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#### Status quo implementation of transportation infrastructure is profoundly neo-liberal. Policy makers focus on market mechanisms and privatization 🡺 racism and social exclusion

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

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

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

Cities starved by neoliberal state restructuring responded to their fiscal troubles by adopting entrepreneurial norms, practices, and institutional frameworks. Entre-preneurial municipal governments prioritize policies that create a good business climate and competitive advantages for businesses (Harvey, 1989; Smith, 2002) by “reconstituting social welfare provisions as anticompetitive costs'', and by implementing ``an extremely narrow urban policy repertoire based on capital subsidies, place promotion, supply side intervention, central-city makeovers and local boosterism'' (Peck and Tickell, 2002, pages 47 ^ 48). In effect, neoliberal urbanization encourages local governments to retreat from social redistribution and integrated social welfare policies in favor of bolstering business activity (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). As a consequence, entrepreneurial mayors emerged in the 1980s to forge alliances between government and business leaders (what I refer to as the `global city growth machine') under the banner of urban revitalization (Judd and Simpson, 2003). City space is mobilized ``as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices'' (Brenner and Theodore, 2002, page 21). The abandonment of Fordist planning, privileging a more integrated urban form in favor of selective investment in privileged places, has resulted in what scholars have variously deemed as a fragmented, polarized, splintered, or quartered urbanity (Graham and Marvin, 2001; Marcuse and van Kempen, 2000; Sassen 1991; Swyngedouw et al, 2002).

The business-friendly policies and practices pursued by entrepreneurial urban governments must also be understood in relation to the global reorganization of production. Global cities emerged as the command and control nodes of the global economy, where multinational headquarters, producer services, and FIRE (finance, insurance, and real estate) firms cluster (Sassen, 1991). To lure multinational corporate headquarters, producer services, professional ^ managerial workers, and tourists to their city, municipal governments recreate urban space by prioritizing megaprojects and infrastructure that help businesses gain competitive advantages and keep them connected within global networks as well as providing financing and amenities for gentrification, tourism, and cultural consumption (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Fainstein, 2008; Graham and Marvin, 2001; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). These urban development strategies are ideologically and discursively legitimized by the global city growth machine as necessary for `global city' or `world-class city' formation (McGuirk, 2004; Wilson, 2004).

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

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

In order to finance new urban transit projects, cash-strapped entrepreneurial governments are increasingly entering into long-term partnerships with the private sector, or public- private partnerships (PPPs), in which the public sector pays for services and infrastructure delivered by the private sector (Phang, 2007; Siemiatycki, 2006; Solin¬o and Vassallo, 2009). In studies of PPPs used both for large-scale urban redevelopment projects and urban rail projects, scholars have noticed that planning agencies are increasingly favoring infrastructure projects favoring affluent segments of the population that have greater potential for profitability rather than delivering the largest public benefit (Fainstein, 2008; Siemiatycki, 2006; Swyngedouw et al, 2002).

By privileging market-based metrics of efficiency, entrepreneurial administrations have profoundly changed the function of public transportation. In the Fordist era, public transportation involved a modicum of centralized planning aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs and alleviating the effects of uneven development produced by the highly subsidized highway system (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). Neoliberal statecraft abandons the Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups' access to the city. In its place, socially regressive neoliberal practices favor market-oriented growth and elite consumption patterns (Boschken, 2002; Grengs, 2004; Young and Keil, 2010). Thus, public transportation service has become a battleground in the global city growth machine's revanchist claims to the city (Smith, 1996).

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

#### This attempt to exterminate public spaces is indicative of neoliberalism’s larger ideological function – as a system it 🡺 social exclusion and racial apartheid

Giroux Global Television Network Chair Professor at McMaster University 2004 Henry Neoliberalism and the Demise of Democracy: Resurrecting Hope in Dark Times Dissident Voice http://dissidentvoice.org/Aug04/Giroux0807.htm

The ideology and power of neoliberalism also cuts across national boundaries. Throughout the globe, the forces of neoliberalism are on the march, dismantling the historically guaranteed social provisions provided by the welfare state, defining profit-making as the essence of democracy, and equating freedom with the unrestricted ability of markets to “govern economic relations free of government regulation.” [5] Transnational in scope, neoliberalism now imposes its economic regime and market values on developing and weaker nations through structural adjustment policies enforced by powerful financial institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Secure in its dystopian vision that there are no alternatives, as England’s former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once put it, neoliberalism obviates issues of contingency, struggle, and social agency by celebrating the inevitability of economic laws in which the ethical ideal of intervening in the world gives way to the idea that we “have no choice but to adapt both our hopes and our abilities to the new global market.” [6] Coupled with a new culture of fear, market freedoms seem securely grounded in a defense of national security, capital, and property rights. When coupled with a media driven culture of fear and the everyday reality of insecurity, public space becomes increasingly militarized as state governments invest more in prison construction than in education. Prison guards and security personnel in public schools are two of the fastest growing professions.

In its capacity to dehistoricize and depoliticize society, as well as in its aggressive attempts to destroy all of the public spheres necessary for the defense of a genuine democracy, neoliberalism reproduces the conditions for unleashing the most brutalizing forces of capitalism. Social Darwinism has been resurrected from the ashes of the 19th century sweatshops and can now be seen in full bloom in most reality TV programs and in the unfettered self-interests that now drives popular culture. As narcissism is replaced by unadulterated materialism, public concerns collapse into utterly private considerations and where public space does exist it is mainly used as a confessional for private woes, a cut throat game of winner take all, or a advertisement for consumerism.

Neoliberal policies dominate the discourse of politics and use the breathless rhetoric of the global victory of free-market rationality to cut public expenditures and undermine those non-commodified public spheres that serve as the repository for critical education, language, and public intervention. Spewed forth by the mass media, right-wing intellectuals, religious fanatics, and politicians, neoliberal ideology, with its ongoing emphasis on deregulation and privatization, has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and on the very notion of the public sphere. Within the discourse of neoliberalism, the notion of the public good is devalued and, where possible, eliminated as part of a wider rationale for a handful of private interests to control as much of social life as possible in order to maximize their personal profit. Public services such as health care, child care, public assistance, education, and transportation are now subject to the rules of the market. Construing the public good as a private good and the needs of the corporate and private sector as the only source of investment, neoliberal ideology produces, legitimates, and exacerbates the existence of persistent poverty, inadequate health care, racial apartheid in the inner cities, and the growing inequalities between the rich and the poor. [7]

#### Racism is the logic of extermination

Elden, Lecturer in politics at the University of Warwick, England, 2002 Stuart, boundary 2 29.1, project muse

The reverse side is the power to allow death. State racism is a recoding of the old mechanisms of blood through the new procedures of regulation. Racism, as biologizing, as tied to a state, takes shape where the procedures of intervention "at the level of the body, conduct, health, and everyday life, received their color and their justification from the mythical concern with protecting the purity of the blood and ensuring the triumph of the race" (VS, 197; WK, 149). [37](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT37) For example, the old anti-Semitism based on religion is reused under the new rubric of state racism. The integrity and purity of the race is threatened, and the state apparatuses are introduced against the race that has infiltrated and introduced noxious elements into the body. The Jews are characterized as the race present in the middle of all races (FDS, 76). [38](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT38) The use of medical language is important. Because certain groups in society are conceived of in medical terms, society is no longer in need of being defended from the outsider but from the insider: the abnormal in behavior, species, or race. What is novel is not the mentality of power but the technology of power (FDS, 230). The recoding of old problems is made possible through new techniques.

A break or cut (coupure) is fundamental to racism: a division or incision between those who must live and those who must die. The "biological continuum of the human species" is fragmented by the apparition of races, which are seen as distinguished, hierarchized, qualified as good or inferior, and so forth. The species is subdivided into subgroups that are thought of as races. In a sense, then, just as the continuum of geometry becomes divisible in Descartes, [39](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT39) the human continuum is divided, that is, made calculable and orderable, two centuries later. As Anderson has persuasively argued, to suggest that racism has its roots in nationalism is a mistake. He suggests that "the dreams of racism actually have their origin in ideologies of class, rather than in those of nation: above all in claims to divinity among rulers and to ‘blue' or ‘white' blood and breeding among aristocracies." [40](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT40) As Stoler has noted, for Foucault, it is the other way around: "A discourse of class derives from an earlier discourse of races." [41](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT41) But it is a more subtle distinction than [End Page 147] that. What Foucault suggests is that discourses of class have their roots in the war of races, but so, too, does modern racism; what is different is the biological spin put on the concepts. [42](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/boundary/v029/29.1elden.html#FOOT42) But as well as emphasizing the biological, modern racism puts this another way: to survive, to live, one must be prepared to massacre one's enemies, a relation of war. As a relation of war, this is no different from the earlier war of races that Foucault has spent so much of the course explaining. But when coupled with the mechanisms of mathematics and medicine in bio-power, this can be conceived of in entirely different ways. Bio-power is able to establish, between my life and the death of the other, a relation that is not warlike or confrontational but biological: "The more inferior species tend to disappear, the more abnormal individuals can be eliminated, the less the species will be degenerated, the more I—not as an individual but as a species—will live, will be strong, will be vigorous, will be able to proliferate." The death of the other does not just make me safer personally, but the death of the other, of the bad, inferior race or the degenerate or abnormal, makes life in general healthier and purer (FDS, 227–28). "The existence in question is no longer of sovereignty, juridical; but that of the population, biological. If genocide is truly the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a return today of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population" (VS, 180; WK, 136). "If the power of normalization wishes to exercise the ancient sovereign right of killing, it must pass through racism. And if, inversely, a sovereign power, that is to say a power with the right of life and death, wishes to function with the instruments, mechanisms, and technology of normalization, it must also pass through racism" (FDS, 228). This holds for indirect death—the exposure to death—as much as for direct killing. While not Darwinism, this biological sense of power is based on evolutionism and enables a thinking of colonial relations, the necessity of wars, criminality, phenomena of madness and mental illness, class divisions, and so forth. The link to colonialism is central: This form of modern state racism develops first with colonial genocide. The theme of the political enemy is extrapolated biologically. But what is important in the shift at the end of the nineteenth century is that war is no longer simply a way of securing one race by eliminating the other but of regenerating that race (FDS, 228–30). As Foucault puts it in La volonté de savoir: [End Page 148]Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of all; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity. Massacres have become vital [vitaux—understood in a dual sense, both as essential and biological]. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men to be killed. (VS, 180; WK, 136)

