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# Transit Apartheid 1AC

#### Transportation constitutes the fundamental element of lived experience in our current age. Public transit especially shapes and constrains who can move where, when, and why. Current federal transportation infrastructure investment is tilted in favor of suburban needs, both subsidizing high-speed rails and highways, leaving the transport-dependent without options.

Joe Grengs, professor of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Michigan 2005 (“The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA” City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action Volume 9, Issue 1, 2005 pages 51-66)

The case opened up new questions about the equality of transit services provided. Can a transit agency go too far in shifting its emphasis in favour of one constituency of suburban commuters over another constituency of local bus riders in the urban core? How should a transit agency achieve a balance between these different constituencies? Vuchic (1999) describes an efficient transportation system as one that is physically and functionally integrated with the variety of activities and services offered by a metropolitan region. To best serve this variety of places and needs in large cities, a transportation system might accommodate a mix of modes—automobiles, bicycles, pedestrians, and a “family of transit” ranging from buses on local streets to high‐speed regional rail. Unfortunately, federal transportation policy—both in highways and transit—has been constructed under a mistakenly narrow view, and has produced a highly imbalanced system that favours automobiles over all other modes (Rose, 1990; Vuchic, 1999). This imbalanced system has in turn produced greatly different constituencies: the majority are drivers dependent on cars; a minority are transit riders who cannot drive a car and who use mass transit for nearly all kinds of trips; and an even smaller minority are transit commuters who seek to avoid car congestion by riding transit to work. A balanced transportation system would provide reasonable options for all these constituencies. An imbalanced system, however, leaves some groups at a serious disadvantage. Besides contributing to an imbalanced transportation system, federal transportation policy also places transportation users in competition with one another. Transit advocates struggle against highway interests in competition for scarce transportation dollars. Even among transit advocates, one constituency has long been in conflict with another. Jones (1985) argues that from the very beginning federal programmes for public transit were biased in favour of the suburban commuter. Federal policy in the early 1960s was “constructed in terms of the world view of the suburbs‐to‐central city commuter … built for and around the racehorses, not the workhorses, of the transit industry” (Jones, 1985, p. 121). The workhorses here are the local buses in the urban core where most transit‐dependent riders live, including the carless, the poor, students, elderly and recent immigrants. Is the Los Angeles case, where a transit agency was found to place too much emphasis on one transit constituency over another, an isolated instance? Commenting on trends in California, Wachs (1997) suggests not, arguing that recent transit initiatives that bring new transit services to suburban commuters lead to diminishing services for riders of inner‐city, local buses: “With federal subsidies to transit being steadily reduced, to fulfill their commitments for rail construction and suburban bus transit expansions, transit agencies are cutting back on cost‐effective inner‐city transit routes in order to use their resources to expand services that require higher subsidies and carry fewer riders than the services they are eliminating.” (Wachs, 1997, p. 9) If transit agencies are indeed shifting their priorities to the suburban commuter, are planners and policy makers losing sight of transit’s social purpose?

#### Perversely, the federal government continues to subsidize dependency on automobiles by favoring parking over mass transit. Such subsidies are more costly than investment in mass transit systems that could end enduring continued inequities that punish the disadvantaged for not owning automobiles.

Todd Litman, founder and executive director of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 2007 (http://urbanhabitat.org/node/342 Transportation Solutions, Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice, Vol. 12 No. 1 Spring)

Current transportation systems and land use patterns tend to be relatively “automobile dependent,” meaning that they provide a relatively high level of service to motorists, but inferior access by other modes. Since physically, economically, and socially disadvantaged people tend to have limited ability to drive, automobile dependency tends to make them even worse off. Planning reforms that create more balanced, multi-modal transportation systems and more accessible land use patterns tend to support social equity objectives, such as helping the poor access education and employment opportunities, and helping disabled people access medical services and social activities. Many of these reforms are incremental and their equity impact may appear small, but the cumulative effects of a well planned package of reforms that improve travel options and reduce automobile dependency can substantially increase social equity. Market Distortions One important way of improving transportation for disadvantaged people is to correct existing market distortions that favor automobile travel over other modes, and that contribute to urban sprawl. Many common planning practices that contribute to automobile dependency reflect market distortions that violate basic economic principles. Planning reforms that correct these distortions can help achieve multiple economic, social, and environmental objectives. The underpricing of automobile transportation in planning models is fundamental to the skewed preference for automobile dependent systems. Although vehicles are expensive to own, they are relatively cheap to drive—just a few cents per mile in direct expenses—because most costs, such as depreciation, insurance, registration, and residential parking, are fixed. Other costs, such as free parking and local road maintenance, plus the costs associated with congestion, accident risks, and environmental impacts, are external, funded by general tax revenues. In fact, less than half the costs of driving are efficiently priced. This increases per capita automobile travel and reduces demand for alternative modes, which leads to a self-reinforcing cycle of automobile-dependency. Other distortions that favor motorized travel include: Travel surveys undercount non-motorized travel (walking and cycling trips) and overlook short or non-commute trips, and travel by children. A multi-modal trip involving walking, a bus ride, and bicycling may be counted solely as a transit trip. Economic evaluations of transportation investments often ignore the true impacts of increased vehicular traffic—incremental parking, traffic accidents, and consumer costs—and the real benefits of alternative modes of transport. Most travel models do not account for the negative impacts of additional vehicular traffic that results from roadway capacity expansion, and overestimate the economic benefits of urban highway projects. Transportation planning indicators, such as average traffic speeds, congestion delays, and roadway level of service, measure mobility rather than accessibility. Current funding practices tend to increase automobile dependency by favoring parking and roadway facilities over alternative modes of transport, even if the latter are more cost-effective. Most parking costs are bundled into building costs, often due to zoning code requirements, or funded through special accounts. Many jurisdictions have dedicated highway funds that either cannot be used for other transportation projects, or which provide lower matching rates for alternatives. In addition, land use planning practices tend to encourage lower-density, single-use, urban fringe development, which is unsuited for access by alternative modes. Although individual market distortions may seem modest and justified, their effects are cumulative, significantly increasing transportation inequities and problems. For example, many businesses provide free parking, a subsidy that typically increases automobile travel by 15 to 25 percent. Offering a comparable benefit for users of other modes of transport is more equitable and an effective way to reduce congestion and pollution problems. Win-Win Transportation Solutions Integrated transportation planning gives as much weight to managing demand as to increasing capacity. It considers all significant costs and benefits, including non-market impacts. And it involves the public in developing and evaluating alternatives. For example, instead of segregated highway and public transit programs, funding available for roadway and parking facility expansion projects could be used for transit improvements, rideshare programs, or mobility management programs if they are proven to be more cost effective overall. Improvement in the public transit system—such as additional routes, expanded coverage, increased service frequency, and longer hours of operation; comfort improvements; pricing innovations; improved rider information; and transit oriented development (neighborhoods designed around transit stations)—would bring benefits for all. Win-Win Solutions, such as mileage-based pricing for insurance and car registration, road congestion pricing, managing parking access, and other modest reforms, are “no regret” measures whose combined benefits can be substantial while increasing consumer benefits and economic development. Parking access changes, such as reduced or flexible minimum parking requirements, cash subsidies for employees, and unbundling parking from building space, can encourage more transit use. Pay-as-you-drive pricing, which bases insurance premiums on a vehicle’s mileage during the policy term, makes insurance more equitable and affordable, and benefits lower-income motorists who tend to drive their vehicles less than average. High occupancy vehicles-only lanes give buses, vanpools, and carpools priority over general traffic. High-occupancy vehicles-only lanes are a more efficient and equitable allocation of road space and use of road capacity (they impose less congestion on other road users), and can serve as an incentive to shift transportation modes. Commute trip reduction programs give commuters resources and incentives to reduce their automobile trips. They typically include improved transportation options, such as ridesharing, transit, telework and flextime, and incentives such a parking cash out or parking pricing. Walking and bicycling improvements directly substitute for automobile trips and support public transit and ridesharing. Residents of communities with good walking and bicycling conditions drive less and use transit more. “Smart Growth” land use improves accessibility for non-drivers and encourage the development of more compact, pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented communities, where residents need to drive less. Carsharing provides affordable, short-term (hourly and daily rate) motor vehicle rentals in residential areas, giving consumers a convenient and affordable alternative to vehicle ownership. Traffic management designs reduce traffic speeds and volumes, and discourage short-cuts through residential neighborhoods. This increases road safety and community livability, and creates a more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly environment. Road/congestion pricing, where motorists pay a fee to drive on a particular roadway causes drivers to shift travel times, routes, destinations, and modes of transport, and increases overall transportation efficiency. Many transportation problems are impossible to resolve without some of the reforms suggested. Unfortunately, although transportation planners recognize their potential benefits, they often treat them as last resort measures, to be used to address specific congestion and air pollution problems where conventional solutions prove to be ineffective. If fully implemented to the degree that they are economically justified, Win-Win Solutions could reduce motor vehicle impacts by 20 to 40 percent, and help meet Kyoto emission reduction targets.

#### This federal posture reflects a brand of neoliberal racism, an insidious systemic philosophy that encourages slashing services to those most dependent on public transit in favor of increasing flexibility to an elite consumer class. City developers use transit policy to promote images of urban decadence at the expense of marginalized and poor populations.

Stephanie Farmer, professor of Sociology, Roosevelt University, 2011 (“Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA” Environment and Planning A 2011, volume 43, pages 1154 – 1172)

Public transportation, as one crucial component of a city's transportation network, enables the mobility and flow of people and goods that make cities livable. Public transportation plays a vital role in the urban economy in that it creates place-based advantages, facilitates the circulation of capital, and attracts investment in local real estate markets. At the level of everyday lived experience, public transit shapes and constrains opportunity (time it takes to access jobs, schools, and services) and sociospatial relations into the built environment. In many places, public transportation is also wielded as an instrument of power, dominance, and social control, entrenching the privileges of the affluent and the disadvantages of working people into the built environment (Graham and Marvin, 2001). Therefore, trends in public transportation infrastructure and service levels constitute one dimension of uneven geographical development in urban areas. My research considers the ways in which neoliberalism and global city building are shaping new patterns of uneven geographic development in the public transit sector by focusing on public transportation planning and investment in the city of Chicago. The purpose of my paper is to contribute to the scholarship on the politics of infrastructure (Keil and Young, 2008; McFarlane and Rutherford, 2008) emphasizing the ways in which infrastructure and cities are produced and transformed together in a global context as well as how these processes contribute to urban fragmentation and inequality. The second part of this paper positions my study in the literature on entrepreneurial urban governments, neoliberal public transportation projects, and emerging sociospatial relations of inclusion and exclusion in the global city. The third part examines public transportation planning and new construction projects taking place in the city of Chicago in order to illustrate the impact of neoliberalization on the geography of uneven public transportation development. The narrative was assembled through a combination of documents produced by government, transit and planning agencies, secondary sources (mostly journalistic materials and documents produced by nonprofit groups), interviews, and nonparticipant observation of community meetings. My investigation of Chicago's public transportation policy reveals that the city is sinking scarce transit funds into projects that transform the downtown Central Area into the image of a global city. These global city public transit projects are prioritized over expanding access to transit for working-class and minority residents living in transit-poor areas of the city. Additionally, the neoliberal squeeze of the public sector has resulted in declining service levels and the neglect of basic maintenance across the system, contributing to unreliable and poor public transportation service. These trends in public transportation policy pursued by the city of Chicago reveal the nature of uneven geographic development taking shape within this neoliberalizing city, where the global city growth machine favors business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago's global city downtown showcase zone. I conclude with a discussion on how neoliberal public transportation planning interlocks with neoliberal housing policies enacted in the city of Chicago to create new patterns of racial segregation and exclusion. 2 Uneven development and public transportation neoliberalism Since the production of space is inherently a social phenomenon, a theory of uneven geographic development should be attuned to the particular articulation of structural forces and social relations in capitalist society. Uneven geographic development is produced by a constellation of factors consisting of (1) the embedding of capital accumulation processes in space; (2) historical class, social, and political relations contingent to a geography that privileges some places, social groups, or activities over others; (3) the preexisting built environment; (4) institutional and political policies implemented in localities; and (5) consumption preferences (Harvey, 2006, page 78). Harvey (1999) sketches out the contours of uneven geographic development: Uneven development occurs as capital mobilizes particular places as forces of production creating a highly variegated capitalist geography consisting of an unequal distribution of productive forces, institutional arrangements, raw materials, the built environment and transport facilities, as well as differentiations of social relations and a litany of other factors shaping spatial relations'' (page 416). The specific configuration of market forces, state regulation, and class relations at work at a given time and place (the prevailing accumulation regime) profoundly shapes the development of the urban terrain. Contemporary urbanization processes are strongly shaped by the logic and policies of neoliberalism. Neoliberal ideology advocates the extension of market-based princi- ples 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 profit- ability 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 articu- lated 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 implement- ing ``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 infra- structure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting ``premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service. The neoliberal trend towards premium public transportation deployed for the purposes of constructing competitive advantages in the global capitalist system privileges profit making for capital, or exchange-value purposes, and not necessarily for everyday use, or use-value purposes (Keil and Young, 2008; Logan and Molotch, 1987). In order to finance new urban transit projects, cash-strapped entrepreneurial governments are increasingly entering into long-term partnerships with the private sector, or public-private partnerships (PPPs), in which the public sector pays for services and infrastructure delivered by the private sector (Phang, 2007; Siemiatycki, 2006; 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 devel- opment, mitigating labor costs and alleviating the effects of uneven development produced by the highly subsidized highway system (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). Neo- liberal statecraft abandons the Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups' access to the city. In its place, socially regressive neoliberal practices favor market-oriented growth and elite consumption patterns (Boschken, 2002; Grengs, 2004; Young and Keil, 2010). Thus, public transportation service has become a battleground in the global city growth machine's revanchist claims to the city (Smith, 1996). 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.

#### Neoliberalism and racism are a deadly double edged sword: As profit takes priority over people’s lives, those lives sacrificed are almost always raced. But transit apartheid is not inevitable; social justice could once again be a central aim of transit policy.

