# \*\*\*RACISM AFF\*\*\*

## --- Topicality ---

### 1NC Extra T

#### A. Definitions --

#### “Increase” refers to a mandate, not a potential result

HEFC 4 (Higher Education Funding Council, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt200304/jtselect/jtchar/1> 67/167we98.htm# n43)

9.1 The Draft Bill creates an obligation on the principal regulator to do all that it "reasonably can to meet the compliance objective in relation to the charity".[ 45] The Draft Bill defines the compliance objective as "to increase compliance by the charity trustees with their legal obligations in exercising control and management of the administration of the charity".[ 46] 9.2 Although the word "increase" is used in relation to the functions of a number of statutory bodies,[47] such examples demonstrate that "increase" is used in relation to considerations to be taken into account in the exercise of a function, rather than an objective in itself. 9.3 HEFCE is concerned that an obligation on principal regulators to "increase" compliance per se is unworkable, in so far as it does not adequately define the limits or nature of the statutory duty. Indeed, the obligation could be considered to be ever-increasing.

#### “Substantially” means the increase must be definite --- potential future increases are not topical

Words and Phrases 64 (40W&P 759)

The words" outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive," in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain: absolute: real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including, admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Investment” requires capital expenditure

Anderson 6 (Edward, Lecturer in Development Studies – University of East Anglia, et al., “The Role of Public Investment in Poverty Reduction: Theories, Evidence and Methods”, Overseas Development Institute Working Paper 263, March, http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/1786.pdf)

1.3 Definitions

We define (net) public investment as public expenditure that adds to the public physical capital stock. This would include the building of roads, ports, schools, hospitals etc. This corresponds to the definition of public investment in national accounts data, namely, capital expenditure. It is not within the scope of this paper to include public expenditure on health and education, despite the fact that many regard such expenditure as investment. Methods for assessing the poverty impact of public expenditure on social sectors such as health and education have been well covered elsewhere in recent years (see for example, van de Walle and Nead, 1995; Sahn and Younger, 2000; and World Bank, 2002).

#### B. Violation -- the aff results in transportation infrastructure investment through consultation with local communities – the investment is contingent on the outcome of the consultation, which is not certain.

#### C. Voting Issue ---

####  1. Ground – requiring the aff to be a definite increase in investment represents the core of ALL neg ground – consultations allows them to spike out of the tradeoff disad , politics links, and ALL counterplans.

#### 2. Limits – allowing the aff to be contingent explodes the research burden to all possible outcomes of the consultation which guts negative strategy forcing us to rely on bad generics like the K.

#### 3. Extra T is an independent voter – adding the consultation process uniquely allows the aff to skirt core resolutional questions about the necessity of federal action – crushes topic education and fairness.

## --- Racism Advantage ---

### 1NC: Racism Advantage

#### Their disposability impact is predicated off of a disaster scenario – their cards are talking about Katrina – zero internal for this impact –more public transport not key – Bullard says they need cars which the plan doesn’t solve.

#### Their author concedes poor evacuation plans are the problem – increased public transport can’t solve.

Bullard et al 7. (Robert D, Ware professor of sociology and director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University; Glenn S. Johnson, a research associate in the Environmental Justice Resource Center and an associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the same university;. Angel O. Torres, a geographic information system training specialist with the Environmental Justice Resource Center “Dismantling transportation Apartheid in the United States Before and After Disasters Strike” Vol. 34 No. 3 Summer 2007 http://www.americanbar.org/publications/human\_rights\_magazine\_home/human\_rights\_vol34\_2007/summer2007/hr\_summer07\_bujoto.html)

Hurricane Katrina also exposed a major weakness in urban mass evacuation plans. It shone a spotlight on the heightened vulnerability of people without cars. Katrina’s evacuation plan did work relatively well for people with cars but miserably failed those depending on public transit. More than one-third of New Orleans’s African American residents did not own a car. Over 15 percent of the city’s residents relied on public transportation as their primary mode of travel. Local, state, and federal emergency planners must have known—for years—of the risks facing these transit dependent residents.¶ At least 100,000 New Orleans residents—and perhaps double or triple that—did not have cars to evacuate in case of a major storm. A 2002 article titled “Planning for the Evacuation of New Orleans” detailed the risks faced by the hundreds of thousands of persons without cars and nondrivers in New Orleans. Brian Wolshon, Planning for the Evacuation of New Orleans, Inst. Transp. Engineers J. 45 (Feb. 2002), available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3734/is\_200202/ai\_n9045870/print. Of the 1.4 million inhabitants in the high-threat areas, government officials assumed that only 60 percent of the population—850,000 people, give or take—would be able to leave. Although the various agencies knew that this large vulnerable population existed, there simply was no effective plan to evacuate these New Orleanians. Yet this problem had received national attention in 1998 during Hurricane Georges, when emergency evacuation plans mostly left behind residents who did not own cars. Further, when Hurricane Ivan had struck New Orleans in 2004, many New Orleanians who did not own cars had been left to fend for themselves, while others were evacuated to the Superdome and other “shelters of last resort.” More telling, New Orleans’s post-Ivan emergency plan had been modified to include the use of public buses to evacuate those without private transportation. Transporting an estimated 100,000 to 135,000 people out of harm’s way certainly would have been no small undertaking. Yet when the hurricane hit, most of the city’s five hundred transit and school buses were without drivers. During the storm, about 190 RTA buses were lost to flooding. Afterward, most of the New Orleans Rapid Transit Authority (NORTA) employees were dispersed across the country, and many were left homeless. Before Katrina, NORTA employed more than 1,300 people. A year later, the NORTA Board of Directors laid off 150 of its 730 remaining employees. These layoffs included about 125 of NORTA’s 400 operators, and 21 of its 162 maintenance employees.

#### There’s always value to life –Prefer our ev because of Frankl’s subject position.

Coontz 1. [Phyllis D., PhD Graduate School of Public and International Affairs University of Pittsburgh, et al, JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSING, 2001, 18(4), 235-246 – J-Stor]

In the 1950s, psychiatrist and theorist Viktor Frankl (1963) described an existential theory of purpose and meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, re- lated several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terri- ble suffering using his own experiences and observations. He believed that these experi- ences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth. Frankl (1969) claimed that transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are un- changeable. He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity. Therefore, self-transcendence provides mean- ing and enables the discovery of meaning for a person (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl's work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are ex- periencing physical and mental pain. This expansion beyond the self occurs through in- trospection, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and fu- ture to strengthen one's present life (Reed, 1991b).

#### Racism Not Root Cause ---

Barndt 7 – director of Crossroads, a ministry to dismantle racism (Joseph, Understanding and Dismantling Racism, p 10)

While dealing with the subject of racism, we need to be aware that racism is not the only social problem of our society. The dross of our happiness Machines produce other "isms" such as sexism, heterosexism, classism, nationalist, militarism, anti-Semitism, and environmental pollution--all of which cause tremendous suffering and endanger humanity's existence. The same fable could be used to describe the social reality of poverty-stricken people, women and children, gays and lesbians, oppressed religions, and political domination throughout the world. All of these social problems are interwoven into a single fabric of oppression, and they are not easily disentangled from each other. However, it is not possible to simply analyze and resist "oppression in general." Just as this book addresses racism, each of these other "isms" must be separately analyzed and addressed.

#### And monocausal focus on root cause justifies violence and tyranny

Achterhuis 2. **[Hans**, Professor of Philosophy @ Twente University, Peace Review, vol. 14, p. 158]

At base, each person who has-or claims to have-a single account for violence is proceeding in an extremely violent manner. Those who claim to know the origin of violence, to know the root of all evil, give themselves at the same stroke the moral right to reach back and root it out-thus providing, via a chain of reasoning with which we are all familiar, the justification for using violence in order to drive violence from the world. If we know where its origin lies, what could be wrong with using violence for the (sole) purpose of obtaining eternal peace and prosperity? This is a violent chain of reasoning. Implicitly or explicitly, it entails the call for a relentless struggle against the discovered origin of evil, whether that be said to lie in a particular class, nation, or ethnic group; a particular social structure such as capitalism or socialism; or a particular condition such as poverty. Whenever or wherever such an origin is posed, violence is alread 'resent for it inevitably sets up the argument that violence is permitted in order to achieve peace. It is a means-ends logic**:** the noble ends sanctify the violent means. From Valkenberg I learned that we cannot think about violence as a means-ends logic, but only in the form of a dialogue between human beings. If readers sense a strong reaction on my part against monocausal theories, I readily admit that the reaction is first of all directed against myself. For it is a lesson I learned only through trial and error. Once upon a time I too thought that I had located the origin of violence and could thus revolutionize the world. But this, in my opinion, is the greatest temptation for the political thinker. Many political philosophers have proposed **totalitarian therapies** based on philosophical analyses that attribute the origin of social evil to a single root. But single philosophical answers to the question of violence can never be more than partial. Such answers are but pieces of a dialogue.

#### Tons of Alt Causes –

#### A. you totally jack rural communities.

Bullard 4. [Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology, Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University, “13th Annual Symposium on contemporary urban challenges: Urban Equity: Considerations of race and the road towards equitable allocation of municipal services: Addressing urban transportation equity in the United States” Fordham Urban Law Journal -- October -- lexis]

In the real world, all transit is not created equal. In general, most transit systems have taken their low-income and people of color "captive riders" for granted and concentrated their fare and service policies on attracting middle-class and affluent riders out of their cars. 62 Moreover, transit subsidies have favored investment in suburban transit and expensive new commuter bus and rail lines that disproportionately serve wealthier "discretionary riders." 63 Almost 40% of rural counties in this country have little or no public [\*1190] transportation, 64 and "in areas with populations from one million and below, more than half of all transit passengers have incomes of less than $ 15,000 per year." 65

#### B. Federal housing and welfare policies – your author.

Johnson 11. Olatunde C.A. Johnson\* Associate Professor of Law, Columbia Law School¶ Columbia Law Review¶ January, 2011¶ Columbia Law Review¶ 111 Colum. L. Rev. 154

Civil rights commentary has not centrally focused on the connection between race and federal spending; yet it is increasingly clear from recent social science literature that federal grant programs in housing, transportation, and social welfare generated significant racial harms. 15 Indeed, an explicit goal of recent historical accounts is to explain contemporary [\*160] and existing patterns of racial inequality by recovering a history of discrimination in federal programs often omitted from standard civil rights narratives. 16 By these accounts, the federal government's social security, housing, and transportation programs contributed greatly to contemporary and persistent disparities in wealth, and to current patterns of segregation and concentration of poverty. 17

#### Squo Solves -- Big budget increases for mass transit now.

Jacobson 9. [Louis, staff writer for politifact, “Stimulus money boosts public transportation.” 9-4-2009, Online, http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/promises/obameter/promise/483/invest-in-public-transportation/] /WFI-MB

The Obama administration has been quick to shovel more money to public transportation. The economic stimulus package signed into law in February 2009 has two major pots of money aimed at mass transit systems. It allocated $8.4 billion to the Federal Transit Administration, the division of the Transportation Department that supports "locally planned, constructed, and operated public transportation systems throughout the United States," including "buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, streetcars, monorail, passenger ferry boats, inclined railways (and) people movers." This stimulus money is aimed at supporting capital improvements for those systems. According to the administration, 322 grants to transit agencies were made by July 30, totaling $3.9 billion in stimulus money. The second major source of money open to transit systems is from Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (or TIGER) grants. These grants are designed to boost "multimodal" projects — those that involve more than one type of transportation — with a preference for those located in economically distressed areas. They can range from $20 million to $300 million. On July 30, Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced that he was accelerating the process of awarding the grants, allowing the department to announce the awardees in January 2010, one month ahead of the statutory deadline. This was a pretty broad promise and it's been fulfilled largely because of the money from the stimulus. We rate it a Promise Kept.

###  Ext: AT -- Disposability/Extinction Inevitable

#### Their inevitability claim is overdetermination- specific factors and explanations outweigh

Sagan 00. [Scott D Sagan, prof of Poli Sci Stanford, ACCIDENTAL WAR IN THEORY AND PRACTICE 2-8-00 www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc]

 To make reasonable judgements in such matters it is essential, in my view, to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination." Looking backwards at historical events, it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war and argue that the likelihood of conflict was so high that the war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off. If taken too far, however, this tendency eliminates the role of contingency in history and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways that were present to historical actors. The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, a bizarre false warning incident in the U.S. radar systems facing Cuba led officers at the North American Air Defense Command to believe that the U.S. was under attack and that a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida. Now imagine the counterfactual event that this false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and resulted in a U.S. nuclear "retaliation" against the Russians. How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III? One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given the deep political hostility of the two superpowers, the conflicting ideology, the escalating arms race, nuclear war would have occurred eventually. If not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin, or the Middle East, or Korea. From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.

#### Otherness not the root cause of war

Volf 2 [Miroslav Evangelical Pentecostal Church of Croatia and Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.]) has been Henry B. Wright Professor of Theology at Yale Divinity School since 1998. Educated at the University of Zagreb, Evangelical Theological Seminary in Zagreb, Fuller Theological Seminary, and Eberhard-Karls-Universitat, Tubingen (Dr. theol., 1986; Dr. theol, habil., 1995), he also taught at Evangelical Theological Seminary in Osijek, Croatia (1979-80, 1984-91) and Fuller Theological Seminary (1991-98). Journal of Ecumenical Studies 1-1-02]

Though “otherness”–cultural, ethnic, religious, racial difference–is an important factor in our relations with others, we should not overestimate it as a cause of conflict. During the war in the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990′s, I was often asked, “What is this war about? Is it about religious and cultural differences? Is it about economic advantage? Is it about political power? Is it about land?” The correct response was, of course, that the war was about all of these things. Monocausal explanations of major eruptions of violence are rarely right. Moreover, various causes are intimately intertwined, and each contributes to others. That holds true also for otherness, which I am highlighting here. However, neither should we underestimate otherness as a factor. The contest for political power, for economic advantage, and for a share of the land took place between people who belonged to discrete cultural and ethnic groups. Part of the goal of the war in the former Yugoslavia was the creation of ethnically clean territories with economic and political autonomy. The importance of “otherness” is only slightly diminished if we grant that the sense of ethnic and religious belonging was manipulated by unscrupulous, corrupt, and greedy politicians for their own political and economic gain. The fact that conjured fears for one’s identity could serve to legitimize a war whose major driving force lay elsewhere is itself a testimony to how much “otherness” matters.

###  Ext: No Root Cause

#### Consensus of experts vote neg.

Cashman 00. [Greg, Professor of Political Science at Salisbury State University “What Causes war?: An introduction to theories of international conflict” pg. 9]

Two warnings need to be issued at this point. First, while we have been using a single variable explanation of war merely for the sake of simplicity, multivariate explanations of war are likely to be much more powerful. Since social and political behaviors are extremely complex, they are almost never explainable through a single factor. Decades of research have led most analysts to reject monocausal explanations of war. For instance, international relations theorist J. David Singer suggests that we ought to move away from the concept of “causality” since it has become associated with the search for a single cause of war; we should instead redirect our activities toward discovering “explanations”—a term that implies multiple causes of war, but also a certain element of randomness or chance in their occurrence.

#### No single root cause of anything – monocausal explanations cause political paralysis

Martin ‘90 (Brian, associate professor of Society, U Wollongong -- Uprooting War, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/90uw/uw13.html)

In this chapter and in the six preceding chapters I have examined a number of structures and factors which have some connection with the war system. There is much more that could be said about any one of these structures, and other factors which could be examined. Here I wish to note one important point: attention should not be focused on one single factor to the exclusion of others. This is often done for example by some Marxists who look only at capitalism as a root of war and other social problems, and by some feminists who attribute most problems to patriarchy. The danger of monocausal explanations is that they may lead to an inadequate political practice. The ‘revolution’ may be followed by the persistence or even expansion of many problems which were not addressed by the single-factor perspective. The one connecting feature which I perceive in the structures underlying war is an unequal distribution of power. This unequal distribution is socially organised in many different ways, such as in the large-scale structures for state administration, in capitalist ownership, in male domination within families and elsewhere, in control over knowledge by experts, and in the use of force by the military. Furthermore, these different systems of power are interconnected. They often support each other, and sometimes conflict. This means that the struggle against war can and must be undertaken at many different levels. It ranges from struggles to undermine state power to struggles to undermine racism, sexism and other forms of domination at the level of the individual and the local community. Furthermore, the different struggles need to be linked together. That is the motivation for analysing the roots of war and developing strategies for grassroots movements to uproot them.

#### No root cause to war- their argument eliminates the conscious choice element- destroys its explanatory power

Smoke and Harman ’87 (Richard Smoke BA Harvard magna cum laude, PhD MIT, Prof. @ Brown, Winner Bancroft Prize in History, AND Willis Harman M.S. in Physics and Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from Stanford University , Paths To Peace 1987 p. 36-7)

The two kinds of deeply felt social injustices—ethnic and religious hatred and severe economic disparities—represent underlying causes of war that may be especially important to cope with if our world is to have a future of peace. But one should not believe that even complete removal of these causes would by itself lead to that result. That belief assumes that war is not simply the result of deliberate decision by nation-states, but that war has to be "caused" by other factors. That assumption is questionable. Although some wars clearly seem to have roots, say, in evident ethnic/religious hatreds, others seem far removed from explanations about underlying causes, and seem most plausibly to be the result of calculated decisions by national governments. (Specialists sometimes call such wars policy wars.) The U.S. invasion of Grenada in 1983 seems a clear example of a policy war, if it can be considered a war. Another, more painful example is the U.S. war in Vietnam. The United States is not an economically deprived country, and while some ethnic hatred among U.S. soldiers in Vietnam resulted from the war, it did not cause the war. Neither democratic nor Marxist explanations apply either, at least not in any very satisfactory way. The more democratic country chose to enter the conflict. Neither markets nor resources of any significance were at stake, and it was obvious very early that U.S. capitalism had more to lose than to gain from the escalating U.S. involvement. Grenada and Vietnam were both policy wars in which a decisionmaking elite made one or a series of calculated decisions based on concepts of power balances, cost/benefit ratios, and the containment or removal of regimes conceived to be hostile. An "explanation" of these U.S. wars, then, would consist primarily of analysis of the intellectual premises on which those calculations were made. One should not assume, then, that a world in which there were no social injustices between nations would be a world automatically at peace. Quite possibly there could still be calculated wars of policy in such a world. However, one is safe in assuming that a future world that did continue to suffer from deeply felt social injustices would be a world without peace, at least without a peace that was reliable and lasting. Peace, as so many have pointed out, requires justice.

###  Ext: Alt Causes

#### Mass alt causes to the spacialization of race – Johnson is the aff’s main solvency advocate and the whole article discusses how housing and welfare policies entrench these patterns of discrimination – the aff has zero spillover claim or comparative evidence that indicates why transportation is key – prefer our cards because they’re from \*their\* author.

#### Here’s more ev from their author saying Housing is a bigger internal link.

Johnson 11. Olatunde C.A. Johnson\* Associate Professor of Law, Columbia Law School¶ Columbia Law Review¶ January, 2011¶ Columbia Law Review¶ 111 Colum. L. Rev. 154

Federal spending programs create new programmatic and funding structures that help sustain existing patterns of racial inequality. The segregative effect of twentieth-century housing programs provides an important example. In the public housing context, federal spending cemented patterns of discrimination and segregation in housing that existed before the federal funding stream. In the North, the executive branch's refusal to create housing opportunities for blacks in low-poverty suburbs reflected a norm that poor African Americans would be spatially segregated from whites of all classes. 28 Rampant private discrimination by whites, particularly in the North in the early part of the century, in the wake of the Great Migration, shaped the residential housing patterns upon which the federal government built. 29 In the North, this infrastructure served to expand and deepen racial housing patterns. 30 As the federal government became involved through urban renewal and the construction of low-income housing, resistance by state and local governments and white communities to the presence of blacks in white neighborhoods influenced decisions on where public housing was located. 31¶ [\*163] The essential concept - that poor blacks lived in inner cities and that whites lived in suburbs - would provide the frame for mid-century policies in public housing and urban renewal. It is not simply that they would go unchallenged by federal policy, but that they would become the operative frame that guided federal policy. In the wake of Brown v. Board of Education, 32 local authorities in the South exploited this new federal funding structure in housing to create segregatory living patterns that had not before existed. 33 Federal urban renewal and public housing policies thus institutionalized segregation, lending it new permanence. 34

#### And welfare programs.

Johnson 11. Olatunde C.A. Johnson\* Associate Professor of Law, Columbia Law School¶ Columbia Law Review¶ January, 2011¶ Columbia Law Review¶ 111 Colum. L. Rev. 154

A similar account can be found in the housing loan programs subsidized by the federal government. 35 Federal agencies, following patterns established by the private sector, institutionalized redlining, consistently undervaluing black and integrated neighborhoods for the purpose of making mortgage loans. 36 The redlining practices influenced federal loan decisions and those of private banks, and contributed to the deterioration of predominantly black urban neighborhoods. 37 Federal loans provided to veterans were particularly powerful forces behind the tremendous [\*164] suburbanization of the postwar period and in promoting middle class homeownership and wealth acquisition. 38¶ In income security too, Social Security's ultimate exclusion of agricultural and domestic workers transferred existing patterns of labor market segregation to the public system. The exclusion had grave effects because of the relative poverty of African Americans and their overrepresentation in the lowest wage sector of the American labor force. 39 In effect, these design decisions reproduced the unequal private labor market structure, inscribing it into federal program design.

#### Arguments that housing and welfare programs aren’t as big an internal link are the result of the invisibility of the federal roots of racism – prefer our arguments.

Johnson 11. Olatunde C.A. Johnson\* Associate Professor of Law, Columbia Law School¶ Columbia Law Review¶ January, 2011¶ Columbia Law Review¶ 111 Colum. L. Rev. 154

These federal spending choices soon become hidden. Rendered invisible, the resulting landscape begins to seem natural and inevitable. Federal decisions might have shaped the construction of suburbs, the placement of highways, and the location of public housing, but the resulting physical, spatial structure is encompassing, and thus quickly begins to seem preordained and fixed. 40 Racial meanings become cemented in these created spaces. In his study of residential segregation in Detroit, political scientist Thomas Sugrue notes that even as "blackness and whiteness assumed a spatial definition" in postwar cities, the federal policy decisions regarding public housing and urban renewal that produced this segregation remained invisible. 41 Federally funded urban renewal programs displaced blacks, who were then concentrated in federally funded, racially segregated public housing. 42 Racially discriminatory federal loan [\*165] practices deprived blacks of access to suburban housing markets enabled by the government-subsidized mortgage industry. 43 Yet these decisions remained, as a practical matter, invisible to the public. Whites could see "ghettoization" as "an inevitable, natural consequence of profound racial differences." 44 Those residing in the "ghetto," though acutely aware of the poverty and disinvestment that surrounds them, might thus fail to see their communities as constructed by discriminatory government policies and spending decisions. 45 Invisibility attends federal subsidies to create private markets in particular. As historian Dolores Hayden notes in her examinations of the discrimination embedded in federal housing and loan programs, the racially tiered housing market was enabled by federal policy, yet "mystified many working-class and middle-class Americans, who saw minimal subsidies for the poor but never understood that their own housing was far more heavily subsidized." 46 Historian David Freund's recent account of federal policy on fair housing underscores the manner in which the federal government itself promoted its mortgage programs as market-driven rather than as products of federal spending. 47 This account of housing reveals how embedding racial outcomes and obscuring federal spending's role in shaping racial outcomes become mirror developments: As federal policy shapes segregation and patterns of inequality, the funding and policy decisions often remain concealed to beneficiaries and the broader public.