#### Neoliberal thinkers control the framing of policy discussions – you should be highly skeptical of their defenses of this ideology

Ross Prof of Education U British Columbia 2010 E. Wayne Resisting the Common-nonsense of Neoliberalism: A Report from British Columbia Workplace #17 http://firgoa.usc.es/drupal/files/ross.pdf

The first step in resisting neoliberalism is realizing that we are not “all in this together,” that is, neoliberalism benefits the few at the expense of the many (Ross & Gibson, 2007). The corporate mass media would have us adopt the mantra that what is good for the corporate capitalist class is good for the rest of us—thus we have the “logic” of “efficiency” or “cost containment” in education prized over the educational well-being of the public.

Public debates in the corporate media about education (and other social goods) are framed in ways that serve the interests of elites. For example, in BC free market neoliberals in think tanks such as the Fraser Institute and in the dominant media outlets (particularly Canwest Global Communications, Inc.) have been successful in framing discussions on education in terms of accountability, efficiency, and market competition. 1 A frame is the central narrative, the organizer, for making sense of particular issues or problems (e.g., problem definition, origin, responsible parties) and solutions (e.g., policy). The frame is presented as common sense, thus the assumptions underlying the frame are typically unquestioned or at least under-analyzed.

Apocalyptic rhetoric should be abandoned as a political strategy – it incorrectly levels questions of probability and actual magnitude of events

Gross new media strategist & Gilles domestic abuse advocate 2012 Matthew Barrett & Mel The Atlantic 4/23

http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/how-apocalyptic-thinking-prevents-us-from-taking-political-action/255758/

Flip through the cable channels for long enough, and you'll inevitably find the apocalypse. On Discovery or National Geographic or History you'll find shows like MegaDisasters, Doomsday Preppers, or The Last Days on Earth chronicling, in an hour of programming, dozens of ways the world might end: a gamma ray burst from a nearby star peeling away the Earth's ozone layer like an onion; a mega-volcano erupting and plunging our planet into a new ice age; the magnetic poles reversing. Turn to a news channel, and the headlines appear equally apocalyptic, declaring that the "UN Warns of Rapid Decay in Environment" or that "Humanity's Very Survival" is at risk. On another station, you'll find people arguing that the true apocalyptic threat to our way of life is not the impending collapse of ecosystems and biodiversity but the collapse of the dollar as the world's global currency. Change the channel again, and you'll see still others insisting that malarial mosquitoes, drunk on West Nile virus, are the looming specter of apocalypse darkening our nation's horizon.

How to make sense of it all? After all, not every scenario can be an apocalyptic threat to our way of life -- can it? For many, the tendency is to dismiss all the potential crises we are facing as overblown: perhaps cap and trade is just a smoke screen designed to earn Al Gore billions from his clean-energy investments; perhaps terrorism is just an excuse to increase the power and reach of the government. For others, the panoply of potential disasters becomes overwhelming, leading to a distorted and paranoid vision of reality and the threats facing our world -- as seen on shows like Doomsday Preppers. Will an epidemic wipe out humanity, or could a meteor destroy all life on earth? By the time you're done watching Armageddon Week on the History Channel, even a rapid reversal of the world's magnetic poles might seem terrifyingly likely and imminent.

The last time apocalyptic anxiety spilled into the mainstream to the extent that it altered the course of history -- during the Reformation -- it relied on a revolutionary new communications technology: the printing press. In a similar way, could the current surge in apocalyptic anxiety be attributed in part to our own revolution in communications technology?

The media, of course, have long mastered the formula of packaging remote possibilities as urgent threats, as sociologist Barry Glassner pointed out in his bestseller The Culture of Fear. We're all familiar with the formula: "It's worse than you think," the anchor intones before delivering an alarming report on date-rape drugs, stalking pedophiles, flesh-eating bacteria, the Ebola virus (née avian flu cum swine flu). You name it (or rename it): if a threat has even a remote chance of materializing, it is treated as an imminent inevitability by television news. It's not just that if it bleeds, it leads. If it might bleed, it still leads. Such sensationalist speculation attracts eyeballs and sells advertising, because fear sells -- and it can sell everything from pharmaceuticals to handguns to duct tape to insurance policies. "People react to fear, not love," Richard Nixon once said. "They don't teach that in Sunday school, but it's true."

Nothing inspires fear like the end of the world, and ever since Y2K, the media's tendency toward overwrought speculation has been increasingly married to the rhetoric of apocalypse. Today, nearly any event can be explained through apocalyptic language, from birds falling out of the sky (the Birdocalypse?) to a major nor'easter (Snowmageddon!) to a double-dip recession (Barackalypse! Obamageddon!). Armageddon is here at last -- and your local news team is live on the scene! We've seen the equivalent of grade inflation (A for Apocalypse!) for every social, political, or ecological challenge before us, an escalating game of one-upmanship to gain the public's attention. Why worry about global warming and rising sea levels when the collapse of the housing bubble has already put your mortgage underwater? Why worry that increasing droughts will threaten the supply of drinking water in America's major cities when a far greater threat lies in the possibility of an Arab terrorist poisoning that drinking supply, resulting in millions of casualties?

Yet not all of the crises or potential threats before us are equal, nor are they equally probable -- a fact that gets glossed over when the media equate the remote threat of a possible event, like epidemics, with real trends like global warming.

Over the last decade, the 24-hour news cycle and the proliferation of media channels has created ever-more apocalyptic content that is readily available to us, from images of the Twin Towers falling in 2001 to images of the Japanese tsunami in 2011. So, too, have cable channels like Discovery and History married advances in computer-generated imagery with emerging scientific understanding of our planet and universe to give visual validity to the rare and catastrophic events that have occurred in the past or that may take place in the distant future. Using dramatic, animated images and the language of apocalypse to peddle such varied scenarios, however, has the effect of leveling the apocalyptic playing field, leaving the viewer with the impression that terrorism, bird flu, global warming, and asteroids are all equally probable. But not all of these apocalyptic scenarios are equally likely, and they're certainly not equally likely to occur within our lifetimes -- or in our neighborhoods. For example, after millions of Americans witnessed the attacks of 9/11 on television, our collective fear of terrorism was much higher than its actual probability; in 2001, terrorists killed one-twelfth as many Americans as did the flu and one-fifteenth as many Americans as did car accidents. Throughout the first decade of the 21st century, the odds of an American being killed by a terrorist were about 1 in 88,000 -- compared to a 1 in 10,010 chance of dying from falling off a ladder. The fears of an outbreak of SARS, avian flu, or swine flu also never lived up to their media hype.

This over-reliance on the apocalyptic narrative causes us to fear the wrong things and to mistakenly equate potential future events with current and observable trends. How to discern the difference between so many apocalyptic options? If we ask ourselves three basic questions about the many threats portrayed apocalyptically in the media, we are able to separate the apocalyptic wheat from the chaff. Which scenarios are probable? Which are preventable? And what is the likely impact of the worst-case model of any given threat?

In answering these questions, it becomes clear that much of what the media portrays as apocalyptic is not. The apocalyptic scenarios involving global disaster -- from meteor impacts to supervolcanic eruptions -- are extraordinarily rare. An asteroid could hit the Earth and lead to the extinction of all mammals, including us, but the geologic record tells us that such massive strikes are unlikely, and logic tells us that there is little we can do to prevent one. Nor are terrorist attacks or an outbreak of avian flu likely to destroy humanity; their impact is relatively small and usually localized, because we can be prepared for such threats and can contain and mitigate their effects. The apocalyptic storyline tells us that most of these events are probable, largely unpreventable, and destined to be catastrophic. But none of this is true -- their probability is either low or can be made lower through preventive means, or their impact is containable.

The danger of the media's conflation of apocalyptic scenarios is that it leads us to believe that our existential threats come exclusively from events that are beyond our control and that await us in the future -- and that a moment of universal recognition of such threats will be obvious to everyone when they arrive. No one, after all, would ever confuse a meteor barreling toward Earth as anything other than apocalyptic. Yet tangled up in such Hollywood scenarios and sci-fi nightmares are actual threats like global warming that aren't arriving in an instant of universal recognition; instead, they are arriving amid much denial and continued partisan debate.

