recent tendencies in labor exploitation within the American economy, that is, increasing discrepancies between U.S. productivity and earnings, in further violation of the productivity rule of no exploitation. Reportedly, in modern, particularly ruthless American capitalism, there have been “dramatic increases in the wage-productivity gap—the divergence between the growth rates of aggregate [and thus marginal] productivity and real wages—in the post-1981 period”9 (Ferguson 1996: 77), at the expense of wages. In retrospect, these tendencies have been associated with a period of the resurgence of economic conservatism (the new Right) in major capitalist economies, including what Keynes would term financial Puritanism, as exemplified by Reaganomics in the United States and Thatcherism10 in the United Kingdom. In an empirical study, Kalmans (1997) showed that for most of the postwar period, the United States experienced a higher level and faster growth of its rate of surplus value (SV)/ exploitation than did Japan. A major factor for this has been the falling rate of profitability in the United States. For example, the rate of profit has recovered just 40 percent of the previous decrease during the 1960s and 1970s (Moseley 1997: 23). In turn, this has been due to the increasing share of unproductive labor in SV. Reportedly, the “main reason for the lack of a more significant increase in the rate of profit is a continued increase in the relative proportion of unproductive labor [in the United States]” (Moseley 1997: 23). In response, U.S. companies have increased the rate of labor exploitation to compensate for this loss of SV. So long as this loss of SV continues, one can expect that U.S. companies will further increase the exploitation rate in the future (a similar argument is made by Gordon 1996a) insofar as the fate of American corporate capitalism hinges increasingly on the profit rate (Moseley 1997) and thus on worker exploitation. In turn, workers’ bargaining strength and thus labor’s positional or institutional power (Gordon 1998; Howell 1999; Perrone 1984) is inversely related to the fear of losing their jobs (Screpanti 1996), with this fear increasing as the unemployment rate increases. In such a situation, labor exploitation or exploitative employment appears to most workers as a lesser evil than involuntary joblessness. This seems to particularly apply to American workers who are forced, in the absence of a social net comparable to that in most developed countries, to make a “choice” between involuntary joblessness and ruthless exploitation, choosing the second because at least they have “jobs.” In turn, American workers’ acceptance of virtually any available jobs (recently, largely part-time, low-paid ones) seems to give an almost unfettered “license to exploit” to capitalist corporations making the U.S. free enterprise system “the utopia (becoming a reality) of unlimited exploitation” (Bourdieu 1998: 94). The outcome is a vicious circle in which the fear of joblessness and labor exploitation reinforce each other. As with labor exploitation, the fear of losing jobs is more pervasive in the United States than any other country, given the permanent revolution of restructuring and downsizing of American companies, of which prime victims are regularly workers and their jobs, with the stock market celebrating such victimization. Such “corporate squeeze of working Americans” (Gordon 1996a) thus dispels the myth of managerial downsizing by increasingly “fat” and “mean” American corporations. No wonder American workers’ already weak bargaining strength has further plummeted in recent years.11 The breakdown of the U.S. postwar system of labor relations, namely, the capital-labor accord, was hastened by opportunistic attacks by American capital on labor (Nilsson 1996). All this sheds light both on the increasing job insecurity and on the high rate of labor exploitation in the American economy. Based on data from Table 3, an empirical generalization is that exploitation rates are comparatively the highest in what can be termed Anglo-Saxon capitalism (the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, Australia). In turn, exploitation rates appear lower in European welfare states, that is, in most countries of northern Europe. It would seem that the more an economy is laissez-faire, capitalistic, and decentralized, the higher is the exploitation rate, and vice versa. Specifically, laissez-faire, capitalistic, and decentralized economies characterized by enterprise-level wage negotiations such as the United States, as well as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, have higher exploitation rates than centralized welfare (e.g., Scandinavian) states having economy-wide negotiation with government involvement and those (Germany, Holland, and Belgium) at intermediate levels with industry-based bargaining (Alesina and Perroti 1997: 930). The overall finding is thus that laissez-faire capitalism is comparatively more exploitative than its welfare state/corporatist forms. This would suggest that an unregulated and unfettered labor market, of the sort extolled by neoclassical orthodoxy, tends to generate greater exploitation rates than do other markets. In the absence of pertinent and balanced government and other social regulation of its operation, such a market appears to give capitalist employers virtually unrestricted freedom to exploit laborers given the asymmetrical power of capital and labor, particularly in countries such as the United States. The fact that a laissez-faire economy rests on such freedom of exploitation of labor by capital helps one understand the advocacy of “free enterprise” on the part of capitalists and their political representatives and conservative ideologues (Botwinick 1993: 256). However, what all these groups defend as Adam Smith’s “natural system of liberty,” driven by individual freedom, initiative, and responsibility, laborers experience as both Leviathan and anarchy (Buchanan 1975), that is, as systemic overcontrol and the license to be exploited within some sort of Hobbesian antisocial state and thus “trapped in a modern jungle” (Botwinick 1993: 120n). Conditions of persistent labor superexploitation in myriad U.S. industries (garments, electronics, poultry, etc.) are thus a “remainder of the worst kinds of abuse that can take place within the ‘free labor markets’ of modern capitalism” (Botwinick 1993: 119–20). Hence, contrary to economic orthodoxy, laissez-faire capitalism or America’s free-enterprise system displays an intrinsic tendency to generate and perpetuate higher rates of labor exploitation than other social systems, especially welfare states, as free (labor and consumer) markets “often work blindly, cruelly and exploitatively—and thus create the paradox of freedom in principle and lack of freedom in practice.” At this juncture, the question can arise as to whether having a strong welfare state or centralized bargaining transforms a society into a less capitalistic one or merely a different form of capitalism. The second answer seems more plausible to the extent that the economy remains essentially privately owned and controlled. On this account, even countries with strong welfare states such as, for example, Germany and Sweden, qualify as capitalist, given the dominance of private ownership and control of the means of production. In this regard, such societies can be characterized by the category of welfare capitalism as distinguished from its laissez-faire counterpart (Esping-Andersen 1994).

#### Our alternative: let labor accomplish its own spatial fixes.

#### This means rejecting policies that favor capital accumulation – we must understand geography from the perspective of labor.

Andrew Herod ‘3 University of Georgia “Workers, Space, and Labor Geography” International Labor and Working-Class History (2003), 64 : pp 112-138

However, whereas the spatial ﬁxes that capitalists seek to implement in the¶ landscape in their pursuit of proﬁt must have use value for capital—that is to say,¶ such landscapes must facilitate the production and realization of surplus value—¶ they may have little or no use value for labor. Herein lies a source of contradiction and (potential) struggle, for workers may have quite different geographical¶ visions concerning how capitalism should be arranged spatially. Consequently,¶ workers may pursue a spatial ﬁx either of their own organization or of capitalism more generally which is quite different from that preferred by capital. The¶ struggles which are the hallmark of capitalism, then, may not just be over the¶ production and extraction of surplus value in the workplace but may also stem¶ from the production of the material landscape and of the geographical relationships between different places therein.¶ Conceiving of capitalism as not only a political and economic system but¶ also as a profoundly spatial system takes us into the realm of what we might call¶ “spatial praxis.” In particular, whilst much neo-Marxist theorizing within human¶ geography has focused upon understanding how capital attempts to create a spatial ﬁx in its own image, a growing number of “labor geographers” during the¶ 1990s sought to examine how workers’ lives were spatially structured and how¶ workers attempt to create what we might call “labor’s spatial ﬁx” as they seek to¶ secure their economic and political goals. Such a conceptualization of workers’¶ lives as deeply spatialized and of the reproduction of capitalism as an inherently geographical process puts the production of space (and struggles over this¶ production) at the center of workers’ social praxis, such that the making of the¶ spatial relations of capitalism ends up being a central aspect of their social activities, even if they are not recognized as such by those involved.¶ 25¶ Acknowledging that workers may seek to impose within the landscape their own spatial¶ visions which can be quite different from those of capital, then, forces us to theorize how workers’ social practices are shaped by their spatial contexts and how,¶ in turn, their spatial practices play an important role in structuring the evolving¶ social and spatial relations of capitalism.

# Links

### Transportation Links

#### Transportation infrastructure directly serves the interests of capital against labor – expanding labor markets allow the capital accumulation to continue unabated

David C. Hodge ‘90 Department of Geography University of Was hi ngton Urban Geography, 1990, 11, 1, pp. 87-100.