###  Ext: Public Transport Can’t Solve Disposability

#### Your author says public transport alone can’t solve emergency scenarios – no internal link to disposability.

Bullard et al 7. (Robert D, Ware professor of sociology and director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University; Glenn S. Johnson, a research associate in the Environmental Justice Resource Center and an associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the same university;. Angel O. Torres, a geographic information system training specialist with the Environmental Justice Resource Center “Dismantling transportation Apartheid in the United States Before and After Disasters Strike” Vol. 34 No. 3 Summer 2007 http://www.americanbar.org/publications/human\_rights\_magazine\_home/human\_rights\_vol34\_2007/summer2007/hr\_summer07\_bujoto.html)

Public transportation alone will not address all emergency needs, as demonstrated by Hurricane Katrina. Clearly, private car ownership increases mobility in normal times as well as in times of a disaster. Car ownership, maintenance, and insurance demonstration programs should be put in place for “jitney” opportunities for people of color business entrepreneurs. Since many taxi cab monopolies fail to pick up black passengers, especially black males, boosting African American car ownership rates would increase mobility and narrow the interracial employment gap. It would also clearly enhance their ability to evacuate during natural disasters.

## --- Solvency ---

### 1NC Solvency

#### Mass Transit Fails:

#### A. Inefficient pricing patterns.

Clifford 10 (Winston Clifford, September 2010, Last Exit : Privatization and Deregulation of the U. S. Transportation System, Brookings Institute, Ebrary MSU, JDP)

Efficient pricing is crucial for developing an optimal transit network because it identifies the costs and benefits that should enter into the decisions about what routes to serve and how often to serve them. In practice transit pricing has not played that role; instead, its inefficiencies are at the heart of transit’s budget deficits. Today more than 80 percent of public transit systems charge a uniform price to all passengers who use the system, regardless of the duration or time of day of a passenger’s trip. 16 This pricing policy ignores the higher cost of providing service to riders who travel during peak periods; who travel greater distances; and who travel on low-density routes (thus spreading the costs over fewer passengers than occurs on high-density routes). In addition, uniform transit fares and even fares that vary broadly by time of day and distance are kept well below the short-run marginal cost of transit service to compete with the cost and convenience of automobile travel and to raise total ridership, an important measure considered by policymakers when deciding whether to grant additional subsidies. Winston and Shirley (1998) find that replacing bus and rail transit fares with fares based on the marginal cost of serving a passenger would, as expected, force travelers to pay higher fares but produce annual social welfare gains of $3 billion (1998 dollars) by reducing public subsidies. As in the case of road pricing, because marginal cost pricing of transit would raise the per-mile cost of public transportation, it would improve land use by causing some households to move closer to their workplaces and increase urban density. However, little quantitative evidence exists on transit’s effect on residential location.

#### B. Federal investment ignores maintenance – their systems will become inefficient and bloated

Hess and Lombardi ‘5 (Daniel Baldwin and Peter A. Daniel Baldwin Hess, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University at Buffalo, State University of New York. He received a doctoral degree in urban planning from the University of California, Los Angeles. He has published articles about urban transportation planning and public transit policy and finance. Peter A. Lombardi is a graduate student in city and regional planning at the Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University. He received a B.A. in environmental design from the University at Buffalo. “Governmental Subsidies for Public Transit: History, Current Issues, and Recent Evidence.” Public Works Management Policy, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 138-156; October, 2005. <<http://128.205.119.40/pdfs/planning/hess/Governmental_Subsidies.pdf>> D.A. 7/11/12) [MP]

Although bypassing the federal funding process may accelerate project completion in many cases, the act of foregoing the rigorous federal ratings procedures may, in the end, encourage the development of inefficient and overcapitalized transit systems. Many researchers have asserted that similar outcomes have resulted from federal policies promoting capital over operating assistance. The original intent of emphasizing capital assistance over operating subsidies was to promote the construction or acquisition of infrastructure that would make transit systems operate more efficiently, therefore reducing the need for operating subsidies (Wachs, 1989, 1995). This capital bias has, in some cases, occurred at the expense of regular maintenance and led many transit systems to exchange operating costs for capital expansion without short- or long-term economic justification (Taylor & Samples, 2002). As a result, there is a general consensus among researchers that the capital bias of federal policy has not improved the economic or operating efficiency of many transit systems and may have encouraged the formation of overcapitalized and fiscally unsustainable systems, particularly those that used federal capital assistance to construct underperforming rapid transit systems (Li & Taylor, 1998).

#### Your author goes on to list a whole host of things that are key to solve that you can’t do.

Bullard 4. [Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology, Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University, “13th Annual Symposium on contemporary urban challenges: Urban Equity: Considerations of race and the road towards equitable allocation of municipal services: Addressing urban transportation equity in the United States” Fordham Urban Law Journal -- October -- lexis]

Increase Funding to MPOs: Increase funding to Metropolitan Planning Organizations and provide them with greater flexibility to tailor regional transportation solutions to their own distinct locally-defined needs.

THEIR CARD ENDS

 [\*1207] Public Participation: Ensure greater stakeholder participation and public involvement to receive effective transportation decision making. 221 The statewide transportation agencies and MPOs must design and implement MPO public involvement strategies with community-based organizations to identify minority and low-income populations, their concerns, and facilitate their involvement into transportation decision making.¶ Disproportionate and Adverse Impacts: Ensure the use of performance measures to assess equity impacts (benefits and burdens) of state DOTs and MPOs transportation planning, investment decisions, and policies impact on Title VI protected classes, minority populations, and low-income populations.¶ Research and Evaluation: Improve research, data collection, and assessment techniques to analyze disparities that exist when it comes to transportation benefits. Incorporate an automated mapping system (Geographical Information System) that joins socioeconomic data with transportation plans. 222¶ Interagency Cooperation and Planning: Promote interagency cooperation in transportation planning, development, and program implementation to achieve livable, healthy, and sustainable communities. An interagency approach offers great promise in addressing social equity and environmental justice concerns. Solutions for many of these local, regional, and state transportation problems will require several agencies working together with the public. 223¶ Environmental Justice and Certification Review: Incorporate environmental justice as a benchmark for MPO recertification to ensure that compliance of federal funds for transportation projects [\*1208] include public input and public involvement in the transportation decision making process. 224¶ New Guidelines for Financial Disclosure for Transportation Planning: Encourage MPOs to develop new guidelines in publicizing their transportation improvement program documents. 225 MPOs, DOTs, and the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") need to create a common system of project tracking and data-sharing among themselves and with community stakeholders. 226¶ Employment Transportation Projects Partnerships: Implement employment transportation projects that are community-based and consist of training and educating community residents for transportation jobs, and conduct transportation job fairs in low-income minority communities 227 because they are transit dependent and rely on others for their mobility.¶ Baseline Assessment Tools: There is a need for increased knowledge in the development of improved baseline transportation equity assessments that estimate current levels of inaccessibility and adverse impacts; improved mobility assessment methods; air pollution and noise models that are more capable of micro-scale (neighborhood analysis); more effective methods of reaching affected populations and gauging neighborhood-level priorities regarding elements needing preservation or enhancement; better predictive approaches for estimating trip geography and travel desires of low-income populations and minority populations in specific situations; location analysis of public and private facilities that take into account protected populations' abilities to conduct their daily activities; and improved techniques for communicating probable impact, positive and negative, of contemplated transportation system changes. 228

#### Johnson assumes explicitly conditioned federal funding AND is all about housing and welfare discrimination – proves the aff can’t solve and the existence of huge alt causes.

#### Your author lists a wreck of stuff you don’t do – proves many alt causes.

Williams 11. [Mantill, APTA staff, “ Congress Must Support Public Transportation Investment to Keep America Moving Forward.” 3-29-11, Online, http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2011/Pages/110329\_Millar\_Testimony.aspx] /WFI-MB

In addition, Millar shared specific policy recommendations that can help cut costs and streamline federal transportation programs, which were developed with input from APTA’s diverse membership of public and private sector leaders. These recommendations include:¶ Eliminating overly burdensome requirements and approval processes in the New Starts program, such as the duplicative Alternatives Analysis requirement,¶ Enhancing and broadening the TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act) program,¶ Consolidating the Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom and Elderly and Disabled Formula programs into a single, new Coordinated Mobility Program,¶ Continuing to support and fund the Small Transit Intensive Cities program.

#### Public Transit fails- overcrowded during peak hours, frequent low ridership, and insufficient income

Rodrigue 09 (Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrique, The Geography of Transport Systems, 2009, Hofstra, http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch6en/conc6en/ch6c4en.html, Accessed July 10, 2012, JDP)

Public transport inadequacy. Many public transit systems, or parts of them, are either over or under used. During peak hours, crowdedness creates discomfort for users as the system copes with a temporary surge in demand. Low ridership makes many services financially unsustainable, particularly in suburban areas. In spite of significant subsidies and cross-financing (e.g. tolls) almost every public transit systems cannot generate sufficient income to cover its operating and capital costs. While in the past deficits were deemed acceptable because of the essential service public transit was providing for urban mobility, its financial burden is increasingly controversial

###  Ext: Mass Transit Fails

#### Multiple problems prevent effective public transit- decentralization, fixity, connectivity, competition, and financing and fare structures

Rodrigue 09

(Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrique, The Geography of Transport Systems, 2009, Hofstra, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch6en/conc6en/ch6c4en.html>, Accessed July 10, 2012, JDP)

Decentralization. Public transit systems are not designed to service low density and scattered urban areas that are increasingly dominating the landscape. The greater the decentralization of urban activities, the more difficult and expensive it becomes to serve urban areas with public transit. Additionally, decentralization promotes long distance trips on transit systems causing higher operating costs and revenue issues for flat fare transit systems.¶ Fixity. The infrastructures of several public transit systems, notably rail and subway systems are fixed, while cities are dynamical entities, even if the pace of change can take decades. This implies that travel patterns tend to change and that a transit system built for servicing a specific pattern may eventually face "spatial obsolescence".¶ Connectivity. Public transit systems are often independent from other modes and terminals. It is consequently difficult to transfer passengers from one system to the other. This lead to a paradox between the preference of riders to have direct connections and the need to provide a cost efficient service network that involves transfers.¶ Competition. In view of cheap and ubiquitous road transport systems, public transit faced strong competition and loss ridership in relative terms and in some cases in absolute terms. The higher the level of automobile dependency, the more inappropriate the public transit level of service. The public service being offered is simply outpaced by the convenience of the automobile. However, changes in energy prices are likely to impose a new equilibrium in this relationship.¶ Financing and fare structures. Most public transit systems have abandoned a distance-based fare structure to a simpler flat fare system. This had the unintended consequence of discouraging short trips for which most transit systems are well suited for, and encouraging longer trips that tend to be more costly per user than the fares they generate. Information systems offer the possibility for transit systems to move back to a more equitable distance based fare structure.

#### Mass transit ineffective- huge expenses, necessity of high ridership levels, trade-off with other public transit, and divert operating from poorer communities

Guerra and Cervero 11

(Erick Guerra and Robert Cervero, Cost of a Ride, 2011, Journal of the American Planning Association, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2011.589767>, Accessed July 10, 2012, JDP)

American spending on rail transit construction has skyrocketed in recent decades. According to the American Public Transportation Association ([2010](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2011.589767#CIT0002)), inflation-adjusted capital expenditures on light (LRT) and heavy rail (HR) have more than doubled from $3.9 billion in 1992 to $9.8 billion in 2008. An increase in route-mile construction, several extremely expensive projects, and an escalation in the cost of extending existing systems have contributed to this rise. Sections of Los Angeles's Red Line subway cost more than $750 million per mile, and some light rail investments, often touted as low-cost alternatives to heavy rail, cost more than $200 million per mile. The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) initial 70-mile heavy rail investment, the first post-WWII new-generation rail system in the United States, cost $97 million per mile in 2009 dollars. Three decades later, despite a less central location, the extension of BART to the San Francisco International Airport cost more than $180 million per mile. [1](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2011.589767#EN0001)¶ Expensive transit projects need high ridership levels. In addition to the upfront costs, new rail investments will inevitably incur large operating deficits if they do not have sufficient riders. They will also fail to produce substantial environmental or social benefits. Transit reduces traffic congestion and tailpipe emissions when it draws potential motorists, particularly single-occupant drivers, to trains and buses. A high-cost rail system, furthermore, may divert operating funds away from bus routes serving poorer communities (Garrett & Taylor, [1999](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2011.589767#CIT0024)). A system with few riders and a high price tag will, by most accounting, prove a poor investment economically, environmentally, and socially. A better understanding of characteristics of the most successful transit investments can help inform future investment policy and improve the performance of existing transit systems.

#### Public transportation has less than 20% ridership, construction costs exceed expectations, and billions wasted on maintenance

Cox 11

(Wendell Cox, March 2 2011, Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less>, Accessed July 12, 2012, JDP)

Just how bad America’s transit program is has been the focus of a stinging indictment by Brookings Institution economist Clifford Winston. Winston’s new book, Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System, published by the Brookings Institution Press,[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn1) suggests that transit subsidies are largely the result of labor productivity losses, inefficient operations, and counterproductive federal regulations.¶ Winston finds that transit service is so underutilized that load factors (occupancy rates) were at 18 percent for rail and 14 percent for buses in the 1990s before the Federal Transit Administration stopped requiring transit agencies to report that information. A car carrying a single driver has as high a load factor as the average American transit system.¶ Rail Systems: Extravagance Extraordinaire¶ Winston singles out the nation’s urban rail systems, which have consumed so much of transit tax funding in recent decades, for special criticism.¶ Winston reminds readers of the considerable literature showing that “the cost of building rail systems are notorious for exceeding expectations, while ridership levels tend to be much lower than anticipated” and that “continuing capital investments are swelling the deficit.” At the same time, he questions high subsidy levels for rail transit, noting, for example, that the average income of rail transit riders is approximately double that of bus transit riders.¶ Winston criticizes in particular the now-under-construction Dulles Airport rail line that will become a part of the Washington, D.C.–area transit system, noting that the route is not cost-effective. He characterizes cost overruns on the Dulles rail line and the soon-to-be-under-construction Honolulu rail line as “inevitable” (this despite the fact that both lines have already experienced substantial cost escalation). Indeed, he notes that government subsidies exceed the benefits on all U.S. rail systems except for San Francisco’s BART system.¶ Winston’s analysis can be supplemented by information from the latest Federal Transit Administration “New Starts Report.”[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn2) The annual capital and operating cost per new round trip weekday rider on the Dulles Airport rail line will be at least $40,000. That is about as much as the annual cost to lease each new rider a Rolls Royce—though only a bottom-of-the-line $245,000 “Ghost” model.¶ The reality is that virtually every federally funded new rail system costs as much as leasing a car for every new rider on an annual basis, and, of course the rider would be able to use that car 24/7, in contrast to transit’s limited availability. Admittedly, sometimes it is only an economy car that equates to the cost per new rider, but just as often it has been a much more expensive car. Added to transit’s financial woes is the nearly $80 billion in deferred maintenance to restore transit systems to a state of “good repair,” according to Federal Transit Administrator Peter Rogoff.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn3)

## --- 2NC Tricks ---

### Nuke War Turns Racism

#### Nuclear war causes exploitation of marginalized groups

Martin 82. [Brian, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, 1982, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War” Published in Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/82bpp.html

 There are very strong links between militarism and repression[18]: hierarchical, centralised bureaucratic structures underlie and thrive on each of them. Any fundamental challenge to war must challenge these structures as well. A nuclear emergency would greatly intensify the pressures both for military intervention in civil affairs and for state-sponsored repression. This points to the need to build very strong links between peace activists and those who are struggling against state power, such as groups opposing political police, civil liberties groups, groups defending the rights of racial minorities, women, homosexuals and prisoners, and groups supporting freedom of information and other checks on bureaucracies. Also important are strong links - as already exist in many cases - between peace groups and Third World groups struggling for justice and equality. Exploitation of people, especially in poor countries, is as major feature of the institutions which spawn the threat of nuclear war. Third World justice struggles are a continuing threat to these institutions. In a nuclear crisis or nuclear war, there would be strong pressures from exploiting groups to continue or expand repression and exploitation, for example to provide for recovery from nuclear attack. If opposition groups in exploited countries were prepared to push their claims harder and oppose repression in a nuclear crisis, this could both reduce the risk of nuclear war and lay the basis for ever stronger challenges to the institutions underpinning war. This will be especially effective if opposition groups in both power blocs - for example both eastern Europe and Latin America - increase their efforts in tandem.

#### Nuclear war causes government crackdown

Martin 2. [Brian Martin, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, 3 September 2002, “Activism after nuclear war?” http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/02tff.html]

Nuclear war would also lead to increased political repression. Martial law might be declared. Activists would be targeted for surveillance or arrest. Dissent would become even riskier. War always brings restraints on civil liberties. The political aftermath of September 11 - increased powers for police forces and spy agencies, increased intolerance of and controls over political dissent - is just a taste of what would be in store in the aftermath of nuclear war.

### Nuke War Turns Disposability

#### Nuclear war turns your disposability impact.

Martin 82. [Brian Martin, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, 1982, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War” Published in Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1982, pp. 149-159, http://www.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/82bpp.html]

 In addition to the important physical effects of nuclear war there would be important indirect political effects. It seems very likely that there would be strong moves to maintain or establish authoritarian rule as a response to crises preceding or following nuclear war. Ever since Hiroshima, the threat of nuclear destruction has been used to prop up repressive institutions, under the pretext of defending against the 'enemy'.[3] The actuality of nuclear war could easily result in the culmination of this trend. Large segments of the population could be manipulated to support a repressive regime under the necessity to defend against further threats or to obtain revenge. A limited nuclear war might kill some hundreds of thousands or tens of millions of people, surely a major tragedy. But another tragedy could also result: the establishment, possibly for decades, of repressive civilian or military rule in countries such as Italy, Australia and the US, even if they were not directly involved in the war. The possibility of grassroots mobilisation for disarmament and peace would be greatly reduced even from its present levels. For such developments the people and the peace movements of the world are largely unprepared.

#### War turns racism and dehumanization.

Marable 2. (Manning Marable, October 11, 2002, Professor of History and Political Science at Colombia University, “Global Apartheid in the Twenty-first Century”, Peacework, http://www.peaceworkmagazine.org//)

 The links between racism and war: The militarism and political intolerance displayed in the Bush administration's response to the September 11 attacks created a natural breeding ground for bigotry and racial harassment. For the Reverend Jerry Falwell, the September 11 tragedy was God's condemnation of a secularist, atheistic America. Falwell attributed the attacks to "the pagans and the abortionists and the feminists and the lesbians and of course the ACLU." After a firestorm of criticism, Reverend Falwell was forced to apologize. Less well-publicized were the hate-filled commentaries of journalist Anne Coulter, who declared after September 11 that "we should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them all to Christianity." Similar voices of intolerance were also being heard in Europe. For example, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi stated that Western civilization was clearly "superior to Islamic culture." He praised imperialism, predicting that "the West will continue to conquer peoples, just as it conquered communism." Falwell, Berlusconi, and others illustrate the direct linkage between racism and war, between imperialism and militarism. The relationship is symbiotic. In a racialized social hierarchy, you cannot pursue a policy of mass coercion, the use of the prisons as a means of warehousing the unemployed and the poor and the working poor in the United States, without constructing an ideology that justifies your actions. The same thing is true in a global context. If you have a global world order of apartheid, globalized apartheid, the haves and the have-nots, as Malcolm X put it at the end of his life, the fundamental division on the global scale, when you pursue war in the interest of maintaining that division--you must utilize the demonization; you must denigrate the cultures of the others. The globalized other, therefore, is demonized. Consequently, we cannot talk about the war against terrorism and the construction of the globalized other unless we also look at its origins in terms of racism.

### Nuke War Outweighs

#### The risk of extinction via nuclear war outweighs all – ethics demands you evaluate our disad

Seeley 86. [Robert Seeley, Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, 1986, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70]

Supporters of U. S. and Soviet nuclear policy have argued that projections of human extinction, extensive environmental damage, and so on are not conclusively established. This is true, but it does not follow, as nuclear supporters suggest, that we are thereby made morally free to choose our current suicidal policies. In moral reasoning prediction of con­sequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in decid­ing whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinc­tion of the race, for in order to *be* a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not—may not—risk. Though not conclusively estab­lished, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible under any sane moral code.

# \*\*\*NEOLIB AFF\*\*\*

## --- Neolib Good ---

### Neoliberalism Good – 1NC

#### Neoliberalism is key to value to life, it reduces poverty, and solves war and disease

Rockwell 2 Llewellyn H., President of the Mises Institute, The Free Market, “Why They Attack Capitalism”, Volume 20, Number 10, October, http://www.mises.org/freemarket\_detail.asp?control=418&sortorder-articledate

If you think about it, this hysteria is astonishing, even terrifying. The market economy has created unfathomable prosperity and, decade by decade, for centuries and centuries, miraculous feats of innovation, production, distribution, and social coordination. To the free market, we owe all material prosperity, all our leisure time, our health and longevity, our huge and growing population, nearly everything we call life itself. Capitalism and capitalism alone has rescued the human race from degrading poverty, rampant sickness, and early death. In the absence of the capitalist economy, and all its underlying institutions, the world’s population would, over time, shrink to a fraction of its current size, in a holocaust of unimaginable scale, and whatever remained of the human race would be systematically reduced to subsistence, eating only what can be hunted or gathered. And this is only to mention its economic benefits. Capitalism is also an expression of freedom. It is not so much a social system but the de facto result in a society where individual rights are respected, where businesses, families, and every form of association are permitted to flourish in the absence of coercion, theft, war, and aggression. Capitalism protects the weak against the strong, granting choice and opportunity to the masses who once had no choice but to live in a state of dependency on the politically connected and their enforcers. The high value placed on women, children, the disabled, and the aged— unknown in the ancient world—owes so much to capitalism’s productivity and distribution of power. Must we compare the record of capitalism with that of the state, which, looking at the sweep of this past century alone, has killed hundreds of millions of people in wars, famines, camps, and deliberate starvation campaigns? And the record of central planning of the type now being urged on American enterprise is perfectly abysmal.

#### Neoliberalism solves extinction and genocide.

Teune, 2, Henry, Political Science Department at the University of Pennsylvania, May, 2002 “Global Democracy”, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 581 Annals 22, Lexis

During the past three decades, social scientists and professional observers described an emerging global political economy, but without democracy. It took most of the 1990s to grasp that without democracy, globalization could not continue in a peaceful, orderly fashion. Democracy began to become the bedrock of the prosperity promised by globalization. It may well turn out to be the best invention for human survival and the betterment of everyday living. Indeed, in time, democracy in large-scale societies may be judged the most important discovery of the twentieth century since vaccines. Governments systematically killing their own peoples and nearly nonstop international wars of scale marked the first half of the twentieth century (Rummel 1996). The killing of masses of people by legitimate authorities may be the most important international fact of the first half of the twentieth century. But the most important fact of this era of globalization is that almost all governments, save one or two, stopped doing that around the century's end, following the spread of democracy.