Joe Grengs professor of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Michigan 2005 (The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action Volume 9, Issue 1, 2005 pages 51-66)

Imagine a bus stop in a typical working‐class neighbourhood of inner‐city Los Angeles, a city with an extraordinary array of peoples and cultures. The bus pulls up with standing room only, filled with a variety of people: Mexican, Salvadoran, Korean, Filipino and African American; men and women going to jobs, some of them janitors, some street vendors. People on the bus include women clutching children and grocery bags, kids going to school, elderly folks off to the Senior Centre. The ride is like always: hot, noisy and desperately crowded. The riders come from decidedly different backgrounds, yet share the same experience daily—jostled against one another, staring blankly out cracked windows, minding their own business, intent on getting where they need to go. And getting it over with as quickly as possible. In another part of town, people of a different income class are riding in a new train. They come from the suburbs, clacking away at laptops and sipping cappuccino on their way to downtown jobs. These are people taking advantage of what Mike Davis (1995, p. 270) calls “the biggest public works project in fin de siecle America”, an ambitious series of commuter rail lines that were budgeted at $183 billion over 30 years (Sterngold, 1999). These train riders choose to leave their cars at home to avoid the maddening freeway jams of Los Angeles. Some ride the train on principle. Trains are, after all, better for the environment. Back on the inner‐city bus … someone’s handing out leaflets and talking about forming a union—of bus riders? First in English then in Spanish, the organizer tells riders how the train that’s always in the newspapers is costing more than planners expected, and that politicians now propose to take money away from buses to keep building the train lines. Then the organizer talks about racial discrimination. Racial discrimination? What do buses have to do with racial discrimination? “Yeah, I never thought about that! Yeah, look at this bus. We’re all of color. Not the same race, but we’re all of color. We’re poor. We’re all waiting on the darn corner. We’re all going to a job in general that doesn’t pay us jack. And yeah, you have a good point.” (del Barco, 1997, p. 1) Introduction Hidden behind the surge of national headlines about sprawl, Smart Growth, and maddening freeway congestion lies a series of conflicts emerging in cities across the USA. These conflicts pit poor people of colour in inner cities against mostly white commuters in the suburbs over scarce public transit funds, with questions of civil rights and social equity playing central roles. These emerging conflicts reveal that the very purpose of mass transit in the sprawling metropolis is undecided. As populations continue to disperse, as poverty concentrates at the core, and as costs outpace revenues, transit planners are facing a growing dilemma: should transit serve people who have few transportation choices, or should transit offer drivers an alternative to their cars? The neoliberal city of the USA is one that must struggle to compete and remain viable in the network of globalizing cities by cutting costs, reducing social welfare, deregulating business activity, privatizing previously public spaces and activities, and engaging in new forms of social control (Marcuse and van Kempen, 2000; Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Goonewardena, 2003). This essay examines how the contradictions of the neoliberal city influence mass transit policy in the USA, creating a worsening divide between disparate transit constituencies and undermining longstanding social equity goals. Mass transit is a new space of emerging social conflict over how the contradictions of neoliberalism will be resolved in cities of the USA (Rodriguez, 1999; Grengs, 2002). This new space of conflict holds special relevance for planners, because the neoliberal agenda involves central questions about public services in an increasingly privatized polity, the agenda contributes directly to changing urban spatial patterns, and the emerging spatial patterns raise new questions for planning theory about the role of social justice in cities where racial and economic segregation are worsening. Contradictions within neoliberal urbanization highlight an obscure but crucial predicament faced by transit planners. Are current transit policies hurting social equity? Should public transit serve an even higher purpose, as an instrument for advancing social justice? Transit once held promise as a means for advancing larger social goals. Congress embraced transit as a legitimate means of redistributing wealth, as an acceptable counterbalance to the damages imposed by a transportation system skewed toward the automobile (Fitch, 1964; Smerk, 1991; Weiner, 1999). Despite a commitment to social goals over several decades aimed at providing mobility for people who cannot drive, other goals have taken over in prominence. But transit policy is slowly, almost imperceptibly, shifting away from its broader social purposes. This shift away from meeting social goals toward the more narrow purpose of relieving traffic congestion, from achieving equity toward merely efficiency, is now influenced by a neoliberal political agenda that separates the social from the economic, causing planners to lose sight of the public purpose of mass transit. In an emerging world order where capitalism spreads American‐style to all corners of the globe, three major problems are widely recognized by critics from left to right: a continuous threat of war; persistent economic inequality that threatens to disrupt the social order; and a loss of political community that undermines our ability to address day‐to‐day problems and decisions (Goonewardena, 2003). By way of analysing transportation policy, I will set aside the question of war even though we grow ever more dependent on oil to feed our bigger and faster cars. The recent headlines about surging gasoline prices and the ongoing wars in the Middle East add up to a compelling case that our highway‐dependent lifestyles have as much to do with the threat of war as perhaps any other explanation. But here I focus on the two problems of social inequality and the loss of political community because they both bear on future outcomes of mass transit policy. The argument proceeds in three steps. First, government support for mass transit has long carried with it explicit social goals. The US federal government took decisive steps starting in the 1960s to advance mass transit. These congressional actions strengthened transit as a counterbalance to previous federal programmes that had overwhelmingly supported highway construction as the principal thrust of transport policy, and had inadvertently contributed to urban spatial patterns that put some people without access to a car at a serious disadvantage. Second, the social purpose of public transit is becoming supplanted by the economic imperative of efficiency and competitiveness. Gains in shifting commuters from cars to transit may actually undermine the goal of providing transit for those without cars, so that the social goal of providing mobility becomes displaced by the economic goal of reducing congestion. The third part of the argument explains how recent changes in transportation policy are influenced by a neoliberal political agenda, heightening the conflict between transit’s competing goals in ways that are not readily evident. To the casual observer, support for transit is growing. But national policy has at the same time encouraged a shift in emphasis within the transit programme, a shift that is likely to harm those who depend most on good transit.

#### Space can be designed to promote interaction or competition. A neoliberal agenda destroys places for unique democratic engagement as it takes up whole swathes of the urban landscape, while outer areas become spaces marked for death. While the crises of neoliberal capitalism mount, we must refuse to turn a blind eye and instead confront the degradation and warfare that will become inevitable

David Harvey, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

At times of crisis, the irrationality of capitalism becomes plain for all to see. Surplus capital and surplus labour exist side by side with seemingly no way to put them hack together in the midst of immense human suffering and unmet needs. In midsummer of 2009, one third of the capital equipment in the United States stood idle, while some 17 per cent of the workforce were either unemployed, enforced parttimers or discouraged workers. What could be more irrational than that? For capital accumulation to return to 3 per cent compound growth will require a new basis for profit-making and surplus absorption. The irrational way to do this in the past has been the rough the destruct on of the achievements of preceding eras by way of war, the devaluation of assets, the degradation of productive capacity, abandonment and other forms of 'creative destruction', The effects are felt not only throughout the world of commodity production and exchange. Human lives are disrupted and even physically destroyed, whole careers and lifetime achievements are put in jeopardy. deeply held beliefs are challenged, psyches wounded and~ respect for human dignity is cast aside. Creative destruction is visited upon the good, the beautiful the bad and the ugly alike. Crises, we may conclude, are the irrational rationalisers of an irrational system. Can capitalism survive the present trauma? Yes. of course. But at what cost? This question masks another. Can the capitalist class reproduce its power in the face of the raft of economic. social. political and geopolitical and environmental difficultiess? Again, the answer is a resounding ·Yes it can: This will however, require the mass of the people to give generously of the fruits of their labour to those in power, to surrender many of their rights and their hard -won asset values (in everything from housing to pension rights) and to suffer environmental degradations galore, to say nothing of serial reductions in their living standards which will mean starvation for many of those already struggling to survive at rock bottom. More than a little political repression, police violence and militarised state control will be required to stifle the ensuing unrest. But there will also have to be wrenching and painful shifts in the geographical and sectoral locus of capitalist class power. The capitalist class cannot, if history is any guide, maintain its power without changing its character and moving accumulation on to a different trajectory and into new spaces (such as east Asia). Since much of this is unpredictable and since the spaces of the global economy are so variable, then uncertainties as to outcomes are heightened at times of crisis. All manner of localised possibilities arise for either nascent capitalists in some new space to seize opportunities to challenge older class and territorial hegemonies (as when Silicon Valley replaced Detroit from the mid-1970s onwards in the United States) or for radical movements to challenge the reproduction of an already destabilized and therefore weakened class power. To say that the capitalist class and capitalism can survive is not to say that they are predestined to do so, nor that their future character is given. Crises are moments of paradox and possibility out of which all manner of alternatives, including socialist and anti-capitalist ones, can spring, So what will happen this time around? If we are to get back to 3 per cent growth, this will mean finding new and profitable global investment opportunities for $1.6 trillion in 2010, rising to closer to $3 trillion by 2030. This contrasts with the $0.J5 trillion new investment needed in 1950 and the $042 trillion needed in 1.973 (the dollar figures are inflation adjusted). Real problems of finding adequate outlets for surplus capital began to emerge after 1980, even with the opening up of China and the collapse of the Soviet bloc. The difficulties were in part resolved by the creation of fictitious markets where speculation in asset values could take off unchecked by any regulatory apparatus. Where will all this investment go now? Leaving aside the undisputable constraints in the relation to nature (with global warming of obvious paramount importance), the other potential barriers of effective demand in the market place, of technologies and of geographical geopolitical distributions are likely to be profound. Even supposing - which is unlikely - that no serious active oppositions to continuous capital accumulation and further consolidation of class power materialise. What spaces are left in the global economy for new spatial fixes for capital surplus absorption? China and the ex-Soviet bIoc have already been integrated. South and south-east Asia are filing up fast Africa is not yet fully integrated, but there is nowhere else with the capacity to absorb all the is surplus capital. What new lines of production can be opened up to absorb growth? There may be no effective long-term capitalist solutions (apart from reversion to fictitious capital manipulations) to this crisis of capitalism. At some point quantitative changes lead to qualitative shifts and we need to take seriously the idea that we may be at exactly such all inflexion point in the history of capitalism. Questioning the future of capitalism itself as an adequate social system ought, therefore to be in the forefront of current debate. Yet there appears to be little appetite for such discussion, even as conventional mantras regarding the perfectibility of humanity with the help of free markets and free trade, private properly and personal responsibility and low taxes and minimalist state involvement in social provision sound increasingly hollow. A crisis of legitimacy looms. But legitimation crises typically unfold at a different pace and rhythm to stock market crises. It took. for example, three-e or four Years for the stock: market crash Of 1929 to produce the massive social movements (both progressive and fascistic) that emerged after 1932 or so. The intensity of the current pursuit by political power of ways to exit the present crisis measures the political fear of looming illegitimacy. The existence of cracks in the ideological edifice does not mean it is utterly broken, Nor does it follow that because something is clearly hollow people will immediately recognise it as such. As of now, faith in the underlying presumptions of free market ideology have not eroded too much. There is no indication that people in the advanced capitalist countries (apart from the usual malcontents) are looking for radical changes of lifestyle, although many recognise that they may have to economise here or save money there. Those foreclosed upon in the United States (so preliminary surveys tell us) typically blame themselves for their failure {sometimes through bad luck) to live up to the personal responsibilities of homeownership. Where there is anger at bankers’ duplicity and populist outrage over their bonuses., there seems to be no movement in North America or Europe to embrace radical and far-reaching changes. In the global south, Latin America in particular, the story is rather different How the politics will play out in China and the rest of Asia, where growth continues and politics turns on different axes, is uncertain. The problem there is that growth is continuing, though at a lower rate. The idea that the crisis had systemic origin is scarcely mooted in the mainstream media. Most of the governmental moves so far in North America and Europe amount to the perpetuation of business as usual, which translates into support for the capitalist class. The moral hazard' that was the immediate trigger for the financial failures is being taken to new heights in the bank bail-outs. The actual practices of neoliberalism (as opposed to its utopian theory) always entailed blatant support for finance capital and capitalist elites (usually on the grounds that financial institutions must be protected at all costs and that it is the duty of state power to create a good business climate for solid profiteering). This has not fundamentally changed. Such practices are justified by appeal to the dubious proposition that a 'rising tide' of capitalist endeavour will 'lift all boats: or that the benefits of compound growth. will magically ‘trickle down' (which it never does. except in the form of a few crumbs from the rich folks' table). Throughout much of the capitalist world, we have lived through an astonishing period in which politics has been depoliticised and commodified. Only now, all the state steps in to bail out the financiers, has it become dear to all that state and capital are more tightly intertwined than ever both institutionally and personally. The ruling class, rather than the political class that am as its surrogate. is now actually seen to rule.

#### Specifically, 70,000 people will die each year due to the smog produced by the neoliberal engine, more dedicated to car culture than to providing livable communities for the urban poor.

Robert D. Bullard, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, 2005 (All Transit Is Not Created Equal, Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice Vol. 12 No. 1 Winter, http://urbanhabitat.org/node/306)

Transportation-related sources account for over 30 percent of the primary smog-forming pollutants emitted and 28 percent of the fine particulates. Vehicle emissions are the main reason why 121 Air Quality Districts in the U.S. are in noncompliance with the 1970 Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Over 140 million Americans, 25 percent of them children, live, work, and play in areas where air quality does not meet national standards.[8] Emissions from cars, trucks, and buses cause 25 to 51 percent of the air pollution in the nation's non-attainment areas. Transportation related emissions also generate more than a quarter of the greenhouse gases.[9] Improvements in transportation investments and air quality are of special significance to low-income persons and people of color who are more likely to live in areas with reduced air quality. National Argonne Laboratory researchers discovered that 57 percent of whites, 65 percent of African Americans, and 80 percent of Latinos lived in the 437 counties that failed to meet at least one of the EPA ambient air quality standards.[10] A 2000 study from the American Lung Association shows that children of color are disproportionately represented in areas with high ozone levels.[11] Additionally, 61.3 percent of Black children, 69.2 percent of Hispanic children, and 67.7 percent of Asian American children live in areas that exceed the 0.08 parts per million ozone standard, while only 50.8 percent of white children live in such areas. Asthma—The Price of Pollution Air pollution from vehicle emissions causes significant amounts of illness, hospitalization, and premature deaths. A 2002 study published in The Lancet shows a strong causal link between ozone and asthma.[12] Ground-level ozone may exacerbate health problems such as asthma, nasal congestion, throat irritation, respiratory tract inflammation, reduced resistance to infection, changes in cell function, loss of lung elasticity, chest pains, lung scarring, formation of lesions within the lungs, and premature aging of lung tissues.[13] Air pollution claims 70,000 lives a year, nearly twice the number killed in traffic accidents.[14] A 2001 Center for Disease Control report, “Creating a Healthy Environment: The Impact of the Built Environment on Health,” points a finger at transportation and sprawl as major health threats.[15] Although it is difficult to put a single price tag on the cost of air pollution, estimates range from $10 billion to $200 billion a year.[16] Asthma is the number one reason for childhood emergency room visits in most major cities in the country. The hospitalization rate for African Americans is three to four times the rate for whites and they are three times more likely than whites to die from asthma.[17] Moreover, Blacks and Hispanics now comprise 52.6 percent of the 43 million Americans without health insurance. Nearly one-half of working-age Hispanics (46 percent) lacked health insurance for all or part of the year prior to the survey, as did one-third of African Americans (30 percent). In comparison, one-fifth of whites and Asian Americans (21 and 20 percent, respectively) in the 18 to 64 age group lacked coverage for all or part of the year.[18]

#### We have an obligation to promote an end to this exclusion. Treating poor communities of color as expendable excess in the neoliberal economy risks the worst forms of state violence based upon racism.