If the raison d’etre of cities is to provide the opportunity for interaction, ¶ few aspects of urban infrastructure match the importance of the provision ¶ of urban transportation. While the focus of transportation has been on its ¶ importance as an enabling (or determining) technology that has altered ¶ spatial form, it may prove more useful to consider urban transportation in a more contentious way as the major structural agent shaping ground rent ¶ (Feldman, 1977) and giving rise to patterns of relative (dis)advantage (Adler, ¶ 1987, 1988) for investment and capital accumulation. In this section I will ¶ briefly highlight this critical view of urban transportation as well as a second ¶ role that transportation plays in capital accumulation as an industry in its ¶ own right. ¶ There is little disagreement about the importance of transportation to ¶ the growth and functioning of cities. There is even agreement that investments ¶ in transportation open new outlets for the investment of capital in the ¶ physical infrastructure, changing the distribution of ground rent, “creating” ¶ and coordinating space (Feldman, 1977; Gottdiener, 1985). However, there ¶ is much less agreement as to the true nature of the role played by ¶ transportation investment. Adler (1 988), for example, contrasts transportation ¶ investment as either accomodationist, a somewhat benign response to other ¶ forces structuring urban areas, or developmental, leading land development ¶ (and by implication capital accumulation). Adler concludes that U.S. ¶ transportation policy has been expansionist and developmental, a position ¶ which has considerable support (Jackson, 1985; Jones, 1985). Moreover, ¶ Adler argues that most attention to urban transportation policies has stressed ¶ issues related to modal conflict and in so doing obscures “the fundamental ¶ dimension of urban transport politics, which is place conflict- competition ¶ between places to maintain and attract capital investment” (1 988, ¶ p. 267-emphasis added). It should be added that not only is there a ¶ competition between places but also a competition between different factions ¶ of capital (Badcock, 1984; Gottdiener, 1985) and, because of social geography, ¶ different social groups. According to Adler (1987), competition between places is a basic feature ¶ of metropolitan development processes which leads to place-based coalitions ¶ that are particularly concerned with transportation because (I) transportation ¶ facilities create locational advantage and (2) transportation facilities offer ¶ greater leverage over the location decisions of other investors. In an especially ¶ insightful comparison of San Francisco and Los Angeles, Adler (1987) argues ¶ that Los Angeles failed to get started on a rail system in the late 1940s ¶ because there were so many competing centers where the plans were ¶ viewed as an attempt to promote downtown Los Angeles. In contrast, ¶ Oakland feared competition for a more southerly crossing of the Bay and ¶ thus joined forces with San Francisco; this not only promoted the interests ¶ of San Francisco but also secured a prominent developmental position for ¶ the Oakland area. In another interesting case study Cohen (1 988) investigated ¶ the deterioration of the quality of mass transit service in New York City. ¶ Contrary to popular images, Cohen argues that the deterioration did not ¶ occur because of either a preference in funding for the automobile or a ¶ lack of money because of the fiscal crisis of New York City in the ¶ mid-1970s. Rather it was the result of a deliberate policy to spend money ¶ on new construction rather than maintaining or upgrading existing capital ¶ stock. One of the key reasons for such policy was a response to the political demands for more services in developing areas. Also, such policies ¶ promoted the interests of key business and financial institutions in the ¶ region, leading Cohen to agree with Whitt and Yago's (1985, p. 59) ¶ proposition that rail construction projects are primarily "political tools for ¶ u r ba n develop men t. " ¶ Finally, while the emphasis above has been on urban transportation ¶ investments as a factor influencing other capital investments, it is also ¶ important to consider investment in urban transportation as a vehicle for ¶ accumulation in its own right. Certainly this was easier to do when transit ¶ companies were privately held, although the close liaisons with real estate ¶ developers, especially during the streetcar era, and the ongoing control over ¶ rates muddles the record even in that period (Jackson, 1985; Jones, 1985). ¶ The most famous chapter of the private transit industry, the alleged collusion ¶ of General Motors, Firestone, Phillips Petroleum, and Standard Oil to ¶ substitute buses for streetcars, has been carefully examined by Yago (1980) ¶ and Whitt and Yago (1985) and popularized on television's 60 Minutes ¶ and in the movie Who Framed Roger Rabbit? While there seems little ¶ doubt that collusion existed and that it hastened the demise of rail transit ¶ in many cities, it is difficult to believe that the collusion amounted to ¶ much more than a relatively minor factor in the ultimate hegemony of ¶ the automobile in most cities.

#### Public infrastructure fragments space – it guarantees divisions within cities that brutalize life

Butler 08-(Christopher Butler is Professor of English Literature at Oxford University. “Slicing through Space”. http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/griffith17&div=27&g\_sent=1&collection=journals)

A key element in Lefebvre's analysis of the production of space is his depiction of the dominant spatial formation of contemporary capitalism as 'abstract space' - a space structured by tendencies towards fragmentation, homogenisation and hierarchy. The fragmentary character of abstract space can be understood on a number of different levels. Private land ownership breaks the city up and segments it into discrete parcels, which can be bought and sold as commodities, while land use controls divide social space into zones that can be categorised and policed according to designated uses. Public infrastructure, such as road and freeway developments that allow traffic to pass through existing residential areas, also contribute to the physical fragmentation and segmentation of urban space. Recognising the inherent violence in the deployment of technology in this way, Lefebvre describes how the 'motorway brutalizes the countryside and the land, slicing through space like a great knife'. While at the local level abstract space appears to be fractured, it also tends towards homogeneity, through the subjection of space to the market criteria of pure exchange and through the state's attempts to impose coherence and unity to the various subsystems that operate within the city. This allows us to observe how infrastructure projects such as roads and freeways impose a form of invisible legality on urban space. Freeway developments in particular contribute to spatial homogenisation by extending similar road forms and elevated flyovers throughout the city and extending the capacity of the motor car to travel at uniform speeds, unimpeded by the interruptions of other traffic or pedestrians.

#### Transportation infrastructure is a tool of the state to structure markets in favor of capital and against labor – increased mobility allows corporations to exploit labor more ruthlessly and efficiently

Gottdiener ‘85 (Mark Gottdiener is a professor of Sociology at the University of Buffalo, *The Social Production of Urban Space*. (Page 251-252), Austin: University of Texas, 1985. Print.)

In the next section, I shall examine more closely the causes of the sunbelt shift; at present, it is necessary to inquire after the factors which have stimulated the location of new plants and industries in the outer rings of metropolitan regions. **Since World War II, Late Capitalist transformations have altered the business enterprise, and it has become progressively more unhinged from its dependence on the city center.** Certainly this development depends to an extent on the lowering of interaction costs through technological innovation. Yet, other factors are also involved in these transformations, such as the restructuring of the world economic system since 1975 (Chase-Dunn 1984; Sassen-Koob 1984; Cohen 1981). In the main, **monopoly capitalist corporations have been best able to take advantage of modern infrastructural changes that have made central city location obsolete.** Due to the ease of internal financing, the administration of prices, which insures a stable market, the harnessing of technical expertise, and the administrative control over space, the large corporations of our concentrated industries have “internalized many of the economies of agglomeration” (Walker 1981:399) which once favored the central city as the site of industry. Consequently, **the shift to the suburbs reflects the growing power of the highly concentrated conglomerate business enterprise in the United States.** Furthermore, **increased mobility provided corporations with the ability to control labor costs by shifting organization and location, the prelude to what is presently a global labor sourcing strategy. The shift to suburban and/or peripheral global locations with cheap, organized labor is one stage in this worldwide process. As in the case of homeownership, the location pattern of new industrial wealth in the suburbs could not have been produced without the incentives, regulations, and subsidies provided by active state intervention.** Many analysts see this as a form of direct intervention. It is not. As indicated**, the role of the state has been less in the form of planning than in indirect subsides through policies aimed at aiding powerful business interests rather than developing space.** **Thus, the effects on metropolitan spatial patterns have been largely unanticipated and uncoordinated, because they are not the object of coherent government policy**. With regard specifically to the local and state governments, direct subsidies to local business which have had unplanned effects include tax write-offs, especially those which provide incentives to build new plants and new facilities rather than refurbish existing ones (Marcuse 1981; Bluestone and Harrison 1982); real estate abatements; low interest loans; and tax exempt development bonds. **In addition, federal assisted loans have worked in concert with tax credits to discriminate against the city and in favor of the intermetropolitan shift to suburban locations** (Peterson 1979). **In this way, while the Late Capitalist industries came into being as a consequence of worldwide economic transportations, the present mode of sociospatial organization was partly produced by the state.** **In the case of intraregional location patterns, these seem to be almost wholly a mixed local, state, and federal government project.** Thus, while local governments possess fundamental powers to intervene in space as regulators of land, most of these restrictions are ignored when an industry wishes to enter an area–space is at the service of growth. **In this manner, the direct interventionist power to plan in sacrificed so that the state can intervene indirectly to subsidize the economy through pro-growth policy.**

### Space Key

#### Restructuring space is key to the survival and continued growth of capitalism

Andrew Herod ‘3 University of Georgia “Workers, Space, and Labor Geography” International Labor and Working-Class History (2003), 64 : pp 112-138

Arguably, the central tenet of “labor geography” is that capitalism’s spatial organization is important to the way in which it functions and that, consequently,¶ the making of this spatial organization is a potential source of great conﬂict between various factions of capital and of labor. Such ideas draw upon a body of¶ neo-Marxist work that has developed within human geography since the 1970s¶ and which has sought, basically, to spatialize Marx.¶ 5¶ This work has contended¶ that space does not have ontological status before the actions that bring it into¶ being and should not be considered as merely a pre-existing platform upon¶ which social life plays out but, instead, as something which is forcefully created¶ by the activities of various social actors and which, in turn, structures those activities.¶ 6¶ Thus, whereas viewing space as simply a stage for the performance of¶ social life separates ontologically the spatial from the social, such that space and¶ society are viewed as capable of existing separately one from the other and are¶ brought together only at the actual moment of the performance, neo-Marxist¶ work in human geography has argued that space and society are dialectically¶ linked, that the one cannot, in fact, exist without the other; space is produced¶ within the very bowels of society whilst, simultaneously, society is deeply structured by its geographies.¶ Certainly, there are intimations in some of Marx’s writings as to the importance of space for how capitalism works as a political economic system. Thus, in¶ Grundrisse Marx writes about how revolutions in transportation technology had¶ reduced travel times between the cities of Victorian Britain, thereby effectively¶ bringing about the “annihilation of space [conceived of here as the distance between places] by time,” whilst at the end of Volume One of Capital he hints at a¶ geographical solution to the problems of overaccumulation in industrial Britain¶ through the export to the colonies of underutilized capital and laborers.¶ 7¶ Such¶ ideas were, of course, subsequently taken up by Lenin in his thesis about how¶ imperialism represented the highest stage of capitalism, whilst Rosa Luxemburg¶ argued (though clearly wrongly) that capitalism, being an inherently expansive¶ form of economic organization, would collapse in upon itself once it had spread¶ to every nook and cranny of the globe and there were no more pre-capitalist¶ spaces that remained to be brought under its sway.¶ 8¶ It was not, however, until¶ the work of French theoretician Henri Lefebvre that the connections between¶ the functioning of capitalism and its spatial organization were made more explicit.¶ 9¶ Speciﬁcally, Lefebvre argued that in order for accumulation to occur capital needs to create particular types of landscape and that, consequently, the production of space in certain ways is central to the reproduction of capital and¶ capitalist social relations.¶ 10¶ Effectively responding to Luxemburg, Lefebvre suggested that capitalism has found itself able to attenuate (if not resolve) its internal contradictions for a century, and consequently, in the hundred years since the writing of Capital, it has succeeded in achieving ‘growth.’ We cannot calculate at what price, but¶ we do know the means: by occupying space, by producing a space.¶ 11 For Lefebvre, then, part of capital’s success lies in its capacity to build the appropriate material geographies that it can use to facilitate the extraction and realization of surplus value during the accumulation process and through which it¶ can thereby ensure the tacit renewal of capitalism.