### Neoliberalism Good - Environment

#### Neoliberalism solves the environment

Bast et al 94 (Joseph, pres Heartland Institute, Peter Hill, econ@Wheaton College, Richard Rue, EnergyWise CEO, Eco-Sanity, http://www.heartland.org/bin/media/publicpdf/23673b.pdf, accessed: 1 July 2011, JT)

The superior economic and environmental performance of capitalism is probably not what many environmentally conscious readers expected. The images that have stayed with us from grade school or college classes are of the industrial revolution’s smoky factories, sweatshops, violent strikes, child labor, and colonialism. A system that would allow such atrocities, we feel almost instinctively, cannot be trusted to protect the rights of workers or a fragile environment. Even a professional writer on economics, the aforementioned Frances Cairncross, writes: For it is only government that can decide how much society should value the environment, and how that value should be inserted into economic transactions. The market, that mechanism that so marvelously directs human activity to supply human needs, often has no way of putting a proper price on environmental resources, It is time to update our attitudes toward capitalism, and particularly our understanding of how it puts “a proper price on environmental resources.” Capitalism is based on a system of markets and private property rights. When rights are correctly defined and enforced, capitalism will protect the environment for four reasons: ti It creates incentives to do the right things; ti It generates and distributes needed information; ti It enables people to trade things or rights in order to solve problems that otherwise can’t be solved; and r/ It enables property rights to evolve over time. The free-enterprise system creates wealth, rewards efficiency, and \_ protects the environment better than any other system yet devised by man. The tireless campaign against this system by some quarters of the environmental movement is wrong-headed and counterproductive.

#### Environment collapse leads to extinction.

Diner ‘94—Major David, Judge Advocate General’s Corps, United States Army, Military Law Review, Winter, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." n79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, n80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

### Neoliberalism Good – Env - Ext

#### Neoliberalism solves environmental collapse.

Christmann and Taylor 1 American businessman and the head of a privately held multinational company, Professor Christmann specializes in research of the global economy (Petra and Glen, Globalization and the environment: Determinants of firm self-regulation in China. Journal of International business studies, 32(3), 439-458, ABI/INFORM) http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=277452]

In contrast, globalization proponents contend that lower barriers to trade and foreign investment encourage firms to transfer environmental technologies and managemement systems from countries with stricter environmental standards to developing countries, which lack access to environmental technologies and capabilities (Drezner, 2000). Governmental failure to protect the environment, it is suggested in this line of argument, might also be ameliorated through self-regulation of environmental performance by firms in developing countries. Self-regulation refers to a firm’s adoption of environmental performance standards or environmental management systems (EMS) beyond the requirements of governmental regulations. Globalization can increase self-regulation pressures in several ways. First, globalization increases MNEs’ investment in developing countries where their subsidiaries can be expected to self-regulate their environmental performance more than domestic firms do. MNEs can transfer the more advanced environmental technologies and management systems developed in response to more stringent regulations in developed countries to their subsidiaries. MNEs also face pressures from interest groups to improve their worldwide environmental performance. Second, globalization might contribute to environmental performance as a supplier-selection criterion, which also pressures domestic firms in developing countries to self-regulate environmental performance…Globalization does not necessarily have negative effects on the environment in developing countries to the extend suggested by the pollution-haven and industrial-flight hypotheses. Our study suggests that globalization increases institutional and consumer pressures on firms to surpass local requirements, even when they may be tempted by lax regulations and enforcement in countries offering themselves as pollution havens (Hoffman, 1999; Rugman and Verbeke, 1998).

#### Neoliberalism solves the environment – policies fail.

Chen, 2K, Jim, Professor of Law University of Minnesota Law School, November/December, 2000 Fordham International Law Journal, PAX MERCATORIA: GLOBALIZATION AS A SECOND CHANCE AT "PEACE FOR OUR TIME, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217, Lexis

"Across-the-board globalism" is the best way of coordinating free trade and environmental protection as "complementary" policies. Admittedly, simultaneously advocating free trade and environmental integrity typically earns a deluxe suite at the "very small hotel" that will be hosting the next "global convention of rabid free trade environmentalists." Yet this jarring juxtaposition is unavoidable in a world of falling frontiers. The creation of "transboundary communities" causes "environmental interconnection" and in turn the "inevitable" abandonment of "localism in all spheres." Strictly localist solutions will not suffice; "haphazard local encouragement" cannot replace coordinated responses to "diffuse, cross-jurisdictional" problems such as mobile source emissions and nonpoint-source runoff.

### Neoliberalism Good – Famine / Food Prices

#### Only neoliberalism can respond fast enough to prevent famines

Lockitch 9 (Keith, fellow@ Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights, Energy & Environment, 20(5), http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/25905.pdf, accessed: 1 July 2011, JT)

Despite drought conditions severe enough to rate comparison with the 1930s Dust Bowl, Americans saw only minor economic losses and fluctuations in food prices. It is telling that the most that Weart could find to say was that the Midwest droughts showed up on “the front pages of newspapers and on television news programs.” Observe that they specifically did not “show up” at all on people’s waistlines and barely registered on their pocketbooks. Such resilience is testament to the adaptive flexibility of an industrialized economy and a (relatively) free market—to industrial capitalism’s ability to respond quickly when normal conditions are disrupted. While the other regions mentioned suffered a total failure of their food production and distribution systems, the United States donated surplus food supplies to Africa, sold food grains to India, and arranged a massive sale of wheat to the Soviet Union in late 1972. Contrast this to the helplessness before nature of India’s peasant farmers or the Sahel’s nomadic tribes. Why were they unable to benefit from the agricultural practices that empowered the American farmers—the irrigation of fields, the use of fertilizers and pesticides, and the application of sophisticated methods of agricultural management? What role did their primitive cultural traditions and their countries’ oppressive political systems play in suppressing the industrial development and free market mechanisms that made such advances possible? And in the case of the Soviet Union, should there really be any surprise that its state-owned collective farms were unable to cope with unfavorable weather conditions? Even under good conditions— and with the advantage of some of the most fertile agricultural land in the world—the central planners of the Soviet agricultural ministry were rarely able to coerce adequate food production.

#### Food shortages lead to World War III

Calvin 98. (William, theoretical neurophysiologist @ U Washington, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop”, Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 281, No. 1, January, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War -- but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### Neoliberalism Good - Poverty

#### Neoliberalism solves global poverty.

Bandow 1 senior fellow at the CATO Institute [Doug Bandow, , March 25th, 2001 Globalization Serves the World's Poor, http://www.cato.org/dailys/04-25-01.html]

Indeed, the problems of globalization must always be "compared to what?" Yes, factories pay low wages in Third World countries. But workers in them have neither the education nor the skills to be paid at First World levels. Their alternative is not a Western university education or Silicon Valley computer job, but an even lower-paying job with a local firm or unemployment. The choice is clear: according to Edward Graham of the Institute of International Economics, in poor countries, American multinationals pay foreign citizens an average of 8.5 times the per capita GDP. Overall, the process of globalization has been good for the poor. During the 1980s, advanced industrialized countries grew faster than developing states. In the 1990s, as globalization accelerated, poor nations grew at 3.6 percent annually, twice that of their richer neighbors. Despite the illusion of left-wing activists that money falls from the sky, poverty has been the normal condition of humankind throughout most of history. As even Marx acknowledged, capitalism is what eliminated the overwhelming poverty of the pre- industrial world. That remains the case today. Resource endowment, population level and density, foreign aid transfers, past colonial status none of these correlate with economic wealth. Only economic openness does. The latest volume of the Economic Freedom in the World Report, published by the Cato Institute and think tanks in 50 other countries, finds that economic liberty strongly correlates with economic achievement. Policies that open economies strongly correlate with economic growth. By pulling countries into the international marketplace, globalization encourages market reforms. With them comes increased wealth.

#### Statistics prove that neoliberalism dramatically decreases poverty

Chen, 2K, Jim, Professor of Law University of Minnesota Law School, November/December, 2k

Fordham International Law Journal, PAX MERCATORIA: GLOBALIZATION AS A SECOND CHANCE AT "PEACE FOR OUR TIME, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217, Lexis

The antiglobalization movement has made some extraordinary claims. Let us transplant a precept of natural science into this social realm: extraordinary claims demand extraordinary proof. From Seattle to Prague, protesters have argued that the organs of international economic law conspire with multinational corporations to sap national and local governments of legitimate power, to destabilize global security, and to poison workplaces as well as ecosystems. That case has not met even the most generous standard of proof. The antiglobalization movement has failed to refute the following: Dramatic improvements in welfare at every wealth and income level. Since 1820 global wealth has expanded tenfold, thanks largely to technological advances and the erosion of barriers to trade. The world economic order, simply put, is lifting people out of poverty. According to the World Bank, the percentage of the world's population living in extreme poverty fell from 28.3 to 23.4% between 1987 and 1998. n182 (The World Bank defines extreme and absolute poverty according to "reference lines set at $ 1 and $ 2 per day" in 1993 terms, adjusted for "the relative purchasing power of currencies across countries.") A more optimistic study has concluded that "the share of the world's population earning less than US$ 2 per day shrank by more than half" between 1980 and 1990, "from 34 to 16.6 percent." In concrete terms, "economic growth associated with globalization" over the course of that decade helped lift 1.4 billion people out of absolute poverty. Whatever its precise magnitude, this improvement in global welfare has taken place because of, not in spite of, flourishing world trade.

### Neoliberalism Good - War

#### Neoliberalism checks war through interdependence and democracy

Griswold 6 director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute [Daniel T. Griswold, , 2006 CATO Institute, Peace on earth? Try free trade among men, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)]

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

## --- Capitalism Impact Turns ---

### **Sustainability – 1NC**

#### **Capitalism is sustainable – market reforms solve their warrants for collapse**

Rogoff Professor of Economics at Harvard University 2011 Kenneth Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable Project Syndicate http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable-

In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt.

Will capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

### Sustainability - Ext

#### Free markets are sustainable – no spill over of financial crises

Sorrentino political consultant 2012 Nick Free Market Capitalism is Sustainable Against Crony Capitalism 6/13 http://www.againstcronycapitalism.org/2012/06/free-market-capitalism-is-sustainable/

Not only are free markets natural, they are sustainable and resilient. It is central planning which is inherently unstable.

If the world economy is made of millions or billions of little exchanges each part of a massive whole, but also limited because the exchange is one of a sea of exchanges, there is a fundamental stability to the system. If things go crazy in one part of the market for whatever reason (though a market “going crazy” is a matter of perspective) the possibility of contagion is limited. Because there is no one central hub (a central bank, a government, etc.) the likelihood of widespread “craziness” is mitigated.

#### Capitalism is key to sustainability

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

I make no apologies for believing in capitalism. I believe that the opportunity to generate and retain one's own wealth is a driving force for not only improving our environment, but also for individual and societal advancements. I believe that when businesses that are respectful of the environment and advancing of the human condition are profitable, we all benefit.

To me, that is the very essence of 'sustainability' -- creating and building that virtuous cycle so that the net gains outweigh the net costs of doing business.

#### No sustained movements to transform capitalism

Ghosh professor of economics at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 2012 Jayati “The Emerging Left in the 'Emerging' World” Economic & Political Weekly 6/16 page lexis

But even as resistance to global capitalism builds up in both the South and the North, it tends to be accompanied by gloomy perceptions that grand socialist visions of the future are no longer possible. Indeed, much of the popular protest that is evident today in various places is still essentially about "resistance" rather than "transformation", and involves rearguard action to stem the tide of brutal fiscal austerity measures that deny the social and economic rights of citizens within the existing economic system, rather than conceiving and putting in place alternative systems. A basic lack of confidence in anything other than capitalism as a way of organising economic life still permeates popular protests in Europe and the United States, such that the purpose of the left is seen to be to somehow exert a restraining influence on the worst excesses of current capitalism - the left as a civilising and moderating force, not so much a transformative (much less revolutionary) force.

### Capitalism Good – Internal Link

#### Capitalism requires neoliberalism as a political idelogy

Levidow 2 (Les, U of Sussex, “Terrorising Dissent: the Neoliberal 'Anti-terrorist' Strategy”, http://www.commoner.org.uk/02-6groundzero.htm#uno)

How does political protest become terrorism? Answer: whenever governments say that it is. They increasingly do so because capitalism has no alternative to neoliberal globalization and new enclosures. This agenda can be imposed only by terrorizing dissent -- in the name of protecting the public from terrorism, of course. In this way, 'counter-terrorism' is redefining or even replacing politics. As this article argues, effective resistance becomes inseparable from a struggle against new enclosures and for new commons.

### Capitalism Good - War

#### Only economic centralization 🡺 collapse and war

Sorrentino political consultant 2012 Nick Free Market Capitalism is Sustainable Against Crony Capitalism 6/13 http://www.againstcronycapitalism.org/2012/06/free-market-capitalism-is-sustainable/

Prices find their own level. Usually the biggest problems in the economy happen when this tendency of prices is restricted in some way, usually for political purposes. When things collapse, as they always do when prices are restricted, at some point needless damage is wreaked in the lives of economic participants and upon the Earth. One only need look at China to see what economic planning does to the planet.

Yes the fact that many of China’s rivers are ribbons of chemicals and waste is because of the huge run up in development they have seen over the last 30 years. But it is because this development was planned to a large extent by Beijing and because there is no real system of property rights in China that piles of noxious externalities find their way into the South China Sea and into the lungs of Chinese children. It is because the planners control the levers that China is building dozens of coal fired power plants every year.

Central planning is a destroyer. It is from central planning that we get wars, and things like Chernobyl.

#### Capitalism is key to peace – markets decrease the potential for war

Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11/15/2005 Doug, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets.

The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism.

But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets.

An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems.

Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq.

But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states.

Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor.

The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.

Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

#### Capitalism is key for peace – business prevents conflict

Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11/15/2005

Doug, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war.

Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

#### Imperial wars pre-date capitalism by centuries, war is illogical under capitalism because it destroys wealth

MacKenzie 2003 graduate student in economics at George Mason University Does Capitalism Require War? Monday, April 07, 2003 http://www.mises.org/fullstory.asp?control=1201

Perhaps the oddest aspect of these various, but similar, claims is that their proponents appeal so often to historical examples. They often claim that history shows how capitalism is imperialistic and warlike or at least benefits from war. Capitalism supposedly needs a boost from some war spending from time to time, and history shows this. Robert Higgs demonstrated that the wartime prosperity during the Second World War was illusory[i]. This should come to no surprise to those who lived through the deprivations of wartime rationing. We do not need wars for prosperity, but does capitalism breed war and imperialism anyway? History is rife with examples of imperialism. The Romans, Alexander, and many others of the ancient world waged imperialistic wars. The Incan Empire and the empire of Ancient China stand as examples of the universal character of imperialism. Who could possibly claim that imperialism grew out of the prosperity of these ancient civilizations? Imperialism precedes modern industrial capitalism by many centuries. Uneven wealth distribution or underconsumption under capitalism obviously did not cause these instances of imperialism. Of course, this fact does not prove that modern capitalism lacks its own imperialistic tendencies. The notion that income gets underspent or maldistributed lies at the heart of most claims that capitalism either needs or produces imperialistic wars. As J.B. Say argued, supply creates its own demand through payments to factors of production. Demand Side economists Hobson and Keynes argued that there would be too little consumption and too little investment for continuous full employment. We save too much to have peace and prosperity. The difficulty we face is not in oversaving, but in underestimating the workings of markets and the desires of consumers. Doomsayers have been downplaying consumer demand for ages. As demand side economist J.K. Galbraith claimed, we live in an affluent society, where most private demands have been met. Of course, Hobson made the same claim much earlier. Earlier and stranger still, mercantilists claimed that 'wasteful acts' such as tea drinking, gathering at alehouses, taking snuff, and the wearing of ribbons were unnecessary luxuries that detracted from productive endeavors. The prognostications of esteemed opponents of capitalism have consistently failed to predict consumer demand. Today, consumers consume at levels that few long ago could have imagined possible. There is no reason to doubt that consumers will continue to press for ever higher levels of consumption. Though it is only a movie, Brewster's Millions illustrates how creative people can be at spending money. People who do actually inherit, win, or earn large sums of money have little trouble spending it. Indeed, wealthy individuals usually have more trouble holding on to their fortunes than in finding ways to spend them. We are never going to run out of ways to spend money. Many of the complaints about capitalism center on how people save too much. One should remember that there really is no such thing as saving. Consumers defer consumption to the future only. As economist Eugen BÃ¶hm-Bawerk demonstrated, people save according to time preference. Savings diverts resources into capital formation. This increases future production. Interest enhanced savings then can purchase these goods as some consumers cease to defer their consumption. Keynes' claim that animal spirits drive investment has no rational basis. Consumer preferences are the basis for investment. Investors forecast future consumer demand. Interest rates convey knowledge of these demands. The intertemporal coordination of production through capital markets and interest rates is not a simple matter. But Keynes' marginal propensities to save and Hobson's concentration of wealth arguments fail to account for the real determinants of production through time. Say's Law of Markets holds precisely because people always want a better life for themselves and those close to them. Falling interest rates deter saving and increase investment. Rising interest rates induce saving and deter investment. This simple logic of supply and demand derives from a quite basic notion of self interest. Keynes denied that the world worked this way. Instead, he claimed that bond holders hoard money outside of the banking system, investment periodically collapses from 'the dark forces of time and uncertainty, and consumers save income in a mechanical fashion according to marginal propensities to save. None of these propositions hold up to scrutiny, either deductive or empirical. Speculators do not hoard cash outside of banks. To do this means a loss of interest on assets. People do move assets from one part of the financial system to another. This does not cause deficient aggregate demand. Most money exists in the banking system, and is always available for lending. In fact, the advent of e-banking makes such a practice even less sensible. Why hoard cash when you can move money around with your computer? It is common knowledge that people save for homes, education, and other expensive items, not because they have some innate urge to squirrel some portion of their income away. This renders half of the market for credit rational. Investors do in fact calculate rates of return on investment. This is not a simple matter. Investment entails some speculation. Long term investment projects entail some uncertainty, but investors who want to actually reap profits will estimate the returns on investment using the best available data. Keynes feared that the dark forces of time and uncertainty could scare investors. This possibility, he thought, called for government intervention. However, government intervention (especially warfare) generally serves to increase uncertainty. Private markets have enough uncertainties without throwing politics into the fray. The vagaries of political intervention serve only to darken an already uncertain future. Capital markets are best left to capitalists. Nor is capital not extracted surplus value. It comes not from exploitation. It is simply a matter of people valuing their future wellbeing. Capitalists will hire workers up to the point where the discounted marginal product of their labor equals the wage rate. To do otherwise would mean a loss of potential profit. Since workers earn the marginal product of labor and capital derives from deferred consumption, Marxist arguments about reserve armies of the unemployed and surplus extraction fail. It is quite odd to worry about capitalists oversaving when many complain about how the savings rate in the U.S. is too low. Why does the U.S., as the world's 'greatest capitalist/imperialist power', attract so much foreign investment? Many Americans worry about America's international accounts. Fears about foreigners buying up America are unfounded, but not because this does not happen. America does have a relatively low national savings rate. It does attract much foreign investment, precisely because it has relatively secure property rights. Indeed, much of the third world suffers from too little investment. The claims of Marxists, and Hobson, directly contradict the historical record. Sound theory tells us that it should. The Marxist claim that capitalists must find investments overseas fails miserably. Larry Kudlow has put his own spin on the false connection between capitalism and war. We need the War as shock therapy to get the economy on its feet. Kudlow also endorses massive airline subsidies as a means of restoring economic prosperity. Kudlow and Krugman both endorse the alleged destructive creation of warfare and terrorism. Kudlow has rechristened the Broken Window fallacy the Broken Window principle. Kudlow claims that may lose money and wealth in one way, but we gain it back many time over when the rebuilding is done. Kudlow and Krugman have quite an affinity for deficits. Krugman sees debt as a sponge to absorb excess saving. Kudlow see debt as a short term nuisance that we can dispel by maximizing growth. One would think that such famous economists would realize that competition does work to achieve the goal of optimum growth based on time preference, but this is not the case. While these economists have expressed their belief in writing, they could do more. If the destruction of assets leads to increased prosperity, then they should teach this principle by example. Kudlow and Krugman could, for instance, help build the economy by demolishing their own private homes. This would have the immediate effect of stimulating demand for demolition experts, and the longer term affect of stimulating the demand for construction workers. They can create additional wealth by financing the reconstruction of their homes through debt. By borrowing funds, they draw idle resources into use and stimulate financial activity. Of course, they would both initially lose wealth in one way. But if their thinking is sound, they will gain it back many times over as they rebuild. The truth is that their beliefs are fallacious. Bastiat demonstrated the absurdity of destructive creation in his original explanation of the opportunity costs from repairing broken windows. Kudlow is quite clear about his intentions. He wants to grow the economy to finance the war. As Kudlow told some students, "The trick here is to grow the economy and let the economic growth raise the revenue for the war effort"[ii]. Kudlow also praises the Reagan Administration for growing the economy to fund national defense. Here Kudlow's attempts to give economic advice cease completely. His argument here is not that capitalism needs a shot in the arm. It is that resources should be redirected towards ends that he sees fit. Kudlow is a war hawk who, obviously, cannot fund this or any war personally. He instead favors using the state to tax others to fund what he wants, but cannot afford. He seems to think that his values matter more than any other's. Why should anyone else agree with this? Kudlow tarnishes the image of laissez faire economics by parading his faulty reasoning and his claims that his wants should reign supreme as a pro-market stance. Unfortunately, it is sometimes necessary to defend capitalism from alleged advocates of liberty, who employ false dogmas in pursuit of their own militaristic desires. Capitalism neither requires nor promotes imperialist expansion. Capitalism did not create imperialism or warfare. Warlike societies predate societies with secure private property. The idea that inequity or underspending give rise to militarism lacks any rational basis. Imperialistic tendencies exist due to ethnic and nationalistic bigotries, and the want for power. Prosperity depends upon our ability to prevent destructive acts. The dogma of destructive creation fails as a silver lining to the cloud of warfare. Destructive acts entail real costs that diminish available opportunities. The idea that we need to find work for idle hands in capitalism at best leads to a kind of Sisyphus economy where unproductive industries garner subsidies from productive people. At worst, it serves as a supporting argument for war. The more recent versions of the false charges against capitalism do nothing to invalidate two simple facts. Capitalism generates prosperity by creating new products. War inflicts poverty by destroying existing wealth. There is no sound reason to think otherwise.

### Capitalism Good – Poverty

#### Capitalism decreases poverty – we’ll be the only ones with uniqueness because poverty is rapidly decreasing in the world of globalization

Norberg, author of In Defense of Capitalism, 2003

Johan, September 15, http://www.cato.org/special/symposium/debate.html

This is the revolution that is transforming the world today. As the United Nations Development Programme has observed, in the last 50 years global poverty has declined more quickly than in the previous 500. If we allow globalization to continue, this trend will continue as well. The World Bank has calculated that a substantial free trade agreement would add as much as $520 billion to global incomes by 2015, lifting 144 million people out of poverty.

### Capitalism Good – Quality of Life

#### Capitalism improves living conditions

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

Individual wealth creation -- the ability to earn and retain capital -- is a tremendous force for change and demonstrates the concept of a virtuous cycle through the overlap between these three (human, ecological and economic) sets of assets. Critics are all too eager to point out that successful capitalism changes the way the environment looks; as anyone who has seen a factory and the environs nearby can attest.