#### Apocalyptic rhetoric 🡺 failed political solutions to catastrophe

Gross new media strategist & Gilles domestic abuse advocate 2012 Matthew Barrett & Mel The Atlantic 4/23

http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/how-apocalyptic-thinking-prevents-us-from-taking-political-action/255758/

Talking about climate change or peak oil through the rhetoric of apocalypse may make for good television and attention-grabbing editorials, but such apocalyptic framing hasn't mobilized the world into action. Most of us are familiar with the platitude "When the only tool you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail." In a similar way, our over-reliance on the apocalyptic storyline stands between us and our ability to properly assess the problems before us. Some see the looming crises of global warming and resource and energy depletion and conclude that inaction will bring about the end of civilization: only through a radical shift toward clean energy and conservation, those on the Left argue, can we continue the way of life that we have known. Those on the Right dismiss the apocalyptic threats altogether, because the proposed solutions to peak oil, global warming, and overpopulation conflict with core conservative beliefs about deregulation and the free-market economy, or with a religious worldview that believes humanity is not powerful enough to alter something as large as our climate. Still others dismiss the catalog of doom and gloom as mere apocalypticism itself. Surely, we convince ourselves, all the dire warnings about the effects of global warming aren't that different from the world-ending expectations of the Rapturists?

The result is that the energy we could expend addressing the problems before us is instead consumed by our efforts to either dismiss the threat of apocalypse or to prove it real. Ultimately, the question becomes not what to do about the threats before us but whether you believe in the threats before us.

By allowing the challenges of the 21st century to be hijacked by the apocalyptic storyline, we find ourselves awaiting a moment of clarity when the problems we must confront will become apparent to all -- or when those challenges will magically disappear, like other failed prophecies about the end of the world. Yet the real challenges we must face are not future events that we imagine or dismiss through apocalyptic scenarios of collapse -- they are existing trends. The evidence suggests that much of what we fear in the future -- the collapse of the economy, the arrival of peak oil and global warming and resource wars -- has already begun. We can wait forever, while the world unravels before our very eyes, for an apocalypse that won't come.

The apocalyptic storyline becomes a form of daydreaming escape: the threat of global warming becomes a fantasy to one day live off the grid, or buy a farm, or grow our own food; economic collapse becomes like a prison break from the drudgery of meaningless and increasingly underpaid work in a soul-crushing cubicle; peak oil promises the chance to finally form a community with the neighbors to whom you've never spoken. Yet despite the fantasia peddled by Hollywood and numerous writers, a world battered by natural disasters and global warming, facing declining natural resources and civic unrest, without adequate water or energy or food, with gross inequalities between the rich and the poor, is not a setting for a picaresque adventure, nor is it the ideal place to start living in accord with your dreams.

The deeper we entangle the challenges of the 21st century with apocalyptic fantasy, the more likely we are to paralyze ourselves with inaction -- or with the wrong course of action. We react to the idea of the apocalypse -- rather than to the underlying issues activating the apocalyptic storyline to begin with -- by either denying its reality ("global warming isn't real") or by despairing at its inevitability ("why bother recycling when the whole world is burning up?"). We react to apocalyptic threats by either partying (assuaging our apocalyptic anxiety through increased consumerism, reasoning that if it all may be gone tomorrow, we might as well enjoy it today), praying (in hopes that divine intervention or mere time will allow us to avoid confronting the challenges before us), or preparing (packing "bugout" packs for a quick escape or stocking up on gold, guns, and canned food, as though the transformative moment we anticipate will be but a brief interlude, a bad winter storm that might trap us indoors for a few days or weeks but that will eventually melt away).

None of these responses avert, nor even mitigate, the very threats that have elicited our apocalyptic anxiety in the first place. Buying an electric car doesn't solve the problem of a culture dependent on endless growth in a finite world; building a bunker to defend against the zombie hordes doesn't solve the growing inequities between the rich and poor; praying for deliverance from the trials of history doesn't change that we must live in the times in which we were born. Indeed, neither partying, nor preparing, nor praying achieves what should be the natural goal when we perceive a threat on the horizon: we should not seek to ignore it, or simply brace for it, but to avert it.

### PLAN

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in free and accessible public transit in the United States

### SOLVENCY – 1AC

Free and accessible public transit solves – this concrete political strategy refuses crisis based politics and creates the conditions for broad movements against neo-liberalism

Schein Assistant Prof Human Rights – The Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton 2011 Rebecca Free Transit and Social Movement Infrastructure: Assessing the Political Potential of Toronto’s Nascent Free Transit Campaign Alternate Routes volume 22 http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14421

The demand for free and accessible public transit has the potential not only to develop into a broad-based movement, but also to drive the development of the new kind of organization that the Assembly aspires to become. The Assembly is committed to its call for the outright abolition of transit fares, not merely a fare-freeze or fare-reduction. What is exciting to me about the free transit campaign is that the expression of a radical anti-capitalist principle—the outright de-commodification of public goods and services—actually serves in this instance to invite rather than foreclose genuine political dialogue about values, tactics, and strategies. While still in its early stages, the free transit campaign is already pushing us to elaborate both analytical and strategic links between commodification, environmental justice, the limits and capacities of public sector unions, and the interlocking forms of exclusion faced by people marginalized by poverty, racism, immigration status, or disability. Free transit could represent a site of convergence between many distinct activist circles in the city and foster greater integration and collaboration between environmental advocacy, anti-poverty work, and diverse human rights organizations. If the free transit campaign does succeed in bringing diverse and distinct activist cultures into conversation with each other, it will force the Assembly to grapple with strategic questions about its relationship to less radical organizations in the city. Given the marginalization and isolation that have long plagued leftist groups in Toronto and elsewhere, this should be a welcome challenge, particularly if the Assembly hopes to become an effective left pole in a broad alliance.

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

But perhaps more fundamentally, the free transit campaign is a rare example of a political project on the left that is not reactive, defensive, nostalgic, or alarmist, but hopeful, proactive, and forward-looking. “Crisis talk” is pervasive in much of contemporary culture, but in left circles, it has become difficult to imagine a mode of organizing that is not oriented around predicting or responding to punctuated calamities of various kinds—whether a financial meltdown, an un/natural disaster, the latest wave of layoffs and service cuts, or the systematic violation of basic civil liberties on a weekend in downtown Toronto. In the case of free transit, however, we are free to move ahead with the campaign on our own timeline, to seek out and develop the kinds of relationships and democratic spaces that are necessary to sustain grassroots movements over the long term. For the Assembly, this will mean having the space and time to realistically assess its own capacities and to organically develop its own strategies and priorities.

The Assembly does not have modest ambitions: it hopes to nurture a broad based anti-capitalist movement and to vitalize a new working class politics (Rosenfeld & Fanelli, 2010; Dealy, 2010). Its members are, I think, tired of listening to militant rhetoric unanchored to any genuine hope of winning. The push for an excellent, fully public and accessible transit system is a radical demand with immense popular appeal, an ambitious, long-range goal for which clear, achievable interim political victories are possible along the way. Free transit is not a crazy idea. Arguments in favour of free transit have surfaced sporadically in Toronto over the years, whether in an editorial by CAW economist Jim Stanford in The Globe and Mail or in a CBC interview with Deborah Cowen, a professor of geography at the University of Toronto (Stanford, 2005; Cowen, 2010). Some cities already have free transit systems, and many have partially free systems—in the downtown core, during holiday seasons or off-peak hours, or on “spare the air” days when smog levels are high. But in Toronto there has not yet been an initiative focused on building a broad-based movement dedicated to the eventual abolition of transit fares in the name of social, economic, and environmental justice.

Without abandoning or compromising its radicalism, the Assembly can push for concrete steps in the direction of de-commodified transit and build productive relationships with individuals and organizations who do not necessarily identify themselves as anti-capitalist. It will be in the process of pushing for interim reforms along the way to a de-commodified transit system that the Assembly will most need to articulate its political principles and its analysis of the spatialization of race and class in Toronto. Free transit in the downtown core may, for instance, be good for Toronto’s tourism industry, but will it benefit the immigrant and working class communities in transit-poor areas of the inner suburbs, who spend proportionately more of their income to access poorer quality services than those available downtown?

Proposals to pay for free transit through suburban road tolls will similarly hit hardest those working class communities whose neighbourhoods are so underserved by transit that they have no choice but to drive into the city for work. The process of developing interim priorities will not, in other words, postpone the challenge of articulating and popularizing a class-based and anti-racist argument for public infrastructure. Instead, the Assembly will be forced to pursue its most radical aspirations by cultivating a sustained dialogue about the interim remedies and strategies that will both address real needs in our communities and help build a broad-based movement over the long term.

It will be through this process of dialogue, I hope, that a new articulation of a politicized working class identity might emerge. Our earliest discussions of the free transit campaign are already pushing us to think about the social complexities that will need to be navigated if we are to build an effective free transit movement. Success will depend on our capacity to carve out and sustain a space for dialogue and negotiation among transit workers and riders, within unions, and across neighbourhoods and communities that have been unevenly affected by fare hikes and inadequate services. Questions of tactics and strategy cannot be divorced from the process of identifying, developing, and strengthening the complex connections between the people who need and use public goods and services and the workers who provide them. We will need to recognize the different ways in which our various constituencies are powerful and vulnerable and learn how to defend and protect each other. The free transit campaign lends itself to the kind of intensely local organizing through which honest dialogue, trust, and long-term relationships can be developed and nurtured—within and across neighbourhoods and among transit riders and workers. And of course, without these things, the campaign will go nowhere.