### Journey to Work Link

#### Making the journey to work more efficient solidifies and reproduces the exploitative relationship at the heart of labro

David C. Hodge ‘90 Department of Geography University of Was hi ngton Urban Geography, 1990, 11, 1, pp. 87-100.

While the dominant public issue involving the journey to work revolves ¶ around congestion and mode choice (Pucher, 1988a, 1988b), ultimately the ¶ journey to work must be understood for its role in shaping fundamental ¶ relationships within urban areas. It is important to note here that I am ¶ not focusing on the findings that the simultaneous determination of workplace ¶ and residence in an econometric model yield better results (Simpson, 1987). ¶ Rather, I am discussing the more fundamental ways in which the home ¶ environment affects the work decision, the work environment affects home ¶ decisions (Hanson and Pratt, 1988), and urban transportation connects the ¶ two (Feldman, 1977). In one of the best papers discussing these implications, ¶ Feldman (1977, p. 30) notes the multiple and “more or less contradictory ¶ function [of urban transportation] as commodity, reproducer of labor power, ¶ social-control mechanism, and structurer of space.” His basic argument is ¶ that “transit” (read urban transportation) reproduces the divisions within and ¶ between classes in society by mediating the relationship between status at ¶ the point of production (workplace) and status at the point of consumption ¶ (homeplace). Good transit can theoretically contribute to the separation of ¶ production and consumption interests (fragmenting class interests of labor) ¶ while simultaneously accommodating patterns of residential segregation that ¶ contribute to the reproduction of labor.

### Labor Flow Link

#### Transportation infrastructure strengthens capitalism through the amplification of the “free” flow of labor and capital.

Kuswa 2004 (Kevin Kuswa; P.h. D. in Rhetoric from UT, Department of Rhetoric and Communication Studies at Richmond “Machinic Rhetoric, Highways and Interpellating Motions”; Spring 2004; http://www.rhizomes.net/issue8/kuswa.htm; NBaj)

Beginning with the highway machine's movement, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) intervene with a diagram that is indispensable to any discussion of circulation and modernity. They plot the state's shift from "machinic enslavement" to "social subjection" as the components of the nation are captured by an organizing apparatus working through capitalism. As Fordism and the energy crisis demonstrated, machines are tied to nations and states-in this case the highway machine intertwines with America and the United States government. Capitalism, likewise, is effectuated by a law of states that offers the possibility of a "free" flow of labor and capital for a group of producers.¶ More generally, we must take into account a 'materialist' determination of the modern State or nation-state; a group of producers in which labor and capital circulate freely, in other words, in which the homogeneity and competition of capital is effectuated, in principle without external obstacles. In order to be effectuated, capitalism has always required there to be a new force and a new law of States, on the level of the flow of labor as on the level of the flow of independent capital. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p455)¶ A state, then, is a nation that has been realized through the flow of capital (land) and the flow of labor (people). When the land and the people are deterritorialized or overcoded through flows of labor and capital, the nation becomes "the very operation of a collective subjectification, to which the modern State corresponds as a process of subjection" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p456). This does not mean that nations are simply appearances or the consequences of a dominant ideology. Instead, nations "are the passional and living forms in which the qualitative homogeneity and the quantitative competition of abstract capital are first realized" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p456).

### Movement Link

#### Allowing for more movement within capitalism allows the system to function more ruthlessly

#### Massey ‘94(Doreen Barbara Massey, is a contemporary British social scientist and geographer, working among others on topics typical of Marxist geography. She currently serves as Professor of geography at the Open University. [http://narrativadigitalmagister.wikispaces.com/file/view/Space%2CPlace+and+Gender-Doreen+Massey.pdf](http://narrativadigitalmagister.wikispaces.com/file/view/Space%2CPlace%2Band%2BGender-Doreen%2BMassey.pdf), 07/ 24/1994. Accessed 07/24/12. GS)

This is well established and often noted in the relationship between capital and labour. Capital's ability to roam the world further strengthens it in relation to relatively immobile workers, enables it to play off the plant at Genk against the plant at Dagenham. It also strengthens its hand against struggling local economies the world over as they compete for the favour of some investment. The 747s that fly computer scientists across the Pacific are part of the reason for the greater isolation today of the island of Pitcairn. But also, every time someone uses a car, and thereby increases their personal mobility, they reduce both the social rationale and the financial viability of the public transport system - and thereby also potentially reduce the mobility of those who rely on that system. Every time you drive to that out-of-town shopping centre you contribute to the rising prices, even hasten the demise, of the corner shop. And the 'time- space compression' which is involved in producing and reproducing the daily lives of the comfortably-off in First World societies - not just their own travel but the resources they draw on, from all over the world, to feed their lives - may entail environmental consequences, or hit con- straints, which will limit the lives of others before their own. We need to ask, in other words, whether our relative mobility and power over mobility and communication entrenches the spatial imprisonment of other groups.

### Regional Specialization Link

#### Division of labor that is stretched out between areas creates a world or dominant regions that control the economy, and submissive regions that are powerless

Massey ’94 (Doreen Massey is a contemporary British social scientist and geographer, working among others on topics typical of Marxist geography. She currently serves as Professor of geography at the Open University. “Uneven Development: Social Change and Spatial Divisions of Labour” Space Place and Gender (page 88-89)

So, the interregional or inter-area relations, as they are so often called, are actually these relations of production stretched out between areas (at any scale of analysis from the very local to the international). To different degrees they are the relations of class power and control. These relations exist between functions within the overall division of labour. Regions or local areas may be specialized in the performance of a small number of functions and these in turn may be those to which attach power, and strategic control over the operation of the economy, or they may be those which are relatively powerless, subordinated. Most often, there will be a mixture. But, further, the performance of particular functions within society is part of what defines groups within the class structure. One of the bases of the definition of classes and social strata is their place within the overall relations of production. The location of headquarters in one region/country/local area and of branch plants in another will be reflected in the social compositions of those places. So will the location of the functions of research and development as opposed to shop-floor manufacturing, or of financial functions as opposed to more direct production.

### Speed Link

#### **Speed justifies the expansion of markets and the circulation of capital**

Goldman et al. ’05; Robert Goldman is a Professor of Sociology at Lewis & Clark College in Portland, Oregon. My work focuses on the political economy of commodity signs from its inception early in the 20th century to its position today in the current stage of global capitalism; Stephen Papson teaches sociology at St. Lawrence University in Canton, New York; Noah Kersey received his BA in sociology and anthropology from Lewis & Clark College in Portland, Oregon in 2001; “Speed: Through, Across, and In —  The Landscapes of Capital;” Issue 1.1 of Fast Capitalism, a journal devoted to analyzing the impact of information and communication technologies on self, society and culture in the 21st century. bridges the social sciences and the humanities. welcomes disciplinary and interdisciplinary work; 2005; www.fastcapitalism.com

In the discourse of corporate advertising, the subject of real time comes up in relation to various agendas: 1) general issues of competition in the marketplace, where speed becomes its own justification and where faster to market means more profits; 2) the immediacy of computerized stock trading brings the promise of lower costs and premise of fairer exchanges 3) organizing complex and far-flung divisions of labor within a globally extensive corporate world; 4) being able to monitor sales and inventory supplies on a daily and even hourly basis in order to control costs and integrate systems management; 5) the video simulacrum where time-space compression is achieved via the magic of cameras and computers. A 2001 IBM ad addresses the rationale of "real time" directly as a matter of profit imperatives. IBM's spokesman situates the question of real time in an ominous and menacing tone: Here the hegemony of real time is presented as a hostile necessity, as a fait accompli driven by inexorable market forces that cannot be resisted or debated. A meta-narrative of speed weaves itself into narrative assumptions regarding competitive markets. The voracious and the insatiable appetites of market growth demand greater speed in the circulation of Capital. The forces of capital driven markets are also likened to the laws of nature—"Time waits for no man or woman or business . . . everything faster. Products to market, ideas to profits." The IBM ad unfolds this way, offering an almost structural-Marxian interpretation of how the underlying forces of capitalism become more and more determinant in the decisions and choices that actors must make. Here we have the contradictions of capital circulation—as capital matures and there is greater competition and profit margins grow thinner, then being able to do things faster makes a lot of sense—faster to market brings with it competitive advantage and offsets the tendency for the rate of profit to decline. But going faster carries its own price, it takes competition into the realm of circulation time. But panic marketing offers a quick way out—"powerful software" (scientific magic) can tame the imperatives of market speed by controlling real time—the absolute present.