But they may be too quick to overlook the many benefits that are associated with that same operation, including increasing quality of homes that people live in, the schools that can afford to pay qualified teachers, the influx of skilled labor opportunities to support the operation -- and the community -- and the medical professionals that serve to improve the health and well being of everyone.

Another benefit of a wealth-generating population is the link between individual and public gain. Companies that are profitable pay more in taxes, as do individuals. That allows for improvements to the infrastructure and the general living conditions of everyone in the community. Schools, roads, transportation linkage to other towns and cities are all tremendous benefits to the community at large.

#### Capitalism is key to freedom

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

There is another major benefit of capitalism -- freedom. It is important to note that capitalism is an economic, not a political model. However, the ability to earn and retain one's earnings is hugely empowering for anyone seeking a better situation in life. Immigrants who could afford even the cheapest passage came to America in droves on ships to escape religious, political and/or economic oppression. The phrase 'the land of opportunity' describes the optimism that spurred them across the open seas to an unknown future.

Today the ability to earn and retain the financial fruits of one's own labors continues to be a driving force that changes lives and societies. It may be a factor in the low marriage and high divorce rates in the United States, as women no longer rely on a 'breadwinner' they can stay independent longer, and are not tied economically to stay in oppressive marriages. As those fiscal pressures ease, societal norms change. While it is true that we still have a long way to go to achieve economic parity, the roles of gender in the workplace and our society have transformed radically since the days of World War 2, when the men went off to fight and women first entered the workforce in massive numbers.

## --- EDUCATION CP ---

### Repeal NCLB CP – 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should repeal Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and reallocate the funds toward non-charter, primary and secondary education.

#### NCLB is based upon neoliberal ideals to transform the education sector into a privatized and profitable business.

Hursh 8 [David Hursh is an Associate Professor in the Warner School of Education at the University of Rochester and author., “Neoliberalism and the control of teachers, students, and learning: The rise of

standards, standardization and accountability in the United States,” May/June 2008, p.1, <http://www.rougeforum.org/CSSE2008/HurshCSSE2008.pdf>,]

An exemplar of Neoliberal thinking is Thomas Friedman (of the world is flat fame), who in an earlier book, The Lexus and the Olive Tree (1999), argues that globalization requires free market capitalism The driving force behind globalization is free market capitalism--- the more you let market forces rule and the more you open up your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient your economy will be. Globalization means the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every corner of the world. Therefore, globalization also has its own set of economic rules--- rules that revolve around opening, deregulating and privatizing your economy, in order to make it more competitive and attractive to foreign investment. (p. 9) Such ideas are also reflected in President Bush’s public pronouncements, where he has used globalization to defend NCLB, an act that aims to have public schools compete for students in an educational market, in which students and schools are evaluated by scores on standardized tests, and if the schools are found to be failing (and the way in which Adequate Yearly Progress is determined ensures that initially many and eventually most schools are found to be failing) face having their administration and other services, such as tutoring, privatized, and eventually turned into a publicly funded private schools.

#### Repealing No Child Left Behind and increasing federal funds to public education pushes out the private sector.

Saltman 07 (Kenneth J., professor of Social and Cultural Foundations in Education at DePaul University, “Schooling in Disaster Capitalism: How the Political Right Is Using Disaster to Privatize Public Schooling”, Teacher Education Quarterly, Volume 34 (2), Pg 134-135, Spring 2007)

A study of the Great Lakes region of the U.S. by educational policy researchers found that 85% - 95% of schools in that region would be declared “failed” by NCLB AYP measures by 2014.14 These implications are national. Under NCLB, “The entire country faces tremendous failure rates, even under a conservative estimate with several forgiving assumptions.” 15 Under NCLB, in order for Illinois, for example, to get much needed federal Title I funds, the school must demonstrate “adequate yearly progress,” AYP. Each year Illinois has to get higher and higher standardized test scores in reading and math to make AYP. Illinois schools, and specifically Illinois schools already receiving the least funding and already serving the poorest students, are being threatened with: (1) losing federal funds; (2) having to use scarce resources for under-regulated and often unproven (SESs) supplemental educational services (private tutoring) such as Newton, a spin-off company of the much criticized for profit Edison Schools; or (3) being punished, reorganized, or closed and reopened as a “choice” school (these include for-profit or non profit charter schools that do not have the same level of public oversight and accountability, that often do not have teachers unions, and that often have to struggle for philanthropic grants to operate). Many defenders of public education view remediation options 2 and 3 under NCLB as having been designed to undermine those public schools that have been underserved in the first place in order to justify privatization schemes. 16 Public schools need help, investment, and public commitment. NCLB is setting up for failure not just Illinois public schools but public schools nationally by raising test-oriented thresholds without raising investment and commitment. NCLB itself appears to be a system designed to result in the declaration of wide-scale failure of public schooling to justify privatization. 17 Dedicated administrators, teachers, students, and schools are not receiving much-needed resources along with public investment in public services and employment in the communities where those schools are situated. What they are getting instead are threats. The theoretically and empirically dubious underlying assumption of NCLB is that threats and pressure force teachers to teach what they ought to teach, force students to learn what they ought to learn. In terms of conventional measures of student achievement, Sharon Nichols, Gene Glass, and David Berliner found in their empirical study, High-Stakes Testing and Student Achievement: Problems for the No Child Left Behind Act, that “there is no convincing evidence that the pressure associated with high-stakes testing leads to any important benefits for students’ achievement . . . [the authors] call for a moratorium on policies that force the public education system to rely on high-stakes testing.” 18 These authors find that highstakes testing regimes do not achieve what they are designed to achieve. However, to think beyond efficacy to the underlying assumptions about “achievement” it is necessary to raise theoretical concerns. Theoretically, at the very least, the enforcement-oriented assumptions of NCLB fail to consider the limitations of defining “achievement” through high-stakes tests, fail to question what knowledge and whose knowledge constitute legitimate or official curricula that students are expected to master, fail to interrogate the problematic assumptions of learning modeled on digestion or commodity acquisition (as opposed to dialogic, constructivist, or other approaches to learning), and such compartmentalized versions of knowledge and learning fail to comprehend how they relate to the broader social and political realities informing knowledge-making both in schools and in society generally.

### Solvency - Ext

#### Neoliberalism was created to produce inequalities and education is the key internal link to solving.

Hursh and Martina 3 [David Hursh is an Associate Professor in the Warner School of Education at the University of Rochester and author. He and his colleague Camille Martina have conducted an in depth analysis of the politics of testing in New York State., Camille Martina is a doctoral student at the Warner School of Education at University of Rochester, English teacher in the Rochester City School District, and, along with David Hursh, active in the Coalition for Common Sense in Education. One focus of her doctoral research is the politics of high-stakes testing, of which her co-authored paper, Resisting the Tyranny of Tests: The Battle for New York, is one outcome. “Neoliberalism and schooling in the U.S.” October 2003, http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=12, Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies v.1 n.2.]

In order to restore higher rates of profit, the U.S. and other developed countries implemented monetarist and neo-liberal policies (Gill, 2003, p. 7) that would support corporations over workers. In the US monetarist policies restored the power of capital by inducing a recession to deflate wage demands, escalate the scarcity of jobs and reverse the growth of social spending. Such policies were instituted with the intent of reducing the living standards of all but wealthy Americans. In 1979 Paul Volcker, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, provided the following rationale for the recession: “The standard of living of the average American has to decline. I don’t think you can escape that” (Parenti, 1999, p. 119). Such monetarist policies were soon linked with neo-liberal policies that emphasize "the deregulation of the economy, trade liberalization, the dismantling of the public sector [such as education, health, and social welfare], and the predominance of the financial sector of the economy over production and commerce" (Vilas, 1996). In particular, the consequences for education are similar to that for all public goods and services. Tabb (2002) writes that neo-liberalism stresses the privatization of the public provision of goods and services—moving their provision from the public sector to the private—along with deregulating how private producers can behave, giving greater scope to the single-minded pursuit of profit and showing significantly less regard for the need to limit social costs or for redistribution based on nonmarket criteria. The aim of neoliberalism is to put into question all collective structures capable of obstructing the logic of the pure market. (p. 7) Efforts to privatize public services, then, are occurring world wide, partly in response to the U.S. dominated World Bank and International Monetary Fund requirement that national governments develop economic policies that emphasize economic growth and property rights over social welfare and personal rights. In some countries, such a Chile, social security, health care, higher education and, to some extent, elementary and secondary education have been highly privatized (Collins and Lear, 1995). Such global changes led Stephen Gill to conclude that “[t]he social settlements and forms of state created after World War II have been transformed and in some respects destroyed” (Gill, 2003, p. 9). Efforts to dismantle the public sector have significant implications for educational policy. While some policy makers may desire to reduce funding for education, education remains significant as a means of developing productive workers and legitimizing current inequalities. As Roger Dale (Fall, 2000) notes, government policies need to support continued economic expansion while “providing a basis for legitimation of the system as a whole” (437).

#### Neoliberalization of education is a result of lacking federal investment and causes racism.

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

In the United States, the neoliberal restructuring of education is deeply racialized. It is centered particularly on urban African American, Latino, and other communities of color, where public schools, subject to being closed or privatized, are driven by a minimalist curriculum of preparing for standardized tests. The cultural politics of race is also central to constructing consent for this agenda. As Stephen Haymes argues, the “concepts ‘public’ and ‘private’ are racialized metaphors. Private is equated with being ‘good’ and ‘white’ and public with being ‘bad’ and ‘Black.’”9 Disinvesting in public schools, closing them, and opening privately operated charter schools in African-American and Latino communities is facilitated by a racist discourse that pathologizes these communities and their public institutions. But “failing” schools are the product of a legacy of educational, economic, and social inequities experienced by African Americans, Latinos/as, and Native Americans.10 Schools serving these communities continue to face deeply inequitable opportunities to learn, including unequal funding, curriculum, educational resources, facilities, and teacher experience. High stakes accountability has often compounded these inequities by narrowing the curriculum to test preparation—producing an exodus of some of the strongest teachers from schools in low-income communities of color.11

#### Neoliberalism is repressing education systems which are the *only* mechanisms to break away from the turbo capitalism, racism and jingoism.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>)

What is crucial to grasp at the current historical moment is that the fate of democracy is inextricably linked to a profound crisis of contemporary knowledge, characterized by its increasing commodification, fragmentation, privatization and a turn toward racist and jingoistic conceits. As knowledge becomes abstracted from the rigors of civic culture and is reduced to questions of style, ritual and image, it undermines the political, ethical and governing conditions for individuals to construct those viable public spheres necessary for debate, collective action and solving urgent social problems. As public spheres are privatized, commodified and turned over to the crushing forces of turbo capitalism, the opportunities for openness, inclusiveness and dialogue that nurture the very idea and possibility of a discourse about democracy cease to exist. The lesson to be learned in this instance is that political agency involves learning how to deliberate, make judgments and exercise choices, particularly as the latter are brought to bear on critical activities that offer the possibility of change. Civic education as it is experienced and produced throughout an ever-diminishing number of institutions provides individuals with opportunities to see themselves as capable of doing more than the existing configurations of power of any given society would wish to admit. And it is precisely this notion of civic agency and critical education that has been under aggressive assault within the new and harsh corporate order of casino capitalism.

#### Education is inextricably linked to savage capitalism and authoritarian ideals.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism)

Indeed, many institutions that provide formal education in the United States have become co-conspirators with a savage casino capitalism, whose strength lies in producing, circulating and legitimating market values that promote the narrow world of commodity worship, celebrity culture, bare-knuckle competition, a retreat from social responsibility and a war-of-all-against-all mentality that destroys any viable notion of community, the common good and the interrelated notions of political, social and economic rights. University presidents now make huge salaries sitting on corporate boards, while faculty sell their knowledge to the highest corporate bidder and, in doing so, turn universities into legitimation centers for casino capitalism.(34) Of course, such academics also move from the boardrooms of major corporations to talk shows and op-ed pages of major newspapers, offering commentary in journals and other modes of print and screen culture. They are the new traveling intellectuals of casino capitalism, doing everything they can to make the ruthless workings of power invisible, to shift the blame for society's failures onto the very people who are its victims and to expand the institutions and culture of anti-intellectualism and distraction into every aspect of American life. Across all levels, politics in the United States now suffers from an education deficit that enables a pedagogy of distraction to dictate with little accountability how crucial social problems and issues are named, discussed and acted upon. The conservative re-education machine appears shameless in its production of lies that include insane assertions such as: Obama's health care legislation would create death panels; liberals are waging a war on Christmas; Obama is a socialist trying to nationalize industries; the founding fathers tried to end slavery; and Obama is a Muslim sympathizer and not a US citizen. Other misrepresentations and distortions include: the denial of global warming; the government cannot create jobs; cuts in wages and benefits create jobs; Obama has created massive deficits; Obama wants to raise the taxes of working- and middle-class people; Obama is constantly "apologizing" for America; and the assertion that Darwinian evolution is a myth.(35) Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney continues spinning this spider web of lies unapologetically, even when members of his own party point out the inconsistencies in his claims. For instance, he has claimed that, "Obamacare increases the deficit,"(36) argued that Obama has "increased the national debt more than all other presidents combined" and insisted that Obama has lied about "his record on gay rights." He has falsely claimed that, "Obama promised unemployment below eight percent,"(37) dodged the truth regarding "his position on climate change" and blatantly misrepresented the truth in stating that, "he pays a 50% tax rate."(38) Diane Ravitch has recently pointed out that in making a case for vouchers, Romney has made false claims about the success of the DC voucher program.(39) The politics of distraction should not be reduced merely to a rhetorical ploy used by the wealthy and influential to promote their own interests and power. It is a form of market-driven politics in which educational force of the broader culture is used to create ideologies, policies, individuals and social agents who lack the knowledge, critical skills and discriminatory judgments to question the rule of casino capitalism and the values, social practices and power formations it legitimates. Politics and education have always mutually informed each other as pedagogical sites proliferate and circulate throughout the cultural landscape.(40) But today, distraction is the primary element being used to suppress democratically purposeful education by pushing critical thought to the margins of society. As a register of power, distraction becomes central to a pedagogical landscape inhabited by rich conservative foundations, an army of well-funded anti-public intellectuals from both major parties, a growing number of amply funded conservative campus organizations, increasing numbers of academics who hock their services to corporations and the military-industrial complex, and others who promote the ideology of casino capitalism and the corporate right's agenda. Academics who make a claim to producing knowledge and truth in the public interest are increasingly being replaced by academics for hire who move effortlessly among industry, government and academia. Extreme power is now showcased through the mechanisms of ever-proliferating cultural/educational apparatuses and the anti-public intellectuals who support them and are in turn rewarded by the elites who finance such apparatuses. The war at home is made visible in the show of force aimed at civilian populations, including students, workers, and others considered disposable or a threat to the new authoritarianism. Its most powerful allies appear to be the intellectuals, institutions, cultural apparatuses and new media technologies that constitute the sites of public pedagogy, which produce the formative culture necessary for authoritarianism to thrive.

#### The market for private education encourages racism and classism and results in violence.

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

Across African-American communities, the mayoral-appointed school board has closed schools on the grounds of low achievement. Others, particularly in gentrifying Latino/a communities, have been closed for low enrollment, despite evidence to the contrary. The board has replaced neighborhood schools with charter schools or selective enrollment schools that most neighborhood children are unable to attend. School closings have resulted in increased mobility, spikes in violence, and neighborhood instability as children are transferred to schools out of their neighborhoods.24 Moreover, Renaissance 2010 has not increased educational opportunities for most students, with 80 percent of displaced students attending schools no better than the ones that were closed.25

### CP 1st

#### The CP is a prerequisite to the case-education unlocks all other social spheres.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>)

While a change in consciousness does not guarantee a change in either one's politics or society, it is a crucial precondition for connecting what it means to think otherwise to conditions that make it possible to act otherwise. The education deficit must be seen as intertwined with a political deficit, serving to make many oppressed individuals complicit with oppressive ideologies. As the late Cornelius Castoriadis made clear, democracy requires "critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question.... while simultaneously creating the conditions for individual and social autonomy."(41) Nothing will change politically or economically until new and emerging social movements take seriously the need to develop a language of radical reform and create new public spheres that support the knowledge, skills and critical thought that are necessary features of a democratic formative culture. Getting beyond the big lie as a precondition for critical thought, civic engagement and a more realized democracy will mean more than correcting distortions, misrepresentations and falsehoods produced by politicians, media talking heads and anti-public intellectuals. It will also require addressing how new sites of pedagogy have become central to any viable notion of agency, politics and democracy itself. This is not a matter of elevating cultural politics over material relations of power as much as it is a rethinking of how power deploys culture and how culture as a mode of education positions power. James Baldwin, the legendary African-American writer and civil rights activist, argued that the big lie points to a crisis of American identity and politics and is symptomatic of "a backward society" that has descended into madness, "especially when one is forced to lie about one's aspect of anybody's history, [because you then] must lie about it all."(42) He goes on to argue "that one of the paradoxes of education [is] that precisely at the point when you begin to develop a conscience, you must find yourself at war with your society. It is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person."(43) What Baldwin recognizes is that learning has the possibility to trigger a critical engagement with oneself, others and the larger society - education becomes in this instance more than a method or tool for domination but a politics, a fulcrum for democratic social change. Tragically, in our current climate "learning" merely contributes to a vast reserve of manipulation and self-inflicted ignorance. Our education deficit is neither reducible to the failure of particular types of teaching nor the decent into madness by the spokespersons for the new authoritarianism. Rather, it is about how matters of knowledge, values and ideology can be struggled over as issues of power and politics. Surviving the current education deficit will depend on progressives using history, memory and knowledge not only to reconnect intellectuals to the everyday needs of ordinary people, but also to jumpstart social movements by making education central to organized politics and the quest for a radical democracy.

### AT No Spillover

#### Education is the mechanism for social homogenization and capitalist indoctrination. We have to solve the root of the problem.

Hill 09 (David, Professor at Middlesex University and is Visiting Professor of Critical Education Policy and Equality Studies at the University of Limerick, Ireland, *Global Neoliberalism and Education and Its Consequences*, Taylor and Francis 2009, pg. 209-210)

The first of the four claims-“the development of the person and his or her potential”-formulates, in an obscure language and with a touch of Christian “personalism” (though there are other versions), the idea that a pupil has to become what is expected of him: a social being with the necessary knowledge, skills, norms and attitudes for its future life. This “socialization” function is probably the least obscure in the ideological rhetoric.

The second claim-“to create free and responsible citizens”-barely conceals its deeper meaning: education has the function of ensuring the ideological cohesion of society by explicitly defending its economic and political organization and by justifying social inequalities through selection mechanisms.

The “equal opportunities” dogma is designed to legitimize true inequality: hierarchical social selection constitutes the third “function” of the capitalist school system. Given that “opportunities” for social advancement are believed to be equal, inequality in social achievement is perceived as the logical outcome of differences in merit or individual talents.

Finally, behind all those promises of access to employment lies the necessity of providing the economy with sufficient numbers of workers and consumers to meet current requirements.

#### The privatization of education is the root cause of community-level neoliberalization

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

This policy eliminates schools that are anchors in their communities, contributing to further disinvestment. In gentrifying areas, closing neighborhood schools and replacing them with schools branded for the middle class facilitates the displacement of working-class families. Chicago, like New Orleans, is an example of the intertwining of education policy and neoliberal urban development. Real estate development is a pivotal sector in urban economies, and closing neighborhood public schools in disinvested areas to open up elite, selective-enrollment public schools or prestigious charter schools is part of the neoliberal restructuring of urban space.26 This nexus of education policy and real estate development is located in the spatial logics of capital—the physical location of production facilities, the built environment of cities, and places of consumption are devalued and selectively rebuilt in order to establish a “new locational grid” for capital accumulation.27 In other disinvested, low-income neighborhoods, students attending under-resourced and struggling public schools are a ready consumer base for the proliferation of charter schools, particularly large charter school chains that target these areas.

# \*\*\*THE UTIL DEBATE\*\*\*

## --- 1NC Goods ---

### 1NC: Util First

#### Governments must consider consequences – can’t put one ethic or right categorically first.

Harries 94. [Owen Spring, Editor of National Interest, “Power of Civilizations” Journal of International Affairs and Diplomacy – Questia]

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, "In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?", Lee immediately answers, "Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice." This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is "the ethic of responsibility" rather than "the ethic of absolute ends" that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered. Lee's answer might also be compared to Edmund Burke's conclusions on how England should govern its colonies, as expressed in his Letter to the Sheriffs of the City of Bristol in 1777: |I~t was our duty, in all soberness, to conform our government to the character and circumstances of the several people who composed this mighty and strangely diversified mass. I never was wild enough to conceive that one method would serve for the whole, that the natives of Hindostan and those of Virginia could be ordered in the same manner, or that the Cutchery court and the grand jury of Salem could be regulated on a similar plan. I was persuaded that government was a practical thing made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish out a spectacle of uniformity to gratify the schemes of visionary politicians.

#### Moral absolutism suffers from tunnel vision that generates evil and political irrelevance

Isaac 2. [Jeffrey C. Isaac, professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington, director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale, Spring 2002, Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest]

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Evaluation of consequences is the utmost ethical act – their ethic allows infinite violence

Williams 5. [Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth 2005 The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations p. 174-176]

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what Schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in International Relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful Realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful Realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the Realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and uncritical stances of abstract moralism or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, Realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 Objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will. But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful Realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the precondition for freedom. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 But it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

### 1NC: Yes Value to Life

#### There’s always value to life –Prefer our ev because of Frankl’s subject position.

Coontz 1. [Phyllis D., PhD Graduate School of Public and International Affairs University of Pittsburgh, et al, JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSING, 2001, 18(4), 235-246 – J-Stor]

In the 1950s, psychiatrist and theorist Viktor Frankl (1963) described an existential theory of purpose and meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, re- lated several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terri- ble suffering using his own experiences and observations. He believed that these experi- ences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth. Frankl (1969) claimed that transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are un- changeable. He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity. Therefore, self-transcendence provides mean- ing and enables the discovery of meaning for a person (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl's work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are ex- periencing physical and mental pain. This expansion beyond the self occurs through in- trospection, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and fu- ture to strengthen one's present life (Reed, 1991b).

## --- 2NC Goods ---

### 2NC: Util First

#### Policymakers must evaluate consequences – competing claims must be weighed in order to ensure the most ethical decision for all people, not just the rights of individual groups – prefer our evidence because it assumes the role of a policymaker and not an individual which their position incorrectly assumes.

#### And survival is a pre-requisite to rights – if we win the disad impact is true it outweighs.

Nye 86. [Joseph S. Nye, Jr., professor of government at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, former chair of the National Security Council Group on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, 1986, Nuclear Ethics, p. 65]

The equal access approach assumes that each generation would wish to make the tradeoffs for themselves. The current generation cannot avoid imposing some risks upon the future. As Derek Parfit argues, the risk does not do injustice to identifiable persons, since they do not yet exist. Later the harm may become real. Nonetheless, if the risks are kept low and values are successfully preserved, the gamble benefits a next generation, who then make their own decisions about risks and benefits to be passed on to further generations. Keeping risks to the survival of the species at a low level is essential to a sense of proportionality. Survival is not an absolute value, but it is important because it is a necessary condition for the enjoyment of other values. The loss of political values may (or may not) be reversed with the passage of time. The extinction of the species would be irreversible. Thus proportionality requires that we rate survival very highly, but it does not require the absence of all risk. Proportionality in risks is easier to judge if we think in terms of passing the future to our children and letting them do the same for their children rather than trying to aggregate the interests of centuries of unknown (and perhaps nonexistant) people at this time. While the contemplation of species extinction—or what Schell calls “double death”—may reduce the meaning of life to some people in the current generation, that is a value to be judged against others in assessing the risks that are worth running for this generation. It is not a cause of injustice to a future generation.