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

The idea of a free transit movement immediately foregrounds a number of thorny strategic questions for the left in Toronto: how to build trust, dialogue, and support for a free transit movement within the transit union; how to address and re-focus the widespread anger, mistrust, and resentment directed at the public sector in the current climate; how to sustain and advance anti-capitalist principles while building productive relationships within broader progressive milieux. Navigating these questions will be challenging, and the Assembly is still a long way from a coherent and systematic approach to answering them. But the fact that these questions surface so quickly and urgently is a positive sign of the ambition and seriousness with which the Assembly is approaching the organization of a free transit movement. The free transit campaign will push the Assembly to develop further its internal organizational and decision-making capacities, but it will also demand an outward-looking, inclusive process, in which the Assembly’s role is to open space for debate, dialogue, and collective strategizing.

In fact, the transit system itself can provide the venue for us to stage public discussions about our collective resources and to share alternative visions for our city: the transit system is a readymade classroom, theatre, and art gallery, attended every day by people who could come to recognize their stake in the de-commodification of public goods of many kinds. My hope is that Toronto’s buses, streetcars, and subway platforms could be places for experimentation, places to develop the new tactics, organizing skills, and relationships that might permit us to really depart from the prevailing script.

#### Challenging neo-liberal policy is key to establishing an alternative to market based rationality

Brown, professor of political theory at Berkeley, 2003 Wendy, Theory and Event 7:1 project muse

What remains for the Left, then, is to challenge emerging neo-liberal governmentality in EuroAtlantic states with an alternative vision of the good, one that rejects homo oeconomicus as the norm of the human and rejects this norm's correlative formations of economy, society, state and (non)morality. In its barest form, this would be a vision in which justice would not center upon maximizing individual wealth or rights but on developing and enhancing the capacity of citizens to share power and hence, collaboratively govern themselves. In such an order, rights and elections would be the background rather than token of democracy, or better, rights would function to safeguard the individual against radical democratic enthusiasms but would not themselves signal the presence nor constitute the central principle of democracy. Instead a left vision of justice would focus on practices and institutions of shared popular power; a modestly egalitarian distribution of wealth and access to institutions; an incessant reckoning with all forms of power -- social, economic, political, and even psychic; a long view of the fragility and finitude of non-human nature; and the importance of both meaningful activity and hospitable dwellings to human flourishing. However differently others might place the accent marks, none of these values can be derived from neo-liberal rationality nor meet neo-liberal criteria for the good. The development and promulgation of such a counter rationality -- a different figuration of human beings, citizenship, economic life, and the political -- is critical both to the long labor of fashioning a more just future and to the immediate task of challenging the deadly policies of the imperial U.S. state.

#### Collective political strategies resist neoliberalism

Read Professor of Philosophy at the University of Southern Maine 2009 Jason A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity, Foucault Studies http://rauli.cbs.dk/index.php/foucault-studies/article/viewFile/2465/2463

Despite Negri’s tendency to lapse back into an opposition between labor and ideology, his object raises important questions echoed by other critics of neoliberalism. What is lost in neoliberalism is the critical distance opened up between different spheres and representations of subjectivity, not only the difference between work and the market, as in Marxism, but also the difference between the citizen and the economic subject, as in classical liberalism. All of these differences are effaced as one relation; that of economic self-interest, or competition, replaces the multiple spaces and relations of worker, citizen, and economic subject of consumption. To put the problem in Foucault’s terms, what has disappeared in neoliberalism is the tactical polyvalence of discourse; everything is framed in terms of interests, freedoms and risks. 22 As Wendy Brown argues, one can survey the quotidian effects or practices of governmentality in the manner in which individualized/market based solutions appear in lieu of collective political solutions: gated communities for concerns about security and safety; bottled water for concerns about water purity; and private schools (or vouchers) for failing public schools, all of which offer the opportunity for individuals to opt out rather than address political problems. 23 Privatization is not just neoliberalism’s strategy for dealing with the public sector, what David Harvey calls accumulation by dispossession, but a consistent element of its particular form of governmentality, its ethos, everything becomes privatized, institutions, structures, issues, and problems that used to constitute the public. 24 It is privatization all the way down. For Brown, neoliberalism entails a massive de-democratization, as terms such as the public good, rights and debate, no longer have any meaning. “The model neoliberal citizen is one who strategizes for her or himself among various social, political, and economic options, not one who strives with others to alter or organize these options.” 25 Thus, while it is possible to argue that neoliberalism is a more flexible, an open form of power as opposed to the closed spaces of disciplines, a form of power that operates on freedoms, on a constitutive multiplicity, it is in some sense all the more closed in that as a form of governmentality, as a political rationality, it is without an outside. It does not encounter any tension with a competing logic of worker or citizen, with a different articulation of subjectivity. States, corporations, individuals are all governed by the same logic, that of interest and competition.

Foucault’s development, albeit partial, of account of neoliberalism as governmentality has as its major advantage a clarification of the terrain on which neo-liberalism can be countered. It is not enough to simply oppose neoliberalism as ideology, revealing the truth of social existence that it misses, or to enumerate its various failings as policy. Rather any opposition to neoliberalism must take seriously its effectiveness, the manner in which it has transformed work subjectivity and social relationships. As Foucault argues, neoliberalism operates less on actions, directly curtailing them, then on the condition and effects of actions, on the sense of possibility. The reigning ideal of interest and the calculations of cost and benefit do not so much limit what one can do, neoliberal thinkers are famously indifferent to prescriptive ideals, examining the illegal drug trade as a more or less rational investment, but limit the sense of what is possible. Specifically the ideal of the fundamentally self-interested individual curtails any collective transformation of the conditions of existence. It is not that such actions are not prohibited, restricted by the dictates of a sovereign or the structures of disciplinary power, they are not seen as possible, closed off by a society made up of self-interested individuals. It is perhaps no accident that one of the most famous political implementers of neoliberal reforms, Margaret Thatcher, used the slogan, “there is no alternative,” legitimating neoliberalism based on the stark absence of possibilities. Similarly, and as part of a belated response to the former Prime Minister, it also perhaps no accident that the slogan of the famous Seattle protests against the IMF and World Bank was, “another world is possible,” and it is very often the sense of a possibility of not only another world, but of another way of organizing politics that is remembered, the image of turtles and teamsters marching hand and hand, when those protests are referred to. 26 It is also this sense of possibility that the present seems to be lacking; it is difficult to imagine let alone enact a future other than a future dominated by interest and the destructive vicissitudes of competition. A political response to neoliberalism must meet it on its terrain, that of the production of subjectivity, freedom and possibility.

### Public Transportation Key

#### Public transportation reverses inequality

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

Public transportation, as one crucial component of a city's transportation network, enables the mobility and flow of people and goods that make cities livable. Public transportation plays a vital role in the urban economy in that it creates place-based advantages, facilitates the circulation of capital, and attracts investment in local real estate markets. At the level of everyday lived experience, public transit shapes and constrains opportunity (time it takes to access jobs, schools, and services) and sociospatial relations into the built environment. In many places, public transportation is also wielded as an instrument of power, dominance, and social control, entrenching the privileges of the affluent and the disadvantages of working people into the built environment (Graham and Marvin, 2001). Therefore, trends in public transportation infrastructure and service levels constitute one dimension of uneven geographical development in urban areas. My research considers the ways in which neoliberalism and global city building are shaping new patterns of uneven geographic development in the public transit sector by focusing on public transportation planning and investment in the city of Chicago. The purpose of my paper is to contribute to the scholarship on the politics of infrastructure (Keil and Young, 2008; McFarlane and Rutherford, 2008) emphasizing the ways in which infrastructure and cities are produced and transformed together in a global context as well as how these processes contribute to urban fragmentation and inequality.

## \*\*\*AFF IMPACTS\*\*\*

### Sustainability

#### Collapse of neoliberalism is inevitable – elites perceive and transition struggles now

Li Associate Prof of Economics at U of Utah 2010 Minqi The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity Science & Society 74.3 http://guilfordjournals.com/doi/pdf/10.1521/siso.2010.74.3.290

THE GLOBAL CAPITALIST ECONOMY is now in its deepest crisis since the Great Depression. Even the world’s ruling elites no longer have any doubt that a significant historical turning point has arrived. The neoliberal phase of capitalist development is coming to an end. This will prove to be the end of the so-called “End of History” and the era of global counter-revolution it signifies.1

The immediate and important question is: what will be next? Where is the world heading as the crisis unravels and evolves? Many among the intellectual left and probably not a small section of the working classes in the advanced capitalist countries are hoping and expecting that the current crisis will lead to a successful restructuring of global capitalism. There will be a new global “new deal” based on social compromise and management of the global environmental crisis. Is this hope realistic? If yes, what conditions are required for it to be materialized? If not, what should “we” (those who are committed to a social transformation that will bring about a more egalitarian and more democratic social system) expect and hope for?

The current crisis is likely to be followed by a prolonged period of global economic and political instability that could last several decades. As the old (neoliberal) institutional structure disintegrates, different social groups, classes, and states will engage in complex and intense conflicts and struggles. It is through the interactions of these conflicts and struggles that the direction of a new institutional structure will be shaped and determined.