#### The obsession with speed causes a neglect of space and depicts time as a scarce resource – this creates a loss of orientation and paradoxically forces us into an infinite loop of homogeneity

Goldman et al. ’05; Robert Goldman is a Professor of Sociology at Lewis & Clark College in Portland, Oregon. My work focuses on the political economy of commodity signs from its inception early in the 20th century to its position today in the current stage of global capitalism; Stephen Papson teaches sociology at St. Lawrence University in Canton, New York; Noah Kersey received his BA in sociology and anthropology from Lewis & Clark College in Portland, Oregon in 2001; “Speed: Through, Across, and In —  The Landscapes of Capital;” Issue 1.1 of Fast Capitalism, a journal devoted to analyzing the impact of information and communication technologies on self, society and culture in the 21st century. bridges the social sciences and the humanities. welcomes disciplinary and interdisciplinary work; 2005; www.fastcapitalism.com

Breaking speed-barriers is not a new obsession. Speed of movement not only signals our capacity for overcoming the fixity of geographical distance (space), it also has come to suggest the possibility for increased flexibility, efficiency and productivity. Since its inception, capitalism has measured value in terms of time inputs since the amount of labor required to produce a commodity could most easily be measured in units of time. So it stands to reason that our "common-sense" understanding of technologies of speed connote a future liberation from material scarcity. In contemporary society, where time itself has become perceived as a scarce resource, appeals to instantaneity and immediacy are seductive. Has speed annihilated spatial distance? Paul Virilio writes that one of the most revolutionary transformations occurring today "is the invention of a perspective of real time." Real time now prevails above both real space and the geosphere. The primacy of real time, of immediacy, over and above space and surface is a fait accompli and ushers a new epoch. Something nicely conjured up in a (French) advertisement praising cellular phones with the words: "Planet Earth has never been this small". This is a very dramatic moment in our relation with the world and for our vision of the world. (Virilio 1995) Virilio sees a dark side to the hegemony of speed. Sometimes referred to as time-space compression, sometimes as deterritorialization, this process threatens/promises to transform not only the ways in which we work and do business, but also the ways in which we conduct and experience our private lives. Virilio contends that hyperspeed induces a general "loss of orientation." How do corporate ads represent hyperspeed in our lives? Here it is important once again to distinguish between what actually goes on in the world and how it is represented, or at least leave open the question of how these are related. Our own position is that while time-space compression and deterritorialization are real processes, not simply discourses, they produce neither homogeneous time nor homogeneous space. Capitalism is nothing, if not uneven, in the production of space and time. Close inspection of the ads in our database does not reveal a singular kind of hegemonic speed, but a more contradictory set of representations. Indeed, while "faster" is everywhere presumed to be the goal in these commercials, the technologies of speed and commodification are no less obsessed with repetition—so much so that latent meanings of speed in the ads suggest that efforts at eclipsing space have placed us in an infinite loop. But the efforts at representing digital networks operating in "real time" require a shift in our vision of the world—a shift in our vision of how time, space and culture can be viewed as coordinates on a map.

#### **Capitalism can only be maintained by expanding into and occupying new space – technologies that permit faster transportation only feed this expansion and are used to justify exploitation**

Herod ’03, professor of geography at the University of Georgia. He has written widely on issues of globalization and workers. “Geographies of Labor Internationalism.” Social Science History 27.4 (2003) 501-523

The idea that there is an important connection between social life and space has a long history within social science, even if it has not been more fully explored until relatively recently. For instance, Marx's discussion of colonialism at the end of volume 1 of Capital (first English edition of Das Kapital [1967 {1887}]) suggests that many of the economic crises of European capitalism (such as overproduction and the growth of unemployment) could be addressed through the geographical solution of colonialism, wherein the colonies of the European powers could act as spatial safety valves by serving as dumping grounds to which "excess" commodities and workers (in the form of migrants) could be exported. This idea, of course, was more fully developed by Lenin (1939) in his thesis about imperialism. Likewise, Rosa Luxemburg (1951) argued, though as it turns out clearly incorrectly, that once capitalism had spread throughout the globe and there were no more precapitalist spaces to be incorporated within its orbit, then the system would collapse in on itself because its geographically expansionary nature would have run up against the limits of our geologically given planet. In running out of noncapitalist space into which to expand, Luxemburg averred, capitalism would effectively run out of steam. It was French social theorist Henri Lefebvre (1976, 1991), however, who outlined the ways in which the production and realization of profit were dependent upon what he called "the production of space," even if the particular landscapes which were produced under capitalism were historically and geographically specific. Thus, Lefebvre (1976: 21, emphasis in original) argued that "capitalism has found itself able to attenuate (if not resolve) its internal contradictions for a century, and consequently, in the hundred years since the writing of Capital, it has succeeded in achieving ‘growth.' We cannot calculate at what price, but we do know the means: by occupying space, by producing a space." Such ideas have subsequently been expounded upon by a number of geographers. David Harvey (1982, 1985), for instance, has developed the notion of what he calls capital's "spatial fix," by which he means the ways in which capital attempts to organize space "in its own image [and] builds a physical landscape appropriate to its condition at a particular moment in time" (Harvey 1978: 124). Likewise, Neil Smith (1990) has argued that the geographically uneven development of the economic landscape that is evident at numerous spatial scales (urban, regional, national, global) is a central element in how capitalism as an economic system operates. Thus, for Smith the uneven development of the economic landscape under capitalism is not simply the result of the impossibility of "even development" but, rather, is the active expression of contradictory tendencies within capital itself and the need for capital investment to be, on the one hand, geographically fixed in particular places so that production can take place and, on the other, sufficiently mobile so as to be able to take advantage of new investment opportunities that may open up elsewhere. For her part, Massey (1995) has argued that various rounds of capital investment at different historical time periods produce what she calls "spatial divisions of labor," such that some places develop as, say, regions of branch plant manufacturing whereas others develop into centers for high-tech research and development. In turn, the way these spatial divisions have been laid down in the economic landscape will affect subsequent patterns of capital investment—capital may be attracted to, or repulsed [End Page 504] from, particular locations based upon their place within the broader spatial division of labor. Given that capitalism operates as an ordered (if not necessarily orderly) spatial system, then, it is important to consider how contemporary changes, such as globalization, are affecting its geographical organization. In this regard there are, I think, at least two (intimately related) significant developments worth pondering. First, globalization has clearly transformed the spatial relationships between places, as changes in transportation technologies have brought about the phenomenon of the "shrinking globe." This process, of course, is not in and of itself new, for revolutions in transportation technology stretch back a long way into human history—a century and a half ago, for example, Marx (1973: 539) observed how the building of the railroads was transforming the spatial relationships between the places of the Victorian world and was leading to "the annihilation of space through time" as travel times were dramatically reduced by steam power. However, the distances that can today be traversed in any given time period through modern technologies such as long-range jet aircraft are now very much greater than they ever have been, and many locations once considered to be worlds apart are now very much closer in terms of travel times. The result of this compression of distance is that cities like Santo Domingo, Tegucigalpa, Manila, and Bangkok could today realistically be considered manufacturing suburbs of New York, Los Angeles, London, Tokyo, and Paris (Herod 2000a). Of course, the shrinking of relative distances between places has itself been a geographically and historically uneven process, and not all places have been affected in the same way. [2](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/social_science_history/v027/27.4herod.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT2) Nevertheless, such transformations in the spatial relationships between the different parts of the world have significant implications for workers and organized labor. The second notable transformation in the spatial organization of capitalism augured by globalization is the greater speed with which the consequences of economic and political events can now be transmitted from one place to another within the global economy—witness how a bad day's trading on the Tokyo stock market is felt on Wall Street when the market opens, or how quickly news of a coup or similar event can keep the world transfixed, courtesy of cable television news. Again, this is not a new development per se: the telegraph in the nineteenth century dramatically increased the speed with which information and money could flow between places, allowing financial capitalists to move money about the globe more quickly than when they had [End Page 505] to rely upon the physical transportation of letters of credit. However, the plethora of new telecommunications and transportation technologies does mean that capital, information, goods, and people all flow from location to location much more quickly than ever before in human history, such that money can be inserted into and withdrawn from various national and regional economies literally in the twinkling of an eye, with all the attendant consequences for workers and for the planet's economic geography. Furthermore, not only are people in one part of the world now affected much more rapidly than ever before by events happening elsewhere, but they also have concomitantly less time to respond to them. Indeed, Michel Foucault (1986: 22) has argued that we have now entered what he called the "epoch of simultaneity" as the consequences of any event are felt almost instantaneously across the planet. As with the shrinking of relative distances between places, of course, this also has not been a historically or geographically uniform process, and different places have been affected in different ways, with different implications for workers in different parts of the world. Thus, while Ben Agger (1989) has argued that parts of our world have now moved into an age of "fast capitalism," it is patently the case that many of the world's workers still live in a world of what we might call "slow(er) capitalism." This unevenness notwithstanding, the move toward such an epoch of simultaneity poses important implications for hundreds of millions of workers across the globe.

### Overaccumulation Link

#### Transportation infrastructure addresses short term problems of overaccumulation, allowing capitalism to grow

Erica Schoenberger ‘4 Department of Geography and Environmental Engineering, The Johns Hopkins University (Antipode Volume 36, Issue 3, pages 427–433, June 2004)

There’s no doubt that the concept of the spatial fix overlaps meaningfully with these other ideas, but it is by no means limited to their¶ single notion that capital solves problems of profitability and politics¶ by moving from the problem location to new and more malleable¶ locations. That was about solving a profit squeeze caused by rising¶ costs in traditional industrial regions, especially labor costs, and¶ envisaged solving a spatial problem (the high cost of Place A) with a¶ spatial solution (relocation to Place B). Limits, on the other hand, was¶ constructing a general theory of capitalism in all its historical and¶ geographical complexity, not an analysis of the ‘‘present crisis,’’ and its¶ conceptual apparatus, including the spatial fix, was far richer and,¶ importantly, more flexible than notions such as the new international¶ division of labor.¶ The larger and more basic idea of the spatial fix is that it provides a¶ way to productively soak up capital by transforming the geography of¶ capitalism. Overaccumulation, of course, is the great problem of¶ capitalism that threatens its very existence. Because it is inherent in¶ the system, it is unavoidable over the long run, and the system is¶ periodically thrown into more or less violent crises during which the¶ excess is savagely devalued at great cost to people and places. But¶ although there is no permanent solution to the crisis tendencies of capitalism, the system does generate some important ways of delaying them¶ or diverting them into reasonably productive pathways. Harvey’s great¶ insight in Limits was that restructuring the geography of capital—¶ altering its very earthly foundations—was a particularly effective way¶ of productively absorbing these excesses.¶ This is the spatial fix. It is a very general notion that can have¶ different expressions historically and geographically. The geographic¶ spread of investment, output and consumption is one critical avenue¶ for the absorption of excess capital. Thus, incorporating more and¶ more of the territory of the globe into the ambit of capital, transforming relations of production and ways of life on an expanding scale, and¶ generally trying to keep ahead of the shock wave of crisis are all ways¶ of accelerating the pace at which capital can be plowed back into productive investment rather than uselessly piled up. If this works in¶ the short run, it of course magnifies the problem over the long run as¶ more and more capital is accumulated worldwide. Still, it’s better than¶ an immediate crash.¶ Another form of the spatial fix is the creation of an expanded and¶ improved built environment—investment in the whole suite of physical installations that sustain and enhance the system’s ability to create¶ wealth. This includes, for example, transportation networks, water¶ supply, waste disposal systems, communications systems and the¶ like. The beauty of this form of the spatial fix is that it is so intensely¶ grounded. The investments required are typically large and longlived, so immobilizing a significant tranche of accumulated capital in¶ the earth while using it to support the further accumulation of capital.¶ Because of its temporal and spatial properties, much of this investment used to be considered the ‘‘natural’’ sphere of the state, but of¶ late that has changed dramatically with important consequences for¶ how the spatial fix may be playing out now.