Duarte– Professor of Philosophy @ Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, Brazil. 2005 [André Duarte, “Biopolitics and the dissemination of violence: the Arendtian critique of the present,” Final version - 27 April 2005, pg. http://hannaharendt.net/research/biopolitics.html]

Moreover, to consider totalitarianism as a disruptive event in Western history is by no means to deny the possibility of understanding it as a historical phenomenon – in Arendt’s terms, as the crystallization of different historical elements that have become constitutive of late modern politics and, therefore, also have something to do with liberal democracies. In other words, although totalitarian regimes should not be considered as the necessary culmination of modernity, neither are they mere accidents. To recall Zygmunt Bauman’s Arendt-inspired analysis, totalitarianism has to be understood in a historical context involving the conjunction of modern science and technology, bureaucratic administration and mass murder, all of which may be united by the desire to purify and embellish the so-called “garden of politics.” 8) One should not forget that if such a desire is less present in liberal democracies than in totalitarian regimes, both of them share a substantially similar historical background. Thus many of the historical elements that crystallized in totalitarian regimes remain present in our times: racism, xenophobia, political apathy and indifference, economic and territorial imperialism, the massed use of lies and violence to dominate whole populations, the multiplication of the displaced and the stateless, the political and economic superfluousness of huge masses of human beings. Under these conditions we should be attentive not only to the possible appearance of new totalitarian regimes, but also to quasi-totalitarian elements at the core of our mass democracies. At the end of her analysis of totalitarianism, Arendt herself warned of the standing danger of totalitarian measures to ‘solve’ contemporary political dilemmas: The danger of the corpse factories and holes of oblivion is that today, with populations and homelessness everywhere on the increase, masses of people are continuously rendered superfluous if we continue to think of our world in utilitarian terms. Political, social, and economic events everywhere are in a silent conspiracy with totalitarian instruments devised for making ~~men~~ [PEOPLE] superfluous. … The Nazis and the Bolsheviks can be sure that their factories of annihilation which demonstrate the swiftest solution to the problem of overpopulation, of economically superfluous and socially rootless human masses, are as much of an attraction as a warning. Totalitarian solutions may well survive the fall of totalitarian regimes in the form of strong temptations which will come up whenever it seems impossible to alleviate political, social, or economic misery in a manner worthy of man 9). Towards the notion of biopolitics in Arendt’s thought What does it mean to characterize the present equation of politics and violence in terms of biopolitics? And how can this non-Arendtian notion make sense within Arendt’s work? Let us begin with the first question. My contention is that the distinguishing mark of the political from the turn of the nineteen century to the present day is the following paradox: the elevation of life to the status of the supreme good combined with the multiplication of instances in which life is degraded to the utmost. I believe, therefore, that the constitutive element of the political in the present is the reduction of citizenship to the level of “bare life”, as Agamben understands it. Human life is thus politicised, divided between life included and protected by the political and economic community and life excluded and unprotected, exposed to degradation and death 10) As to the second question – how the notion of biopolitics may fit into Arendt’s work: we find an answer encapsulated in Arendt’s thesis regarding the “unnatural growth of the natural,” a peculiar formula meant to capture the main historical transformations of the modern age. This notion comprehends a range of different historical phenomena stemming from the Industrial Revolution, such as: the spread of the capitalist form of production; the widening of the realm of human ‘life processes’ (that is, labouring and consuming), to the point that life itself becomes the supreme good and the furtherance of these processes (which centre on the private interests of animal laborans) the most important object of politics; the requirement of the continuous production and consumption of goods in ever increasing abundance, so that nature is reduced to a stock of natural resources – a stock abused to the point where its self-reproducing character is endangered; the promotion of labouring activity to the status of the most important human activity and the concomitant understanding of human beings primarily as animal laborans, a living being whose needs are satisfied by the cycle of labouring and consuming. In this process the public sphere is transformed into a social one, that is, a market for economic exchanges based on a cycle of ceaseless production and consumption. From the nineteenth century onwards, then, the political realm has been overrun by individual, social and economic interests, which today we see massed in the form of international corporations, coercive international trade regimes, financial globalisation and free-market ideologies. This results from politics becoming the activity of managing the production and reproduction of animal laborans’ life and happiness. To put it in Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt’s terms, the industrial and financial powers of the present produce not only commodities, but also subjectivities, needs, social relations, bodies and minds, since they actually produce the producers. Politically, perhaps the most salient consequence of this historical process is that we do not know if there is even any space left for the establishment of new and radical political alternatives, since all state policies – above all in underdeveloped countries – are always subject to the decidedly unstable flows of international financial investments, stock-exchange fluctuations and global financial institutions such as the World Bank. The changes associated with the development of global capitalism imply many losses, if we follow Arendt: the loss of the political as a space of freedom, replaced by requirements of economic necessity; free and spontaneous action replaced by predictable, conformist behaviour;11)he subordination of public and shared interests to those of private lobbies and other hidden pressure groups, freed from public vigilance by the withering of the public realm; the submission of all political opinion to the supposedly inexorable laws of market economics; the substitution of violence for the power won through persuasion; the weakening of the citizen’s ability to consent and to dissent, our ability to act in concert replaced at best by the solitary experience of voting; the reduction of the political arena to disputes among bureaucratic and oligarchic party machines; with a compliant media depicting those who do not accept their game-rules as ‘anarchists,’ ‘rioters,’ even ‘terrorists.’ The ‘citizen’ consumes in the democratic-supermarket: choose from a strictly limited variety of political brands, with no option to question the political options on offer. (And what would the question be when all political parties declare that their aim is to protect citizens’ interests and quality of life?) As Agamben argues, to question the limitations of our political system has become more and more difficult since politics has been declared as the task of caring for and administering bare life. In this situation, traditional political distinctions (right-left, liberalism-totalitarianism, private-public) have lost their intelligibility, since all political categories are subordinated to the demands of bare life. Since “capitalism has become one with reality,” we are condemned, in Marina Garcés’s words, ‘to make choices in an elective space in which there are no options. Everything is possible, but we can do nothing.’12). Even the practices and discourses of the so-called anti-globalisation movements – “another globalisation is possible” and the like – are largely unable to create real alternatives to the economic realities they are intent on confronting. These historic transformations have not only brought more violence to the core of the political but have also redefined its character by giving rise to biopolitical violence. As stated, what characterizes biopolitics is a dynamic of both protecting and abandoning life through its inclusion and exclusion from the political and economic community. In Arendtian terms, the biopolitical danger is best described as the risk of converting animal laborans into Agamben’s homo sacer, the human being who can be put to death by anyone and whose killing does not imply any crime whatsoever 13). When politics is conceived of as biopolitics, as the task of increasing the life and happiness of the national animal laborans, the nation-state becomes ever more violent and murderous. If we link Arendt’s thesis from The Human Condition to those of The Origins of Totalitarianism, we can see the Nazi and Stalinist extermination camps as the most refined experiments in annihilating the “bare life” of animal laborans (although these are by no means the only instances in which the modern state has devoted itself to human slaughter). Arendt is not concerned only with the process of the extermination itself, but also the historical situation in which large-scale exterminations were made possible – above all, the emergence of ‘uprooted’ and ‘superfluous’ modern masses, what we might describe as animal laborans balanced on the knife-edge of ‘bare life.’ Compare her words in ‘Ideology and Terror’ (1953), which became the conclusion of later editions of The Origins of Totalitarianism: Isolation is that impasse into which men are driven when the political sphere of their lives… is destroyed… Isolated man who lost his place in the political realm of action is deserted by the world of things as well, if he is no longer recognized as homo faber but treated as an animal laborans whose necessary ‘metabolism with nature’ is of concern to no one. Isolation then become loneliness… Loneliness, the common ground for terror, the essence of totalitarian government, and for ideology or logicality, the preparation of its executioners and victims, is closely connected with uprootedness and superfluousness which have been the curse of modern masses since the beginning of the industrial revolution and have become acute with the rise of imperialism at the end of the last century and the break-down of political institutions and social traditions in our own time. To be uprooted means to have no place in the world, recognized and guaranteed by others; to be superfluous means not to belong to the world at all 14). The conversion of homo faber, the human being as creator of durable objects and institutions, into animal laborans and, later on, into homo sacer, can be traced in Arendt’s account of nineteenth century imperialism. As argued in the second volume of The Origins of Totalitarianism, European colonialism combined racism and bureaucracy to perpetrate the “most terrible massacres in recent history, the Boers’ extermination of Hottentot tribes, the wild murdering by Carl Peters in German Southeast Africa, the decimation of the peaceful Congo population – from 20 to 40 million reduced to 8 million people; and finally, perhaps worst of all, it resulted in the triumphant introduction of such means of pacification into ordinary, respectable foreign policies.” 15) This simultaneous protection and destruction of life was also at the core of the two World Wars, as well as in many other more local conflicts, during which whole populations have become stateless or deprived of a public realm. In spite of all their political differences, the United States of Roosevelt, the Soviet Russia of Stalin, the Nazi Germany of Hitler and the Fascist Italy of Mussolini were all conceived of as states devoted to the needs of the national animal laborans. According to Agamben, since our contemporary politics recognizes no other value than life, Nazism and fascism, that is, regimes which have taken bare life as their supreme political criterion are bound to remain standing temptations 16). Finally, it is obvious that this same logic of promoting and annihilating life persists both in post-industrial and in underdeveloped countries, inasmuch as economic growth depends on the increase of unemployment and on many forms of political exclusion. When politics is reduced to the tasks of administering, preserving and promoting the life and happiness of animal laborans it ceases to matter that those objectives require increasingly violent acts, both in national and international arenas. Therefore, we should not be surprised that the legality of state violence has become a secondary aspect in political discussions, since what really matters is to protect and stimulate the life of the national (or, as the case may be, Western) animal laborans. In order to maintain sacrosanct ideals of increased mass production and mass consumerism, developed countries ignore the finite character of natural reserves and refuse to sign International Protocols regarding natural resource conservation or pollution reduction, thereby jeopardising future humanity. They also launch preventive attacks and wars, disregard basic human rights, for instance in extra-legal detention camps such as Guantánamo,27) and multiply refugee camps. Some countries have even imprisoned whole populations, physically isolating them from other communities, in a new form of social, political and economic apartheid. In short, states permit themselves to impose physical and structural violence against individuals and regimes (‘rogue states’ 18) ) that supposedly interfere with the security and growth of their national ‘life process.’ If, according to Arendt, the common world consists of an institutional in-between meant to outlast both human natality and mortality, in modern mass societies we find the progressive abolition of the institutional artifice that separates and protects our world from the forces of nature 19). This explains the contemporary feeling of disorientation and unhappiness, likewise the political impossibility we find in combining stability and novelty 20). In the context of a “waste economy, in which things must be almost as quickly devoured and discarded as they have appeared in the world, if the process itself is not to come to a sudden catastrophic end,” 21) it is not only possible, but also necessary, that people themselves become raw material to be consumed, discarded, annihilated. In other words, when Arendt announces the “grave danger that eventually no object of the world will be safe from consumption and annihilation through consumption,” 22) we should also remember that human annihilation, once elevated to the status of an ‘end-in-itself’ in totalitarian regimes, still continues to occur – albeit in different degrees and by different methods, in contemporary ‘holes of oblivion’ such as miserably poor Third World neighbourhoods 23) and penitentiaries, underpaid and slave labour camps, in the name of protecting the vital interests of animal laborans.

## Thus, the plan:

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding of regional transport systems that give priority to fulfilling the needs of transit-dependent users by requiring end-user market pricing for automobile parking.

#### We must advance the movement for transportation justice by demanding new prioritization in the allocation of federal transportation investment towards those who most depend on public transit. Such a transportation system is a prerequisite to more fundamental political transformations away from environmentally destruction profit-generation, to creating genuine livable relations.