#### Global collapse of capitalism is inevitable – Chinese economic collapse and shrinking energy supplies

Li Associate Prof of Economics at U of Utah 2010 Minqi The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity Science & Society 74.3 http://guilfordjournals.com/doi/pdf/10.1521/siso.2010.74.3.290

By about 2015, however, the irreversible decline in world oil production will become apparent. As the decline of the energy supply takes place against the continuing growth of demand in China and possibly in other large semi-peripheral states, world energy prices will again rise rapidly, generating global inflationary pressure.

Squeezed between shrinking export markets (as the advanced capitalist countries suffer from economic stagnation) and rising energy costs, China’s trade surpluses will likely disappear and China may be forced to sell some of its foreign exchange reserves to stave off economic crisis. The combination of China’s dollar sales, global inflationary pressure, and the U. S. fiscal crisis will greatly increase the likelihood of a general dollar collapse that will take the global economic crisis into a second, more violent and more destructive phase.

Chinese capitalism will not be able to postpone the crisis forever. In perhaps five to ten years from now, China will likely be hit by an insurmountable economic crisis as its export-oriented manufacturing industries suffer from the shrinking of the global market and its massive demand for energy and materials can no longer be sustained. The third and final phase of the global economic crisis is likely to see the general collapse of the Chinese, and with it the global, capitalist economy.

#### Revolution in the periphery 🡺 global shift of power

Li Associate Prof of Economics at U of Utah 2010 Minqi The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity Science & Society 74.3 http://guilfordjournals.com/doi/pdf/10.1521/siso.2010.74.3.290

Confronted simultaneously with the collapse of global trade, decline of world energy production, and the prospect of growing working-class militancy, the semi-periphery is likely to prove to be the “weakest link” in the global capitalist chain and a key battleground of global class struggle. If working-class revolutions take place and get consolidated in Russia, China, and Latin America in the coming one or two decades, then the global balance of power could be turned decisively in favor of the global working classes and revolutionary forces.

### AT: Cap Solves War

Their concept of security is depoliticized – capitalism necessitates insecurity of the periphery – their focus preserves the status quo

Goodman Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology Sydney 2009 James Global Capitalism and the Production of Insecurity Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence, edited by Grenfell and James page 44-45

In capitalist societies insecurity is systemic. Capitalism literally produces insecurity. The opportunity to proﬁt and the risk of loss is capitalism’s life-blood. Capitalist security hinges on private property, on “having” rather than “not having” and on the security that possessions provide. As wealth is stratiﬁed, so is security and with the concentration of property ownership comes the concentration of security. Here the question of pursuing security is profoundly political. When security is deﬁned by the powerful, “making safe” tends to serve the status quo. When security is deﬁned by the sub-ordinated, it tends to challenge the social order. Removing sources of insecurity for the subordinated means removing the means to dominate, and under capitalism this means removing the “inalienable right” to private property.

With deepening capitalist relations, systemic insecurities are intensiﬁed. The process of commodiﬁcation and ﬁnancialization has gained global reach, deepening the integration of livelihoods and living environments into a universal cash nexus (Rupert 2003). Societies as a result become ever-more vulnerable to volatile ﬂows of liquid assets, rendering them radically insecure. This globalization of insecurity is deeply stratiﬁed, with sharpening divides between those suffering under it and those proﬁting from it. Indeed, globalizing capitalism is best understood as a system displacing insecurity from rich to poor across the globe. Such systemic insecurity is socially concentrated at the collision between living environments and marketization, and profoundly exacerbates social divides, including contributing to the feminization of poverty. It is spatially concentrated in a growing range of poorer and vulnerable states, but, as argued here, the side-effects of systemic insecurity rebound on the center. There is increasing anxiety amongst dominant states about vulnerability to refugee ﬂows, to the “contagion” of ﬁnancial instability, to cross-border environmental crises, to subversive information ﬂows, to transnational political violence, to ﬂows of laundered money, to illicit drugs and arms ﬂows. Reﬂecting this, there are increasingly intensive efforts to secure external borders and escalating interventions against “failed” or “rogue” states on the periphery.

#### The logic of commodification makes war inevitable

Goodman Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology Sydney 2009 James Global Capitalism and the Production of Insecurity Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence, edited by Grenfell and James page 52

In a global system that relies upon opportunity and risk, insecurity is always on the horizon. As the United States and its allies take on “the impossible task of suppressing the expressions of the fundamental problems of the world today” we are forced to live with endemic instability and violence (Ichiyo2002). The war for security must go on forever - there is “never enough”- and thus war has to be domesticated and naturalized (Ferguson and Turnbull2004). This systemic insecurity may however be seen as the central and even fatal ﬂaw of commodiﬁcation. The totalizing command state can never secure control (James 2004). Security can only be achieved by forcing instability to the margins, even as it erupts across the multiplying arcs of instability.

#### Capitalism necessitates imperialist wars

Harvey Distinguished Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York 2008 David The Right to the City New Left Review 53 Sept/Oct http://newleftreview.org/?view=2740

The perpetual need to find profitable terrains for capital-surplus production and absorption shapes the politics of capitalism. It also presents the capitalist with a number of barriers to continuous and trouble-free expansion. If labour is scarce and wages are high, either existing labour has to be disciplined—technologically induced unemployment or an assault on organized working-class power are two prime methods—or fresh labour forces must be found by immigration, export of capital or proletarianization of hitherto independent elements of the population. Capitalists must also discover new means of production in general and natural resources in particular, which puts increasing pressure on the natural environment to yield up necessary raw materials and absorb the inevitable waste. They need to open up terrains for raw-material extraction—often the objective of imperialist and neo-colonial endeavours.

### AT: Cap Solves Poverty

#### Their argument is misleading – even if poverty is being reduced social inequality is sky-rocketing

Harvey Distinguished Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York 2006 David A Conversation with David Harvey Logos 5.1 http://www.logosjournal.com/issue\_5.1/harvey.htm

I’ll respond in two ways, there is a lot of controversy over the kind of data you look at and how you prove that. For instance if you ask the question of how many people were in poverty in 1980 and how many people there are in poverty today, you might say, there are fewer people in poverty now than there was back then. But when you look at the economic performance, of say China and India, and you look at the aggregate data, it looks like the world is better off. If you start to look at social inequality however, you start to see in many instances, that neo-liberalization has increased social inequality, even at the same time that it has lifted some of the people at the bottom out of poverty. If you look at the concentration of wealth, at the very top bracket of society, you will see immense concentrations of wealth at the very top 0.1% of the population.

At this point the question is: who is neo-liberalization really benefiting? And if you look at concentrations of political and economic power, it has largely benefited a very very small elite. And we have to start looking at that. For instance, the New York Times had this interesting data a couple of months ago. How rich, on average, are the richest 200 (or 400) families in the United States? I think the data showed that back in 1980, they had something like $680 million. In constant dollars it is something like $2.8 billion. They have quadrupled their wealth in the last twenty years and this is a familiar story not just in the U.S but also globally. In Mexico, after neo-liberalization, you see the same thing. You see the same think happening in China and in India. When Thomas Friedman talks about a flat world, he is saying you do not have to come to America to be a billionaire; you can be a billionaire in Bangalore now. You do not have to migrate to America, but the social inequality in India is increasing dramatically.

#### Capitalism necessitates poverty – only the aff can solve

McMillian PhD in Psychoanalysis from Massey University 2009 Chris Disavowed Foundations1/30http://chrismcmillan.org/2009/01/30/hello-world/

Nonetheless, one should not jump to the vulgar conclusion that exclusion, suffering and hunger are active created by capitalist subjectivity, that some mysterious conspiring agents are secretly maintaining this situation in the name of Capital. Rather, the situation is much more complex and subsequently more horrific. Extreme poverty is not the consequence of a contingent aberration in the system, soon to be eliminated by economic progress or the enlightenment of the masses. Nor are some sinister agents of power responsible, such that a mere act of political will can rectify the situation. Instead, I contend that this extreme and absolute poverty is the systematic result of our mediocre day-to-day economic interactions and pleasures. That is, for the capitalist system to remain functional, providing the wealth available in the western world, extreme poverty, hunger and death occur on a horrific scale as the necessary consequence of capitalist subjectivity.

Consequently any discourse which seeks to intervene in the suffering of the hungry cannot do so within the epistemological limits of capitalism. Instead, we must develop a new space for our globally shared social life, or rather the material reproduction of that life. This new economic space must avoid both the exceptionality and the exclusion of both the masses and the even more marginalised hungry. In our current circumstances, however, such an alternative form of economy is not on the horizon. Capitalism has become so pervasive that both conservatives and many radicals have come to support Francis Fukuyama’s ‘End of History’ thesis. While conservatives celebrate the victory of liberal-democratic (capitalism), for radicals such a resignation is tinged with more than a hint of tragedy. Meanwhile, although any alternative to capitalism is likely to be in the socialist, or at least Marxist, tradition, the existence of actually existing socialism provides little in the way of inspiration, but much in the way of melancholy and nostalgia.