### Spatial Fix Link

#### Spatial fix is key to sustaining larger capitalist social formations

David Harvey ‘4 “Globalization and the “Spatial Fix”” *geographische revue* Zeitschrift für Literatur understanding

Diskussion, Jahrgang 3 · 2001 · Heft 2 http://geographische-revue.de/archiv/gr2-01.pdf#page=23

For geographers like myself, however, the production, reproduction and reconfiguration of space have always been central to understanding the political economy of capitalism. For us, the contemporary form of globalization is nothing more than yet¶ another round in the capitalist production and reconstruction of space. It entails a further¶ diminution in the friction of distance (what Marx referred to as “the annihilation of space¶ through time” as a fundamental law of capitalist development) through yet another round¶ of innovation in the technologies of transport and communications. It consequently entails¶ a geographical restructuring of capitalist activity (deindustrialization here and reindustrialization there, for example) across the face of planet earth, the production of new¶ forms of uneven geographical development, a recalibration and even recentering of global¶ power (with far greater emphasis upon the Pacific and newly industrializing countries) and¶ a shift in the geographical scale at which capitalism is organized (symbolized by the¶ growth of supra-state organizational forms such as the European Union and a more¶ prominent role for institutions of global governance such as the WTO, the IMF, the G8, the¶ UN and the like). Contemporary globalization has been, we can argue, the product of these¶ specific geographically grounded processes. The question is not, therefore, how globalization has affected geography but how these distinctive geographical processes of the¶ production and reconfiguration of space have created the specific conditions of contemporary globalization In my own work, globalization has largely been interpreted in terms of a theory of “the¶ spatial fix”. This term (and the theory it centers) is in need of clarification, however, since¶ different interpretations have been offered leading to confusions if not serious errors. In¶ part the differences reflect an ambiguity of language. In English, the word “fix” has¶ multiple meanings. One meaning, as in “the pole was fixed in the hole”, refers to something being pinned down and secured in a particular locus. The idea is that something is¶ secured in space: it cannot be moved or modified. Another, as in “fix a problem”, is to¶ resolve a difficulty, take care of a problem. Again, the sense is that things are made secure,¶ but by returning things to normal functioning again (as in “he fixed the car’s engine so that¶ it ran smoothly”). This second meaning has a metaphorical derivative, as in “the drug¶ addict needs a fix”, in which it is the burning desire to relieve a chronic or pervasive¶ problem that is the focus of meaning. Once the “fix” is found or achieved then the problem¶ is resolved and the desire evaporates. But, as in the case of the drug addict, it is implied¶ that the resolution is temporary rather than permanent, since the craving soon returns. It is¶ sometimes said, for example, that “technological fixes” have counteracted the Malthusian¶ dilemma of population growth outrunning resources. The implication is that continuous¶ technological progress and rising productivity are necessary conditions to prevent the¶ dismal Malthusian scenario of mass starvation and social disruption becoming a reality.¶ It was primarily in this last sense that I first deployed the term “spatial fix” to describe¶ capitalism’s insatiable drive to resolve its inner crisis tendencies by geographical expansion and geographical restructuring. The parallel with the idea of a “technological fix” was¶ deliberate. Capitalism, we might say, is addicted to geographical expansion much as it is¶ addicted to technological change and endless expansion through economic growth. Globa- lization is the contemporary version of capitalism’s long-standing and never-ending search¶ for a spatial fix to its crisis tendencies. Since there is a long history to these spatial fixes,¶ there is a deep continuity (as I and many others have insisted) in the production of space¶ under capitalist social relations and imperatives. There is, from this perspective, nothing¶ particularly new or surprising about globalization since it has been going on since at least¶ 1492 if not before.¶ While these disparate meanings of “to fix” appear contradictory, they are all internally¶ related by the idea that something (a thing, a problem, a craving) can be pinned down and¶ secured. In my own use of the term, the contradictory meanings can be played out to reveal¶ something important about the geographical dynamics of capitalism and the crisis¶ tendencies that attach thereto. In particular, I use it to focus on the particular problem of¶ “fixity” (in the first sense of being secured in place) versus motion and mobility of capital.¶ I note, for example, that capitalism has to fix space (in immoveable structures of transport¶ and communication nets, as well as in built environments of factories, roads, houses, water¶ supplies, and other physical infrastructures) in order to overcome space (achieve a liberty¶ of movement through low transport and communication costs). This leads to one of the¶ central contradictions of capital: that it has to build a fixed space (or “landscape”)¶ necessary for its own functioning at a certain point in its history only to have to destroy¶ that space (and devalue much of the capital invested therein) at a later point in order to¶ make way for a new “spatial fix” (openings for fresh accumulation in new spaces and¶ territories) at a later point in its history. The idea of “the spatial fix” initially came out of attempts to reconstruct Marx’s theory¶ of the geography of capitalist accumulation. In the first essay on this topic, published in¶ Antipode in 1975, I showed that Marx’s fragmentary writings on the geography of capitalist accumulation could be consolidated into a reasonably consistent account that¶ depicted the spatial as well as the temporal dynamics of capitalism. I later sought to¶ deepen the argument through an examination of the relation between Hegel’s views on¶ imperialism, von Thünen’s arguments concerning the frontier wage (a precursor to key¶ formulations on marginal pricing in neoclassical economics) and Marx’s arguments on¶ colonialism (most particularly the peculiarity of closing the first volume of Capital with a¶ chapter on colonial land policies). It was in this article, entitled “The Spatial Fix: Hegel,¶ von Thunen and Marx” that I first used the term “spatial fix” directly. It was later deployed¶ as a fundamental concept in The Limits to Capital (1982) and in a summary essay on “The¶ Geopolitics of Capitalism” (1985). (These earlier essays will all appear shortly in a¶ volume entitled Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography to be published by¶ Edinburgh University Press and Routledge (USA)).¶ The primary result of these enquiries was to show that (a) capitalism could not survive¶ without being geographically expansionary (and perpetually seeking out “spatial fixes” for¶ its problems), (b) that major innovations in transport and communication technologies¶ were necessary conditions for that expansion to occur (hence the emphasis in capitalism’s evolution on technologies that facilitated speed up and the progressive diminution of¶ spatial barriers to movement of commodities, people, information and ideas over space)¶ and (c) its modes of geographical expansion depended crucially upon whether it was the¶ search for markets, fresh labor powers, resources (raw materials) or fresh opportunities to¶ invest in new production facilities that was chiefly at stake.¶ On this latter point there is a strong connection between how the overaccumulation of¶ capital (the central indicator of crisis in Marx’s theory) is manifest and how the spatial fix¶ gets pursued. Overaccumulation, in its most virulent form (as occurred in the 1930s, for¶ example) is registered as surpluses of labor and capital side by side with seemingly no way¶ to put them together in productive, i.e. “profitable” as opposed to socially useful ways. If¶ the crisis cannot be resolved, then the result is massive devaluation of both capital and¶ labor (bankruptcies, idle factories and machines, unsold commodities, and unemployed¶ laborers). Devaluation can sometimes lead to physical destruction (surplus commodities¶ get burned and laborers die of starvation) and even war (the whole sequence of events that¶ occurred in the 1930s and 1940s came close to such a scenario). But there are ways to¶ stave off such an outcome. In practice, most crisis phases combine selective devaluations¶ with strategies to alleviate the difficulties. One such strategy is to seek out some “spatial¶ fix” to the problem. If, for example, a crisis of localized overaccumulation occurs within a¶ particular region or territory then the export of capital and labor surpluses to some new¶ territory to start up new production would make most sense (as, for example, in the¶ migration of both labor and capital across the Atlantic from Britain to North America in¶ the crisis years of the nineteenth century). If, on the other hand, overaccumulation is¶ chiefly registered as lack of effective demand for commodities then opening up new¶ markets in non-capitalist territories appears the best strategy (the China market has been a¶ favorite “imagined” goal for North American capital whenever it has run into difficulties¶ for a century or more, hence the current commercial interest in the USA for integrating¶ China into the WTO). Surpluses of capital and shortages of labor (or rigidity in labor¶ markets because of political and institutional barriers) can be “fixed” either by the¶ movement of capital to areas of labor surpluses and/or weak labor organization (hence¶ North American capital moving into the maquillas along the Mexican border) or¶ importation of cheap labor (as with guest worker programs in Europe) into centers of¶ capitalist development. Surpluses of wage labor and shortages of capital often generate¶ strong migratory currents (legal and illegal, as with the movement of Mexicans into the¶ USA).