Eric Mann et al, members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center 2005 (Eric Mann, Kikanza Ramsey, Barbara Lott-Holland, and Geoff Ray are members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center. An Environmental Justice Strategy for Urban Transportation, Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice Vol. 12 No. 1 <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/305>)

Across the United States, federal and state transportation funds favor suburban commuters and auto owners at the cost of the urban poor, the working class, the lowest income communities of color, the elderly, high school students, and the disabled. People dependent on public transit for their transportation needs suffer dilapidated buses, long waits, longer rides, poor connections, service cuts, overcrowding, and daily exposure to some of the worst tail-pipe toxins. The movement for first-class, regional transportation systems that give priority to the transit dependent requires the mobilization of those excluded and marginalized from politics-as-usual, and will challenge the pro-corporate consensus. Equity demands a mass movement of funds from the highway and rail interests to bus systems, from suburban commuters, corporate developers, and rail contractors to the urban working class of color. Such a transformation will not happen—cannot happen— until a mass movement of the transit-dependent is built from the bottom up. A Transit Strategy for the Transit-Dependent In 1993, the Labor/Community Strategy Center (LCSC) in Los Angeles founded the Bus Riders Union (BRU)—now the largest multi-racial grassroots transportation group in the U.S.—with more than 3,000 members representing the roughly 400,000 daily bus riders. The BRU’s 12 years of organizing, significant policy and legal victories, and analytical and theoretical expertise can be used as a resource for the urgent work of mass transit reconstruction in U.S. urban communities. The needs and the leadership capacity of the urban working class of color must play a central role in developing sustainable communities. We must aim to: reduce suburban sprawl; promote ecological and environmental public health; create non-racist public policy; and focus on the transportation needs of society’s most oppressed and exploited. The needs of the working class and communities of color are both an end in themselves and an essential building block of any effective organizing plan. The transit-dependent are defined as those who depend on public transportation for their mobility and personal viability because of income (unable to afford the purchase or maintenance of a car), age (too young or too old to drive), or disability. It is the lowwage workers, the people of color, the elderly, the high school students, and the disabled who must be at the center of any viable transit strategy. The deterioration of urban public transportation is racially coded and must be addressed with an explicitly anti-racist perspective. In every major urban area in the United States, the low-wage workforce is at the center of the region’s political economy—the domestic, department store, convenience store, electronic assembly, garment, hotel, and restaurant workers, the security guards, and the street vendors. These workers often have children, rent apartments rather than own homes, use public transportation, and have family incomes of $15,000 to $20,000 a year. Everything they do—transporting children to and from schools and childcare facilities; going to work; looking for work; attending community colleges; even enjoying modest forms of recreation— depends upon a viable public transportation system. Public Health vs. Culture of the Automobile Any serious movement that prioritizes public health over corporate profit, especially with regard to toxins and air pollution, must draw some very radical political and policy conclusions. As Barry Commoner, the noted environmental scientist, observed, the only effective way to radically reduce airborne toxins is to ban them before they are produced. With regard to the internal combustion engine and the auto industry, it would be best if there were the most stringent restrictions on auto emissions, combined with some radical restrictions on auto use. The problem is that there can be no effective mass movement to drastically reduce fossil fuel and automobile usage until there is a well-developed public transportation system. This brings us up against the legendary automobile/highway lobby, and something else: the deeply ingrained culture of the automobile, which cuts across every social and economic class in this society, not just the white, middle-class suburbanites. Unfortunately, the car culture has won the hearts and minds of many low-income people, including Blacks and Latinos. Given the centuries of housing segregation and discrimination, it is not surprising that a fancy car has become one of the few attainable symbols of status and upward mobility in communities of color. This cultural attachment can only be challenged if the public transportation system can at least meet the people’s transit needs as efficiently as the car. Public Health vs. Corporate Science If organizers are indeed successful in using public health arguments to challenge the cultural obsession with the automobile, we will still be faced with overcoming the corporate counter-attack on public health science. In the debate about air toxins, corporate ‘scientists’ have shown themselves to be masters of the art of obfuscation and sometimes, outright lying. It is generally agreed that most criteria pollutants and air toxins take years, or even decades, to generate cancers and other diseases. But that is all the more reason to restrict their production in the present. However, organizers from impacted communities have found that approaching government regulatory agencies, such as the Air Quality Management District of Southern California (AQMD), and talking to them in common-sense public health terms— “your chemicals are killing me,” or “my daughter cannot breathe from the asthma,” or “if you know a chemical is carcinogenic, why do you produce it in the first place?”—gets them nowhere. The offending industries characteristically respond with a battery of scientists and lawyers arguing for multi-causality, meaning that the cancer or leukemia could have been caused by the chemical plant in question, or an oil refinery down the road, or any of the many known carcinogens in our air and water. They may have debates about actual exposure levels (“We acknowledge emitting known carcinogens into the air but we cannot be sure that your daughter was directly exposed to those emissions”) and dosage levels—reflected in parts per million and even cancers per million! They may acknowledge the link between benzene and leukemia, but will deny that the benzene emissions from their cars is sufficient to cause leukemia, just as cigarette companies argued that their products are neither addictive nor deadly. To spend a day dealing with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the AQMD, or any other similar agency, is to feel a sense of futility and exhaustion. It is as if the people are on trial and have to carry the burden of proof even as the system asserts that known polluters and carcinogens are innocent until proven guilty. Over the years, however, we have found that public health education is a powerful organizing tool. Low-income residents come to enjoy the science as much as anyone else, and they enjoy challenging corporate science. They understand that a social movement, while rooted in passion and direct experience, can be greatly strengthened by a little knowledge of anatomy, physiology, toxicology, and epidemiology. The victory of the Bus Riders Union in forcing the MTA to abide by its clean-fuel standards and drop its plans to purchase diesel buses is a positive example of grassroots science defeating corporate science in the arena of public policy and public debate. Transportation Justice Demands A comprehensive list of demands for a renewed transportation justice movement will be long, but following the successful Future of Transportation organizing conference in Los Angeles this year, we currently see the following as central to any serious movement. Low-priced public transportation—24/7 A common complaint across the country is that urban and rural bus systems are coming undone at the seams but the government continues to fund the insatiable highway lobby (80% of all federal funds) and boondoggle rail projects. At $200 million per mile for ‘light rail’ and $350 million per mile for subways—in construction costs alone—these projects generate constant budget deficits. This in turn leads to massive fare increases and service cuts in urban and rural bus systems all over the United States and Canada, forcing low-income people to fall back on unreliable, gas-guzzling, often uninsured cars. What is needed instead is aptly expressed by the chant: “We need a 50-cent fare/and $20 passes/mass transportation/ belongs to the masses.” A clean fuel, bus-centered mass transit system As a model, the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union plan proposes the deployment of 600 buses and 50 community jitneys, covering hundreds of miles and hundreds of thousands of riders, for a $1.5 billion price tag, which includes capital and operating costs. This plan is in sharp contrast to the typical ‘light rail’, which covers six to eight miles and serves no more than 15,000 riders for the same price. The efforts of the rail lobbyists to characterize the Riders Union and other civil rights groups as “narrow and protest-based” (read Black, Latino, Asian, female, and low-income, as opposed to the white, suburban, privileged, car-riding constituencies who supposedly embody the “broader” view) can easily be repudiated. Plus, a growing number of transit planners are coming around to accepting the idea that replacing automobiles on the existing highways and surface streets with a clean fuel, bus-centered, rapid transit system, is the way to go. Paying attention to dirty-atsource clean fuels As Clayton Thomas-Muller from the Indigenous Environmental Network has pointed out, many clean fuels, such as compressed natural gas and hydrogen, are very dirty at the source. There are growing violations of Indigenous peoples’ sovereignty and impacts on public health from coal mining, oil exploration, the extraction of natural gas, and other ‘dirty-atsource’ energy schemes. We need less energy altogether and a focus on truly renewable energy sources. We need to place public health and the survival of Third World nations at the center of our U.S. environmental organizing work. The U.S., with just six percent of the world’s population, consumes and abuses 25 percent of the world’s resources. We need a radical restriction of this toxic lifestyle, beginning with a major challenge to the auto industry. As nations around the world face devastating extreme weather events, we have to take this message to the Black, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Indigenous communities, as well as the white middle-class and workingclass communities: the future of the planet is at stake. Mass Transit: The Heart of the New Revolution Transportation is a great multifaceted issue around which to build a movement, because it touches so many aspects of people’s lives. Transportation affects public health, access to jobs, childcare, housing, medical care, education, and more. It is inextricably tied to the history of the civil rights movement now and in the past. Now it has taken on a life and death urgency because of the public health crisis and global warming brought on by the automobile. Public transportation can be a great unifier—bringing together people of all races and classes who seek a saner, healthier world in which wars for oil and energy are exposed and opposed.

#### Ending the subsidizing of automobile transit by charging for parking can result in new funding for public transit, removing massive damages to the environment and urban communities.

Donald Shoup, professor of urban planning, UCLA 2005 (The High Cost of Free Parking)

We cannot change the past, but we can change the future. Our unwise parking policies have damaged our cities, our economy, and our environment. These policies have produced a fiasco, but better policies can lead to great improvements. I will conclude by comparing the dramatically different outcomes of two alternative parking policies we can choose for the twenty-first century. Free Parking We can choose not to change anything. Cities can keep curb parking free and continue to require plentiful off-street parking for every land use. The cost of parking will remain hidden in higher prices for everything else. Free parking will skew our transportation choices toward cars, and we will continue to design our cities around this distortion. We will commit scarce land and capital to supply free parking, and as a result neglect many other goals. We will waste more time in traffic, consume more energy, import more oil, breathe dirtier air, and pay more for everything except parking. Everyone will pay for parking whether they use it or not. Cities will impose the high cost of free parking on everyone, even those too poor to own a car. Parking Benefit Districts We can, however, choose a better future. Cities can charge fair-market prices for curb parking/ return the resulting revenue to pay for neighborhood public services, and remove the requirements for off-street parking. With this approach/ the cost of parking will slowly become unbundled from the prices for everything else. Responding to this change, we will drive less. As a result, we will waste less time in traffic, consume less energy, import less oil, breathe cleaner air, and pay less for everything except parking. We will also have more revenue to pay for local public services. A generation ago, many planners and politicians opposed market solutions to public problems almost as a matter of principle, but even skeptics who still doubt the merits of market prices for other public services can in good conscience recommend charging for parking. If cities underprice curb parking, they must require off-street parking everywhere-imposing enormous costs on the economy and the environment. Planners can and should regulate the quality of parking, but they should deregulate or limit its quantity. Instead of planning without prices, we can let prices do the planning. THREE REFORMS These three reforms--charge fair-market prices for curb parking, return the resulting revenue to neighborhoods to pay for public improvements, and remove the requirements for off-street parking-will align our individual incentives with our common interests, so that private choices will produce public benefits. We can achieve enormous social, economic, and environmental benefits at almost no cost simply by subsidizing people and places, not parking and cars.

#### The 1AC’s highlighting of the fundamental racialized character of current transportation politicizes infrastructure policy, allowing us to redefine the meaning of urban space and the ideas of belonging and exclusion.

Douglas Young, professor of political science, York University, and Roger Keil professor and Director, The City Institute at York University, 2010 (Reconnecting the disconnected: The politics of infrastructure in the in-between city, Cities Volume 27, Issue 2, April 2010, Pages 87–95)

Transit justice, i.e. overcoming the class–gender–ethnicity–age biases of the system, will certainly have to play a part in the politicization of infrastructure. Yet, one of the inherent dangers of a politics of metropolitan infrastructure is exactly the racialized subtext of the transformations we are experiencing. Often taking cues from the way segregated American cities have been portrayed, popular and scientific discourse has noted the increasing significance of ethno-cultural and class divisions. A Toronto daily newspaper headlined an article on the topic last year with “Everything’s white when you’re downtown” and commented: “White picket fences and manicured lawns cared for by mostly white, upper-middle class families come to mind when the word ‘suburban’ is mentioned. But in recent years, the Cunninghams and the Cleavers are moving into the downtown core, while multicultural and poorer populations take up residence behind those picket fences” (Liu, 2008:5; A more scholarly discussion of the relationship of class and ‘race’ in the Canadian metropolis can be found in Walks and Bourne, 2006). In order to understand the complexity of the in-between city’s infrastructure politics better, we need to overcome such rigid throwbacks to the dichotomies of the old city-suburban scheme. In fact, the “politicization of infrastructure” will need to explode such hierarchical notions of urban space as well as the more linear models of social inclusion that rest on these notions. It cannot be sufficient anymore to link the periphery to the centre by better supply of hard and soft infrastructures. While important, such conventional politics of infrastructure is ultimately flawed because it overlooks the complex networked mobility needs and realities present in those communities that are traditionally marginalized by the dichotomous centre-periphery model. Considering “the relation between social exclusion, mobility and access to be a dynamic one, and one that plays out at the level of society as a whole” (Cass, 2005, p. 553), we believe that bringing better connectivity to the in-between city is not a matter of closing the modernization gap. While we firmly believe that building light-rail and flexibilizing the bus routes for example are minimum requirements of a new politics of infrastructure “out there”, we also concur that “initiatives in transport, planning and communications should promote networking and meetingness (and minimize missingness) amongst those living, working and visiting particular places” (Cass, 2005, p. 553). This includes at a minimum to acknowledge these communities’ existence beyond neo-colonial gestures from the political high ground of the central city. The politicization of infrastructures therefore includes the politicization of the people in the in-between city around issues of transportation, infrastructure, and connectivity on the basis of their own experienced needs of mobility and access.

#### Thus, our affirmative is a call to embrace the ethics of the unoppressive city. By strengthening the capacity for all to meet as strangers in public urban space, embraces difference and opens up new possibilities for radical politics.

Iris Marion Young, professor of political science, University of Chicago, 2010 (“The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference” in the Blackwell City Reader)