#### Absolutist stances on racism fail – consequences must come first.

Trachtenberg 85. [Marc, professor in the department of history at the University of Pennsylvania. He also teaches political science courses. Source: Ethics, Vol. 95, No. 3, Special Issue: Symposium on Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence (Apr., 1985), pp. 728-739 Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381047 ]

No one today would defend slavery, of course; but the more I thought about it, the clearer it seemed that before the Civil War one should have indeed tried to balance all the relevant considerations: that the institution of slavery was not so absolute an evil that it was morally imperative to do whatever was necessary to eradicate it immediately, without regard to any other consideration. In fact, if it was obvious that it would take a war-as it turned out, a long and gruesome war-to abolish slavery, the suffering and anguish that that war would produce should certainly have been taken into account. And one should have given some thought to what would happen to the ex-slaves, even in the event that the North were to win: if one could predict that there was a good chance that slavery would be replaced by another brutal and repressive system-by in fact the kind of system that took root in the South after Reconstruction- then this too should have been entered into the balance. And it also would have made sense to look at just how brutal the slave system was: there are different degrees of loathsomeness, and this could have made a difference in one's assessments. (Questions of degree are of course crucial if we are interested in striking a balance.) Finally, arguments about peaceful alternatives -the bidding up of the price of slaves by the federal government, for instance, to make the institution economically irrational in comparison with free labor-would certainly have had a place; historical experience-an analysis of the peaceful way slavery had in fact been ended in the British Empire is the most obvious case-might also have played a central role. Why shouldn't these things all be taken into account? Are we so convinced of the rightness of our personal moral values that we can turn a blind eye to the kinds of considerations that might moderate the force of our commitment? One wonders even whether it can ever be truly moral to simply refuse to weigh these sorts of factors seriously. One can take the argument a step further by means of a hypothetical example. Suppose, in this case, that the Southerners had told the abo- litionists that, if the North did come down to free the slaves, before they arrived the slaves would all be killed. Certainly at this point considerations other than the moral impermissibility of slavery would have to be taken into account. In such a case, an absolutist position-that the institution of slavery was so great an evil that it had to be rooted out without regard to consequence-reveals itself as inhuman and, indeed, as morally pre- posterous. There has to be some point where issues of balance become morally salient; and thus in general these basic moral issues have to be approached in nonabsolutist-and by that I mean more than just non- deontological-terms.

### 2NC: Extinction Outweighs VTL

#### Extinction outweighs moral side constraints – policymakers are responsible for consequences.

Shafer-Landau 97. [Russ, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, July 1997, Ethics, Vol 104, No 4]

Even Nozick, a staunch absolutist, allows that cases of "catastrophic moral horror" may require suspension of absolute side constraints.(18) Attention to the dire consequences that may be brought about by allegiance to absolute rules needn't move us to the consequentialist camp--it didn't incline Ross or Nozick in that direction, for instance. But it does create a presumptive case against absolutism. Absolutist responses to the argument standardly take one of two forms. The first is to reject premise (1) and deny that absolutism generates tragic consequences, by arguing that a set of suitably narrowed absolutist rules will not require behavior that results in "catastrophic moral horror." The second response is to reject premise (2) and defend the moral necessity of obedience even if tragic consequences ensue. Rejecting Premise (1) Consider the first strategy. This is tantamount to a specificationist program that begins by admitting that the standard candidates--don't kill, lie, cheat, commit adultery--cannot plausibly be construed as absolute rules. Just as we had to narrow their scope if we were to show them universally relevant, so too we need to narrow the scope of such properties to show them universally determinative. The question, though, is how far, and in what way, this added concreteness is to be pursued. The double dangers that the absolutist must avoid at this juncture are those of drawing the grounding properties too broadly, or too narrowly. Rules drawn too narrowly will incorporate concrete details of cases in the description of the grounding properties, yielding a theory that is particularist in all but name. The opposite problem is realized when we allow the grounding properties to be drawn broadly enough as to be repeatably instantiated, but at the cost of allowing the emerging rules to conflict. Some middle ground must be secured. How could we frame an absolute rule that enjoined just the actions we want, while offering an escape clause for tragic cases? There seems to be no way to do this other than by appending a proviso to the rule, to the effect that it binds except where such obedience will lead to catastrophic consequences, very serious harm, horrific results. Because of the great variety of ways in which such results can occur, there doesn't seem to be any more precise way to specify the exceptive clause without reducing it to an indefinitely long string of too-finely described scenarios. Is this problematic? Consider an analogous case. Someone wants to lose weight and wants to know how long to maintain a new diet. A dietician offers the following advice: "Cut twenty percent of your caloric intake; this will make you thinner, but also weaker. If you reach a point where you've gotten too thin and weak, increase your calories." The dietician's advice is flawed because it doesn't give, by itself, enough information to the person trying to follow it. It's too general. The qualified moral rule is similarly uninformative. If abiding by the rule will occasion harmful results, one wants to know how harmful they have to be to qualify as too harmful. The rule doesn't really say--`catastrophic' is just a synonym for `too harmful'. Such a rule is crucially underspecific, and this undermines efforts to apply it as a major premise in deductive moral argument. This lack of specificity results from an absence of necessary and sufficient conditions that could determine the extension of the concept "catastrophic consequences."(19) Efforts to remove this underspecificity by providing a set of definitional criteria typically serve only to falsify the resulting ethical assessments; imagine the futility of trying to precisely set out in advance what is to count as catastrophic consequences. Rendering the notion of "catastrophic" more precise seems bound to yield a rule that omits warranted exceptions. Or it may cover all such exceptions, but at the cost of making the exceptive clause so fine-grained that it will be nothing less than an indefinitely long disjunction of descriptions of actual cases that represent exceptions to the general rule. Neither option should leave us very sanguine about the prospects of specifying absolute rules so as to ensure that such rules can be obeyed without occasioning catastrophic consequences. Rejecting Premise (2) The alternative for the absolutist is to stand fast and allow that morality requires adherence to rules that will sometimes yield catastrophic horrors. There is no inconsistency in taking such a stand. But the ethic that requires conduct that is tantamount to failure to prevent catastrophe is surely suspect. Preventing catastrophe is presumptively obligatory. The obligation might be defeasible, but absolutists have yet to tell the convincing story that would override the presumption. Imagine that you are a sharpshooter in a position to kill a terrorist who is credibly threatening to detonate a bomb that will kill thousands. If you merely wound him, he will be able to trigger the firing mechanism. You must kill him to save the innocents. Suppose that in obedience to an absolutist ethic you refrain from shooting. The terrorist detonates the bomb. Thousands die. Something must be said about the agent whose obedience to absolute rules occasions catastrophe. It is possible that an absolutist ethic will blame you for doing your duty. Possible, but unlikely. Absolutists who allow that obedience to their favored rules may occasion catastrophe typically seek ways to exculpate those whose obedience yields tragic results. The standard strategy is to endorse some version of the doctrine of double effect, or the doctrine of doing and allowing. The former says that harms brought about by indirect intention may be permissible even though similar harms brought about by direct intention are forbidden. The latter says that bringing about harm through omission or inaction may be permissible even though similar harms brought about by positive action are forbidden. The motivating spirit behind both doctrines is to legitimate certain kinds of harmful conduct, to exculpate certain harm doers, and to forestall the possibility that absolute rules might conflict. The truth of either doctrine would ensure that agents always have a permissible option to pursue--namely, obedience to an absolute moral rule.(20) Quite apart from the fact that these doctrines have yet to be adequately defended,(21) their adequate defense would still leave us short of a justification of the absolute rules that are to complement them. Neither of these doctrines is itself a defense of absolutism; rather, they are really "helping doctrines," whose truth would undermine the inevitability of conflict among absolute rules. We may always have a permissible option in cases where we must choose between killing and letting die, intending death or merely foreseeing it, but this by itself is no argument for thinking that the prohibition on intentionally killing innocents is absolute.

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority.

Wapner 3. [Paul, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm]

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Life is a pre-requisite to everything

Seeley, ’86(Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70)

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however**,** human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinction of the race, for in order to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible **under any sane moral code.**

#### Preventing extinction is more moral than preventing misery because we can always recover from loss of value to life

Leslie 98 (John, Oxford educated, former philosophy professor @ U of Guelph, Lecturer appointed by British Academy, "The end of the world: the science and ethics of human extinction", London: Routledge, April 17, pp. 135-7) GZ

Another is this. It could well seem that only short-term dangers could be much threat to the very survival of the human race or its descendant races. What can it matter that, for example, the sun will become a red giant and boil the Earth's oceans some five billion years If they had survived until then, humans or their descendants could be expected to have spread to Pluto, or to space colonies positioned at a comfortable distance, or to the neighbourhoods of other stars. Humankind's eggs would no longer be all in the one basket. Not unless, that's to say, a vacuum metastability disaster—see Chapter 2—swept through the galaxy at virtually the speed of light. But the chances of such a disaster can seem tiny, while those of its happening in the distant future could be negligible: the necessary high-energy experiment would have been performed much earlier, or would have been banned. Any good library can provide plenty of material on O'Neill cylinders Venus breathable at a cost of a few trillion dollars, or plans for pushing galactic colonization forwards at a sizable fraction of the speed of light, either with humans or with machines clever enough to be persons. Just shelves at home, there are fascinating discussions of all this in Barrow and Tipler's The Anthropic Cosmological Principle; in Brand's Space Colonies; in Close's End; in Davoust's The Cosmic Water Hole; in Dyson's Disturbing the Universe and Infinite in All Directions; in McDonough's The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence; in Rood and Trefil's Are We Alone?; in Sagan's Cosmos; in Shklovskii and Sagan's Intelligent Life in the Universe; in Sullivan's We Are Not Alone; and in Tipler's contribution to Rothman et al., Frontiers of Modern Physics.5 Some of the suggestions in these and similar books involve speculative technological advances. For instance, they concern use of nuclear fusion or of antimatter in rocket engines, or accelerating a light-sail to tremendous speed with lasers, subsequently using it to deposit nanomachinery which manufactures braking-lasers to stop the massive passenger vehicles that follow.6 But back in the 1970s G. O'Neill had persuaded many people that kilometer-long cylinders for ten thousand space colonists could be made quickly and inexpensively with the technology then already available. And the chemical-rocket technology of those days—let alone the small H-bombs of Project Orion, each accelerating a spaceship just a bit faster,7 an idea studied intensively in the US until the treaty banning nuclear explosions in space—could itself conceivably have been used for sending space colonists to the neighbourhoods of other stars, albeit slowly: the Voyager spacecraft are travelling at a speed which could take them to the nearest star in forty thousand years. Accelerated first by ground-based lasers and then by sunlight, and using the light of the target stars for deceleration, light-sails could today do the job at higher speed and smaller cost;8 and there have been various further suggestions, some of them now quite old, for space travel using fairly low technology.9 It could well seem, then, that the human race is sure to have become secure against imminent extinction, more or less regardless of whatever disasters thereafter hit the Earth, within five centuries from now, if only it manages to survive for that long. What is surprising is that so little has been done to develop Earth-based artificial biospheres to get us through whatever disasters those centuries may hold. People were all too quick to criticize the poor science behind 'Biosphere 2' (see Chapter 1: oxygen levels dropped disastrously). What they tended to forget was that it had been left to a single individual, E.Bass, to provide the necessary $150 million in funding. If one-hundredth as much had been spent on developing artificial biospheres as on making nuclear weapons, a lengthy future for humankind might by now be virtually assured. Always remember that for doomsday-argument purposes we aren't interested just in whether such things as a pollution crisis would mean misery and death for billions. **Misery and death for billions would be immensely tragic, but might be followed by slow recovery and then a glittering future for a human race which had learned its lesson**. What is crucial to the doomsday argument—and, I'd say, the issue most important from an ethical viewpoint—is whether anything could put an end to all humans.

#### Extinction is the worst impact—prioritizing anything else puts the cart before the horse

Schell 82 (Jonathan, Professor at Wesleyan University, The Fate of the Earth, pages 136-137 uw//wej)

Implicit in everything that I have said so far about the nuclear predicament there has been a perplexity that I would now like to take up explicitly, for it leads, I believe, into the very heart of our response-or, rather, our lack of response-to the predicament. I have pointed out that our species is the most important of all the things that, as inhabitants of a common world, we inherit from the past generations, but it does not go far enough to point out this superior importance, as though in making our decision about ex- tinction we were being asked to choose between, say, liberty, on the one hand, and the survival of the species, on the other. For the species not only overarches but contains all the benefits of life in the common world, and to speak of sacrificing the species for the sake of one of these benefits involves one in the absurdity of wanting to de- stroy something in order to preserve one of its parts, as if one were to burn down a house in an attempt to redecorate the living room, or to kill someone to improve his character. ,but even to point out this absurdity fails to take the full measure of the peril of extinction, for mankind is not some invaluable object that lies outside us and that we must protect so that we can go on benefiting from it; rather, it is we ourselves, without whom everything there is loses its value. To say this is another way of saying that extinction is unique not because it destroys mankind as an object but because it destroys mankind as the source of all possible human subjects, and this, in turn, is another way of saying that extinction is a second death, for one's own individual death is the end not of any object in life but of the subject that experiences all objects. Death, how- ever, places the mind in a quandary. One of-the confounding char- acteristics of death-"tomorrow's zero," in Dostoevski's phrase-is that, precisely because it removes the person himself rather than something in his life, it seems to offer the mind nothing to take hold of. One even feels it inappropriate, in a way, to try to speak "about" death at all, as. though death were a thing situated some- where outside us and available for objective inspection, when the fact is that it is within us-is, indeed, an essential part of what we are. It would be more appropriate, perhaps, to say that death, as a fundamental element of our being, "thinks" in us and through us about whatever we think about, coloring our thoughts and moods with its presence throughout our lives.

#### Any risk of extinction shatters the frame of existence – proves consequences come first.

Schell 82, (Jonathan ,journalist, FATE OF THE EARTH, 1982, p. 184.)

The death of our species resembles the death of an individual in its boundlessness, its blankness, its removal beyond experience, and its tendency to baffle human thought and feeling, yet as soon as one mentions the hope of survival the similarities are clearly at an end. For while individual death is inevitable, extinction can be avoided; while every person must die, mankind can be saved. Therefore, while reflection on death may lead to resignation and acceptance, reflection on extinction must lead to exactly the opposite response: to arousal, rejection, indignation, and action. Extinction is not something to contemplate, it is something to rebel against. To point this out might seem like stating the obvious if it were not that one the whole the world’s reaction to the peril of extinction has been one of numbness and inertia, much as though extinction were as inescapable as death is. Even today, the official response to the sickening reality before us is conditioned by a grim fatalism, in which the hope of ridding the world of nuclear weapons, and thus of surviving as a species, is all but ruled out of consideration as “utopian” or “extreme” – as though it were “radical” merely to want to go on living and to want one’s descendants to be born. And yet if one gives up these aspirations one has given up on everything. As a species, we have as yet done nothing to save ourselves. The slate of action is blank. We have organizations for the preservation of almost everything in life that we want but no organization for the preservation of mankind. People seem to have decided that our collective will is too weak or flawed to rise to this occasion. They see the violence that has saturated human history, and conclude that to practice violence is innate in our species. They find the perennial hope that peace can be brought to the earth once and for all a delusion of the well-meaning who have refused to face the “harsh realities” of international life – the realities of self-interest, fear, hatred, and aggression. They have concluded that these realities are eternal ones, and this conclusion defeats at the outset any hope of taking the actions necessary for survival. Looking at the historical record, they ask what has changed to give anyone confidence that humanity can break with its violent past and act with greater restraint. The answer of course, is that everything has changed. To the old “harsh realities” of international life has been added the immeasurably harsher new reality of the peril of extinction. To the old truth that all men are brothers has been added the inescapable new truth that not only on the moral but also on the physical plane the nation that practices aggression will itself die. This is the law of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence – the doctrine of “mutual assured destruction” – which “assures” the destruction of the society of the attacker. And it is also the law of the natural world, which, in its own version of deterrence, supplements the oneness of mankind with a oneness of nature, and guarantees that when the attack rises above a certain level the attacker will be engulfed in the general ruin of the global ecosphere. To the obligation to honor life is now added the sanction that if we fail in our obligation life will actually be taken away from us, individually and collectively. Each of us will die, and as we die we will see the world around us dying. Such imponderables as the sum of human life, the integrity of the terrestrial creation, and the meaning of time, of history, and of the development of life on earth, which were once left to contemplation and spiritual understanding, **are now at stake in the political realm and demand a political response from every person. As political actors**, we must, like the contemplatives before us, delve to the bottom of the world, and, Atlas-like, we must take the world on our shoulders.

### 2NC: Util Solves Ethics

#### Consequentialism is key to ethical decision making, because it ensures beings are treated as equal—any other approach to ethics is arbitrary because it considers one’s preferences as more important than others

Lillehammer 11. [Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching\_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism\_and\_Global\_Ethics-1-2.pdf

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles.

#### Preventing death is the first ethical priority – it’s the only impact you can’t recover from.

Bauman 95. [Zygmunt Bauman, University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, 1995, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71]

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.

### 2NC: Yes VTL

#### Their “no value to life” is ignores the subjectivity of each person’s values. Life should be first.

Lee 90. [Steven Lee is the H.L.A. Hart Visiting Research Fellow at the Center for Ethics and Philosophy of Law and University College for Michaelmas, as well as Visiting Research Fellow at the Changing Character of War Programme. He is a Professor in the Humanities and Professor of Philosophy at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Reviewed work(s): Nuclear Deterrence, Morality and Realism. by John Finnis ; Joseph M. Boyle, Jr. ; Germain Grisez ; Jefferson McMahan Source: Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Winter, 1990), pp. 93-106 Published by: Blackwell Publishing Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265364]

The claim that nuclear devastation and Soviet domination cannot be compared in consequentialist terms rests largely on the claim that the kinds of harm or evil involved in these outcomes are incommensurable. For, "the values of life, liberty, fairness, and so on, are diverse. How many people's lives are equivalent to the liberty of how many-whether the same or other-persons? No one can say" (p. 241). When one con- siders the two outcomes, "[e]ach seems the more repugnant while one is focusing upon it" (p. 240). But this incommensurability claim is not plausible. Life and political liberty are diverse goods, but having liberty is only part of what makes life worth living. Certainly most people would prefer loss of liberty to loss of life, and even if consequential value is not a function solely of preferences, the preferences in this case reflect a real difference in value. Even where liberty is lacking, **a life has much poten- tial for value.** Of course, it is unlikely that everyone would die in a nu- clear war, but it is likely that many of the living would envy the dead. As the authors point out, however, we do not know how destructive the nu- clear war might be, nor how repressive the Soviet domination. A very limited nuclear war might be preferable to a very repressive Soviet-im- posed regime. But these are unlikely extremes. In terms of expected util- ities, domination is preferable to war. In this sense, Red is better than dead, and the consequentialist comparison can be made.

## --- Answers To ---

### AT: Consequentialism Bad

#### Their ideological stance is too reductionist – the world does not conform to their criticism – only an ethic of consequences can evaluate a more complicated set of impacts

Williams 5. [Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations 178-179]

This commitment to the construction of an ethic of responsibility in a world without foundations is also illustrated in the very idea of objective enquiry. Why, for example, should analysts be committed to objectivity given wilful Realism’s scepticism toward a science of international politics? Why, as Morgenthau so pointedly asked, should it be a ‘calling’ to seek ‘truth’ and not just ‘power’, when it is so often and so clearly advantageous to speak the truth which power wants to hear? Would not a Realist appreciation of power lead its most astute practitioners to tell power whatever it wanted to hear in order to gain power themselves? Within the wilful Realist tradition, this is again a question of responsibility and, importantly, of will. It is a responsible choice, itself beyond ultimate ground of objectivity. The capacity to recognise the lack of a naïvely ‘objective’ standpoint is necessary for an objective (realistic) understanding of the social world and, vitally, is a condition of the construction of an ethic of responsibility within it. Responsibility in wilful Realism does not entail a simple support for, and acquiescence to, dominant political realities and a consequential analysis of their implications. On the contrary, it is a condition of responsible scepticism toward dominant political claims. Power, in this vision, wants continually to claim that there is no gap between its understandings and actions and truth. The commitment to objectivity in wilful Realism is to demonstrate the inevitably partial nature of these claims, to uncover the ethical and practical limitations and forms of domination that they seek to disguise, and to subject these to ruthless and ongoing criticism. If political success is a matter of continually ensuring that truth bends to the needs of power, responsibility entails consistently challenging this dynamic. The commitment to truth does not emerge from an external reality: it is a responsible element and expression of self-mastery, autonomy, and freedom. Rather than being the outcome of some naïve, disembodied, positivist ideal, or of the uncritical pursuit of some Modernist utopia, it is an expression of will, of creative self-assertion and moral commitment fully conscious of the limits of knowledge. To give oneself over fully to the demands of prevailing structures of power — in the form of either a servile ascription to dominant forms of knowledge or political obligation — or retreat wholly from such commitments in the name of the inescapability of some soporific ‘relativism’, is precisely to forfeit one’s autonomy and to abdicate one’s responsibility.

#### Consequentialism affirms the unconditional value of rational beings as equals – its is the best framework.

Cummiskey 96. [David, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Bates College, Kantian Consequentialism, p. 150-1]

On the other hand, in practice, consequentialists do not defend the sacrifice of the innocent as a principle of public policy. In practice, of course, a Kantian consequentialist can and should appeal to good consequentialist reasons for limiting the use of coercion and maintaining a sphere of personal liberty. There are good consequentialist reasons for secondary principles that constrain a direct appeal to the more basic consequentialist principle. Just as honesty is typically the best policy, protecting individual rights really does advance the common good. In addition, the demands of duty are such that, as Kant would say, finite rational beings cannot be expected to fully satisfy them. We must distinguish what one should do if one can from what we should expect or demand of ourselves and others. Although consequentialists reject moral com­placency and self-satisfaction, they also provide a justification for a distinction between extraordinary and ordinary compliance with duty. Thus, the Kantian consequentialist should follow the tradition, going back at least to Aquinas," that recognizes that "human law" should externally legislate only the more harmful vices and should set its demands at a level a normally virtuous person can satisfy. Full virtue is indeed best left to the internal legislation of finite rational beings. Consequentialism thus provides an *indirect* justification for our intuitive conviction that we should not demand that the innocent sacrifice themselves, and also that we should not sacrifice the innocent. Kant's moral theory, however, simply does not provide a more direct and indefeasible justification for deon­tological constraints. In principle, a conscientious Kantian moral agent may be required to kill one in order to save two. Nonetheless, if someone is unable to do so, this may well not be grounds for reproach. Similarly, if I cannot amputate a leg to save a life-either my own or that of another-I may not be blameworthy for my failure, although it is true that I should have done the nasty deed. Still, in such a situation I must try to force my attention on the good I am doing and thereby enable myself to act. Similarly, in the highly unusual case where it would truly be best to kill some to save others, a good person should also try to focus on the lives to be saved rather than becoming fixated exclusively on those who will be killed. Nonetheless, even though sacrificing some to save others is sometimes the right thing to do, one should still feel regret and mourn the people who are lost. After all, the goal is to save each and every person; thus, one should indeed feel the loss of even one. According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that in deciding what to do, one must give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings leads to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices that a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

### AT: Quality of Life

#### Even their focus on quality of life must put questions of survival before the consideration of the aff

Fried professor of law @ Harvard 2002 Charles Fried “Right and Wrong as Absolute.” P. 76-77 in Absolutism and its Consequentialist Critics, edited by Jorem Graf Haber.