#### Capital uses spatial fixes to trap and exploit labor

Andrew Herod ‘3 University of Georgia “Workers, Space, and Labor Geography” International Labor and Working-Class History (2003), 64 : pp 112-138

Beginning in the early 1970s, such ideas were taken up and explored by a¶ number of Marxist geographers. Arguably, the most prominent of these has¶ been David Harvey. In a number of early writings Harvey sought to show how¶ the geography of capitalist urbanization was reﬂective of the dynamics of accumulation.¶ 12¶ Speciﬁcally, he argued that the actual form which the economic¶ landscape took was shaped by the ﬂows of capital into the built environment to¶ produce those structures necessary either for production to take place (factories, roads, etc.) or for consumption (housing, sidewalks, shops, and the like).¶ 13¶ Consequently, as the demands of accumulation and proﬁt realization change¶ (such as when new forms of transportation technology impact capitalism’s operation) or as overaccumulation in the realm of production encourages speculation in real estate and urban development as an outlet for unproductive capital, then so does the form of the built environment often have to be¶ transformed. Hence, Harvey argued, the relationship between the demands of¶ accumulation and the form of the built environment is such that “capital builds¶ a physical landscape appropriate to its own condition at a particular moment in¶ time, only to have to destroy it [through disinvestment], usually in the course¶ of a crisis, at a subsequent point in time.”¶ 14¶ In his book The Limits to Capital, Harvey provided a more detailed theoretical account of this production of space and how it is linked to the on-going¶ accumulation process.¶ 15¶ In particular, he suggested that capitalists must create¶ particular “spatial ﬁxes” —that is to say, particular geographies of their own organization and of the broader geography of capitalism—in the landscape if accumulation is to proceed. Hence, they must ensure that workers can get to work¶ on time (a consideration which may necessitate securing the construction, perhaps under the auspices of the state, of transportation systems in certain locations), that raw materials reach factories, and that ﬁnished commodities reach¶ consumers, all of which will require a certain spatial arrangement of investments¶ in plant, infrastructure, and the built environment in general. For Harvey, such¶ spatial ﬁxes are integral to the circulation of capital and constitute the very basis for the uneven development of the geography of capitalism, which is never¶ ﬁxed but is constantly being refashioned during “[t]he continuous re-structuring¶ of spatial conﬁgurations through revolutions in value.”

#### By building infrastructure in new areas, the aff merely spreads the existent problem of the spatial fix

Smith et. al. 84 -(Neil Smith is a Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography, at the Graduate Center department of the City University of New York, David Harvey is is the Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and leading social theorist, “Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space”, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5dfKBaNoUbwC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=journey+to> +work+capital&ots=7F9DVdPYRn&sig=n7NXKa\_gi-ITkV88QB3xpl0vCpQ#v=onepage&q=solution&f=false)

That the seesaw movement of capital is evident at the urban scale but hardly at all at the international scale suggests the limits to this theory of uneven development. While indeed capital strives to realize the seesaw movement, as a means to counteract the falling rate of profit, the more absolute the geographical spaces that capital must create to push accumulation and localize devaluation, the greater are the barriers to the mobility necessary to realize the seesawing of capital. As capital stares into the future and runs from the past, it is tempted continually to embrace mobility or fixity as alternative versions of the spatial fix. Insofar as neither of these can work, yet each respectively brings a tendency toward equalization and differentiation of the geographical landscape, the result is an uneven development of capitalism which itself varies between the more stable unevenness of the global scale to the more fluid unevenness of the urban. And whatever the limits placed upon it, the uneven development of capitalism will continue to be driven on by the opposing tendencies of equalization and differentiation, and the seesaw movement of capital that results.

#### Capitalism will continue to expand as the spatial fix is moved to different locations

Smith et. al. 84 -(Neil Smith is a Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography, at the Graduate Center department of the City University of New York, David Harvey is is the Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and leading social theorist, “Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space”, 1984, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5dfKBaNoUbwC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=journey+to+work+capital&ots> =7F9DVdPYRn&sig=n7NXKa\_gi-ITkV88QB3xpl0vCpQ#v=onepage&q=solution&f=false)

To borrow an image from Nigel Harris, capital is like a plague of locusts. It settles on one place, devours it, then moves on to plague another place. Better, in the process of restoring itself after one plague the region makes itself ripe for another. At the very least, uneven development is the geographical expression of the contradictions of capital. The geographical fixation of use-value and the fluidity of the exchange-value translate into the tendencies toward differentiation and equalization. The distinctions, disproportionalities, and disequilibria through which Marx analyzes the overall structure and development of capital translate into so many sources of geographic differentiation within the universalizing tendency of capital. The historic mission of capital is the development of the forces of production via which the geographical equalization of conditions and levels of production becomes possible. The production of nature is the basic condition for this equalization, but equalization is continually frustrated by the differentiation of geographic space. Differentiation as the means to a spatial fix becomes itself the problem to be fixed. The differentiation of geographical space takes many forms, but at root it expresses the social differentiation that is the very definition of capital: the relation between capital and labor. As uneven development becomes an increasing necessity in order to stave off crises, geographical differentiation becomes less and less a by-product, more an inner necessity for capital. The history of capitalism is not simply cyclical but is profoundly progressive, and this too is etched into the landscape. To the extent that cyclical crises do not purge the system of its contradictions, and that the falling rate of profit is not attenuated, the uneven development of capitalism becomes more and more intense as the accumulation process itself is intensified, and with it the tendencies toward differentiation and equalization. The fragility of the economic logic behind uneven development is graphically revealed in crisis when the acute need to restructure geographical space is blocked by existing patterns of uneven development. Despite the usual strengthening of national and political chauvinism with the onset of crisis, the localization of political struggles becomes much harder to maintain as partial crisis develops toward global crisis. Class struggle can be contained only by expanding the scale on which the working class is confronted.

Spatial fixes will continue to relocate the capitalist system, and bring volatility with it as it transitions from place to place

Chase-Dunn, et. al. 6- (Christopher K. Chase-Dunn is an American sociologist best known for his contributions to world-systems theory, Salvatore J. Babones is the author and editor of four books and more than two dozen academic research articles. His academic research focuses on income inequality, economic development, and statistical methods for comparative social science research,Global Social Change: Historical And Comparative Perspectives, 2006,

http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ho5Yf\_rCE5UC&oi=fnd&pg=PA201&dq=spatial+fix+capital&ots=DBmuZwU-W0&sig=hJc5VPcH2D-aruTl72eJyMamW\_c#v=snippet&q=nuclear&f=false)

Either way, spatial fixes can be expected to be associated with interregional volatility and the redirection of capital flows from one space to another. The redirection may occur smoothly, or it may involve what Harvey calls “switching crises”. Switching crises are volatile interregional relocations of capital that disrupt local accumulation but smooth accumulation in the system as a whole. Harvey does not spell out the relationship between overaccumulation crises, spatial-temporal fixes, and switching crises. But the drift of his argument seems to be that, while overaccumulation crises are the cause, switching crises are a possible effect of the spatial-temporal fixes that recurrently revolutionize the historical geography of capitalism. They stem from resistance to the relocations involved in spatial fixes- a resistance that at least in part originates from the contradictory logic of capital accumulation itself. Indeed, “the more capitalism develops the more it tends to succumb to the forces making for geographical inertia,” argues Harvey.

### Public-Private Partnerships Link

#### The plan restructures cities in order to speed up uneven development within capitalism

Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore ‘2 “Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism”” Antipode

Volume 34, Issue 3, pages 349–379, July 2002

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.

### Rail Roads Link

#### **Rails services reinforce economic disparities, what they give to the community they will soon take away ten-fold**

Schwartz et al ’11 ([Robert Schwartz](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Robert%20Schwartz), [Ian Gregory](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Ian%20Gregory), [Thomas Thévenin](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Thomas%20Th%C3%A9venin), “Spatial History: Railways, Uneven Development, and Population Change in France and Great Britain, 1850-1914”, https://www.mtholyoke.edu/courses/rschwart/railways/History\_Geography\_\_Railways\_and\_Social\_Change\_in\_France\_and\_Great\_Britain,\_1830-1930/Essays\_for\_Publication/JIH%20paper.pdf)

The arrival and growth of rail service in the countryside and remote districts reinforced or diminished economic disparities among regions and localities. In well-served areas, rail transport tended to stimulate commerce, extractive industries, and agriculture, depending upon their mix of endowments. In regions where service was remote or nonexistent, inertia and decline were apt to worsen, characterized by rising rates of out-migration and depopulation, as in the Lodève region of Languedoc. There, de-industrialization, in conjunction with the rise of viticulture and the attendant risks of monoculture—and the phylloxera epidemic in particular—comprised but one of many variants in the shifting spatial political economy associated with railway expansion.16 Changing patterns of uneven development in regions and localities were conditioned by circumstances other than the accessibility of rail transport; prevailing market conditions were usually predominant. In agriculture, the transport revolution increased competition at the international level, especially in wheat. The consequences of globalizing markets in foodstuffs flowed downward through markets at the national and regional levels to arrive at the farm gate. Beginning in the 1870s, the arrival in European markets of vast quantities of cheaper wheat from the United States saw prices tumble in Britain, France, and Germany. With farm costs remaining stable or rising, and with a series of poor harvests striking British and French cereal farmers, agriculture fell into a long depression from c. 1876 to 1896. British and French farmers struggled through a first crisis of globalization; those who survived began to breathe easier only at the turn of the century. In this sense, what railways—and steamships—gave with one hand they often took away years later with the other, forcing even favored communities to adapt to changing market conditions.17 **[End Page 70**

### Highways Link

#### Capitalism subjugates individuals to machinic enslavement, dehumanizing them into merely inputs and outputs.

Kuswa 2004 (Kevin Kuswa; P.h. D. in Rhetoric from UT, Department of Rhetoric and Communication Studies at Richmond “Machinic Rhetoric, Highways and Interpellating Motions”; Spring 2004; http://www.rhizomes.net/issue8/kuswa.htm; NBaj)

Returning to the abstract plane, we can trace how the highway links into a statist conception of people and territory. Likewise, two types of machines are implicated and consolidated by the state's process of subjection. The human machine conceives of subjects as constituent parts of larger machines composed of humans and perhaps other components such as animals or tools. In short, the human machine brings inhumanity along for the ride in the form of machinic enslavement. On one hand, the human machine is the body and its full array of experiences-a combination of circulating and resistant parts, "each specialized in function, operating under human control to transmit motion and perform work" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p457). On the other hand, machinic enslavement tortures and erases the human body as a means of dehumanizing the person. The person becomes a small (and replaceable) part within a larger exterior. In the extreme, a human (machine) may be enslaved to the highway or even the television such that the driver/viewer "is no longer a consumer or user, nor even a subject, but intrinsic component pieces, 'input' and 'output,' feedback or recurrences that are no longer connected to the machine in such a way as to produce or use it" (Deleuze & Guattari, p458).