I have claimed that radical politics must begin from historical givens, and coercive radical change not as the negation of the given, but rather as making something good from many elements of the given. The city, as a vastly populated area with large scale industry and places of mass assembly, is for us a historical given, and radical politics must begin from the existence of modern urban life. The material surroundings and structures available to us define and presuppose urban relationships. The very size of the populations in our society and most other nations of the world, coupled with a continuing sense of national or ethnic identity with millions of other people, all support the conclusion that a vision of dismantling a city is hopelessly utopian. Starting from the given of modern urban life is not simply necessary, moreover, it is desirable. Even for many of those who decry the alienation, massification, and bureaucratization of capitalist patriarchal society, city life exerts a powerful attraction. Modern literature, art, and film have celebrated city life, its energy, cultural diversity, technological complexity, and the multiplicity of its activities. Even many of the most staunch proponents of decentralized community love to show visiting friends around the Boston or San Francisco or New York in which they live, climbing up towers to see the glitter of lights and sampling the fare at the best ethnic restaurants. For many people deemed deviant in the closeness of the face-to-face community in which they lived, whether "independent" women or socialists or gay men and lesbians, the city has often offered a welcome anonymity and some measure of freedom. To be sure, the liberatory possibilities of capitalist cities have been fraught with ambiguity. Yet, I suggest that instead of the ideal of community, we begin from our positive experience of city life to form a vision of the good society. Our political ideal is the unoppressive city. In sketching this ideal, I assume some material premises. We will assume a productivity level in the society that can meet everyone's needs, and a physical urban environment that is cleaned up and renovated. We will assume, too, that everyone who can work has meaningful work and those who cannot are provided for with dignity. In sketching this ideal of city life, I am concerned to describe the city as a kind of relationship of people to one another, to their own history and one another's history. Thus, by "city" I am not referring only to those huge metropolises that we call cities in the United States. The kinds of relationship I describe obtain also ideally in those places we call towns, where perhaps 10,000 or 20,000 people live. As a process of people's relating to one another, city life embodies difference in all the senses I have discussed in this chapter. The city obviously exhibits the temporal and spatial distancing and differentiation that I have argued, the ideal of community seeks to collapse. On the face of the city environment lies its history and the history of the individuals and groups that have dwelt within it. Such physical historicity, as well as the functions and groups that live in the city at any given time, create its spatial differentiation. The city as a network and sedimentation of discretely understood places, such as particular buildings, parks, neighborhoods, and as a physical environment offers changes and surprises from one place to another. The temporal and spatial differentiation that mark the physical environment of the city produce an experience of aesthetic inexhaustibility. Buildings, squares, the twists and turns of streets and alleys offer an inexhaustible store of individual spaces and things, each with unique aesthetic characteristics. The juxtaposition of incongruous styles and functions that usually emerge after a long time in city places contribute to this pleasure in detail and surprise. This is an experience of difference in the sense of always being inserted. The modern city is without walls; it is not planned and coherent. Dwelling in the city means always having a sense of beyond, that there is much human life beyond my experience going on in or near these spaces, and I can never grasp the city as a whole. City life thus also embodies difference as the contrary of the face-to-face ideal expressed by most assertions of community. City life is the "being-together" of strangers. Strangers encounter one another, either face to face or through media, often remaining strangers and yet acknowledging their contiguity in living and the contributions each makes to the others. In such encountering people are not "internally" related, as the community theorists would have it, and do not understand one another from within their own perspective. They are externally related, they experience each other as other, different, from different groups, histories, professions, cultures, which they do not understand. The public spaces of the city are both an image of the total relationships of city life and a primary way those relationships are enacted and experienced. A public space is a place accessible to anyone, where people engage in activity as individuals or in small groups. In public spaces people are aware of each other's presence and even at times attend to it. In a city there are a multitude of such public spaces: streets, restaurants, concert halls, parks. In such public spaces the diversity of the city's residents come together and dwell side by side, sometimes appreciating one another, entertaining one another, or just chatting, always to go off again as strangers. City parks as we now experience them often have this character. City life implies a social exhaustibility quite different from the ideal of the face-to-face community in which there is mutual understanding and group identification and loyalty. The city consists in a great diversity of people and groups, with a multitude of subcultures and differentiated activities and functions, whose lives and movements mingle and overlap in public spaces. People belong to distinct groups or cultures and interact in neighborhoods and work places. They venture out from these locales, however, to public places of entertainment, consumption, and politics. They witness one another's cultures and functions in such public interaction, without adopting them as their own. The appreciation of ethnic foods or professional musicians, for example, consists in the recognition that these transcend the familiar everyday world of my life. In the city strangers live side by side in public places, giving to and receiving from one another social and aesthetic products, often mediated by a huge chain of interactions. This instantiates social relations as difference in the sense of an understanding of groups and cultures that are different, with exchanging and overlapping interactions that do not issue in community, yet which prevent them from being outside of one another. The social differentiation of the city also provides a positive inexhaustibility of human relations. The possibility always exists of becoming acquainted with new and different people, with different cul· tural and social experiences; the possibility always exists for new groups to form or emerge around specific interests. The unoppressive city is thus defined as open- ness to unassimilated otherness. Of course, we do not have such openness to difference in our current social relations. I am asserting an ideal, which consists in a politics of difference. Assuming that group differentiation is a given of social life for us, how can the relationships of group identities embody justice, respect, and the absence of oppression? The relationship among group identities and cultures in our society is blotted by racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, suspicion, and mockery. A politics of difference lays down institutional and ideological means for recognizing and affirming differently identifying groups in two basic senses: giving political representation to group interests and celebrating the distinctive cultures and characteristics of different groups. Many questions arise in proposing a politics of difference. What defines a group that deserves recognition and celebration? How does one provide representation to group interests that avoids the mere pluralism of liberal interest groups? What are institutional forms by which the mediations of the city and the representations of its groups in decision making can be made democratic? These questions, as well as many others, confront the ideal of the unoppressive city. They are not dissimilar from questions of the relationships that ought to exist among communities. They are questions, however, which appeal to community as the ideal of social life appears to repress or ignore. Some might claim that a politics of difference does express what the ideal of community ought to express, despite the meaning that many writers give the concept of community. Fred Dallmayr, for example, reserves the term community for just this openness toward unassimilated otherness, designating the more totalistic understanding of social relations I have criticized as either "communalism" or "movement:' As opposed to the homogeneity deliberately fostered in the movement, the communitarian mode cultivates diversity - but without encouraging willful segregation or the repressive preponderance of one of the social subsectors .... Community may be the only form of social aggregation which reflects upon, and makes room for, otherness or the reverse side of subjectivity (and inter-subjectivity) and thus for the play of difference - the difference between ego and Other and between man and nature.16 In the end it may be a matter of stipulation whether one chooses to call such politics as play of difference "community:' Because most articulations of the ideal of community carry the urge to unity I have criticized, however, I think it is less confusing to use a term other than community rather than to redefine the term. Whatever the label, the concept of social relations that embody openness to unassimilated otherness with justice and appreciation needs to be developed. Radical politics, moreover, must develop discourse and institutions for bringing differently identified groups together without suppressing or subsuming the differences.

## 

# 2AC Case Extensions

### AT: Predictions Good

#### Scenario planning fails, expert analysis is dart throwing, give them no risk of calculations

Menand, 2005, Former Professor of Political Science at MIT, [Louis, December 5, “Everybody's and Expert,” <http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/12/05/051205crbo_books1?printable=true>]

“Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—heteaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, economic growth), or less of something (repression, recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.

#### Extremely low probabilities should count as zero—even if there’s some risk, policy decisions can’t be justified by vanishingly small probabilities

**RESCHER 3** (Nicholas, Prof of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, Sensible Decisions: Issues of Rational Decision in Personal Choice and Public Policy, p. 49-50)

On this issue there is a systemic disagreement between probabilists working on theory-oriented issues in mathematics or natural science and decision theorists who work on practical decision-oriented issues relating to human affairs. The former takes the line that small number are small numbers and must be taken into account as such—that is, the small quantities they actually are. The latter tend to take the view that small probabilities represent extremely remote prospect and can be written off. (De minimis non curat lex, as the old precept has it: in human affairs there is no need to bother with trifles.) When something is about as probable as a thousand fair dice when tossed a thousand times coming up all sixes, then, so it is held, we can pretty well forget about it as a worthy of concern. As a matter of practical policy, we operate with probabilities on the principle that when x ≤ E, then x = 0. We take the line that in our human dealings in real-life situations a sufficiently remote possibility can—for all sensible purposes—be viewed as being of probability zero. Accordingly, such remote possibilities can simply be dismissed, and the outcomes with which they are associated can accordingly be set aside. And in “the real world” people do in fact seem to be prepared to treat certain probabilities as effectively zero, taking certain sufficiently improbable eventualities as no long representing real possibilities. Here an extremely improbable event is seen as something we can simply write off as being outside the range of appropriate concern, something we can dismiss for all practical purposes. As one writer on insurance puts it: [P]eople…refuse to worry about losses whose probability is below some threshold. Probabilities below the threshold are treated as though they were zero. No doubt, remote-possibility events having such a minute possibility can happen in some sense of the term, but this “can” functions somewhat figuratively—it is no longer seen as something that presents a realistic prospect.

### AT: Neoliberalism Good

#### Focus on visible violence blinds us of the degraded life chances of billions and systemic violence of capitalism. There may be things worse than death but the sad thing is that we will never know because their impact calculus makes the victims of capitalism anonymous

Zizek and Daly 04—Professor of Philosophy @ Institute for Sociology in Ljubljana [Slavoj and Glyn, “Conversations with Zizek”, pg 14-16]

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette - Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety**.** For too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the trascendence of all forms of economism. in this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with the economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any retrograde return to economism. Zizek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular, we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions**,** but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless(viz. the patronizing reference to the developing world). And Zizek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity; to redirect (or misdirect)social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency of today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix. For Zizek, a confrontation with the obscenities of abundance capitalism also requires a transformation of ethico-political imagination. It is no longer a question of developing ethical guidelines within the existing political frameworks (the various institutional and corporate ‘ethical **committees’)** but of developing a politicization of ethics; an ethics of the Real**. The starting point here is an insistence on the unconditional autonomy of the subject; of accepting that** as human beings we are ultimately responsible for our actions and **being-in-the-world up to and including** the construction of the capitalist system itself**. Far from simple norm-making or refining/reinforcing existing social protocol,** an ethics of the Real tends to emerge through norm-breaking and in finding new directions that**, by defintion,** involve traumatic changes**: i.e. the Real in genuine ethical challenge. An ethics of the Real does not simply defer to the impossible (or infinite Otherness) as an unsurpassable horizon that already marks every act as a failure incomplete and so on. Rather,** such an ethics is on that fully accepts contingency but which is nonetheless prepared to risk the impossible **in the sense of breaking out of standardized positions. We might say that it is an ethics which is not**

### AT: No racism

#### Racial disparities exist and can be fixed by policy changes

Center for Social Inclusion 2009 (http://www.centerforsocialinclusion.org/about-us/what-is-structural-racism/)

A bank chooses where branches will open and who it will lend to. A business decides to locate where labor is plentiful and taxes are low. A local government decides to cut funding for public transit to address a budget shortfall. Communities will not prosper when they have fewer banks, little access to credit for homes and businesses, and longer, more expensive commutes to get to jobs. Collectively, decisions like these structure the world we live in and determine what opportunities and challenges we face. Whether we have decent housing, quality healthcare and good schools, among many other things, is helped or hindered by these decisions. But too often the impact of these decisions comes at the expense of communities of color. Unemployment is too high. And today, people of color are nearly twice as likely to be out of work. African Americans have, on average, one-tenth of the assets of similar white families. Schools that have a majority of students of color typically lack funding and other resources, and have significantly lower graduation rates as a result. Forty-seven million Americans lack health insurance, and half of the uninsured are people of color. Something isn’t right with this picture. What is it? We all may have a ready answer, but looking deeply at policy reveals a hopeful prospect - that policy is behind these problems and policy can fix it. If policy is the root of the problem, it is also the place to find a solution. We can craft public policy demands that chip away at the structural arrangements that produce these disparities, and that work together to build a vibrant and opportunity-rich society. We must recognize, as a growing body of research shows, that policies that explicitly address the needs of communities of color will build a healthier society that improves the well-being of us all.

### AT: No Transit Racism

#### Racial disparities in car ownership transform lack of transit options into structural racism.

Robert D. Bullard, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, 2005 (All Transit Is Not Created Equal, Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice Vol. 12 No. 1 Winter, <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/306>)

Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not. While many barriers to equitable transportation for low-income and people of color have been removed, much more needs to be done. Transportation spending programs do not benefit all populations equally. The lion's share of transportation dollars is spent on roads, while urban transit systems are often left in disrepair. Nationally, 80 percent of all surface transportation funds is earmarked for highways and 20 percent for public transportation. Generally, states spend less than 20 percent of federal transportation funding on transit.[1] Some 30 states even restrict the use of the gas tax revenue—the single largest source of transportation funding—to funding highway programs only.[2] In the real world, all transit is not created equal. In general, most transit systems tend to take their low-income “captive riders” for granted and concentrate their fare and service policies on attracting middle-class and affluent riders.[3] Hence, transit subsidies disproportionately favor suburban transit and expensive new commuter bus and rail lines that serve wealthier “discretionary riders.” What We Pay On average, Americans spend 19 cents out of every dollar earned on transportation—an expense second only to housing. Transportation costs range from 17.1 percent in the Northeast to 20.8 percent in the South, and eat up more than 40 percent of the takehome pay of the nation’s poorest. This is an especially significant statistic for African American households, which typically earn 35 percent less than the average white household.[4] How We Get Around The private automobile is still the most dominant mode of transportation for every segment of the American population and provides enormous employment access advantages to its owner. Automobile ownership is almost universal in the United States with 91.7 percent of households owning at least one vehicle. According to the 2001 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) released in 2003, 87.6 percent of white people, 83.1 percent of Asians and Hispanics, and 78.9 percent of African Americans rely on the private car to get around.[5] Clearly then, a lack of car ownership—especially among low-income people of color— combined with an inadequate public transit service in many central cities and metropolitan regions only serve to exacerbate social, economic, and racial isolation. Living near a seven-lane freeway is not much of a benefit for someone who does not have access to a car. Nationally, only seven percent of white households do not own a car, compared to 24 percent of African American households, 17 percent of Latino households, and 13 percent of Asian American households. African Americans are almost six times as likely as whites to use transit to get around. In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos comprise over 54 percent of transit users (62 percent of bus riders, 35 percent of subway riders, and 29 percent of commuter rail riders). How Race Defines Space In 2000, population in the U.S. was 69 percent European American, 12 percent African American, 12.5 percent Hispanic, and 3.6 percent Asian American. In the nation's 100 largest cities, people of color comprise nearly half of the population. In the major metropolitan areas where most African Americans, Latinos, and Asians live, segregation levels changed little between 1990 and 2000. Black-White segregation is still significantly higher than segregation levels for other ethnic groups. The average white American lived in a neighborhood that was 80 percent white, eight percent Hispanic, seven percent Black, and four percent Asian. Similarly, the typical African American lived in a neighborhood that was 51 percent Black, 33 percent white, 12 percent Hispanic, and three percent Asian.[6]

### AT: Health Impact defense

#### Traffic emissions account for tens of thousands of deaths a year

John Wargo, Ph.D. Yale University et al. 2006 (Linda Wargo, MES Nancy Alderman, MES President, Environment and Human Health, Inc. THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF VEHICLE EXHAUST A CASE FOR POLICY CHANGE <http://www.ehhi.org/reports/exhaust/summary.shtml>)