Even within such boundaries we can imagine extreme cases where killing an innocent person may save a whole nation. In such cases it seems fanatical to maintain the absoluteness of the judgment, to do right even if the heavens will in fact fall. And so the catastrophic may cause the absoluteness of right and wrong to yield, but even then it would be a non sequitur to argue (as consequentialists are fond of doing) that this proves that judgments of right and wrong are always a matter of degree, depending on the relative goods to be attained and harms to be avoided. I believe, on the contrary, that the concept of the catastrophic is a distinct concept just because it identifies the extreme situations in which the usual categories of judgment (including the category of right and wrong) no longer apply. At the other end of the spectrum, there is the concept of the trivial, the de minimis where the absolute categories do not yet apply. And the trivial also does not prove that right and wrong are really only a matter of degree. It is because of these complexities and because the term absolute is really only suggestive of a more complex structure, that I also refer to the norms of right and wrong not as absolute but as categorical.\*) When we say that one must not grievously harm an innocent person, that one must not lie, these are categorical prohibitions in the sense that (within limits) no amount of good can justify them. But they are not absolute in the sense that we may never be justified in doing acts which have these very results—the death of an innocent person, the propagation of false beliefs—as a consequence. They are absolute in the sense that they point out certain acts we must not perform. They are not absolute in the consequentialist's sense; they do not state that a certain state of the world is of such supreme importance that the value of everything else must be judged by its tendency to produce that state. So here we see a complex relation between deontological judgments on what we do and evaluative (axiological) judgments on states of the world—with which we are also concerned. We must indeed be concerned with producing good in the world, but without violating the absolute norms of right and wrong).

### AT: Apocalyptic Rhetoric

#### Apocalyptic scenario-planning is not pointless: It solves their offense, because it’s self-reflexive; and, It boosts valuable participation for the audience.

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

This discussion has largely been focused on the historical precedents for a secular tradition of writing about human extinction. Although literary studies may seem outside of the scope of futures studies, authors like Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, and Margaret Atwood present compelling visions of the future and generate discussions about the imagination of human extinction and the art of writing its scenarios. Furthermore a literary analysis of the apocalyptic mode of writing offers new insights into the reasons why the narrative of human extinction is so powerful and provides background texts that might help shape and inspire future extinction scenarios. D.H. Lawrence once asked: ‘‘What does the Apocalypse matter, unless in so far as it gives us imaginative release into another vital world? After all, what meaning has the Apocalypse? For the ordinary reader, not much’’ [28]. The goal of this edition is to address D.H. Lawrence’s questions and to prove to the ordinary reader that thinking about human extinction an integral step toward changing the present state of the world.

#### Apocalyptic rhetoric is key to policy making

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (1797–1851) is most well known for her first novel, Frankenstein, which was published in 1818 and is considered , among other things, the first piece of science fiction in English literature [1]. In 1826, she published her third novel entitled The Last Man [2] an epic narrative about the destruction of the human race. This book, which is the subject of this essay, was among the first literary works to explore the apocalypse. MWS’s human extinction scenario was one of the most percipient and path breaking and therefore should be required reading for futurists. During the course of the novel, humanity is extinguished by the Plague1 and the main character Lionel Verney suffers the loss of all that humankind had accomplished: art, music, literature, and politics. This profound sense of cultural loss rarely makes it into our current policy discussions about climate change, pandemics and other threats to humanity. It should, though, in order to remind us of the stakes involved in protecting the future of the human race. This paper provides a synopsis of the novel, observations about how this literary work is relevant to futurists today, and a literary analysis of this and other similar apocalyptic writings.

#### Apocalyptic scenario planning is good: Even if the predictions are off, the process remedies powerlessness and does help mobilize against real danger.

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

As we have seen, human extinction scenarios today fit into a long secular and religious history of writing about the apocalypse. The question then becomes: what makes people use the narrative model of the apocalypse as seen in the Old and New Testaments to tell their own stories? A number have scholars have discussed this question. David Ketterer, who studies the apocalyptic mode in American literature, believes that ‘‘apocalyptic literature is concerned with the creation of other worlds which exist, on the literal level, in a credible relationship (whether on the basis of rational extrapolation and analogy or of religious belief) with the ‘real’ world, thereby causing a metaphorical destruction of that ‘real’ world in the reader’s head’’. Furthermore, W. Warren Wagar, a historian and futures scholar who published many books including A Short History of the Future, wrote ‘‘that eschatological fictions help us cope with the fear of death and compensate us for our powerlessness’’. Wagar’s work on the apocalypse relates closely to the subject of MWS’s novel. He argued ‘‘The last man, or one of a handful of last men, is a figure of immeasurable power and importance’’ [18]. David Seed, the editor of an anthology of articles on apocalypse theory, cites Frank Kermode’s The Sense of an Ending in his discussion of the usefulness of apocalypse narratives. According to Seed, Kermode believes that the ‘‘apocalypse depends on a concord of imaginatively recorded past and imaginatively predicted future, achieved on behalf of us, who remain ‘in the middest’’’. Kermode’s ‘‘central insight’’ into apocalypse theory is that the ‘‘apocalypse [is] a narrative, one of the fictions which we employ to make sense of our present’’. Furthermore, ‘‘there is a necessary relation between the fictions by which we order our world and the increasing complexity of what we take to be the ‘real’ history of the world’’ Relating to this point, Lois Parkinson Zamora writes that ‘‘the apocalyptist assigns to event after event a place in a pattern of historical relationships that. . .presses steadily towards culmination’’ [19]. Thus, the apocalypse is a literary device that humans turn to both to comprehend more fully their place in the world and to impress upon others the conditions of the ‘‘real’’ world which must be changed to ensure the future of humanity.

# \*\*\*DISADS\*\*\*

## --- Agenda Links ---

### Obama Good Link: Spending Fights

#### Mass transit policy sparks GOP backlash – spending.

Freemark 11. [Yonah, transportation policy journalist, Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction, “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure” Transport Politic – January 25 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/]

» Conservatives in Congress threaten to shut down funding for transit construction projects and investments in intercity rail. One doesn’t have to look far to see why these programs aren’t priorities for them. Late last week, a group of more than 165 of the most conservative members of the House of Representatives, the Republican Study Committee, released a report that detailed an agenda to reduce federal spending by $2.5 trillion over ten years. Spurred on by increasing public concern about the mounting national debt, the group argues that the only choice is to make huge, painful cuts in government programs. With the House now in the hands of the Republican Party, these suggestions are likely to be seriously considered. Transportation policy is prominent on the group’s list, no matter President Obama’s call for investments in the nation’s transportation infrastructure, expected to be put forward in tonight’s state of the union address. Not only would all funding for Amtrak be cut, representing about $1.5 billion a year, but the Obama Administration’s nascent high-speed rail program would be stopped in its tracks. A $150 million commitment to Washington’s Metro system would evaporate. Even more dramatically, the New Starts program, which funds new rail and bus capital projects at a cost of $2 billion a year, would simply disappear. In other words, the Republican group suggests that all national government aid for the construction of new rail or bus lines, intercity and intra-city, be eliminated.

#### Mass transit policies spark fights over appropriations – guarantees backlash.

New Republic 12. [“Lost Highway” June 7 -- lexis]

But, rather than embrace the Senate's legislation, the House GOP responded by pushing its own, utterly unserious bill. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican member of Congress, has called it "the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during thirty-five years of public service." He wasn't exaggerating: The House bill slashes funding for Amtrak at a time when rapidly expanding ridership is putting even greater strain on the system's resources. It exempts many transit projects from the standard environmental-impact analysis, changing the requirements that apply to projects near parks and historical sites and imposing a restrictive deadline on the review process. It tries to raise revenue from controversial oil and gas ventures--including the Keystone XL pipeline. Perhaps the House bill's most troubling plank is a proposed reversal of the decades-long practice of setting aside a portion of the gas tax to fund mass transit. If it became law, this change would subject vulnerable but important commuter-transit projects to disruptive annual appropriations fights. It's hard to imagine any public endeavor more in need of a predictable funding process than mass transit. (It's a major reason why we support the idea of an infrastructure bank, a proposal that has been championed on our website by New Republic Contributing Editor William Galston.) The House's bill would, disastrously, lead the country in the opposite direction. Whatever else Democrats concede in this fight, they must stand firm against this change, since it threatens to fundamentally imperil an already weak and underfunded mass-transit system.

#### GOP won’t pay for it.

USON 12. [US Official News “Bishop, Bellone, Construction advocates point to Medford bridge as ‘Exhibit A’ in case for Highway Bill” March 16 -- lexis]

While investing in America's infrastructure has been a bipartisan issue in Congress in the past, last month the Republican majority in the House of Representatives was prepared to force a vote on a partisan Highway Bill (H.R. 7) that would have slashed transportation funding for New York State by approximately $1 billion over the next five years, as well as jeopardized future funding for mass transit. Facing united opposition from Democrats and a Republican caucus divided over the controversial proposal, House leadership cancelled thevote on the bill nearly a month ago so it could be re-written. Bishop, a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee,said Republicans have refused to reach out to Democrats on this top national priority thus far but said public pressure would compel worktowards bipartisan bill that honestly addresses America's need for efficient and safe transportation.

#### Mass transit is partisan and would generate Republican backlash

Hiniker 2012 (Steve, “Partisanship on mass transit hurts economy,’ The Capital Times (Madison, Wisconsin), March 28, Lexis.)

**Tea party activists and** their **patrons in the Legislature love to hate mass transit. While mass transit has long enjoyed bipartisan support** - Gov. Tommy Thompson was once a leading proponent of rail transit - **it is now viewed with disdain by nearly all Republicans. While opponents claim their opposition is about money, it actually has nothing to do with the cost.**If it were about the money, spending on all forms of transportation would come under the magnifying glass. Mass transit users already spend far more money on roads than car commuters spend on mass transit. Yet **"conservative" lawmakers starve mass transit systems while giving billions of dollars to build more roads.** State support for the road-building industry is the closest thing Wisconsin has to socialism. Still, there wasn't a whimper from the right about increasing taxpayer support for bigger roads.No, **it's not about the money. It's about red-state partisans showing that they don't support blue-state priorities like urban needs, environment, people of color, students, low-income residents and social programs. Building mass transit systems is too "European"** (another favorite target of the tea party). Why should suburbanites support an urban need like mass transit when they prefer to drive? Republican leaders like Rep. Robin Vos stand in the way of even allowing cities to hold a local referendum on a sales tax to pay for transit.

### Obama Good Link: Geography/Population Density

#### Geography and population density ensures GOP opposition.

Freemark 11. [Yonah, transportation policy journalist, Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction, “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure” Transport Politic – January 25 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/]

These cuts are extreme, and they’re not likely to make it to the President’s desk, not only because of the Democratic Party’s continued control over the Senate but also because some powerful Republicans in the House remain committed to supporting public transportation and rail programs. But how can we explain the open hostility of so many members of the GOP to any federal spending at all for non-automobile transportation? Why does a transfer of power from the Democratic Party to the Republicans engender such political problems for urban transit? We can find clues in considering the districts from which members of the House of Representatives of each party are elected. As shown in the chart above (in Log scale), there was a relatively strong positive correlation between density of congressional districts and the vote share of the Democratic candidate in the 2010 elections. Of densest quartile of districts with a race between a Democrat and a Republican — 105 of them, with a density of 1,935 people per square miles or more — the Democratic candidate won 89. Of the quartile of districts with the lowest densities — 98 people per square mile and below — Democratic candidates only won 23 races. As the chart below demonstrates (in regular scale), this pattern is most obvious in the nation’s big cities, where Democratic Party vote shares are huge when densities are very high. This pattern is not a coincidence. The Democratic Party holds most of its power in the nation’s cities, whereas the GOP retains greater strength in the exurbs and rural areas. The two parties generally fight it out over the suburbs. In essence, the base of the two parties is becoming increasingly split in spatial terms: The Democrats’ most vocal constituents live in cities, whereas the Republicans’ power brokers would never agree to what some frame as a nightmare of tenements and light rail.

#### Urban-rural divide ensures a fight.

Freemark 11. [Yonah, transportation policy journalist, Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction, “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure” Transport Politic – January 25 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/]

What does this mean? When there is a change in political power in Washington, the differences on transportation policy and other urban issues between the parties reveal themselves as very stark. Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration. Highway funding, on the other hand, has remained relatively stable throughout, and that’s no surprise, either: The middle 50% of congressional districts, representing about half of the American population, features populations that live in neighborhoods of low to moderate densities, fully reliant on cars to get around. It is only in the densest sections of the country that transit (or affordable housing, for instance) is even an issue — which is why it appears to be mostly of concern to the Democratic Party. Republicans in the House for the most part do not have to answer to voters who are interested in improved public transportation.

#### No GOP constituency – ensures backlash.

Mark 12. [Jason, editor @ EIJ, environmental politics reporter, “Why do conservatives hate public transit?” Earth Island Journal -- April 3 -- http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why\_do\_conservatives\_hate\_public\_transit/]

This legislative train wreck (sorry for the pun) raises a question that’s been nagging me for a while: Why exactly are conservative representatives so antagonistic to public transit? Here a couple of thoughts. It’s an urban-rural thing. Check out this graphic from the folks at The Transport Politic (hat tip to Ben Jervey for bringing it to my attention.) As you can see, Republicans overwhelming come from rural areas. Democrats usually represent cities. (Leaving the two parties to battle it out for the swing votes in the suburbs.) Transport Politic writer Yonah Freemark sums it up: “Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration.” I don’t know that there’s anything wrong with this. Representatives are elected to serve their constituents as well as the national interest. If their constituents live in areas with low population densities that wouldn’t be well served by buses or bike lanes, then it makes sense to prioritize spending on roads. One basic reason Republicans are against making investments in mass transit is that those projects don’t meet the needs of the people who elected them. Not surprisingly, Congressman DeFazio’s whip count of GOP supporters of the Senate legislation mostly includes Republicans who represent suburban areas that benefit from mass transit.

### Obama Good Link: Trade Union Association

#### GOP opposition to trade unions ensures controversy over the plan.

Mark 12. [Jason, editor @ EIJ, environmental politics reporter, “Why do conservatives hate public transit?” Earth Island Journal -- April 3 -- http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why\_do\_conservatives\_hate\_public\_transit/]

This legislative train wreck (sorry for the pun) raises a question that’s been nagging me for a while: Why exactly are conservative representatives so antagonistic to public transit? Here a couple of thoughts. It’s an urban-rural thing. Check out this graphic from the folks at The Transport Politic (hat tip to Ben Jervey for bringing it to my attention.) As you can see, Republicans overwhelming come from rural areas. Democrats usually represent cities. (Leaving the two parties to battle it out for the swing votes in the suburbs.) Transport Politic writer Yonah Freemark sums it up: “Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration.” I don’t know that there’s anything wrong with this. Representatives are elected to serve their constituents as well as the national interest. If their constituents live in areas with low population densities that wouldn’t be well served by buses or bike lanes, then it makes sense to prioritize spending on roads. One basic reason Republicans are against making investments in mass transit is that those projects don’t meet the needs of the people who elected them. Not surprisingly, Congressman DeFazio’s whip count of GOP supporters of the Senate legislation mostly includes Republicans who represent suburban areas that benefit from mass transit. It’s a trade union thing. The transportation bill has been popular in the past because it’s a surefire way of creating jobs. There’s just one hitch — when it comes to mass transit, many of those jobs are unionized. And of course Republicans don’t like unions. In an editorial last year, the conservative Investor’s Business Daily slammed the Obama administration’s high speed rail plan as just a payoff for its union backers — and therefore something to oppose. “So who could possibly benefit from such a boondoggle? Unions, along with the politicians they vote for — in this case Obama and California Democrats, who'll be able to trade construction jobs and other union sop for votes.” Republican opposition to mass transit, then, is just old-fashioned power politics: The friend of my enemy is my enemy. I can’t say this is as innocent as the rural-urban constituent divide. Not when high speed rail investment is so clearly in the nation’s interest — a way to boost the economy, decrease our reliance on oil imports, and keep America competitive in the twenty-first century.

### Obama Good Link: Big Government

#### Perception of big government causes GOP to spaz.

Mark 12. [Jason, editor @ EIJ, environmental politics reporter, “Why do conservatives hate public transit?” Earth Island Journal -- April 3 -- http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why\_do\_conservatives\_hate\_public\_transit/]

This legislative train wreck (sorry for the pun) raises a question that’s been nagging me for a while: Why exactly are conservative representatives so antagonistic to public transit? Here a couple of thoughts. It’s an urban-rural thing. Check out this graphic from the folks at The Transport Politic (hat tip to Ben Jervey for bringing it to my attention.) As you can see, Republicans overwhelming come from rural areas. Democrats usually represent cities. (Leaving the two parties to battle it out for the swing votes in the suburbs.) Transport Politic writer Yonah Freemark sums it up: “Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration.” I don’t know that there’s anything wrong with this. Representatives are elected to serve their constituents as well as the national interest. If their constituents live in areas with low population densities that wouldn’t be well served by buses or bike lanes, then it makes sense to prioritize spending on roads. One basic reason Republicans are against making investments in mass transit is that those projects don’t meet the needs of the people who elected them. Not surprisingly, Congressman DeFazio’s whip count of GOP supporters of the Senate legislation mostly includes Republicans who represent suburban areas that benefit from mass transit. It’s a trade union thing. The transportation bill has been popular in the past because it’s a surefire way of creating jobs. There’s just one hitch — when it comes to mass transit, many of those jobs are unionized. And of course Republicans don’t like unions. In an editorial last year, the conservative Investor’s Business Daily slammed the Obama administration’s high speed rail plan as just a payoff for its union backers — and therefore something to oppose. “So who could possibly benefit from such a boondoggle? Unions, along with the politicians they vote for — in this case Obama and California Democrats, who'll be able to trade construction jobs and other union sop for votes.” Republican opposition to mass transit, then, is just old-fashioned power politics: The friend of my enemy is my enemy. I can’t say this is as innocent as the rural-urban constituent divide. Not when high speed rail investment is so clearly in the nation’s interest — a way to boost the economy, decrease our reliance on oil imports, and keep America competitive in the twenty-first century. It’s all about government-bashing. Government is good-for-nothing. That foundation of libertarian thinking has become conventional wisdom on the right. If the government does it, the dogma goes, then it must be bad. (The only exception being the maintenance of a massive military.) The folks at the Cato Institute, for example, don’t think the federal government should be involved in funding road projects and argue that “transportation markets need to be liberated from government control.” One reason that conservatives fear mass transit programs specifically — and federal funding for road projects more broadly — is that such infrastructure projects prove that government works. No individual can repair a bridge. No family can build a railroad. Public works projects require, well, the public. Most everyone understands this. Good roads, safe bridges, and convenient transit networks are something that people expect the government will provide. A survey by Republican pollster Frank Luntz found that 84 percent of Americans would pay 1 percent more on their taxes if the funds were targeted for infrastructure. There’s a strong tradition of Republican leaders pushing ambitious infrastructure projects. The Interstate Highway System was build by President Eisenhower. The Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge were both initiated by President Hoover. Many Republicans today retreat from such grand public works projects if for no other reason that they prove that government is good for something.

### Obama Good Link: Tea Party

#### Republicans have never cared.

Doig 12. [Will, editor @ Daily Beast, “The Tea Party’s war on mass transit” Salon -- February 13 -- http://www.salon.com/2012/02/13/the\_tea\_partys\_war\_on\_mass\_transit/singleton/]

Tea Party leaders know all of this. But they also knew that defunding NPR wouldn’t help balance the budget, and they voted to do it anyway. They knew that by law no federal money can go toward abortion services, yet they voted to defund Planned Parenthood too. The Tea Party is superb at disguising cultural battles as the pursuit of responsible thrift. And mass transit exists at the vortex of many of their No. 1 ideological targets. It’s brilliant, when you think about it. Defunding transit is how you smack down urbanites, environmentalists, and people of color, all in one fell swoop. It’s how you telegraph a disdain for all things European. It’s how you show solidarity with swing-state suburbanites who don’t understand why their taxes are going toward subways they don’t even use. And it’s how you subtly reassure your base that you’re not concerned about the very poor. Republicans haven’t pretended to care about cities for decades. In January, none of the candidates showed up to the annual Conference of Mayors. (Two of them didn’t even RSVP.) And even just a month ago, you could argue, as this website did, that “today cities are more ignored than attacked” by Republicans. But the calculus just changed. The transportation bill sends an aggressive message: “Tea Party to Cities: Drop Dead.” It doesn’t matter to the Tea Party that Ronald Reagan, in 1982, created the Mass Transit Account that Republicans now want to kill. Reagan was no friend to cities. But even he earned a respectable share of the vote in New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco. Things hadn’t yet gotten so personal. That era is over. Over the past couple of decades, the GOP has found that bashing “elites” can translate into victory at the polls. And by “elites” they don’t mean folks with Chevy Tahoes and McMansions in the exurbs. They mean urbanites, no matter what their net worth. When they tar Nancy Pelosi as a San Francisco liberal, or Barack Obama as a Chicago politician, they’re not just referencing those cities’ stereotypes. They’re referencing the stereotypes of city culture itself: full of swindlers and gays and blacks and other suspect types. Calling Obama the “food stamp president” conjures up images of housing projects. Sarah Palin calling small-town folks “real America” states unequivocally that urbanites aren’t real Americans. The offensiveness of that statement still boggles the mind. The Tea Party plan to decimate transit is no less explicit a statement. “House Republicans are, essentially, declaring war on cities in the federal transportation bill,” tweeted Naparstek. It’s not just that they know they can’t expect many votes from urban dwellers — that at least would be political calculus. It’s that they despise cities in general. They see “smart growth” principles as a U.N. plot, gun control as fascist, and funding for transit not just as wasteful, but un-American. Don’t like it? Get a car like the rest of us.

#### Tea party goes berserk.

Doig 12. [Will, editor @ Daily Beast, “The Tea Party’s war on mass transit” Salon -- February 13 -- http://www.salon.com/2012/02/13/the\_tea\_partys\_war\_on\_mass\_transit/singleton/]

The Tea Party soared to power on the notion that it was the antidote to wasteful government spending. It’s now clear that reigniting the culture wars was a top priority, too. From guns to abortion, the extremist wing of the Republican Party has fought to turn back the clock on many socially progressive ideals. Mass transit is its newest target. “Federal transportation and infrastructure policy has traditionally been an area of strong bipartisan agreement,” says Aaron Naparstek, a Loeb Fellow at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Design and founder of Streetsblog.org. “Now, it seems, Republicans want to turn cities into a part of the culture wars. Now it’s abortion, gay marriage and subways.” House Republicans seek to eliminate the Mass Transit Account from the federal Highway Trust Fund. The Mass Transit Account is where public transportation programs get their steady source of funding. Without it, transit would be devastated, and urban life as we know it could become untenable. And there’s the rub. “The Tea Party leaders and the Republicans who pander to them do not care about cost-effectiveness in the slightest,” wrote blogger Alon Levy in a comment about the bill on the Transport Politic. “They dislike transit for purely cultural and ideological reasons.” To the Tea Party, transit smacks of the public sector, social engineering and alternative lifestyles.