### AT: Cap Solves Environment

#### Capitalisms conservation of catastrophe makes environmental collapse inevitable

Foster associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon 2011 John Bellamy Monthly Review December http://monthlyreview.org/2011/12/01/capitalism-and-the-accumulation-of-catastrophe

Over the next few decades we are facing the possibility, indeed the probability, of global catastrophe on a level unprecedented in human history. The message of science is clear. As James Hansen, the foremost climate scientist in the United States, has warned, this may be “our last chance to save humanity.”1 In order to understand the full nature of this threat and how it needs to be addressed, it is essential to get a historical perspective on how we got where we are, and how this is related to the current socioeconomic system, namely capitalism.

Fundamental to the ecological critique of capitalism, I believe, is what world-historian William McNeill called the law of “the conservation of catastrophe.” For McNeill, who applied his “law” to environmental crisis in particular, “catastrophe is the underside of the human condition—a price we pay for being able to alter natural balances and to transform the face of the earth through collective effort and the use of tools.” The better we become at altering and supposedly controlling nature, he wrote, the more vulnerable human society becomes to catastrophes that “recur perpetually on an ever-increasing scale as our skills and knowledge grow.”2 The potential for catastrophe is thus not only conserved, but it can be said to be cumulative, and reappears in an evermore colossal form in response to our growing transformation of the world around us.

In the age of climate change and other global planetary threats McNeill’s thesis on the conservation of catastrophe deserves close consideration. Rather than treating it as a universal aspect of the human condition, however, this dynamic needs to be understood in historically specific terms, focusing on the tendency toward the conservation of catastrophe under historical capitalism. The issue then becomes one of understanding how the exploitation of nature under the regime of capital has led over time to the accumulation of catastrophe. As Marx explained, it is necessary, in any critique of capitalism, to understand not only the enormous productive force generated by capital, but also “the negative, i.e. destructive side” of its interaction with the environment, “from the point of view of natural science.”3

## **\*\*\*2ACs\*\*\***

### Apocalyptic Rhetoric – Warming Specific

#### Framing warming in apocalyptic terms fails – it cedes too much to climate deniers and creates a disincentive for change

Gross new media strategist & Gilles domestic abuse advocate 2012 Matthew Barrett & Mel The Atlantic 4/23

http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/how-apocalyptic-thinking-prevents-us-from-taking-political-action/255758/

For example, annual climate-related disasters such as droughts, storms, and floods rose dramatically during the last decade, increasing an average 75 percent compared to the 1990s -- just as many climate models predicted they would if global warming were left unchecked. Yet this rise in natural disasters hasn't produced a moment of universal recognition of the dangers of climate change; instead, belief in climate change is actually on the decline as we adjust to the "new normal" of ever-weirder weather or convince ourselves that our perception of this increased frequency is a magnifying trick of more readily available cable and Internet coverage.

To understand why fewer people believe in climate change even as evidence mounts, we must look beyond the industry-funded movement to deny the reality and effects of climate change. Perhaps equally important -- if not quite equally culpable -- has been the extent to which both the proponents and opponents of human-made climate change have led us down a cul-de-sac of conversation by exploiting the apocalyptic metaphor to make their case.

Whether by design or by accident, the initial warnings of environmentalists -- of oceans rising to engulf our most beloved metropolises, of amber waves of grain scorched into a desert landscape -- activated the apocalyptic impulse. The focus on disastrous repercussions for our behavior at some point in the future echoed the warnings of the Israelite priests to wayward Jews in Babylon or, later, to those who submitted too willingly to Alexander's process of Hellenization. It was a familiar story: change, and change radically, or face hell on earth. Perhaps there was no other way to sound the alarm about the devastating threat presented by global climate change, but that echo of apocalyptic warning was quickly seized upon by the naysayers to dismiss the evidence out of hand.

We've heard this story before, the deniers insisted, and throughout history those who have declared the end of the world was near have always been proven wrong. As early as 1989, the industry front man Patrick Michaels, a climatologist and global warming skeptic, was warning in the op-ed pages of the Washington Post of this new brand of "apocalyptic environmentalism," which represented "the most popular new religion to come along since Marxism." That the solutions to global warming (a less carbon-intensive economy, a more localized trade system, a greater respect for nature's power) parallel so perfectly the dream of environmentalists, and that the causes of global warming (an unrestrained industrial capitalism reliant on the continued and accelerating consumption of fossil fuels) parallel the economic dream of conservatives, has simply exacerbated the fact that global warming has now become just another front in the culture wars. By seizing upon and mocking the apocalyptic imagery and rhetoric of those sounding the alarm, the industry front groups succeeded in framing the debate about global warming into a question about what one believes. Thus, entangled with the myth of apocalypse -- and its attendant hold on our own sense of belief and self-identity -- the debate about anthropogenic climate change has reached an impasse. You believe in the Rapture; I believe in global warming -- and so the conversation stops. But global climate change is not an apocalyptic event that will take place in the future; it is a human-caused trend that is occurring now. And as we expend more time either fearfully imagining or vehemently denying whether that trend will bring about a future apocalypse, scientists tell us that the trend is accelerating.

### Threat Construction – 2AC

#### Threat construction ⇒ violence and ressentiment

Zizek in 2005 (Slavoj, In These Times, August 11, http://www.lacan.com/zizekiranian.htm)

Classic power functioned as a threat that operated precisely by never actualizing itself, by always remaining a threatening gesture. Such functioning reached its climax in the Cold War, when the threat of mutual nuclear destruction had to remain a threat. With the "war on terror", the invisible threat causes the incessant actualization, not of the threat itself, but, of the measures against the threat. The nuclear strike had to remain the threat of a strike, while the threat of the terrorist strike triggers the endless series of preemptive strikes against potential terrorists. We are thus passing from the logic of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) to a logic in which ONE SOLE MADMAN runs the entire show and is allowed to enact its paranoia. The power that presents itself as always being under threat, living in mortal danger, and thus merely defending itself, is the most dangerous kind of power-the very model of the Nietzschean ressentiment and moralistic hypocrisy. And indeed, it was Nietzsche himself who, more than a century ago, in Daybreak, provided the best analysis of the false moral premises of today's "war on terror":

No government admits any more that it keeps an army to satisfy occasionally the desire for conquest. Rather, the army is supposed to serve for defense, and one invokes the morality that approves of self-defense. But this implies one's own morality and the neighbor's immorality; for the neighbor must be thought of as eager to attack and conquer if our state must think of means of self-defense. Moreover, the reasons we give for requiring an army imply that our neighbor, who denies the desire for conquest just as much as our own state, and who, for his part, also keeps an army only for reasons of self-defense, is a hypocrite and a cunning criminal who would like nothing better than to overpower a harmless and awkward victim without any fight. Thus all states are now ranged against each other: they presuppose their neighbor's bad disposition and their own good disposition. This presupposition, however, is inhumane, as bad as war and worse. At bottom, indeed, it is itself the challenge and the cause of wars, because as I have said, it attributes immorality to the neighbor and thus provokes a hostile disposition and act. We must abjure the doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense just as completely as the desire for conquests.

### AT: Economy Impact

#### Attempts to cure recession have lead to continued crisis – further attempts to remedy economic meltdown will lead to never ending wars

Zizek 2009 Slavoj First as Tragedy, Then as Farce page 19-20

Against this tendency, one should insist on the key question: what is the "flaw" in the system as such that opens up the possibility for such crises and collapses? The first thing to bear in mind here is that the origin of the crisis is a "benevolent" one: as we have noted, after the dotcom bubble burst, the decision, taken in a bipartisan fashion, was to facilitate real estate investment in order to keep the economy going and prevent recession-today's meltdown is thus simply the price being paid for the measures taken in the US to avoid recession a few years ago. The danger is thus that the predominant narrative of the meltdown will be the one which, instead of awakening us from a dream, will enable us to continue dreaming. And it is here that we should start to worry-not only about the economic consequences of the meltdown, but about the obvious temptation to reinvigorate the "war on terror" and US interventionism in order to keep the motor of the economy running, or at least to use the crisis to impose further tough measures of "structural adjustment.”

### AT: Spending Links

#### Their call to cut social spending is the unquestionable embrace for the logic of capital – reject their disad because it relies on a false economic calculation of social good the impact is the 1AC – they lack the causation necessary to make their disad true

Zizek 1997 New Left Review http://www.newleftreview.org/?page=article&view=1919

Today, financial crisis is a permanent state of things the reference to which legitimizes the demands to cut social spending, health care, support of culture and scientific research, in short, the dismantling of the welfare state. Is, however, this permanent crisis really an objective feature of our socio-economic life? Is it not rather one of the effects of the shift of balance in the ‘class struggle’ towards Capital, resulting from the growing role of new technologies as well as from the direct internationalization of Capital and the co-dependent diminished role of the Nation-State which was further able to impose certain minimal requirements and limitations to exploitation? In other words, the crisis is an ‘objective fact’ if and only if one accepts in advance as an unquestionable premise the inherent logic of Capital—as more and more left-wing or liberal parties have done. We are thus witnessing the uncanny spectacle of social-democratic parties which came to power with the between-the-lines message to Capital ‘we will do the necessary job for you in an even more efficient and painless way than the conservatives’. The problem, of course, is that, in today’s global socio-political circumstances, it is practically impossible effectively to call into question the logic of Capital: even a modest social-democratic attempt to redistribute wealth beyond the limit acceptable to the Capital ‘effectively’ leads to economic crisis, inflation, a fall in revenues and so on. Nevertheless, one should always bear in mind how the connection between ‘cause’ (rising social expenditure) and ‘effect’ (economic crisis) is not a direct objective causal one: it is always-already embedded in a situation of social antagonism and struggle. The fact that, if one does not obey the limits set by Capital, a crisis ‘really follows’, in no way ‘proves’ that the necessity of these limits is an objective necessity of economic life. It should rather be conceived as a proof of the privileged position Capital holds in the economic and political struggle, as in the situation where a stronger partner threatens that if you do X, you will be punished by Y, and then, upon your doing X, Y effectively ensues.