Air Pollution and Human Health Scientific experts now believe the nation faces an epidemic of illnesses that are exacerbated by air pollution. These illnesses include cardio- vascular disease, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, lung cancer, and diabetes. I Children at Special Risk The American Academy of Pediatrics has concluded that levels of ozone and particulate matter are high enough in many parts of the U.S. to threaten children’s health.1 Eleven million U.S. children live in areas that exceed one or more federal air quality standards; 9 million children live in areas where ozone standards are exceeded; 3.5 million children live in areas where the particulate standards are exceeded, and 2.8 million children live in counties where the carbon monoxide standard is exceeded.2 I Elderly at Special Risk Cardiovascular disease, hypertension, diabetes and cancer are all ill- nesses disproportionately borne by the elderly. Nearly one-half million Connecticut residents are over 65 years of age. I Asthma Chemicals in vehicle exhaust are harmful to asthmatics. Exhaust can adversely affect lung function 3, 4, 5, 6 and may promote allergic reactions and airway constriction.7 All vehicles, especially diesel engines, emit very fine particles that deeply penetrate lungs and inflame the circulatory system, damaging cells and causing respiratory problems.8 Even short- termexposuretovehicleexhaustmayharmasthmatics.9,10,11,12 Asthmatic children are particularly sensitive to air pollution. New England states have some of the highest asthma rates in the country. About 9 percent of Connecticut’s youth have the disease.13 Inhalation of vehicle emissions, even for short periods, may be harmful to asthmatics. One study found that children are 40 percent more likely to have an attack on high outdoor pollution days.14 I Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Vehicle emissions are particularly harmful to people afflicted with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), such as chronic bronchitis. Significant and replicated associations have been foundbetween increased ozone levels and a range of adverse effects on the lungs ,15 and several studies have shown increased risk of hospital admission from COPD associated with high ozone levels.16 There is also a relationship between the levels of PM10 and morbidity17in patients with COPD. These associations were noted in Philadelphia, where the major source of these particles is motor vehicles.18 Fine particle matter is especially harmful to people with COPD 19, 20 and has been found to increase their hospital admission rates.21 High levels of PM10 are also associated with increased morbidity among those with the illness. Cardiovascular Disease Mortality and hospital admissions for myocardial infarction, congestive cardiac failure and cardiac arrhythmia increase with a rise in the concentrations of particulate and gaseous pollutants.22 As concentrations of airborne particles increase, those with cardiovascular disease may experience increasing severity of symptoms, rates of hospitalization, and mortality.23 The risk of having a heart attack is greater for people exposed to pollution from heavy traffic, as well as for those living near air-polluted roadways.24 I Cancer Vehicles emit numerous carcinogenic chemicals. Diesel contains benzene, formaldehyde, and 1,3-butadiene—all three are well recognized carcinogens. EPA estimates that vehicle emissions account for as many as half of all cancers attributed to outdoor air pollution.25 I Diabetes I Increasing levels of air pollution are associated with rising mortality rates among diabetics. Because of the overlap between diabetes and cardiovascular disease, the nature of this association is not yet clear.26 Air Pollution Increases Mortality Among Susceptible Groups Air pollution kills more Americans than breast and prostate cancers combined,27 and the premature deaths associated with particulate matter pollution alone are comparable to deaths from traffic accidents.28 Air pollution is a serious and growing threat to the health of Connecticut residents. We estimate that nearly one million of Connecticut’s 3.5 million residents experience one or more of these illnesses, some without knowing it. I I I I Vehicle Emissions Mobile emissions that are believed to present the greatest health risk to Connecticut residents include ozone, particulate matter, acetaldehyde, acrolein, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, and diesel exhaust. Ozone and Motor Vehicles Motor vehicles emit millions of pounds of hazardous pollutants into the air each year in the U.S., including volatile organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). These chemicals form ozone in the presence of sunlight. Fine Particulate Matter Fine particulate matter is a serious threat to human health. Fine particles can aggravate both heart and lung diseases. Those with diabetes, older adults, and children are especially sensitive. Fine particulate matter is responsible for several tens of thousands of premature deaths annually in the U.S.29 and is measured at levels above federal air quality standards in Connecticut.30 Diesel Exhaust Diesel exhaust is especially dangerous, containing nearly 40 hazardous pollutants. The mixture contains carbon particles that are exceptionally small in size, less than one micron. These fine particles may be deeply inhaled into the lung and carry with them a collection of attached hazardous compounds. Diesel emissions increase the severity and duration of asthma attacks. Diesel Emissions The California Air Resources Board concluded that diesel emissions account for the majority of cancer risk created by all outdoor air pollution sources in the state. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends that children’s exposure to diesel exhaust particles should be decreased and that idling of diesel vehicles in places where children live and congregate should be minimized to protect their health.31 School bus particulate emissions sometimes exceed the federal PM2.5 standards by as much as ten-fold.

### AT: Movements fail

#### Empirically, movements solve in creating equitable transit.

Joe Grengs professor of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Michigan 2005 (The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action Volume 9, Issue 1, 2005 pages 51-66 BRU = Bus rider’s movement)

Several trends influenced by the neoliberal political agenda suggest that planners and policy makers may be losing sight of transit’s longstanding social purpose of providing mobility for people who cannot a drive a car. Finding solutions to the problem of low mobility for transit‐dependent riders goes deeper than merely applying redistributive government policies, helpful though they may be. Finding solutions will likely require changes in the underlying causes of the undesired distribution. Following Bourdieu (1998), Goonewardena (2003) suggests organizing social movements to fight back against such trends, by “planning in the face of neoliberalism”. In the face of a project that subordinates our social goals to economic efficiency, it is more planning—not less—that is needed to reinvigorate a radical democracy (Goonewardena, 2003), and cities are the places to do it. Like the capitalism that took root in feudalism’s nooks and crannies, highly differentiated political activities and economic islands are rising out of what capitalism discards. And planners have special skills for nurturing these nooks and crannies: “The new planning is more entrepreneurial, more daring, less codified … its expertise is increasingly sought not only by the state, where planning powers formally reside, but also by the corporate sector and even groups within organized civil society itself” (Douglass and Friedmann, 1998, p. 3). The BRU movement is a story of people planning on their own behalf, who came to ally themselves with people who identify themselves as planners, and who engaged in a struggle in the tradition of community building. Social movements are one viable route toward achieving more equitable outcomes, resulting in solid, lasting policy changes backed by the courts. The BRU case shows that political opportunities change as a result of actions that planners are skilled at taking—in constructing a forceful counter‐methodology, in acting as intermediaries and in fostering participation (Grengs, 2002). Planners may be uniquely qualified to take action that re‐shapes the external political environment in ways that benefit social equity movements, because of their interdisciplinary nature, their close connection between theory and practice, and because they can bridge the gap between government and the grassroots (Clavel, 1986). By focusing on particular dimensions of the larger political environment, planners inside and outside of community‐based organizations may be able to use their unique skills to help introduce social justice into the transportation planning process, a process that has yet to tap the potential of meaningful citizen participation.

#### Now is the key time for anti-capitalist movements

David Harvey, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the [City University of New York](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_University_of_New_York), 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

Communism is, unfortunately, such a loaded term as to be hard to re-introduce, as some now want to do, into political discourse. In the United States it would prove much more difficult than in, say, France, Italy, Brazil or even central Europe. But in a way the name does not matter. Perhaps we should just define the movement, our movement, as anti-capitalist or call ourselves the Party of Indignation, ready to fight and defeat the Party of Wall Street and its acolytes and apologists everywhere, and leave it at that. The struggle for survival with justice not only continues; it begins anew. As indignation and moral outrage build around the economy of dispossession that so redounds to the benefit of a seemingly all-powerful capitalist class, so disparate political movements necessarily begin to merge, transcending barriers of space and time. To understand the political necessity of this requires first that the enigma of capital be unravelled. Once its mask is torn off and its mysteries have been laid bare, it is easier to see what has to be done and why, and how to set about doing it. Capitalism will never fall on its own. It will have to be pushed. The accumulation of capital will never cease. It will have to be stopped. The capitalist class will never willingly surrender its power. It will have to be dispossessed. To do what has to be done will take tenacity and determination, patience and cunning, along with fierce political commitments born out of moral outrage at what exploitative compound growth is doing to all facets of life, human and otherwise, on planet earth. Political mobilisations sufficient to such a task have occurred in the past. They can and will surely come again. We are, I think, past due.

### AT: No Transit democracy

#### Grassroots mobilization overcomes entrenched interests empirically

Jeff Hobson, Policy Director of the Transportation and Land Use Coalition, 2007 (<http://urbanhabitat.org/node/316> Overcoming Roadblocks to Transportation Justice, Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice Vol. 12 No. 1, Spring)

When politicians set priorities for transportation money, they often choose flashy, news-making projects over cost-effective ones that give more value for every dollar spent. Agencies, too, overestimate benefits and underestimate costs of these mega-projects, and often lack the money to maintain them in the long term. In the Bay Area, two prime examples of this are the recently completed BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) extension to San Francisco International Airport and its proposed extension to San Jose. (See sidebar.) Who Wins, Who Loses: the BART-SFO Fiasco Transportation powerbrokers were exuberant about a regional agreement in 1988 that promised to bring BART to the San Francisco International Airport. They confidently predicted high ridership on this eight-mile, $1.7 billion extension. Transit officials even predicted that it would make money. SamTrans (the bus agency for San Mateo County) agreed to be financially responsible for operating the line. However, the finished extension, which opened in 2003, cost 80 percent more than initial estimates, even accounting for higher costs due to inflation, and gets only about half the expected ridership.3 Today, SamTrans is faced with paying out millions from its operating budget each year and bus riders in San Mateo County are seeing higher fares and fewer buses. This problem hurts low-income and people-of-color communities in two ways. First, these glamorous projects hog money that could provide better mass transit for more people. Second, when agencies run out of money to operate and maintain the new service, they tap into existing budgets, leading to fare hikes and service cuts to transit systems that serve the neediest communities. Complexity Deters Participation Too often, transportation agencies make policy and investment decisions without adequate involvement from low-income residents and people of color. The decision-making processes are complex, and the timelines long, with multiple agencies involved at different points. A lack of understanding about how transportation decisions are made and by whom, is a significant barrier to participating effectively in the process. A central tenet of environmental justice is that government agencies must change their decision-making processes to involve the whole community. Community groups also have to increase their ability to understand, analyze, and affect transportation decisions. Breaking Through the Roadblocks While specific needs and obstacles will vary, the first step to winning transportation justice is to get your community organized and educated so you can focus on new money, advocate for cost-effectiveness, and demand mobility for all. Focus on New Money In the Bay Area, as in many major metropolitan areas, transportation consistently rates as a top concern.[2] These polls guarantee that elected officials will continue to propose billions of dollars in new transportation initiatives. Many of these initiatives require voter approval, so transportation agencies pay the most attention to community groups that can turn out the vote or grab media headlines. Also, new funding programs typically have fewer restrictions than existing ones, so communities have a better chance to influence the outcomes—such as more reliable transit services or safer streets for pedestrians and bicyclists. Advocate for Cost-Effectiveness Improvements to the existing transit systems, including many of the changes environmental justice communities call for the most, usually give “more bang for the buck” than the mega-projects often proposed by higher-income communities. Comparisons, such as “cost per new rider” or “cost per trip,” are most easily applied to the different ways to expand mass transit. Of course, cost-effectiveness should go hand-in-hand with accessibility. For example, late-night and weekend transit is crucial for people who depend on public transit and should be made available, even if it isn’t as cost-effective as commuter service. But in general, focusing on cost-effectiveness is a good way to make sure the needs of the environmental justice communities are fully met. Demand Mobility for All Although transportation planning usually focuses on congestion and long-distance commutes, many people, including more than a third of Bay Area residents, do not own or operate a vehicle. It is a good strategy to use local statistics to enlighten agencies about how the needs of the low-income, disabled, children, and seniors are currently being underserved. Social service agencies have found that inadequate transportation is one of the top three barriers to the transition from welfare to work. Recently, Bay Area advocates, citing local transit-related problems, won a $216 million commitment for a “Lifeline Transportation” program whose funds can only be used to improve transportation services for low-income residents.

### End Free Parking Extension

#### \_\_\_\_ Parking subsidies are more than the value of roads and cars. Drivers only pay 4 percent of the cost of parking, and eliminating subsidies will results in over 200 billion dollars per year in new funding.

Donald Shoup, professor of urban planning, UCLA 2005 (The High Cost of Free Parking)\

We can now put the cost of parking in perspective by comparing it with other costs of the transportation system. These comparisons show that "free" parking greatly reduces the driver's cost of vehicle travel and therefore seriously distorts individual travel choices toward cars. TOTAL SUBSIDY FOR PARKING For many land uses, the area devoted to parking exceeds the floor area of the building it serves. We have no trouble understanding that office buildings cost a lot of money, so it should not surprise anyone that the parking lots or structures (often bigger than the buildings they serve) also cost a lot. Furthermore, curb parking spaces usually line both sides of the adjacent streets. When we consider both curb spaces and off-street spaces in cities, the land and capital devoted to parking probably exceed that devoted to travel. Mark Delucchi of the University of California, Davis, conducted what is by far the most comprehensive evaluation of the total cost of motor vehicle use in the U.S. He estimated both monetary costs (such as for vehicles, fuel, roads, and parking) and nonmonetary costs (such as for air and water pollution). Because inputs and assumptions for the estimates are uncertain, he presented both low and high estimates for each value. For the years 1990-1991, he estimated the annualized capital and operating cost of off-street parking at between $79 billion and $226 billion a year (see Table 7-1).1 Delucchi points out that most parking is not priced separately but is instead bundled with other goods and priced as a package. He estimated that drivers paid only $3 billion a year for parking, while the rest of the cost was bundled into the prices for goods, services, and housing. As a result, drivers paid somewhere between 4 percent ($3 billion -7- $79 billion) and 1 percent ($3 billion -7- $226 billion) of the total cost of parking. The other 96 to 99 percent of the cost of parking was hidden in higher prices for everything else. Delucchi also estimated the annualized capital and operating cost of public roads (including the curb parking spaces) at between $98 billion and $177 billion, close to the estimated cost of parking spaces. If drivers paid only 4 percent of the cost of roads, most people would condemn this as outrageously unfair, but drivers pay at most 4 percent of the cost of offstreet parking, and they complain loudly whenever its price increases. Because Delucchi included the cost of curb parking in the cost of roads, the total cost of the parking supply (both off-street and on-street) is underestimated. Consider a 36-foot-wide residential street, with two lO-footwide travel lanes and two 8-foot-wide parking lanes: curb parking takes up 44 percent of the road space. Clearly, curb parking spaces account for a significant share of the total cost of roads, and an accurate estimate of the total subsidy for parking would take curb parking into accounU The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that the total value of roads is 36 percent of the value of all state and local public infrastructure (which also includes schools, sewers, water supply, residential buildings, equipment, hospitals, and parks). Because curb parking occupies a substantial share of road space, it must be a substantial share of all state and local public infrastructure as well. Since drivers do pay gasoline taxes while they are driving, but do not pay gasoline taxes while their cars are parked, curb spaces are subsidized far more than the travel lanes. Free curb parking may be the most costly subsidy American cities provide for most of their citizens. Since drivers paid only $3 billion a year for parking in 1990-1991, the subsidy for off-street parking was between $76 billion and $223 billion a year. Because the U.S. gross domestic product was $6 trillion in 1991, the subsidy for off-street parking amounted to between 1.2 percent and 3.7 percent of the nation's economic output.4 American cars and light trucks logged 2 trillion miles in 1990, so the off-street parking subsidy amounted to between 4¢ a mile (if the subsidy was $76 billion) and 11¢ a mile (if it was $223 billion).5 In comparison, the average variable cost for gasoline, oil, maintenance, and tires for cars in 1990 was 8A¢ a mile.6 The subsidy for off-street parking was therefore somewhere between 48 percent and 131 percent of the drivers' cost for gasoline, oil, maintenance, and tires. Delucchi's estimate refers to 1990-1991. Adjusted for inflation and the increase in the number of vehicles and off-street parking spaces since then, the total subsidy for off-street parking in 2002 was between $127 billion and $374 billion.7 Because the U.S. gross domestic product had grown to $10.5 trillion in 2002, the subsidy for off-street parking as a share of the economy amounted to between 1.2 percent and 3.6 percent, almost exactly the same as in 1991. This subsidy is huge by any comparison. In 2002, the federal government spent $231 billion for Medicare and $349 billion for national defense.s National defense!! Can the subsidy for off-street parking be that big??? Well, why not? Since the 1950s, most American cities have required every new building to provide ample off-street parking. American households now have more cars than drivers, and their cars are parked 95 percent of the time. Because motorists rarely pay anything for parking, their cars live almost rent free. American cars and light trucks logged 2.6 trillion vehicle miles of travel in 2002, so the subsidy for off-street parking ranged between 5¢ a mile (if the subsidy was $127 billion) and 1M a mile (if it was $374 billion).9 If we use the rule of thumb that increasing the gasoline tax by 1¢ a gallon increases gasoline tax revenues by about $1 billion a year, it would take an increase in the gasoline tax of between $1.27 and $3.74 a gallon to offset the subsidy for off-street parking.lo Removing the subsidies for off-street parking would thus produce the same effect on travel as increasing the gasoline tax by between $1.27 and $3.74 a gallon. Because parking costs so much and motorists pay so little for it, the hidden subsidy is truly gigantic. CAPITAL COST OF THE PARKING SUPPLY The previous estimate referred to the annual cost of the parking supply. We can also estimate the capital cost of the parking supply, and the surprising result is that the cost of all parking spaces in the U.S. exceeds the value of all cars and may even exceed the value of all roads.