#### Transportation infrastructure subjects people people to a scheme of wage labor, thereby holding humans hostage to the system of capitalism.

Kuswa 2004 (Kevin Kuswa; P.h. D. in Rhetoric from UT, Department of Rhetoric and Communication Studies at Richmond “Machinic Rhetoric, Highways and Interpellating Motions”; Spring 2004; http://www.rhizomes.net/issue8/kuswa.htm; NBaj)

Recognizing that machines are not merely metaphors, but also concrete and physical assemblages, the technical machine works to transform machinic enslavement into social subjection. The technical machine distributes humans as subservient to, and determined by, the machines around them. In other words, "one is not enslaved by the technical machine but rather subjected to it" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p457). In many ways, the state has substituted technical machines for machinic enslavement through technological development. Within the state's coding of the nation, capitalism arises as an axiom or "as a worldwide enterprise of subjectification" (p457). These technical machines function as a governing apparatus by subjecting people to a scheme of wage labor, thereby holding human capital hostage to the goals of production and capital accumulation.¶ Through these machines, "the human being is no longer a component of the machine, but a worker, a user" (Deleuze & Guattari, p457). Instead of just being enslaved by the machine, people are also subjected to it. The highway follows both trajectories, enslaving drivers and workers as constituted parts of the machine, but also subjecting the nation to the ever-expanding needs of infrastructure and circulation. Because these two processes (machinic enslavement and social subjection) constitute two coexistent poles, the aggregate includes subjection and enslavement "as two simultaneous parts that constantly reinforce and nourish each other" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p458). The effects of capitalism and the highway machine are bumper-to-bumper throughout America, often becoming "central to the history of the advanced capitalist countries in the twentieth century, and explaining an especially large part of the history of the American people" (Flink, 1988, pvii).

### Megregions Link

#### Megaregions drain other region’s economy’s

Krugman ‘90 (1990, Paul Krugman is an American economist, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, “INCREASING RETURNS AND ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY” NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w3275.pdf?new_window=1>, page 5-6)

But now let the society become richer, so that a higher fraction of income is spent on non-agricultural goods and services; let the factory system and eventually mass production emerge, and with them economies of large-scale production; and let canals, railroads, and finally automobiles lower transportation costs. Then the tie of production to the distribution of land will be broken. A region with a relatively large non- rural population will be an attractive place to produce both because of the large local market and because of the availability of the goods and services produced there; this will attract still more population, at the expense of regions with smaller initial production; and the process will feed on itself until the whole of the non-rural population is concentrated in a few regions.

#### Megaregions grow at the expense of another region

Krugman ‘90 (1990, Paul Krugman is an American economist, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, “INCREASING RETURNS AND ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY” NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w3275.pdf?new_window=1>, page 6-7)

There are two interesting points suggested by this imaginary history. First, it seems that small changes in the parameters of the economy may have large effects on its qualitative behavior. That is, when some index that takes into account transportation costs, economies of scale, and the share of nonagricultural goods in expenditure crosses a critical threshold population will start to concentrate and regions to diverge; once started this process will feed on itself. Thus the geography will go through a kind of change of state when the index crosses a critical level, much as water changes its qualitative behavior when the temperature goes from a little above to a little below freezing. Second, the details of the geography that emerges - which regions end up with the population -- depend sensitively on initial conditions. If one region has slightly more population than another when, say, transportation costs fall below some critical level, that region ends up gaining population at the other’s expense; had the distribution of population at that critical moment been only slightly different, the roles of the regions might have been reversed. Again to use a physical analogy, this is a "random broken symmetry like ice crystallizing as water is cooled, the detailed structure depends on possibly small accidents of early history.

#### The reduction of geographic space leads to the creation of ghost countries, limiting labor mobility.

Pritchett 06-(Lant Pritchett is Professor of the Practice of International Development at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, “Boom Towns and Ghost Countries: Geography, Agglomeration,

and Population Mobility”. Project Muse. )

This is a much less relentlessly happy story about the consequences of the proliferation of sovereigns and globalization of everything but labor. As geographic space is sliced into smaller nation-state units, some regions will experience large, persistent, positive shocks to labor demand and become “boom towns” with rapidly rising wages and incomes. But other regions may well experience large, persistent, negative, geographic-specific productivity shocks that reduce labor demand and lead to incipient “ghost countries.” However, if outward labor mobility is limited, this will lead the adjustment to come not in changes in population but in wages, so countries will be “zombies”— the “living ghosts”—with falling wages and incomes.

## AT: Perm

#### The perm still links – capital requires labor mobility in order to exploit labor. The perm will be co-opted by stronger forces

Feldman ’77 [Associate Professor of Community Planning – U of Rhode Island. Marshall. “A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF URBAN POLITICAl ECONOMY: THE JOURNEY TO WORK.” Antipode [Volume 9, Issue 2,](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anti.1977.9.issue-2/issuetoc) pages 30–50, September 1977 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1977.tb00709.x/abstract]

All commodities obtain their use-value in relation to the social environment in which they are consumed. Transit is relatively unique in that its use-value is reciprocally contingent upon capitalist social relations. It is perhaps possible to imagine feudal serfs commuting to the land they are tied to, however such a situation is highly unlikely. Similarly ,the fact that in a socialist society the means of production are collectively controlled implies that the separation of home and work is subject to conscious social choice (e.g., see Auerback 1976; Short 1976).¶ On the other hand, capitalism is a form of social organization in which production is performed by laborers who sell their labor power as a commodity in the market. As the labor market becomes generalized, individual capitalists and workers are forced to compete in wider and wider markets. In this way individuals are able to lessen the impact of spatial monopoly over the buying and selling of labor power.¶ The generalization of the labor market is predicated upon the existence of a class of wage-earners. In turn, the existence of this class presupposes the social separation of the direct producers from the means of production. Although there is no obvious necessary relation between social and spatial separation, it seems credible that social separation increases the likelihood of spatial separation. Some early capitalist cities did have housing tied to specific workplaces, but as the labor market became generalized, a housing market developed and "specificity of the employment linkage was no longer the case" (Vance 1966: 321); in- stead, "urban stratification" was the rule¶ (ibid.: 322).¶ Perhaps the best empirical evidence of this can be seen by studying the history of "company towns." These towns afford certain advantages to capital such as the ability to control the labor market and urban spatial form. Yet, history shows that such towns are extremely unstable. In the U.S, the earliest cities with employer-supplied work- specific housing were the so-called "Awkright villages" (Vance op.cit. 30l-18). By l8S0, the proletarianization of the work-force and generalization of the labor market led to a decline of such unique ties (ibid.: 319). As individual capitals develop, they have to be able to layoff workers. In company towns such as Pullman, such layoffs led to intense class struggle (Carwardine 1973: x-xviii). Even in "more satisfactory" company towns, such as Akron, which avoided the "paternalism" of Pullman (Lubove 1972: 349), ties to a single employer led to unified working-class militancy during crises. In Akron, for example, the threat of a general strike prevented state ,intervention in the 1936 strike against Goodyear (Lens 1974: 33S-6). Workplace-specific housing is generally unworkable under capitalism because profit in production is inversely related to wages; a capitalist who cuts wages to pre- serve profits necessarily cuts profits realized in land and housing tied to the work- place. Capitalism requires that labor be "footloose," and free to migrate both be- tween firms and between employment and unemployment.¶ This is not to say that there are no incentives for residential areas dominated by a single employer. Certainly, the persistence of company towns is testimony to the utility afforded by such urban forms. Rather, it is to say that such situations are necessarily subject to exorable tensions rooted in the logic of capitalist production. Such a situation may be called a "contradiction." Four characteristic elements of capitalist production give rise to this contradiction: the requirement of labor mobility, the necessary mystification of class relations via the appearance of" freedom" in employment, the ability and necessity of capital to externalize costs, and the general fragmentation of social life.¶ Reich (1972: 17S) estimates that in 1780 only twenty percent of the U.S. labor force was wage or salaried. By 1880 this had risen to 62% and rose steadily there- after until it was 83.6% in 1969. During the same period the percent salaried managers and officials rose from l.l% in l880 to 7.2% in 1969.On the other hand, self-employed entrepreneurs decreased from 80% in 1780 to 36.9% in1880 and finally down to 9.2% in 1969. The relation between this shift to wage labor and spatial separation can be seen in a careful study of early commuting patterns by Pred (1966). He estimates that in 1800 roughly 74% of all workers in New York worked within 1/4 mile of their homes. Even as late as 1840, in spite of several innovations in transportation technology, he conservatively estimates that fewer than 25% of all industrial workers worked outside their homes. These figures probably overstate the overall amount of commuting because they are for industrial workers from a relatively large urban area in a largely rural country (Lampard op.cit.: 108).