### AT: States CP

#### Strategies of devolution and privatization are beholden to the ideology of neoliberalism – don’t trust their evidence its all biased against public action

Fine Prof of Economics U of London & Hall Director of the Public Services International Research Unit – U of Greenwich 2010 Ben & Contesting Neoliberalism: Public Sector Alternatives for Service Delivery Working Paper for the Milan European Economy Workshops http://www.economia.unimi.it/uploads/wp/DEAS-2010\_27wp.pdf

Other areas of policymaking, as with industrial and regional policy, health, education and welfare, R&D, and skills and training, have all been profoundly influenced by neoliberalism, quite apart from the pressure for ’flexibility’ in labour markets, signifying a race to the bottom in wages and working conditions. The priority assigned to private participation in delivery has both squeezed public sector alternatives and the rationale for, and capacity to deliver, them. As already suggested, the logic and practice is to push for what the private sector can deliver with limited regard to broader social and economic objectives or the presumption that these should be picked up by other compensating policy measures. Whether this ever happens is a moot point as opposed to journeying further down the evaluatory trap. There is also significant reliance upon devolution and decentralisation with the presumption of greater local and democratic participation whereas this can often turn out to be the passing on of responsibility for delivery by an authoritarian central state without provision of support for necessary resources.

In short, neoliberalism is not just marked by policy and ideology favouring the private over the public sector, but this has itself been institutionalised within government capacity itself and the commercial pressures to which it responds. And this has been devastating for the potential for formulating and implementing alternative forms of public provision.

For, government and international policy-making itself is subject to institutionalised corporate capture/influence through the extensive use of management consultants and business appointees. These consultancies are themselves made up of a small group of multinational firms - such as Price-Waterhouse, Deloittes, Ernst and Young - which act as a policy replication mechanism. Another form of this is the appointment of increasing numbers of businessmen and women to government policy positions which would normally be held by career civil servants. The process can also be seen at an international level, most obviously in the collaboration between companies, donors and development banks over privatisations.

The institutionalisation of these relationships can be seen as a generalised, if tacit, form of collusion, bordering upon corruption (see above). For these individual acts occur as part of a systematic network between political parties and institutions, on the one hand, and corporate interests on the other, regularly agreeing which policies to adopt, which companies get which contracts and at what price (Della Porta and Vanucci 1999). The process includes not only bribes but also legal donations and other networks of influence, constituting effective “state capture” (Hellman et al 2003). The operation of conditionalities by the development banks can also be recognised as tantamount to corruption, whereby money – in the form of finance for a socially and politically valuable project – is offered in exchange for a national government transferring assets and/or contracts to the corporate interests in the sector, through privatisation or PPPs.

#### The strategy of state implementation is beholden to the logic of neo-liberalism – means the CP cannot solve

Martinez-Fernandez et al Urban Research Centre, University of Western Sydney 2012 Cristina Shrinking Cities: Urban Challenges of Globalization International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 36.2 Wiley Online

Shrinking places are for Smith et al. (2001) and Smith (2002) a form of neoliberal urbanism that is the manifestation in the built environment of contemporary capitalism's creative destruction (Harvey, 2005). Drawing on political economic notions of the global neoliberal project, embodied in the Washington Consensus's doctrine of free trade, state devolution and market deregulation, Smith et al. (2001)3 empirically challenge conventional formulations of urban shrinkage and decline expressed in terms of invasion–succession processes or in terms of who moves in or out of neighbourhoods. In contemporary capitalist societies, neoliberal policy aims to restore and preserve economic and political privilege among the upper economic classes through privatization of all aspects of economic life, financialization of risk and debt, the management and manipulation of financial crises and state redistributional tactics. The resultant neoliberal project's physical and economic decline stems from new processes of wealth accumulation by a few through the growing dispossession of the masses (Harvey, 2005).4 Viewed from this perspective, skills, cultural, educational or other spatial mismatches or deficiencies among residents of shrinking places are not the root of the problem. Rather, speculative circulation of capital in the built environment, such as predatory mortgage lending and its securitization in global financial markets, is largely to blame. As evident in the current and previous financial and real-estate debacles, these speculative processes have brought widespread disinvestment and real-estate devastation to many a neighbourhood and furthered the spread of economic shrinkage and physical decline across the regional and global urban landscapes.

#### Federal funding shapes state and local policies – key to burden sharing

The Economist 4/28/2011 http://www.economist.com/node/18620944

The federal government is responsible for only a quarter of total transport spending, but the way it allocates funding shapes the way things are done at the state and local levels. Unfortunately, it tends not to reward the prudent, thanks to formulas that govern over 70% of federal investment. Petrol-tax revenues, for instance, are returned to the states according to the miles of highway they contain, the distances their residents drive, and the fuel they burn. The system is awash with perverse incentives. A state using road-pricing to limit travel and congestion would be punished for its efforts with reduced funding, whereas one that built highways it could not afford to maintain would receive a larger allocation.

Formula-determined block grants to states are, at least, designed to leave important decisions to local authorities. But the formulas used to allocate the money shape infrastructure planning in a remarkably block-headed manner. Cost-benefit studies are almost entirely lacking. Federal guidelines for new construction tend to reflect politics rather than anything else. States tend to use federal money as a substitute for local spending, rather than to supplement or leverage it. The Government Accountability Office estimates that substitution has risen substantially since the 1980s, and increases particularly when states get into budget difficulties. From 1998 to 2002, a period during which economic fortunes were generally deteriorating, state and local transport investment declined by 4% while federal investment rose by 40%. State and local shrinkage is almost certainly worse now.

States can make bad planners. Big metropolitan areas—Chicago, New York and Washington among them—often sprawl across state lines. State governments frequently bicker over how (and how much) to invest. Facing tight budget constraints, New Jersey’s Republican governor, Chris Christie, recently scuttled a large project to expand the railway network into New York City. New Jersey commuter trains share a 100-year-old tunnel with Amtrak, a major bottleneck. Mr Christie’s decision was widely criticised for short-sightedness; but New Jersey faced cost overruns that in a better system should have been shared with other potential beneficiaries all along the north-eastern corridor. Regional planning could help to avoid problems like this.

### AT: K ALTS

#### Their alternative overestimates the autonomy of individuals oppressed by neo-liberalism – their logic replicates inequality

Portwood-Stacer PhD Comm - USC 2010 Laura The Practice of Everyday Politics: Lifestyle and Identity as Radical Activism – PhD Dissertation at USC http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/assetserver/controller/item/etd-PortwoodStacer-3737.pdf

It is fair to say though that these imagined connections are themselves enabled by the same neoliberal logic that also ends up foreclosing macro strategies for systemic change. Neoliberal discourses of individual autonomy promote the idea that we are each endowed with the agency to choose the best way of life and that the means to realize our choices are readily available if only we will commit to them. Unfortunately, this sense of autonomy may obfuscate the fact that in many cases our “choices” are constrained by conservative economic, political, and cultural networks of power. Much as the discourse of neoliberalism does, anarchist attitudes about lifestyle politics often overestimate the power that individuals may have to actively resist many of the social forces that in fact heavily shape everyday experience.

At the same time, as I will discuss in this dissertation, the case of anarchist lifestyle politics shows that we are not really restricted to a homogenous set of lifestyle choices, nor are our choices fully containable by the commodity market. That is, in many instances, anarchists’ practices and beliefs are qualitatively different from those of most participants in the hegemonic order. Their activism is distinguishable from the kind of commodity activism that involves merely choosing the lesser of many evils from among the options on offer in the marketplace. This goes for not only the literal consumer marketplace, but also the cultural “marketplace of ideas” in which more or less thinly veiled misogyny, racism, and homophobia are the dominant ideologies for sale. Yet the individualist logic of neoliberalism is often implicit in anarchists’ efforts to free their minds and bodies from the grips of repressive forces by choosing a different way. Though they may not exemplify the “possessive or competitive individualism” of the thoroughly “integrated” capitalist subject (Marcuse 2001a, 156), lifestyle practices are still fundamentally individual responses to power, and thus are not adequately equipped to radically rearrange power relations on a social scale.