## 

# 2AC Blocks

## AT: Framework

#### 1. We meet: The plan is a statement of the desirability of the plan implementation by the government.

#### 2. Counter-interpretation: Affirmatives are responsible for their discourse and the desirability of the plan.

Resolved means “To determine **or decide** in purpose; **to make ready in mind; to fix;** to settle; as, he [or she] was resolved by an unexpected event,” Webster's revised unabridged dictionary, 1996 [This evidence was genderparaphrased]

[http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=resolved]

**should** (DUTY) auxiliary verb  used to express that it is necessary, desirable, advisable, or important to perform the action of the following verb **Cambridge Dictionary of American English, 07** (http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=should\*1+0&dict=A)

#### 3. Counter-interpretation superior:

#### a. Ground: Defending discourse increases negative kritik ground and counter-advocacies and is the most immediately relevant education on timeframe because we can control how we speak about the world well before we can implement policy

#### b. Education: Combining a focus on discursive power with political practice is the only way to ensure that the critique engages with the real world.

Giroux, 6. Henry (Penn State Chair of Education and Cultural Studies), Dirty Democracy and States of Terrorism: The Politics of the New Authoritarianism in the United States in Comparative Studies of South Asia Volume 26 Number 6, p 176-177.

Abstracted from the ideal of public commitment, the new authoritarianism represents a political and economic practice and form of militarism that loosen the connections among substantive democracy, critical agency, and critical education. In opposition to the rising tide of authoritarianism, educators across the globe must make a case for linking learning to progressive social change while struggling to pluralize and critically engage the diverse sites where public pedagogy takes place. In part, this suggests forming alliances that can make sure every sphere of social life is recognized as an important site of the political, social, and cultural struggle that is so crucial to any attempt to forge the knowledge, identifications, effective investments, and social relations that constitute political subjects and social agents capable of energizing and spreading the basis for a substantive global democracy. Such circumstances require that pedagogy be embraced as a moral and political practice, one that is directive and not dogmatic, an outgrowth of struggles designed to resist the increasing depoliticization of political culture that is the hallmark of the current Bush revolution. Education is the terrain where consciousness is shaped, needs are constructed, and the capacity for individual self-reflection and broad social change is nurtured and produced. Education has assumed an unparalleled significance in shaping the language, values, and ideologies that legitimize the structures and organizations that support the imperatives of global capitalism. Efforts to reduce it to a technique or methodology set aside, education remains a crucial site for the production and struggle over those pedagogical and political conditions that provide the possibilities for people to develop forms of agency that enable them individually and collectively to intervene in the processes through which the material relations of power shape the meaning and practices of their everyday lives. Within the current historical context, struggles over power take on a symbolic and discursive as well as a material and institutional form. The struggle over education is about more than the struggle over meaning and identity; it is also about how meaning, knowledge, and values are produced, authorized, and made operational within economic and structural relations of power. Education is not at odds with politics; it is an important and crucial element in any definition of the political and offers not only the theoretical tools for a systematic critique of authoritarianism but also a language of possibility for creating actual movements for democratic social change and a new biopolitics that affirms life rather than death, shared responsibility rather than shared fears, and engaged citizenship rather than the stripped-down values of consumerism. At stake here is combining symbolic forms and processes conducive to democratization with broader social contexts and the institutional formations of power itself. The key point here is to understand and engage educational and pedagogical practices from the point of view of how they are bound up with larger relations of power. Educators, students, and parents need to be clearer about how power works through and in texts, representations, and discourses, while at the same time recognizing that power cannot be limited to the study of representations and discourses, even at the level of public policy. Changing consciousness is not the same as altering the institutional basis of oppression; at the same time, institutional reform cannot take place without a change in consciousness capable of recognizing not only injustice but also the very possibility for reform, the capacity to reinvent the conditions and practices that make a more just future possible. In addition, it is crucial to raise questions about the relationship between pedagogy and civic culture, on the one hand, and what it takes for individuals and social groups to believe that they have any responsibility whatsoever even to address the realities of class, race, gender, and other specific forms of domination, on the other hand. For too long, the progressives have ignored that the strategic dimension of politics is inextricably connected to questions of critical education and pedagogy, to what it means to acknowledge that education is always tangled up with power, ideologies, values, and the acquisition of both particular forms of agency and specific visions of the future. The primacy of critical pedagogy to politics, social change, and the radical imagination in such dark times is dramatically captured by the internationally renowned sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. He writes, Adverse odds may be overwhelming, and yet a democratic (or, as Cornelius Castoriadis would say, an autonomous) society knows of no substitute for education and self-education as a means to influence the turn of events that can be squared with its own nature, while that nature cannot be preserved for long without "critical pedagogy"—an education sharpening its critical edge, "making society feel guilty" and "stirring things up" through stirring human consciences. The fates of freedom, of democracy that makes it possible while being made possible by it, and of education that breeds dissatisfaction with the level of both freedom and democracy achieved thus far, are inextricably connected and not to be detached from one another. One may view that intimate connection as another specimen of a vicious circle—but it is within that circle that human hopes and the chances of humanity are inscribed, and can be nowhere else.

#### c. Solves switch-side debate: they still get any claims as to why the substance of our topical plan is bad, including mass transit bad, neoliberalism good, urban politics bad, energy disads, and state-oriented politics bad.

#### 4. Turn: Their impact claims are scare tactics that ensure totalitarian domination.

DuRand 3 [Dr. Cliff DuRand is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland. This paper was presented February 14, 2003 in a public lecture series sponsored by Biblioteca Publica in San Miguel de Allende, Mexico. http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~marto/aip/future.htm]

The main point I want to make about that era is that the climate of fear was deliberately induced by our political elite in order to mobilize a frightened population into supporting its anti-communist crusade. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals alike sought to purge Leftists from the political life of the nation so there could be no dissenting voices from a Cold War to protect capitalism and ensure U.S. hegemony in the world. Never mind that a nuclear arms race made us less secure, that in the name of anti-communism our government sought to crush every progressive movement that emerged anywhere in the world, and that the scope of political discourse at home was limited to a narrow range. A fearful population was willing to accept all this and more. Fear induced an unquestioning, childlike trust in a political elite that promised to protect us from harm. As the 17th century philosopher Thomas Hobbes well understood, those with sufficient fear for their lives, liberties and property will be willing to turn all that over to an all powerful Leviathan in hopes of finding security. The politics of fear has governed our national life ever since. With the end of the Cold War up until 911, there was a hiatus. Without a communist bogeyman to scare us with anymore, the national security state was faced with a legitimization crisis. How could it justify its interventions against Third World countries? How could it justify continued high levels of military expenditures? How could it sustain the powers of an imperial presidency? Without an enemy, without a threat to fear, how could the political elite mobilize public support? Through the 1990s you could see it grasping for a new enemy for us to fear. A war on drugs was offered as cover for interventions in the Andean countries and in Panama, even though the problem of drugs had its roots here at home. We were told to fear crime (at a time when crime rates were actually decreasing) so we would support draconian police and sentencing practices that have given us the highest prison population in the industrial world. But the most ludicrous of all was the propaganda campaign launched by the Pentagon to try to convince us that we were threatened by a possible asteroid that could crash into the earth, destroying all life. To protect against that, we needed to develop space laser weapons that could destroy an oncoming asteroid first. Thus did the military-industrial complex seek to frighten us into supporting the development of star wars weaponry. But none of that could quite do what the political elite needed. Finally, in 2001 on September 11 a spectacular mass terrorist crime gave them a new threat for us to fear. Quickly interpreting it as an act of war rather than a crime, the most reactionary sector of the elite declared war on an undefined enemy - a war without end. They offered us something new to fear so we would need the protection they claimed to offer. And they have played the politics of fear masterfully. With frequent alerts, high visibility security measures, constant reminders of vulnerabilities, an atmosphere of fear has been maintained even in the absence of further real attacks. In his January 29 State of the Union address, George W. Bush fed our fear with these words: "Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans, this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known." The operative word here is 'imagine.' By fueling a fevered imagination, he promotes a "servile fearfulness", to use Shakespeare's phrase. This has enabled this reactionary sector of the elite to not only win acceptance of unprecedented regressive policies domestically, with passive acceptance by the rest of the elite, but now push through a waragainst a country that didn't even have anything to do with terrorism. Again, we can see how fear can be a potent political force in the hands of skilled political leaders.

#### 5. Our 1AC is a critique of their notion of politics: the passivity inherent in acceding political power to elites ensures neoliberal racism will continue to decimate the city and guarantees the invisibility of those locked out of formal forums of discussion. This means the 1NC is part of a politics of neoliberal racism and they should lose the debate.

## AT: States CP

#### 1. Counterplan can’t solve:

#### a. Neoliberalism: The devolution of control over mass transit is crucial to the historic rise of neoliberalism: because of limits in revenue generation, states inevitably turn to private partnerships the redirect mass transit projects to serve elite consumption. That’s Grengs and Farmer

#### b. Federal action key: Federal policies create unbalanced incentives for automobile travel, ensuring transit apartheid and structural racism to flourish. That’s Grengs. Litman, Mann, and Shoup.

#### c. Mass transit fails without changes in federal funding.

David Burwell, director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment and Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative, 2009 (with editorial assistance and additional writing and research by Darren Springer, Greg Dierkers, and Sue Gander at the NGA Center for Best Practices; Innovative State Transportation http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

In addition to demand for passenger transportation, there is significant and growing demand for freight transportation. One report projects that truck freight, which currently moves 61 percent of shipments by weight,6 will double by 2035, and rail freight will increase by 60 percent.7 As demand has grown, the addition of capacity has lagged. Since 1980, VMT has increased by 95 percent, but road capacity has increased 4 percent.8 This has resulted in congestion in many densely populated regions (although in some regions existing capacity has been adequate in meeting growing demand). There are efforts to add transit capacity, and states are working with federal and local partners to invest in new transit for metro regions. Some states and the federal government are considering increased investments in high-speed passenger rail. However, efforts to shift demand to transit and rail, particularly at peak periods of congestion, have been limited. Federal investment currently favors roads to transit by a four-to-one ratio.9 The federal Mass Transit Account receives 2.86 cents from the federal motor fuel tax of 18.4 cents levied on a per-gallon basis. This poses a challenge to efforts to increase mass transit capacity as drivers reduce miles traveled and look to alternative modes, because mass transit funding is in part tied to fuel tax revenues, which decline as fuel consumption and VMT decline. The resulting congestion-related impacts of demand growth are significant. In 2005, congestion nationwide cost drivers 4.2 billion hours of wasted time, 2.9 billion gallons of wasted fuel, and the economy $200 billion in lost productivity.10 Some economists have called for increased use of road pricing and tolls to accurately reflect costs and charge the user accordingly. The bulk of transportation funding comes from revenue sources (fuel tax, general fund, sales taxes on fuel, vehicle fees) that do not charge the user based on distance traveled or peak period use. Direct user chargers, such as permile fees, road tolls, and congestion pricing can be calibrated to more accurately reflect the cost of operating and maintaining facilities and the cost of using them during peak periods.

#### 2. Perm: do both. THE PERM SOLVES THE LINK TO POLITICS BECAUSE NO ONE KNOWS WHO TO BLAME FOR THE PLAN.

LARSON, 8 (Sven, Ph.D., Research Director at the South Carolina Policy Council, “Federal Funds and State Fiscal Independence,” May 15, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Budget/bg2136.cfm)

These state–federal joint ventures create a number of problems. They make it difficult for voters to hold the President, Senators, Representatives, state legisla­tors, and governors accountable. If New York spends more on Medicaid, is that because New York voters demanded that their state government expand Medic­aid or because the voters gave the federal government a mandate to expand the program nationwide? If New York voters want to restrain state spending, should they turn to Albany or Washington? Blurred responsibilities between states and the federal government also make it easier for lawmak­ers to sneak government-growing bills in under the voters' radar.