#### Perm can’t solve – still legitimizes capitalism. Policy concerns prevent the alternative from solving

Feldman ’77 [Associate Professor of Community Planning – U of Rhode Island. Marshall. “A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF URBAN POLITICAl ECONOMY: THE JOURNEY TO WORK.” Antipode [Volume 9, Issue 2,](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anti.1977.9.issue-2/issuetoc) pages 30–50, September 1977 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1977.tb00709.x/abstract]

The majority of urban research has been dominated by administrative and governmental policy concerns. The tone of this research is one of minimizing irreconcilable social conflicts such as class differences and viewing social evils, no matter how recurrent, as "problems" to be solved. As such, this research tends to view the state as an independent entity, standing outside and above, what Hegel called, 'civil society." Characteristic of this literature is an approach which examines human behavior in terms of "policy variables" which can be manipulated t o produce desired behavior, coupled with an almost complete lack of reflection on those social forces which shape and constrain the state itself. This clearly is true of research on urban transportation. Certainly the one element which unifies all theories of urban development is space. Inasmuch as transportation overcomes the frictions of space, transportation is also a central component of urban theory. Urban economics introduces transportation costs exogeneously, as the structuring variable in location and central place theory (Lampard 1968: 82ff). In this way, transportation is treated as a commodity and becomes an element in the cost of all other commodities. Although no explicit theory of transportation exists (Alcaly op.cit.), presumably the neoclassical explanation of marginal costs and the equilibration of supply with demand, given an a priori distribution of income, would form the basis of a neoclassical theory of transportation supply (5)\* Until 1973, radicals attempted to use the theoretical tools found in conventional urban theory for critical analysis of the status quo. But such efforts were limited because of the ideological nature of the tools themselves. Radicals argued that transit, for example, was shaped by powerful groups of industrial capitalists rather than individual preferences and needs expressed through the market and that the benefits of transit were unequally distributed (Gordon 1971: 408-14). The policy implications of such criticism were to give excluded groups more political power and equality in the "benefits" of transit (chiefly in the form of access to employment). In no way were these analyses able to criticize the social institutions of power (i.e., the state) or employment themselves. Instead, the use of orthodox theoretical tools led to calls for a redistribution of "the pie;" the tools were incapable of focusing attention of the "flavor" of the pie itself, much less on how the pie was "baked." In 1973, however, the appearance of two books -- Harvey's Social Justice and the City and O'Connor's Fiscal Crisis of the State -- provided the basis for a profound critique of the urban status quo by the in- fusion of Marxist concepts into urban theory (6)• Since then, Marxist urban political economy has begun to blossom. This work must, of course, adopt what is valid¶ from orthodox theory. However, it must also continually engage in self-critical reflection on all modes of thought. It must especially avoid the trap of "one dimensional thought" and be able to see the contradictions embodied in any concrete phenomenon. The theory developed here attempts to do so by focusing on the relation between production and consumption of transportation of a very special commodity -- human labor power. The central thesis is that this relation can only be understood in the larger dynamic context of capitalist class relations which not only are the major determinants of income distribution, and therefore demand, but also structure the nature of consumption and production of transit itself. In this sense, transit must be seen as a complex of contradictory moments which give both meaning and motion.

# Impacts

#### Labor exploitation creates large systems of domination

Massey ’94 (Doreen Massey is a contemporary British social scientist and geographer, working among others on topics typical of Marxist geography. She currently serves as Professor of geography at the Open University. “Uneven Development: Social Change and Spatial Divisions of Labour” Space Place and Gender (page 87)

Different classes in society are defined in relation to each other and, in economic terms, to the overall division of labour. It is the overall structure of those sets of relationships which defines the structure of the economic aspect of society. One importation element in which any concept of uneven development must relate to, therefore, is the spatial structuring of those relationships – the relations of production – which are unequal relationships and which imply positions of dominance and subordination. It is on this part that the paper will focus.

The notion of groups/classes being mutually defined by the relationships between them goes beyond the obvious case of capitalist and worker. It is not possible to have work which is predominantly ‘mental’ or ‘intellectual’ (in spite of the frequently applied epithet of ‘knowledge-based society’) without manual work. Steve Bell’s cartoon in which yuppies float off into the sky calling ‘we don’t need dustbins’ makes a powerful point. They are wrong. They do. And they need people to empty them. Similarly, it is not possible to have supervisory work without there being activity to supervise. It is not possible to have assembly without the manufacture of components. Thus, the different functions in an economy are held together by mutual definition and mutual necessity. They are the basis of the (economic) division of labor in society and of the unequal relations of wealth and power. Those unequal class relations do not, as the saying goes, exist on the head of a pin. They are organized spatially. And it is contended here that this spatial organization must be an important element in any exploration of the nature of uneven development.

#### Labor exploitation produces mass expendable populations

**DAVIS** ‘**8 (**Mark, Sociology at Leeds **‘**“Bauman on Globalization” in *The Sociology of Zygmunt Bauman* eds. Michael Hviid Jacobsen and Paul Poder p. 145-146)

It is this stark opposition between tourists and vagabonds that Bauman (2004) develops further in his more recent ideas on the 'wasted lives' brought about by processes of globalization. At the basis of this development is Bauman's observation that both sides of the identified opposition between tourists and vagabonds can be characterized by their freedom to move. However, whereas the former travel for enjoyment or profit, and are rewarded for doing so, the latter travel for survival, and — alarmingly—are condemned for doing so. For Bauman, it is this `lie of the free trade promise' that marks the present day combination of the annulment of entry visas and the reinforcement of immigration controls with a particular symbolic significance. In short, it lays bare the fact that 'access to global mobility' is the basis of a world-wide re-stratification**.** To put it in a nutshell: if indeed we are nowadays 'all on the move', only some of us are permitted to be so. Moreover, Bauman notes how the dismantling of all barriers to the free movement of capital, commodities and information, and its carriers, is accompanied by the concomitant production of new and ever-higher barriers to keep out the multitude wishing to follow suit and go where the opportunities beckon. This is supported by the sociological and political phenomenon highlighted at the start of the chapter in relation to the world being 'full'. This new 'fullness' of the planet — or, perhaps more accurately, of those particular areas of the planet where dreams and desires are most likely to be realized — have resulted in an acute crisis of what Bauman calls the "human waste disposal industry" (Bauman 2004:7). According to him, globalization has become a prolific production line of 'wasted humans' precisely because of the global spread of the 'liquid modern' form of life as a single homogenising force. Those different forms of human life and togetherness that, heretofore, represented adequate ways and means of survival in both the biological and sociological sense are destroyed by the dominance of the global over all aspects of the local. As a result, those who represent difference — and thus evoke precisely those feelings of uncertainty and insecurity endemic to 'liquid life' — are uniquely suitable to play the part of visible local target for the unloading of frustrations caused by invisible global After all, asylum seekers and 'economic migrants' are collective replicas (an alter ego?, fellow travellers?, mirror-images?, caricatures?) of the new power elite of the globalized world, widely (and with reason) suspected to be the true villain of the piece. Like that elite, they are untied to any place, shifty, unpredictable. Like that elite, they epitomize the unfathomable 'space of flows' where the roots of the present-day precariousness of the human condition are sunk (Bauman 2004:66). And it is these groups of asylum seekers, 'economic migrants' and refugees that represent the 'human waste' of globalization, the vagabond nightmare in the society of tourists. All periods of modernity have, of course, produced social suffering amongst the excluded. However, Bauman (2004) argues that the suffering experienced by the growing ranks of vagabonds is unique insofar as the included do not forge any common cause with those 'wasted humans' precisely because they rarely come into contact with them. By being managed and administered in localized camps or 'sink estates', the tourists have no opportunity to converse with vagabonds and, as a result of their stigmatization and criminalization, frequently have little desire to do so. As a consequence, an entire way of human-being-in-the-world is denied its reality and so easily removed from the realm of moral obligation. Indeed, it is this that represents one of the central ethical challenges that faces humanity in the era of globalization: the need to recognize the plight of the 'wasted humans' produced by those global processes that make the life of the tourist so desirable. One of the main obstacles to this ethical challenge is precisely the experience of insecurity and fear that 'wasted humans' are so often taken to embody. Furthermore, Bauman notes how current local solutions to these problems fail to address their global causes — 'there are no local solutions to global problems', as he frequently asserts. The growing pervasiveness of fear in 'liquid modern' society, coupled with an absence of global solutions, has led Bauman to explain globalization as entirely 'negative'.

# Framework

#### Our K provides a reason to reject the plan even in a policy framework – space and labor exploitation shape and structure policies

Massey ’94 (Doreen Massey is a contemporary British social scientist and geographer, working among others on topics typical of Marxist geography. She currently serves as Professor of geography at the Open University. “Uneven Development: Social Change and Spatial Divisions of Labour” Space Place and Gender (page 89)

All this immediately has two further implications. First, if these divisions or labour which are stretched out over space (spatial structures) consist, as we have said they do, of mutually defining elements, then the functional (and social) characteristics of some areas define the functional (and social) characteristics of other areas. If one region has all the control functions, and only control functions (to give an extreme example), then other regions must have all the functions which are controlled, the subordinated functions. This clearly has political and policy implications. Second, it means that as far as the characteristics we are considering here are concerned, any local area (region/country) can only be understood when analysed in relation to the functions in the wider division of labour which are performed within it, and in the context of its place within the wider system of relations of production. These characteristics of ‘a local area’, in other words, must be conceptualized in terms of the evolution of the wider structures of the capitalist economy.

#### **Geography determines and structures social relations**

Herod ’03, professor of geography at the University of Georgia. He has written widely on issues of globalization and workers. “Geographies of Labor Internationalism.” Social Science History 27.4 (2003) 501-523

Accepting, then, that the geography of capitalism seems to make a difference in how it works and that this geography is being reconfigured by processes associated with globalization raises a number of questions with regard to the practices of organized labor. First, if we are to consider how workers and their organizations are to operate in the global economy of the early twenty-first century, then we must ask how the changes in the geographical relationships between different parts of the globe outlined above are affecting different sets of workers. Second, we need to consider how workers' geographical embeddedness in different local, regional, and national political economies shapes the possibilities for their political praxis and the kinds of strategies they seek to develop. Third, we need to contemplate how the actions of workers—whether individually or collectively—themselves have spatial consequences and affect the relationships between places and thus the making of the geography of capitalism. Put another way, if we are to recognize that capitalists shape the geography of capitalism through the "spatial fixes" (Harvey 1982) they seek to impose in the landscape, then we must also [End Page 506]recognize that workers, too, may seek to implement in the economic landscape spatial fixes that they themselves find advantageous, even if such fixes are less than revolutionary and still leave them as workers laboring under a capitalist mode of production (I develop the idea of a "spatial fix for labor" in more detail in Herod 2001). Such an approach to theorizing the political and economic practices of organized labor conceptualizes space as not merely an inert stage upon which social life simply plays itself out but, rather, as a social product whose manipulation in particular ways can serve to advance the political agendas of social actors and to retard those of their opponents. Consequently, rather than seeing the geographies of global capitalism as simple reflections of the operation of social relations, it is important to see such geographies instead as intimately tied up in the very constitution of social life and the struggles thereof, for, as sociologist Manuel Castells (1983: 311; emphasis in original) has put it, "space is not a ‘reflection of society,' it is society." It is to such questions of the relationship between workers' political praxis and the making of the geography of global capitalism that I now turn.