### AT: CAP K ALTS

#### The mantra of individual change is an ineffective and dangerous political strategy – it not only fails to change structures of oppression it also shifts responsibility from state and corporate structures onto the oppressed

Portwood-Stacer PhD Comm - USC 2010 Laura The Practice of Everyday Politics: Lifestyle and Identity as Radical Activism – PhD Dissertation at USC http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/assetserver/controller/item/etd-PortwoodStacer-3737.pdf

In the absence of systemic support, many individuals may find individual resistance a practical impossibility. Alyssa was an interviewee who had moved to a small Canadian town after having lived in Northern California for many years. She explained that many of the anti-consumption practices she had engaged in while living in Santa Cruz (a California college town known for its liberal community), such as dumpstering and participating in a bike collective, were simply not feasible in her new location. So while she still stuck to a vegan diet and commuted by bicycle, “so many of those things were available to me in the culture of Santa Cruz, and really aren’t here (the dumpsters are locked, there are no collective spaces like the Bike Church or Free Radio, etc).” Jeremy, another interviewee, called it a “flawed idea that one can individualize capitalism or ‘drop out’ of it.” The fact that completely dropping out of capitalism is in reality a practical impossibility further attests to this incommensurability between individual refusal and systemic power. That is, capitalism is so well integrated into every aspect of life that there is no getting away from it completely, no matter how much the individual might intend to liberate themself from its hold.

Furthermore, even assuming the possibility of individual resistance, it may not be the case that there are enough activists out there to have a quantitatively significant impact on the whole capitalist system, or even one industry or corporation within that system. In this vein, writer Derrick Jensen (a controversial figure among anarchists who take differing stances on lifestyle politics) argues that even if ethical consumption practices were to be adopted by masses of individuals, their material impact might still be relatively small. In an essay titled “Forget Shorter Showers: Why Personal Change Does Not Equal Political Change,” Jensen points out that the environmental damage caused by individuals is miniscule when compared with that of government and corporate institutions. Thus exhortations for individuals to minimize their detrimental effect on the planet through changes in personal consumption have the dual negative consequence of displacing responsibility, and perhaps inconvenience, onto those who are least equipped to cope with it, and allowing the worst offenders to go on conducting (unethical) business as usual.

Littler finds this “responsibilization” of the individual to be a troubling manifestation of neoliberal ideology that masks and displaces the obligations to society which ought to be assumed by policy-makers and vast corporate entities (Littler 2009, 95). Speaking in the context of “green consumerism” Littler asserts that “in ‘the new green order’ individuals are responsibilized into dramatic yet ineffectual actions while corporations and the state shirk their responsibilities” (Ibid., 114). Jensen takes a similar view, arguing that “we’ve been victims of a campaign of systematic misdirection. Consumer culture and the capitalist mindset have taught us to substitute acts of personal consumption (or enlightenment) for organized political resistance” (Jensen 2009). Emily, the interviewee, also had qualms about individual practices of non-consumption as a political tactic:

You hear about sweatshops and you hear about maquiladoras and you know that all these things are involved in how everything is produced and so the best way to feel like you’re not a cause of that is to extract yourself from the situation by not consuming, but it’s a political move that doesn’t generate power it just generates people extracting themselves. I think it’s great, I don’t have any problem with it, but I’m more interested in seeing people organize. If you’re interested in sweatshops, or in consuming fewer resources, build things that enable people to know about it or do something about it to change it in their everyday lives.

As Emily insinuates, anarchist practices of refusal may be quite important at a personal, ethical level yet they may not prove to be very effective tactics for accomplishing the material goals of the movement.

### AT: NORMATIVITY

#### Criticisms of normativity 🡺 neo-liberalism – they rely on a false sense of autonomy and dismiss real life obstacles to change

Portwood-Stacer PhD Comm - USC 2010 Laura The Practice of Everyday Politics: Lifestyle and Identity as Radical Activism – PhD Dissertation at USC http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/assetserver/controller/item/etd-PortwoodStacer-3737.pdf

The problem with a puristic anti-normativity position is that it risks reproducing the neoliberal model of free choice that treats individual acts as pure expressions of personal agency, even though systemic power relations are always at work in structuring those acts. To invoke this discourse is both to dismiss the real obstacles that work against the adoption of counter-hegemonic identifications and practices and to excuse people when their choices happen to replicate traditional oppressive relationships. That is, the likely effect of a movement purporting to reject norms altogether is the invisible conservation of dominant norms within and beyond that movement. Philosophically, it might make sense to oppose the way that norms, both mainstream and subcultural, constrain personal autonomy. Yet, unless anarchism is to stand for a kind of moral relativism, standards of ethical authenticity, and the dynamics of disciplinarity they generate, are politically defensible. Insofar as contemporary anarchists advocate social transformation, they may find it useful to commit to some normative content within their political project.

### AT: MARX

#### Marxist methodology is naïve – the dialectic cannot lead to a revolution – the plan imagined as a movement against capitalism is a more effective methodology

De Lissovoy Ass’t Prof Cultural Studies in Education – UT-Austin 2008 Noah Dialectic of Emergency/Emergency of the Dialectic Capitalism, Nature, Socialism 19.1 proquest

This does not mean abandoning the idea of the dialectic, but it points up the impossibility of realizing the promise of a naive Marxism that saw the dialectic as a kind of locomotive of history, pulling civilization along on the track to revolution. We now see the dialectic as entailing a necessarily radical openness, since the kind of oppositional movement that is called for is unprecedented and challenges our sense (often preserved even among socialists) of historical development as ultimately orderly and organic. Mészáros contrasts a Marxist understanding of the uneven dialectic of history with a unified and Hegelian one by emphasizing that the continuity of historical progress (the persistence through time of antagonistic class relations) is made out of a succession of radical discontinuities taking the form of epochal social transformations and ruptures.15 Just as the unraveling of ecologies is non-linear, as quantitative increases in degradation lead to qualitatively greater orders of destruction, in the same way the formation of a global oppositional movement must develop not only in an accelerated fashion, but in a different manner-crystallizing a new force not from the painstaking construction of a new party, for instance, but from the sudden concatenation of multiple movements. Paradoxically, this emergent movement requires a departure from a faith in its own methodical progressivity, in the form of a radical and unprecedented imaginativeness.

#### Perm – do both – their alternative cannot 🡺 liberation only the permutations embrace of multiple oppositional historical narratives can 🡺 revolution

De Lissovoy Ass’t Prof Cultural Studies in Education – UT-Austin 2008 Noah Dialectic of Emergency/Emergency of the Dialectic Capitalism, Nature, Socialism 19.1 proquest

In light of the foreshortening of historicity discussed above, liberation no longer appears slowly in the form of a newly consolidated class subject that emerges from the bosom of the old order to challenge and to take over from it. It needs, rather, to condense a new agent and a different history. This agent must confront not simply the existing powers, but the logic of power itself. It represents a strange progress, even a kind of egress, from the dialectic itself as traditionally conceptualized. In this context, historical agency does not belong to a single consolidated representative of the totality (i.e., the traditional proletariat). Rather, the subject is no longer separate from its intermittent and provisional communicative production. Thus the new form of this historical subject becomes a continuous condition rather than an organized identification. This dialectic is one of radical unfinishedness and openness, and it reemphasizes the moment of discontinuity in Marx in which the settled meanings and subjects that are consolidated by the hegemony of a class are thrown open in the process of revolution.

As a continuous production and proliferation, rather than simple consolidation, a new revolutionary subject would materialize a range of possibilities and locations simultaneously.37 This subject would appropriate a "compound standpoint" which would press together the range of oppositional narrations of reality. The bringing together of ecological and socialist standpoints in ecosocialism is an example of such a synthesis, as is David Harvey's call for links between struggles against "accumulation by dispossession" (imperialism, privatization, enclosures) and struggles within the sphere of reproduction proper (e.g. trade-union movements). This condensation of standpoints, different from both unification and simple coalition, is also signaled in the contemporary idea of a "movement of movements." It would discover a kind of agency fundamentally different from customary senses, oriented not only toward the dismantling of dominative power but also toward the reorganization of available oppositional selves.

### AT: Anti-Politics

#### Their over-simplification of the left is misleading and dangerous – ignores the fractured and multidimensional nature of the left – neo-liberalism precludes the progress of the left

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

The topic "The Emerging Left in the 'Emerging' World" may appear to be an excessively ambitious one. After all, to talk of one single "emerging left" even in any single part of the world is not just brave but foolhardy. Left politics and left positions have always been - and will continue to be - extremely diverse, within and across national boundaries. Given the profusion and variation of the multiplicity of approaches, it could justifiably be argued that attempts to fit all types of progressive thinking in very different parts of the world into a common box would be over-simplistic and even misleading.

This perception is also a reflection of the accentuated fragmentation of "left" positions. For much of the 20th century, it was easier to talk of an overarching socialist framework, a "grand vision" within which more specific debates were conducted. Of course there were many strands of socialism, however defined, and there were also fierce and occasionally violent struggles between them. Even so, they shared more than a common historical lineage - they also shared a fundamental perception or basic vision. At the risk of crude simplification, this vision can be summarised in terms of perceiving the working class to be the most fundamental agent of positive change, capable (once organised) of transforming not only existing property and material relations but also wider society and culture through its own actions.

But in recent times the very idea of a grand vision has been in retreat, battered not just by the complexities and limitations of "actually existing socialism" in its various incarnations, but more recently and thoroughly by the ferocious triumphalism of its opposite. Indeed, it may be fair to say that insofar as any grand vision has existed at all in recent times, the one that increasingly came to dominate public life almost everywhere in the world by the late 20th century was that of the market as a self-regulating and inherently efficient mechanism for organising economic life. This idea had already fallen by the wayside a century previously, before it was resurrected and dusted off for use in a slightly more "post-modern" format that became the theoretical underpinning for the vast explosion of global economic integration under the aegis of finance capital that has marked the period of globalisation.