### Obama Good Link: Funding Distribution

#### Fights over funding distribution.

Dilger 11. [Robert Jay, Senior Specialist in American National Government, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present” Congressional Research Service -- January 5 -- http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40431.pdf]

Several bills have been introduced during previous Congresses that would fundamentally change existing federal, state, and local government roles and responsibilities in surface transportation policy. For example, Senator Jim DeMint and Representative Jeff Flake introduced legislation during the 109 th Congress and Senator DeMint introduced legislation in the 110 th Congress (S. 2823) that would phase-out most of the federal fuel and excise taxes that support the Highway Trust Fund over five years; preserve federal responsibility for interstate highways, transportation facilities on public lands, national transportation research and safety programs, and emergency transportation assistance; and devolve most other surface transportation programs to states. 3 In addition, during previous reauthorizations some congressional Members from “donor” states (states whose highway users pay more in estimated federal highway tax revenue to the Highway Trust Fund than that state receives from the program) advocated program devolution as a means to achieve program efficiencies and to address what they viewed as an inequitable distribution of federal surface transportation funds to states. 4 As will be discussed, recent reauthorizations have focused a great deal of attention on resolving disagreements among donor and donee states concerning the distribution of the program’s funds. Because many donor states are located in the South and the Mid-West and many donee states are located in the Northeast, Pacific Rim, and sparsely populated Western states, recent reauthorizations have taken on a regional perspective, pitting states from one region against another. Although most governors and state legislative leaders have been united in their advocacy of additional federal funding with minimal restrictions on the use of those funds, the donor-donee debates in recent reauthorizations have divided them.

### Obama Good: Turn Shield

#### GOP ain’t buying it – can’t spin the plan – no risk of turns.

Schmitt 11. [Angie, MA in urban planning, reporter, “Republican Opposition to Transit: A Geographic Explanation” Streets Blog Network -- January 25 -- http://streetsblog.net/2011/01/25/republican-opposition-to-transit-a-geographic-explanation/]

We’ve often scratched our heads as to why many Republicans — especially the party’s leadership — seem so averse to rail, transit and bike infrastructure. There seems to be a mismatch between the party’s espoused ideals and its preference for highly subsidized and highly expensive auto infrastructure. Yonah Freemark at the Transport Politic has illuminated the geographic factor at work here. Freemark points out that, when you break down Congressional districts by population density, Republicans and Democrats increasingly represent different types of places with different needs. The urban-rural political divide is illustrated by the fact that only one Congressional seat with a population density greater than 7,000 people per square mile is currently held by a Republican — and that’s on Staten Island. Freemark writes: The Democratic Party holds most of its power in the nation’s cities, whereas the GOP retains greater strength in the exurbs and rural areas. The two parties generally fight it out over the suburbs. In essence, the base of the two parties is becoming increasingly split in spatial terms: The Democrats’ most vocal constituents live in cities, whereas the Republicans’ power brokers would never agree to what some frame as a nightmare of tenements and light rail. What does this mean? When there is a change in political power in Washington, the differences on transportation policy and other urban issues between the parties reveal themselves as very stark. Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration. This situation, of course, should be of significant concern to those who would advocate for better transit. To put matters simply, few House Republicans have any electoral reason to promote such projects, and thus, for the most part they don’t. But that produces a self-reinforcing loop; noting the lack of GOP support for urban needs, city voters push further towards the Democrats. And sensing that the Democratic Party is a collection of urbanites, those from elsewhere push away. It’s hard to know how to reverse this problem. In addition to securing political support for transit investment, a big part of the challenge for transportation reform, without a doubt, is explaining to the representatives of more rural districts how smart growth policies can save taxpayers money and benefit their constituents. We’ll see how President Obama frames the issue in tonight’s State of the Union address.

#### Aff link turns are too old – no longer bipartisan.

Mark 12. [Jason, editor @ EIJ, environmental politics reporter, “Why do conservatives hate public transit?” Earth Island Journal -- April 3 -- http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why\_do\_conservatives\_hate\_public\_transit/]

Once upon a time — in a political environment that seems otherwordly compared to what we have in the United States today — the federal transportation bill was a bi-partisan endeavor. Now things are different. Congress went into spring recess last week and once again left hanging a reauthorization of the transportation bill, which expired two and a half years ago. Congress was just barely able to approve a temporary, 90-day extension of the lapsed law so that current infrastructure projects can keep moving along. Why the impasse on something that usually wins consensus? It comes down, in part, to a disagreement over how (or even whether) the federal government should fund mass transit programs. The transportation bill moving through the House eliminates the provision that dedicates to mass transit 20 percent of monies from the gas-tax supported Highway Trust Fund — an arrangement that has been in place since Ronald Reagan was president. It also slashes support for high-speed rail projects, cuts subsidies to Amtrak, and eliminates designated funding for bike and pedestrian infrastructure as well as the “Safe Routes to School” program. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood (a former Republican Congressman) called the House measure “the worst transportation bill I’ve ever seen during 35 years of public service.” Compare that with the Senate version, which passed with overwhelming bi-partisan support (74-22). The Senate’s two-year bill, crafted by odd bedfellows Barbara Boxer and Jim Inhofe, would largely maintain the status quo. The easiest thing would be for the House to take up the Senate version, pass it with bi-partisan numbers, and send the law to the president. But that would rankle Speaker John Boehner’s hard-right base. Here’s how Congressman Peter DeFazio, a Democrat from Oregon, summed up the situation: “[The House leadership’s] problem is they have about 80 or 90 people who want to kill off the federal transportation program in their caucus. Then they’re hamstrung because they’ve got 20 or 25 [who] are still rational and say, ‘Hey, if you’re going to kill off transit funding, we won’t vote for the bill.’ So if they do what the flat earth people want, then they lose the moderates, and if they do what the moderates want they lose the flat earth people.”

#### complexity makes transit seem dishonest and ineffective so benefits aren’t perceived

Lewis and Williams ’99 (David Lewis, Ph.D. and president of Hickling Lewis Brod Economics, Inc. Fred Lawrence Williams, Ph.D. with the United States Department of Transportation. “Policy and Planning as a Public Choice” <http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/Policy\_and\_Planning\_as\_Public\_Choice.pdf> D.A.7/10/12) [MP]

To many observers, public sector budgets are a mystery, obscured by arcane technical jargon and unspoken inside information. From this all too accurate perception, some draw the conclusion that public sector budgets are irrational or dishonest. For many, it follows that dependence on public sector budgets makes transit inefficient and ineffective. The idea has taken hold among many transportation professionals that public transit is a subsidized monopoly which is inherently inefficient. Numerous studies suggest that public transit subsidies have been siphoned off by higher labor costs and inefficient service expansions. Indeed, such transit “efficiency” studies conducted in the later 1970s and early 1980s so impressed transit policy boards and transit managers that nearly 20 years later transit managers still think of little else. A valid concern for efficiency has eclipsed interest in transit’s public policy missions.

## --- Elections Links ---

### Elxn: GOP Hates Mass Transit Spending

#### GOP base hates mass transit spending – empirically proven.

Krugman 12. [Paul, badass economist, NYT writer, “Cannibalize the Future” New York Times -- April 12 -- http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/13/opinion/krugman-cannibalize-the-future.html]

Mr. Christie’s big move — the one that will define his record — was his unilateral decision back in 2010 to cancel work that was already under way on a new rail tunnel linking New Jersey with New York. At the time, Mr. Christie claimed that he was just being fiscally responsible, while critics said that he had canceled the project just so he could raid it for funds. Now the independent Government Accountability Office has weighed in with a report on the controversy, and it confirms everything the critics were saying. Much press coverage of the new report focuses, understandably, on the evidence that Mr. Christie made false statements about the tunnel’s financing and cost. The governor asserted that the projected costs were rising sharply; the report tells us that this simply wasn’t true. The governor claimed that New Jersey was being asked to pay for 70 percent of a project that would shower benefits on residents of New York; in fact, the bulk of the financing would have come either from the federal government or from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which collects revenue from residents of both states. But while it’s important to document Mr. Christie’s mendacity, it’s even more important to understand the utter folly of his decision. The new report drives home just how necessary, and very much overdue, the tunnel project was and is. Demand for public transit is rising across America, reflecting both population growth and shifting preferences in an era of high gas prices. Yet New Jersey is linked to New York by just two single-track tunnels built a century ago — tunnels that run at 100 percent of capacity during peak hours. How could this situation not call for new investment? Well, Mr. Christie insisted that his state couldn’t afford the cost. As we’ve already seen, however, he apparently couldn’t make that case without being dishonest about the numbers. So what was his real motive? One answer is that the governor is widely assumed to have national ambitions, and the Republican base hates government spending in general (unless it’s on weapons). And it hates public transportation in particular. Indeed, three other Republican governors — in Florida, Ohio and Wisconsin — have also canceled public transportation projects supported by federal funds. The difference, of course, is that New Jersey is a densely populated state, most of whose residents live either in Greater New York or Greater Philadelphia; given that position, public transit is the state’s lifeblood, and refusing to invest in such transportation will strangle the state’s economy.

#### GOP will spin the plan to ensure backlash – they hate the poor.

Foster 12. [Deborah, former professor who taught social policy, mental health policy, and human diversity, “Republicans advance their war on minorities and the poor with public transportation cuts” Politics USA -- July 1 -- http://www.politicususa.com/loss-war-public-transportation.html]

Like all things public, Republicans want to attack and dismantle public transportation just as badly as they do all the other services provided by government. Showing off their truly loony side, they have gone so far as to accuse public transportation of being a socialist conspiracy perpetrated by the United Nations as part of a “New World Order.” When they are not using bizarre conspiracy theories to fuel the right-wing populism behind tearing down public transportation, Republicans play on two American traditions to sour the American public on mass transit: disdain for the poor and the cultural meme of independence on the open road. Conventionally, people associate the need for public transit with urban, poor populations, and Republicans use this stereotypical association in their favor. Like attacks on welfare, they are able to parlay negative attitudes toward helping the “undeserving poor”, tainted with their ever-present racism, into an “us-versus-them” mentality regarding mass transit. Republicans perpetuate the myth that roads pay for themselves while public transit costs the taxpayer money, despite the fact that this has been shown to be untrue. For example, the State Smart Transportation Initiative in Wisconsin calculated that non-users of roads each pay about $779 for them, while non-users of public transit pay $50. Republicans love to divide and conquer, and emphasizing that transportation dollars that go to public transit benefit “only certain populations in big cities” is an effective way to wedge large swaths of Americans from one another. Not coincidentally, Republicans have been attacking or neglecting big cities in general. For example, during the Republican primary, Rick Santorum said,

## --- Auto Trade Off Disad ---

### Mass Transit Links

#### Public transit causes a direct tradeoff with auto industry growth – undermining the economy

Beutler 12.(Brian, TPMDC senior congressional correspondent, 4/16/12, http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/03/end-of-an-error-the-car-century-begins-to-wane-charts.php)

The economy’s on the rebound, and with it so is the U.S. auto manufacturing sector, three years after Detroit nearly went bankrupt. But a different indicator of U.S. economic growth suggests a significant realignment is under way in the American transportation system — one that isn’t necessarily good news for car makers. The charts below tell a key part of the American story of the last century. Despite their much smaller numbers, Americans in the middle of the 1900s took more public transit trips on buses, trains and so on than we do today as a whole. Many more. In 1947 — the peak year — they racked up 23.4 billion trips in total. Last year it was a paltry-by-comparison 10.4 billion. The key reason why won’t surprise you. “Back then people didn’t have cars,” said APTA spokesman Virginia Miller. “Even in the 1950s people didn’t own a lot of cars, owning one car was common. As we move into the ’60s we saw people moving out into the suburbs [facilitated by] the interstate legislation in 1956 under President Eisenhower.” Public transportation’s been on the rebound for decades, after bottoming out in the early 1970s. But it didn’t really begin booming until the economy caught fire in the mid 1990s. Part of the story is population growth. Part of it’s the revival of American cities. But that recovery stalls every time the economy falls out from under it, which is exactly what happened in 2008. Last year, there was a significant turnaround. And that’s another indication that the economy is really, truly improving: Public transportation usage is back on the rise — in a significant way. That may not seem like it follows. Why wouldn’t people use cheaper modes of public transportation during economic hard times? But, as the New York Times noted earlier this week, an overwhelming number of public transportation users are commuters, and when those commuters lose their jobs, there’s no reason to take the train or the bus to work. APTA, of course, hopes it’s a return to trend. “What’s interesting now, in this new century, is that it appears we’re going back to the future as more and more people are realizing the value of public transportation,” Miller said. If she’s right, that has big implications for the robustness of the auto industry’s recovery, and many, many other aspects of the U.S. economy.

## --- Spending Links ---

### Mass Transit Links

#### Urban transit funds are wasteful and cost billions- the economic payoff is marginal because the benefits are so localized

O’Toole 2012 (Randal O’Toole, Cato Analyst, CATO INSTITUTE, “Urban Transit”, June 2010, accessed 6.12.2012: http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit)

The Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration has an annual budget of more than $10 billion, nearly all of which is spent on subsidies to state and local governments.2 In addition, the economic stimulus bill of 2009 added a further $8 billion in subsidies over a period of years.3 Through these subsidies and related regulations, federal policymakers play a major role in shaping urban transportation choices. Transit funding is costly to taxpayers, and it is not a proper function of the federal government. It encourages state and local governments to pursue high-cost and less-efficient transportation solutions—in particular, rail transit. Outside of a few hyper-dense cities in the world, rail transit is a luxury for the few paid for by everyone. Commuter trains and subways may be necessary to keep Manhattan going, but that doesn't mean that everyone else in the nation should subsidize them. Outside of New York City, rail transit makes little economic sense.

#### Federal transportation can never be cost effective because of the way it contracts with unions

Herbert et al, 2011(Ronald D. Utt, Herbert and Joyce Morgan Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, HERITAGE FOUNDATION, “President Obama Busts the Budget for Pie-in-the-Sky Amtrak and “Livability” Proposals”, 3.4.2011, accessed 6.12.2012: http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/transportation-spending-busting-the-budget-for-amtrak-and-livability)

Added to this is the political allure of federal transportation spending that disproportionately benefits members of labor unions and their leaders. All workers on federally supported construction projects must be paid “prevailing” wages in accordance with the Davis–Bacon Act, and these wages are higher than those in the competitive market. Such wages are common to union contracts. A recent Heritage Foundation study found that the Davis–Bacon Act increases the cost of federal construction projects by 9.9 percent and that its repeal would create 155,000 more construction jobs at the same cost to taxpayers.[3] Davis–Bacon is not the only cost problem. All federally funded transit systems are operated by unionized workers who are paid wages and benefits, and provided costly job protections under Section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act and other federal statutes, well above those of comparable workers in the private sector, whether unionized or not.

#### Mass Transit expensive

Admin 4/23 (Admin, “Cars Are the Mass-Transit Solution of the Future”, APRIL 23, 2012, http://www.financialgod.com/cars-are-the-mass-transit-solution-of-the-future/)

Mass transit is becoming more and more expensive, and cities everywhere are decrying a lack of funding. It costs hundreds of millions to billions of dollars to build new lines, and because mass transit corporations are usually taxpayer-funded public organizations, they not only hold a local market monopoly due to government privilege, but they also hold a gun to the local citizen’s head. If they don’t get the exorbitant compensation increases they feel they deserve, they can bring the city to a grinding halt. The city I live in recently extended a subway line and constructed a few new stations at a total cost of nearly $1 billion, and even the transit agency itself estimates that only around 8,000 people use this new line. Most of those were also existing bus riders. Therefore, the government spent around $125,000 per passenger so that they could sit in a train in a dark tunnel for a few kilometers, instead of a bus. Talk about a massive waste of resources! That money could have been spent elsewhere for a better return, or, better yet, could have been returned to the taxpayers. Keep in mind that maintenance costs for the tunnel, workers and trains also amount to another tens of millions per year. I wonder how many people pocketed out of that deal.

# \*\*\*COUNTERPLANS\*\*\*

## --- Privatization CP ---

### Solvency

#### Increased privatization of mass transit solves better – empirics.

Cox 11

(Wendell Cox, March 2 2011, Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less, Accessed July 12, 2012, JDP)

Last Exit indicates that transit can produce beneficial results, but it makes a compelling case for reform. Winston suggests that transit could be improved by greater involvement of the private sector, following models such as the competitive tendering (i.e., competitive contracting) that now accounts for approximately one-half of Denver’s bus system.¶ The international evidence, which Winston does not cite, is even more substantial. This includes London, the world’s largest bus transit system, the entire Copenhagen bus system, and the entire subway, commuter rail, and bus systems of Stockholm.[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn5) However, the ultimate in privatization is Tokyo, the world’s largest urban area, where transit ridership is 1.5 times that of the entire United States. More than two-thirds of all transit ridership in Tokyo–Yokohama is carried by unsubsidized private rail and bus operators.[[6]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/federal-transit-programs-spending-more-and-more-for-less-and-less%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn6)¶ The Need for Reform¶ As the nation faces the imperative need to reduce spending and borrowing, attention must be focused on the programs that have been more effective in spending money than in delivering service. It is no longer enough to spend more and more to get less and less.

## --- States CP ---

### General Solvency

#### States solve best –local funding improves the quality of transit systems

Gordon ’11 (Michael Gordon, B.A. in economics and international studies and analyst at Charles River Associates. “Funding Urban Mass Transit in the United States”. March 23, 2011 <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2007981> D.A.7/10/12) [MP]

Urban mass transit systems also rely on other government sources of funding beyond federal contributions. For example, in 2008 Boston’s MBTA derived about 15% of its funding from each the federal and local government, while almost 40% of its total funding came from the state, and the remaining 30% from other sources, such as fare revenues and private contributions.20 In fact, federal funding sometimes conditions on the state or local governments matching its funding.21 Federal funds also often require agencies to spend on specific items. For example, ARRA funds capital improvements, even though many systems cannot cover their operating costs. This is especially true during the recent recession – many agencies have cut service, laid off employees, and raised fares in an attempt to cover operating costs. It may make more sense in these cases for government subsidization to target operating losses instead of capital improvements.22 However, funding does not appear to be increasing in the wake of the recession. Only 10% of public transportation agencies expected an increase in local/regional funding in 2010, while 66% expected a decrease. Meanwhile, only 11% expected an increase in state funding while 56% expected a decrease.23 As a result, 69% of urban transit agencies expected budget shortfalls in 2011, indicating that these systems do not expect the current combinations of funding to adequately cover their costs.24 State and local funding may be more effective than federal funding because the dollars are more centralized. A system applying for federal funding does so at the expense of general taxpayers; however, a system applying for state and/or local funding does so at the expense of taxpayers closer to the system. As such, the requested funds may need to have more of an effect to satisfy the taxpayers because they can more easily see the results. If a system must raise funds to avoid a deficit, for example, local and state sources may be more willing to help on this account in order to keep the system running and equitable. This follows the idea of fiscal federalism, which states that providing services at more local levels “in turn improves the efficiency of the public sector by providing a better match between the public services people desire and the public services provided to them.”25 However, the federal government still gives larger funds that the state and local governments cannot afford to replace.

#### States solve – local adaptation key.

Hudgins 1 **(**Edward, Ph.D., Director of Advocacy and Senior Scholar for The Atlas Society, 2001, “Cato Handbook for Congress: Policy Recommendations for the 107th Congress,” http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb107/hb107-39.pdf, Accessed 7/13/12)

Rep. John Kasich of Ohio and Sen. Connie Mack of Florida introduced legislation that would have returned both the responsibility for most roads, bridges, and mass transit and the tax base to the states. That plan would have cut most of the 18.4-cent federal gasoline tax, keeping only a few cents for maintenance of the interstate highway system. If states were allowed to assess and fund their own infrastructure needs, they would be able to select the transportation systems that best suited local conditions. If necessary, they could reintroduce gasoline taxes at the current level, or at higher or lower levels, to pay for their systems.Instead, Congress is spending record amounts of money on roads, much of it as pork-barrel handouts at their worst. Washington continues to collect taxes to which it attaches costly strings. For example, the Davis-Bacon Act requires that workers on projects receiving federal funds must be paid the so-called prevailing wage, which usually means a wage far above the wages that local workers normally are paid. The dough is then doled out according to formulas that, for example, encourage localities to build lightrail systems that are 10 to 100 times more costly than are new bus or high-occupancy-vehicle lanes. Such rail systems induce few commuters to abandon their cars and leave less money for local governments to spend on infrastructure that would ease congestion. The past few years have also seen both local and federal officials taking up the New Urbanist ideology that wants governments to discourage ‘‘suburban sprawl’’ and promote ‘‘smart-growth’’ policies that limit the use of property by suburban landowners. That ideology sees the automobile as the enemy. If state or local governments want to experiment with such unsound policies, they may do so under the Constitution. Unfortunately, the federal government already promotes aspects of this ideology through its transportation programs and likely will be more intrusive in local transportation questions in the future. That is even greater reason for Congress to reevaluate transportation policy. Even though record funds have been authorized, they have not been appropriated. Congress could resist the urge to spend up to approved limits. That, of course, would mean that revenues from the gasoline tax would remain unspent in DOT accounts— which would give Congress an incentive to cut the gasoline tax. Further, the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 should be repealed; its swamp of requirements fails to keep pace with urban change, preventing the efficient operation of urban mass transit systems. When the act was adopted, most commuters traveled from suburbs to cities; now, however, most trips are intrasuburban. Yet the outdated transit act provides incentives for local governments to build urban rail and subway systems by providing up to 75 percent of construction funds, even though many cities need funds for suburban systems such as bus and car-pool lanes.

#### States solve better – federal inefficiencies.

Glaeser 12 (Edward Glaeser, Harvard Professor of Economics and author of “Triumph of the City: How our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer Smarter Greener Healthier and Happier”, PHD from University of Chicago, *Spending Won’t Fix What Ails U.S. Infrastructure*, February 3rd 2012, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-14/spending-won-t-fix-what-ails-u-s-transport-commentary-by-edward-glaeser.html, accessed July 10th, 2012)

Most forms of transport infrastructure overwhelmingly serve the residents of a single state. Yet the federal government has played an outsized role in funding transportation for 50 years. Whenever the person paying isn’t the person who benefits, there will always be a push for more largesse and little check on spending efficiency. Would Detroit’s People Mover have ever been built if the people of Detroit had to pay for it? We should move toward a system in which states and localities take more responsibility for the infrastructure that serves their citizens.

#### Top down structures fail – cp solves better.

**Utt 03 (**Ronald, PhD in economics from Indiana University, Senior Research Fellow in the Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, former senior economist at the Office of Management and Budget, November 21, “Proposal to Turn the Federal Highway Program Back to the States Would Relieve Traffic Congestion,” The Heritage Foundation, Accessed 7/13/12)

Representative Jeff Flake (R–AZ) has introduced legislation that would devolve, or “turn back,” the federal highway and transit programs to the states by allowing them to take over collection of the federal fuel tax and spend those revenues on transportation priorities of their own choosing, not Washington’s. The policies embodied in this bill—the Transportation Empowerment Act (H.R. 3113)—would significantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of surface transportation programs without imposing a tax increase. Problems With the Status Quo With the completion of the interstate highway system more than 20 years ago and the increased urbanization of the population, America’s transportation problems have become increasingly local and regional in nature. As a result, Washington officials have little to offer in the way of effective solutions to distant problems. Indeed, a case could be made that the existing top-down, one-size-fits-all approach embodied in the 1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21) has become a counterproductive waste of money that increasingly benefits influential constituencies at the expense of the ordinary motorists who fund the program through their taxes.

#### Comparative ev that the states are better.

Johnson 12 (Fawn Johnson, correspondent for National Journal on transportation and has written for the Wall Street Journal on financial regulation and communications, M.A. from University of Pennsylvania and B.A. from Bates College, Transportation Experts Blog, *Not Waiting For the Feds,* May 21 2012, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/not-waiting-for-the-feds.php#174592, accessed July 12th)

The transportation community in the states should want the federal government to be fired. Over the next few weeks, they are waiting for negotiators in Congress to pass a highway bill. If lawmakers are successful (and there is no guarantee of that), a few much-needed updates to the transportation program would be in place. But then it will only be 18 months, at most, until policymakers have to address again a handful of percolating problems like shoring up the highway trust fund for the long term. If the chambers can't reach agreement, that likely means a shorter extension of current highway authority. Cuts are possible.¶ This scenario does not offer a ringing endorsement of the federal government as transportation caretaker. The inability of Congress and the White House to articulate and carry out a federal infrastructure policy could give credence to arguments from the right that the states would do a better job of regulating and funding their own transportation. But then Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., colorfully points out the very real problem with that idea--the highway to nowhere. DeFazio has a poster of a Kansas turnpike in 1956 that ends in a farmer's field in Oklahoma. "Devolution, baby! That's where we're headed," he said when showing it off in the Capitol in March

### Your Authors Vote Neg

#### Their author advocates the states cp.

Bullard et al 7. (Robert D, Ware professor of sociology and director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University; Glenn S. Johnson, a research associate in the Environmental Justice Resource Center and an associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the same university;. Angel O. Torres, a geographic information system training specialist with the Environmental Justice Resource Center “Dismantling transportation Apartheid in the United States Before and After Disasters Strike” Vol. 34 No. 3 Summer 2007 http://www.americanbar.org/publications/human\_rights\_magazine\_home/human\_rights\_vol34\_2007/summer2007/hr\_summer07\_bujoto.html)

Transportation is a key ingredient in any organization’s plan to build economically viable and sustainable communities. State DOTs, MPOs, and transit providers have a major responsibility to ensure that their programs, policies, and practices do not discriminate against or adversely and disproportionately impact people of color and the poor. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita demonstrated the inadequacy of emergency plans and the difficulty of evacuating an entire city quickly and smoothly. Funding is desperately needed for local transportation providers to furnish ongoing emergency transportation preparedness for all public transportation personnel, as well as specific training on public transportation provisions of the Americans with Disability Act.¶ State and local governments should offer incentives for local transportation providers to increase efforts to provide alternative transportation services in areas with high concentrations of transit dependent persons and nondrivers. An emergency transportation fund is also needed to support hurricane evacuees to return home and funds to support transportation needs in cities where evacuees are currently living.

### AT: Fed Funding Key

#### No it’s not.

**Roth 12** (Gabriel Roth, Research Fellow at Independent Institute on market-based roads, parking, and transit and has worked for 20 years as a transportation economist for the World Bank. Transportation Experts Blog, *Phase out Federal Transport Financing* inresponse to *Not Waiting on the Feds,* May 21, 2012, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/not-waiting-for-the-feds.php#2211529)

The principle of “subsidiarity” postulates that government decisions should occur at the lowest practicable level, for example locally rather than nationally. This principle suggests that **it is indeed time to relieve the federal government of the burden of financing transportation infrastructure, and of the onus of having to raise the required fees or taxes, and return these responsibilities to the states.** The following reasons come to mind:¶ 1. **The purpose of federal financing — completion of the Interstate Highway System — has been virtually achieved, and it is difficult to identify other advantages from federal financing.**¶ 2. **The disadvantages of federal financing — increased costs and intrusive regulation — are evident and substantial**.¶ 3. Congress, unable to increase the taxes dedicated to roads, seeks to use general funds to finance some of the transportation expenditures it considers necessary, thus abandoning the US traditional “user pays” principle for roads.¶ 4. Congress keeps deferring long-term road legislation and substituting short-term-extensions of previous (2005) legislation, thus hindering long-term planning of transportation projects.¶ 5. **New methods** to pay for road use — such as mileage-based user fees to replace fuel taxes — **are more likely to succeed as a result of innovations sought by different states, than if imposed by a federal government seeking a “one size fits all” solution.**¶ Reliance on general funds has the critical disadvantage that allocations to transportation from general revenues have to compete against other legitimate claims such as defense. On the other hand, when funding is by user fees, expenditures on infrastructure are determined by users’ willingness to pay.¶ I have to admit that, unlike Representative Peter DeFazio, I’ve not read all of the 1,600 plus pages of the Senate bill, but those that I have indicate that it would be best for it to be peacefully laid to rest, in the hope that the next congress could fashion a shorter and better one.¶ Abandonment of this unfortunate bill would benefit the country economically, because the bill fosters irrelevant spending. For example (as reported by our panelist Ken Orski) the creation of a new “National Endowment for the Oceans, Coasts and Great Lakes” to be housed in the Department of Commerce. It also enables spectacularly wasteful spending, such as the 19th century style Dulles Airport and Honolulu rail connections, which would have vehicles running on rails and stopping at every station.¶ And it would benefit the federal congress fiscally, and politically:¶ Fiscally, because congress has run out of money and is desperately seeking savings; and¶ Politically, because road users — who vote — get a particularly raw deal from the bill, under which, according to John Mica, Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, some 35 per cent of their payments are diverted to non-road purposes.

### AT: Johnson Says States = Racist/Fed Signal Key

#### Johnson isn’t about the aff – assumes the world of conditioned federal spending with explicit anti-discrimination goals – means they either don’t get these federal key warrants or they’re not topical because they’re not a definite increase.

(this is their card j ust re-underlined – do not read in the debate)

At the same time, this Essay argues, the stimulus provides a powerful occasion for using federal funds to promote racial equity. Federal law now provides tools unavailable to racial reformers of the New Deal era for guiding how federal money is spent. Indeed, as a result of the legislative gains of the 1960s, federal spending has become a potent vehicle for advancing antidiscrimination norms. By conditioning spending, federal statutes prohibit intentional racial exclusion by federally funded grantees, and even impose affirmative duties on federal agencies and grantees to [\*159] attend to, and to interrupt, the varied and complex ways in which federal funds sustain racial inequality. 14 These statutes are useful not only in litigation but also in allowing civil rights and equity groups to mobilize around the broad idea that government spending should not entrench or subsidize racial inequality.

### AT: States = Racist

#### Claims of state racism are a myth ---- Courts will block

Timothy Zizk, William and Mary Law Review, Oct 2004 v46 i1 p213(131) Statehood as the new personhood: the discovery of fundamental "states' rights".

Perhaps it was not institutional incompetence or necessity that led the Garcia Court to purport to leave the federalism area, and that has led the Court more generally to avoid, at least until recently, an expansive rights regime for states. Perhaps, as Baker and Young contend, individual rights like abortion and sexual privacy are simply "normatively more attractive than states' rights." After all, the phrase "states' rights," for many, conjures a host of negative associations, including, for some, virulent racism. It is possible, therefore, that the Court, and many scholars as well, have been "read[ing] particular values out of the Constitution simply because popular opinion at a given point in history finds them normatively unattractive." This proposition cannot, of course, be tested empirically. There may indeed have been some residual judicial ill will toward "states' rights" due to its association with bad actors, both public and private, in our nation's past. It seems unlikely, however, that in 1985, when Garcia was decided, the Court rested its decision to curtail fundamental "states' rights" federalism on these sorts of negative associations. It probably gives too little credit to the Court, and to scholars, to suggest that modes of judicial enforcement or scholarly support are based primarily upon "changing normative preferences" or mere popularity. Even if one is not willing to give judges and scholars such credit, it is surely a stretch to paint the "states' rights" of National League of Cities with the same brush as the old "states' rights" of segregationists. The "states' rights" of what might be considered the modern era--freedom from federal wages and hours regulations, for example--are hardly the sort that invoke segregationist ghosts.

#### Jurisdictional competition between states ensures that they will protect individual liberties and rights – jurisdictional monopoly is net worse

Calabresi 95 (Steven, Professor of Constitutional Law, Formerly Law Clerk, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Court of Appeals Judge Robert H. Bork, and Ralph K. Winter, and Served in the Reagan and Bush Administrations, December, “A Government of Limited and Enumerated Powers: In Defense of United States v. Lopez” – Michigan Law Review, p. lexis)

Jurisdictional monopoly is conducive not only to a low-quality bundle of public goods; at the extreme, it could be said also to lead to the denial of fundamental individual liberties. Jurisdictional competition, then, is also beneficial because it leads to the protection of liberty. If I dislike the laws of my home state enough and feel tyrannized by them enough, I always can preserve my freedom by moving to a different state with less tyrannous laws. Some may think this liberty argument for federalism is just another form of the argument already made that federalism leads to competition in the provision of public goods. And, of course, if one wrongly believes that fundamental private liberties are "provided" by government as a public good, then these two points indeed do collapse into each other. In fact, however, it turns out that fundamental private liberties are actually antecedent to government, and, therefore, the protection of those liberties through jurisdictional competition is a great and additional benefit of federalism

## --- Courts CP ---

### Courts Solvency

#### Judicial action can solve transportation inequity

Moulding 05

Patrick Moulding \*¶ BIO: ¶ \* J.D. Candidate, Georgetown University Law Center, 2005¶ Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy¶ Spring, 2005¶ 12 Geo. J. Poverty Law & Pol'y 155

. Train Our Sights on the Courthouse¶ One possible route to greater transit equality is to seek justice in the courts. As an introduction to the potential impact of legal action, one significant lawsuit starkly illustrates the economic disparities that exist in transit funding, as well as the dramatically different reactions to legal challenges that can come from the judicial bench. In October 1995, the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority proposed a 20% increase in New York City subway and bus fares and a 9% increase in the fares for commuter rail lines. The increase was scheduled to take effect by mid-November. At the time, racial and ethnic minorities made up about 60% of riders on the subway and bus network (the part of the metro transit system run by the New York City Transit Authority, or NYCTA) but only about 20% of the commuter rail passengers. n94 In response, the New York Urban League, the [\*170] Straphangers Campaign (a transit advocacy group), n95 and three individual plaintiffs brought suit in federal district court on behalf of the minority users of the transit system, seeking to enjoin the rate hike.¶ The plaintiffs took an unusual legal approach, basing their complaint not on procedural improprieties, environmental impact, or insufficient fact-finding by the agency, but instead on Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Law n96 and the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. They alleged that the fare plan would have a disparate impact on racial minorities and illegally discriminated in its distribution of transit subsidies within the transit system. n97 Moreover, they argued that despite the vastly higher ridership of central-city (NYCTA) transit programs relative to the commuter lines, the entire process of transit subsidies in the metro area disproportionately favored the commuters: a 9:1 ratio of NYCTA riders to rail users corresponded to only a 2:1 ratio in funding. The plaintiffs claimed this imbalance, including the effects on minority riders, would only be heightened by the proposed rate increase. n98¶ The creative argument proved persuasive. Judge Patterson's decision in New York Urban League, Inc. v. Metropolitan Transportation Authorityn99 agreed that the questions raised by the allegations were sufficiently serious (and retroactively compensating victims so difficult) to justify an injunction. The judge also found that "a high percentage of the minority group members in question receive public assistance or are among the working poor and would undergo considerable hardship prior to any final judgment being rendered." n100 In finding a likelihood of success on the merits, the court cited the city's inadequate justification for its fare plan:¶ [MTA's] evidence, however, does not provide a business reason for [it] to implement fare increases which would have a disproportionately adverse effect on a population of 969,398 minority employees or approximately 60% of the persons who use NYCTA subways and buses as their primary means of transportation to work. No business reason has been shown to demonstrate why the 173,000 riders of the commuter lines, over eighty percent of whom are white, should have approximately 60% and 50% of their transportation to work costs paid by government subsidies while only 40% of those costs are paid for the 1.6 million persons, 969,000 of whom are minorities, who depend on the NYCTA subways and buses to get to work. n101

#### Courts key to solve transportation racism – issues are rooted in the law

Seymore 05 (Sean, George Mason University George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal, “Set the Captives Free!: Transit Inequity in Urban Centers, and the Laws and Policies which Aggravate the Disparity”, Lexis, 7/10/12, JA)

Although the story of transit inequity often appears to be a collection of anecdotes that reveal the darker side of America's past, this Article has sought to show that the disparities are rooted in the law, beginning with Plessy and continuing with Interstate Era legislation which benefited highways and suburbs at the expense of city transit and the urban core. These laws, combined with government-supported discriminatory housing practices, have created an urban core with low-income residents who are transit dependent. This Article has sought to show that transit inequity extends beyond "train is better than bus." Admittedly transit authorities seek to achieve formidable goals while navigating through a network of regulations and statutes. This Article has shown that the agencies, in exercising their business judgment, tend to placate choice riders at the expense of the captive riders of the inner city. Although the courts must allow transit [\*114] authorities reasonable discretion in allocating resources, the courts must insist that the agencies operate within the law and honor their commitments.

### 2NC: Courts Don’t Link to Politics

#### Nope – judicial process shields the court and legislators from political fall out.

Ward 9 [Artemus, Professor @ NIU, Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy, Congress and The Presidency, pg. 119]

After the old order has collapse the once- united, new-regime coalition begins to fracture as original commitments are extended to new issues. In chapter 3 Whittington combines Skowronek's articulation and disjunctive categories into the overarching "affiliated" presidencies as both seek to elaborate the regime begun under reconstructive leaders. By this point in the ascendant regime, Bourts are staffed by justices from the dominant ruling coalition via the appointment process - and Whittington spends time on appointment politics here and more fully in chapter 4. Perhaps counter-intuitively, affiliated political actors - including presidents - encourage Courts to exercise vetoes and operate in issue areas of relatively low political salience. Of course, this "activism" is never used against the affiliated president per se. Instead, affiliated Courts correct for the overreaching of those who operate outside the preferred constitutional vision, which are often state and local governments who need to be brought into line with nationally dominant constitutional commitments. Whittington explains why it is easier for affilitated judges, rather than affiliated presidents, to rein in outliers and conduct constitutional maintenance. The latter are saddled with controlling opposition political figures, satisfying short-term political demands, and navigating intraregime gridlock and political thickets. Furthermore, because of their electoral accountability, politicians engage in position-taking, credit-claiming, and blame-avoidance behavior. By contrast, their judicial counterparts are relatively sheltered from political pressures and have more straightforward decisional processes. Activist Courts can take the blame for advancing and legitimizing constitutional commitments that might have electoral costs. In short, a division of labor exists between politicians and judges affiliated with the dominant regime.

#### Court action provides political cover.

Rosenberg 91 [Gerald N., Associate Professor in Political Science @ U of Chicago, The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?, pg. 35]

Finally, court orders can simply provide a shield or cover for administrators fearful of political reaction. This is particularly helpful for elected officials who can implement required reforms and protest against them at the same time. This pattern is often seen in the school desegregation era. Writing in 1967, one author noted that “a court order is useful in that it leaves the official no choice and a perfect excuse.” While the history of court-ordered desegregation unfortunately shows that officials often had many choices other than Implementing court orders, a review of school desegregation cases did find that “many school boards pursue from the outset a course designed to shift the entire political burden of the desegregation on the courts.” This was also the case in the Alabama mental health litigation where “the mental health administrators wanted [Judge] Johnson to take all the political heat associated with specific orders while they enjoyed the benefits of his action. Thus, Condition VI: Courts may effectively produce significant social reform by providing leverage, or a shield, cover or an excuse, for persons crucial to implementation who are willing to act.

#### Allows president to deflect blame

Spann 00 [Girardeau, Professor of Law @ Georgetown, Wriing off Race, Law and Contemporary Problems, Lexis]

What President Clinton has failed to do is to assert the full scope of his constitutional authority to formulate race relations policy for the nation that elected him to be its political leader. In so doing, he has aligned himself with past Presidents who were passive rather than active in the formulation of constitutional policy. It is often convenient for a President to deflect political controversy to the Supreme Court. A President can appease political allies with rhetoric that endorses more than the Court will allow, and can appease political opponents by acquiescing in Court-ordered results that fall short of presidential rhetoric. That is rational behavior for a politician -- particularly in the contemporary environment of designer politics, where rhetorical labels seem to matter at least as much substantive outcomes. It is rational, but it may also be unconstitutional.

# \*\*\*THE K\*\*\*

### Capitalism Links

#### Race doesn’t exist. Their emphasis on race as a determinant of disadvantages is a self-fulfilling prophecy that ignores that class is the true cause of all their impacts. The alternative just serves the interest of advocacy groups-Getting over race must start with the state

Balko 2 (Radely, Fox News, Biologically Speaking, Race Doesn't Exist, January 17, 2002, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,43298,00.html)

"Possibly only six genes determine the color of a persons skin," Graves, a professor of evolutionary biology and African-American Studies at Arizona University, said in the Times interview. Six genes, out of the 30,000 to 40,000 genes that make us human, determine race. Graves further asserted what genome researches have been uncovering over several years as the mapping project has wound down: as far as biology is concerned, race doesnt exist. Black, white, Asian all are artificial, really. A black man and a white man from Manhattan, for example, are likely to be more genetically similar than a black man from Manhattan and a black man from Nigeria. Graves sites sickle cell anemia as an example of what’s widely thought to be a "black disease." In fact, because sickle cells offer immunity to malaria, the condition exists wherever malaria exists. American blacks descended primarily from West African blacks, where malaria is abundant. But Graves notes that the disease is also present in Greece and Yemen. Had colonial American slaves been Greek or Yemeni, sickle cell anemia would be known to Americans as a Greek or Yemeni disease, not a black one. Graves and Venter hope their research will prevent doctors from considering race when making diagnoses. But, as the Times points out, old habits die hard. The current Surgeon General, Dr. David Satcher, continues to divert millions of dollars toward eliminating health disparities among the "races" by 2010. Black medical associations continue to fund research into black-only pharmaceuticals for "black-only" ailments. But voices like those of Graves and Venter are beginning to change some minds, if ever so slowly. This heartening new research ought to have sociological implications as well. If my doctor sees no difference between black and white, my Congressman, my teacher and my police chief shouldn’t either. It’s time government stop recognizing race. The 2000 U.S. Census lists eleven different racial and ethnic classifications, and allows for any hybrid combination of those eleven. The last Census also was steeped in racial classification controversy. Should minorities be "actually enumerated," or estimated via statistical sampling? Federal dollars are routinely allocated on the basis of race, as are federal contracts to private firms. The use of race in college admissions processes has mired academia in turmoil and controversy. Private companies are closely monitored to ensure the workers on their payroll have faces tinted to "look like America." Following the governments lead, sociologists, demographers, statisticians and academics endlessly break down our television viewing habits, purchases, mortality rates, income and voting patterns into black and white, red and yellow. Is it any wonder then why America is race-obsessed? Black Americans are routinely told that they are sicker, poorer, less intelligent, less upwardly-mobile, less motivated, more criminally-inclined and more prone to illegitimacy than their white and Asian counterparts. Of course none of these maladies is predicated on biology. They are class disparities, not race disparities. As conservative columnist George Will recently noted, if one could wave a magic wand over black America and make it white, black Americas problems would not disappear with its pigment. Affirmative action, a program that rewards race for races sake, usually at the expense of merit, is a fine example. Black social critics on the left and right have lamented that academic success in urban high schools and among black communities on college campuses is often equated with the "whiteness," or at the very least, with the lack of "blackness," of the African American students. Affirmative action -- government recognition and selection based on race has instilled in black Americans a stigmatization that equates their own race with academic failure. But race isn’t the reason the poor kid from the city needs a boost class is. A white or Asian kid from the inner city is just as disadvantaged as a black one. But he doesn’t get extra consideration. The implication is that being poor is not a disadvantage, but being black is. Some colleges now recognize "hardship" and "background" in the admissions process. But race continues to drive their selections. America will never get over race until we stop crunching our numbers by it. Change should start with the state. As more Americans intermarry, and as overseas and interracial adoptions continue to attract American couples, racial and ethnic distinctions will continue to erode in skin tone, as well as in custom and culture. Consequently, the government’s habit of recognizing these distinctions will become more and more absurd. Unfortunately, the same people who rightly want racial blinders removed from board rooms and highway troopers wrongly want government to continue to recognize race when it benefits their own interests. The statistics and alleged discrepancies that continue to racially marginalize and fractionalize Americans also fuel the fundraising drives, the political clout and the demands for federal assistance from racial advocacy groups. If science ceases to recognize race, government ought to follow suit. It’s time to take race off of the U.S. Census. And, while we’re at it, off of college applications, loan applications, and off the minds of New Jersey’s state troopers. If the state takes the lead, perhaps the rest of us will follow.

#### Modern Racism is no longer based on ideologies of cultural or natural superiority - economic egotism is the root of modern racism

Zizek 2008 Slavoj Violence p 101-104

But we are not dealing here only with good old racism. Something more is at stake: a fundamental feature of our emerging “global” society. On ii September 2001 the Twin Towers were hit. Twelve years earlier, on 9 November 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. That date heralded the “happy ‘9os,” the Francis Fukuyama dream of the “end of history” —the belief that liberal democracy had, in principle, won; that the search was over; that the advent of a global, liberal world community lurked just around the corner; that the obstacles to this ultra-Hollywood happy ending were merely empirical and contingent (local pockets of resistance where the leaders did not yet grasp that their time was up). In contrast, 9/11 is the main symbol of the end of the Clintonite happy ‘9os. This is the era in which new walls emerge everywhere, between Israel and the West Bank, around the European Union, on the U.S.—Mexico border. The rise of the populist New Right is just the most prominent example of the urge to raise new walls. ¶ A couple of years ago, an ominous decision of the European Union passed almost unnoticed: the plan to establish an all-European border police force to secure the isolation of Union territory and thus to prevent the influx of immigrants. This is the truth of globalisation: the construction of new walls safeguarding prosperous Europe from the immigrant flood. One is tempted to resuscitate here the old Marxist “humanist” opposition of “relations between things” and “relations between persons”: in the much-celebrated free circulation opened up by global capitalism, it is “things” (commodities) which freely circulate, while the circulation of “persons” is more and more controlled. We are not dealing now with “globalisation” as an unfinished project but with a true “dialectics of globalisation”: the segregation of the people is the reality of economic globalisation. This new racism of the developed is in a way much more brutal than the previous ones: its implicit legitimisation is neither naturalist (the “natural” superiority of the developed West) nor any longer culturalist (we in the West also want to preserve our cultural identity), but unabashed economic egotism. The fundamental divide is one between those included in the sphere of (relative) economic prosperity and those excluded from it.