#### 3. Perm solves federalism: states want federal guidance

Robert Jay Dilger Senior Specialist in American National Government 2010 (CRS Report for Congress Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present January 5, 2010 http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/18824\_Previous\_Version\_2010-01-05.pdf)

American federalism, which shapes the roles, responsibilities, and interactions among and between the federal government, the states, and local governments, is continuously evolving, adapting to changes in American society and American political institutions. The nature of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy has also evolved over time, with the federal government’s role becoming increasingly influential, especially since the Federal-Aid to Highway Act of 1956 which authorized the interstate highway system. In recent years, state and local government officials, through their public interest groups (especially the National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) have lobbied for increased federal assistance for surface transportation grants and increased flexibility in the use of those funds. They contend that they are better able to identify surface transportation needs in their states than federal officials and are capable of administering federal grant funds with relatively minimal federal oversight. They also argue that states have a long history of learning from one another. In their view, providing states flexibility in the use of federal funds results in better surface transportation policy because it enables states to experiment with innovative solutions to surface transportation problems and then share their experiences with other states. Others argue that the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that federal funds are used in the most efficient and effective manner possible to promote the national interest in expanding national economic growth and protecting the environment. In their view, providing states increased flexibility in the use of federal funds diminishes the federal government’s ability to ensure that national needs are met. Still others have argued for a fundamental restructuring of federal and state government responsibilities in surface transportation policy, with some responsibilities devolved to states and others remaining with the federal government. Congressional attention to federalism issues in surface transportation policy tends to increase during reauthorizations of the federal highway and mass transit program. The authorization for the current highway and mass transit program, the $286 billion, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA, P.L. 109-59), was set to expire on September 30, 2009, but has been extended several times. Its reauthorization is now set to expire on February 28, 2010.1 Issues addressed by Congress during SAFETEA’s reauthorization have included its funding level and financing, especially proposals addressing the Highway Trust Fund’s fiscal sustainability, state funding guarantees, and congressional earmarks.2

#### 4. Counterplan link to politics

Robert Jay Dilger Senior Specialist in American National Government 2010 (CRS Report for Congress Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present January 5, 2010 http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/18824\_Previous\_Version\_2010-01-05.pdf)

Perhaps the most difficult factor to account for in the development of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy over time has been the changing nature of American society and expectations concerning personal mobility. Once a rural society with relatively limited expectations concerning personal mobility, America is now a primarily urban/suburban society where automobile ownership and the personal mobility that automobile ownership brings is not only a powerful social status symbol but also a necessity. Obtaining a drivers’ license is now a major life-altering event, signifying for millions of American teenagers each year the transition from childhood to adulthood. Because the American bond with the automobile is strong, moving away from a primary focus on building and constructing highways towards a “more balanced” intermodal transportation approach has been made more difficult for policymakers at all levels of government. Moreover, given the public’s relatively high expectations concerning personal mobility, Congress has been reluctant to consolidate or devolve surface transportation programs to states, at least in part, because some Members worry that if states are provided additional authority and fail to meet public expectations, that they might be held accountable for that failure on election day. In their view, a more prudent, risk-adverse approach is to provide states additional programmatic flexibility, but retain a federal presence through both program oversight and the imposition of federal guidelines to ensure that states do not stray too far from national objectives. It remains to be seen how all of these factors will play out during SAFETEA’s reauthorization. One certainty is that Congress will play the key role in determining the future of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy**.** Another is that those relationships will continue to evolve over time, adopting to changes in American society and in Congress.

#### 5. Fights over jurisdiction ensures continued racism and the collapse of the environment.

Robert W. Collin and Robin Morris Collin 2005 (Environmental Reparations in THE QUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE POLITICS OF POLLUTION, Robert D. Bullard, ed., Sierra Club Books, 2005)

Antiurban attitudes, covert and institutionalized or normalized racism, and conscious ignorance can undo efforts to resolve nearly any contemporary environmental problem. Cities are where waste streams meet and accumulate. Cities are also becoming increasingly brown and black in their demographic composition. And cities are where the voters necessary for changing governmental policies are located. The profoundly antiurban messages of many U.S. environmentalists and their grounding in racist ideology; parochial land use practices; and the resistance of scientific elites to confronting the phenomenon of multiple, chronic, cumulative, and bioaccumulative toxins in the risk decisions they make, all threaten human health and living systems on which we depend. Largely without support from the mainstream environmental groups and scientific elites, environmental justice communities are struggling against these barriers to build the framework for a reparative, restorative environmental policy based on justice first, then sustainability. Antiurban and racist values have left critical gaps in our approaches to environmental justice, protection, and sustainability. This antiurban attitude within mainstream environmentalism masks an unconscious racism that threatens to replicate racist outcomes even without conscious intent. All environmental problems are local in some sense. They can be local in terms of the cause, source, or impact of the waste stream, including all emissions, discharges, and pollution. As waste streams increase and accumulate, environmental problems have begun to affect areas outside of the immediate locations where waste streams are created. This is particularly true of urban environments. Urban environments are complex. They became the sites of industrialism years before any governmental regulation, and the main sites for human habitat years before knowledge about the human health risks of industrialism. They are also important aspects of ecosystems and bioregions. As wastes, emissions, discharges, and pollution have accumulated in our cities, they have begun to affect air sheds and watersheds of ecosystems near and far from the sources of the pollution. As both wastes and human population increase, they are brought closer together, increasing conflict over environmental decisions. This conflict can take many different forms, such as land use disputes, industrial permitting decisions, court cases, or conflicts over public mass transit projects. In addition, urban dwellers increasingly are people of color who define environment and environmental concern much more holistically than the general population does. This broader approach to environmentalism is at odds with the approaches of mainstream environmental groups, which evolved out of a wilderness-conservation political agenda. 1 The U.S. environmental movement has operated to exclude the concerns of urban dwellers and people of color from the environmental movement and to exclude urban dwellers and people of color from the traditional posts within government devoted to environmental concerns.2 The exclusion of people of color is repeated over and over again, as government and environmentali.sts react to social concerns about the deteriorating environment. Urban environments in particular have been ignored in the U.S. environmental movement and in governmental policies developed to address the environment.3 Traditionally, mainstream environmental activists, public policy officials, and researchers have narrowly conceptualized environmental concerns. Their vision tends to be limited to the media of pollution-air, water, and land-and it ignores public health indicators. This vision shaped the form of current environmental protection agencies, creating artificial barriers to protection with racist and antiurban consequences. According to Robert Bullard, "When we restrict the boundary conditions of 'environmental concern' to include only environmental impacts related to air, water, land, ... we tend to ignore critical impacts to sociocultural and cultural systems. "4 Further, assigning public health and the various environmental indicators to different federal, state, and local agencies decreases our ability to look at the picture of environmental and community health indicators together. It introduces turf battles between agencies into the basic activities of gathering data and making risk management decisions regarding this fragmented data. This disconnection between public health and environmental indicators is repeated at all levels of government. Environmentalists themselves have not seriously examined their own negative attitudes toward cities generally and toward African Americans specifically. From the very beginning of our history in the United States, our political leaders thought of cities as having negative effects on people and as having a corrupting force on democracy. Thomas Jefferson thought of cities as "pestilential to the morals, the health and the liberties of man."5 He went on to write, The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government, as sores do to the strength of the human body. It is the manner and spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these [cities] is a canker which so eats to the heart of its laws and constitution.6 In the early 190os, people began to refer to cities as "jungles" and "wilderness." Later, whites were called "urban pioneers" when they moved back into the cities they had abandoned for suburbs. This potent metaphor of the city as frontier or jungle reveals a certain attitude toward African Americans. It implies that cities can become civilized only when whites are the majority population. This attitude pervades the contemporary environmental movement in countless unexamined ways. Waste sites called "brownfields" are the domain of brown and black city dwellers, while "greenfields" remain predominantly white, suburban, nonindustrialized spaces. Zero population activists and anti-immigration environmental policies continue to promote a vision of land dominated by white culture as the standard and as worthy of having environmental protection. In their discourses, most advocates of sustainability segregate communities of color and ignore them, making exceptions only for token references to Native Americans as the only people of color possessing an authentic environmental ethic. Sustainable policies must be the first exception to the normative rule of exclusionary environmental decision making.

#### 6. 50 STATE FIAT IS ILLEGITIMATE AND A VOTING ISSUE:

#### A) INTERPRETATION: NEGATIVE GETS ONE COUNTERPLAN WITH LITERATURE SUPPORTING THE COUNTERPLAN ACTION.

#### B) STATE UNIFROMITY HAS NEVER OCCURRED, DESTROYING AFF STRATEGY AND OFFENSE, WE DON’T GET THE BEST SOLVENCY TURNS TO THE COUNTERPLAN LIKE EXTERNALITIES AND RACE TO THE BOTTOM. THE COUNTEPRLAN IS IMPOSSIBLE TO RESEARCH.

#### C) RATIONAL ACTOR THEORY: THE JUDGE IS THE DECIDING VOTE IN THE US GOVERNMENT AND HAS NO JURISDICTION TO DECIDE IF AN ALTERNATE AGENT SHOULD DO THE PLAN: NOT REAL WORLD, DESTROYING RELEVANT EDUCATION.

#### D) DISADS TO US ACTION SOLVE ALL THEIR GROUND CONCERNS AND PRESERVES REICPROCAL OFFENSE.

#### E) VOTING ISSUE FOR FAIRNESS AND EDUCATION.

## 

## AT: Federalism DA

#### 1) No Federalism now

Ilya Shapiro, senior fellow in constitutional studies at the Cato Institute, January 17, 2012 (Obamacare’s Medicaid Expansion Violates Federalism <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/obamacares-medicaid-expansion-violates-federalism/>)

Today Cato filed its second Supreme Court amicus brief in the Obamacare litigation, on the issue of whether the health care law’s Medicaid expansion is a proper exercise of the Constitution’s Spending Clause. That is, states must now accept a comprehensive reorganization of Medicaid or forfeit all federal Medicaid funding—even though the spending power is circumscribed to preserve a distinction between what is local and what is national. If Congress is allowed to attach conditions to spending that the states cannot refuse in order to achieve an objective it could not outright mandate, the local/national distinction that is so central to federalism will be erased. Joining the Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence, Pacific Legal Foundation, Rep. Denny Rehberg (chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health & Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies), and Kansas Lt. Gov. Jeffrey Colyer (also a practicing physician) we argue that, in requiring states to accept onerous conditions on federal funds that it could not impose directly, the government has exceeded its enumerated powers and violated basic principles of federalism. California is at risk of losing $25.6 billion in annual federal funding, for example, and together the states stand to lose more than a quarter trillion dollars annually. On average, states would have to increase their general revenue budgets by almost 40% in order to maintain their current level of Medicaid funding. The 1987 case of South Dakota v. Dole, however, prohibits such a coercive use of the spending power and recognizes that “in some circumstances the financial inducement offered by Congress might be so coercive as to pass the point at which ‘pressure turns into compulsion.’” Indeed, the states’ obligations, should they “choose” to accept federal funding and thus commit themselves to doing the government’s bidding, are far more substantial than those the Supreme Court invalidated in New York v. United States and Printz v. United States (which prohibit federal “commandeering” of state officials). Moreover, the Congress that enacted the original Social Security Act, to which Medicare and Medicaid were added in the 1960s, recognized that social safety has always been the prerogative of the states and should continue to be done under state discretion. Medicaid itself was narrowly tailored to serve particularly needy groups. In short, if Obamacare does not cross the line from valid “inducement” to unconstitutional “coercion,” nothing ever will. Just as the Commerce Clause is not an open-ended grant of power, the Spending Clause too has limits that must be enforced.

#### 2) No unique link: increases in federal transportation spending now.

Ben Goldman June 8, 2012 (freelance writer and city planner who served as Interim Editor of Streetsblog Capitol Hill from December 2011 to May 2012. Conservative Motion to Cut Transportation Spending Fails (and Fails Hard)

http://dc.streetsblog.org/2012/06/08/conservative-motion-to-cut-transportation-spending-fails-and-fails-hard/)

The House has just defeated, in a 323 to 82 whopper, a motion to instruct members of the transportation bill conference committee to slash spending by nearly 30 percent in order to stay within the projected limits of the Highway Trust Fund. The motion, sponsored by Georgia Republican Paul Broun, had acheived “key vote” status from conservative groups FreedomWorks and the Heritage Foundation, and got a stamp of approval from the right-wing bloggers at RedState for good measure. Its failure represents a glimmer of hope that the Tea Party has not completely hijacked the transportation reauthorization process from the conference committee. It also hints at how the Senate’s transportation bill could have fared in the House, had it only been brought to a vote. And, like so many storylines of the last two years, it reflects the deep divisions remaining in the Republican caucus.

#### 3) Impossible to sustain federalism

Graglia 8 [LOPEZ, MORRISON, AND RAICH: FEDERALISM IN THE REHNQUIST COURT. By: Lino A. Graglia is the Rex G. Baker and Edna Heflin Baker Professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Texas at Austin Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, 01934872, Spring2008, Vol. 31, Issue 2]

**It is clear that, at least in some circumstances, the advantages of decentralized policy making outweigh its costs.** That does not mean**, however, that** federalism can usefully be instituted and maintained as a matter of constitutional law enforceable by courts. Discussions of federalism often focus on **the** national and state governments being **assigned** separate "spheres" of power **by the Constitution, with each being supreme in its own sphere. The reality, however, is that divided supremacy is an oxymoron. (4)** Policy making power is not a physical object that can be divided **into non-overlapping parts. Virtually everything in the real world has some connection to or impact upon everything else. The federal government cannot have full power over interstate trade, for example, if the states have full power over intrastate trade, which competes with and otherwise affects interstate trade.** The Constitution deals with this problem by providing that when federal and state regulations conflict**, as they often and inevitably do, the** federal regulation prevails**. (5)** It is the federal government**, therefore, th**at is the true sovereign, and, as American history **amply** illustrates, the scope of its **ultimately** unchecked sovereignty has consistently expanded **over time** and will almost certainly continue to do so in the future.

#### 4) States want federal transit programs

National Governors Association February 29, 2012 (EDC-02 Transportation and Infrastructure http://www.nga.org/cms/home/federal-relations/nga-policy-positions/page-edc-policies/col2-content/main-content-list/transportation-and-infrastructur.html)

Our nation’s multi-modal transportation and related-infrastructure systems support and enhance the economic growth of states and the nation. Infrastructure provides the skeletal structure that connects the nation. Together, transportation and infrastructure help sustain quality of life and enable the flow of interstate and international commerce that underpins the United States’ competitive position in the global economy. Governors affirm the following guiding principles in federal laws, regulations, and practices: 2.2 Guiding Principles 2.2.1 National Vision To provide for our nation’s diverse mobility needs, transportation and infrastructure policies require long-term vision and funding stability. The focus of federal transportation laws, regulations, and programs, regardless of mode, should include efficiency of delivery, reliability, capacity, system preservation, cost effectiveness, safety and security, innovative solutions, and partnerships. 2.2.2 Intergovernmental Partnership A strong federal-state partnership is critical for our nation’s transportation and infrastructure systems because all levels of government have a role in transportation, which must be coordinated if we are to improve mobility and safety, protect the environment, and ensure the security of vital transportation and infrastructure assets. 2.2.3 Infrastructure A national commitment to bring existing infrastructure into a state-of-good-repair, and in targeted and strategic places construct new infrastructure, advances the ability of the United States to meet basic mobility and service delivery needs. Infrastructure provides rural access and connectivity, strengthens economic competitiveness, helps reduce congestion, improves safety, supports environmental sustainability, and boosts quality of life. 2.2.4 Funding and Finance All options must be on the table for ongoing evaluation because existing revenue sources are no longer adequate to support the various federal trust funds that help finance transportation and infrastructure. Facilitating investment in infrastructure projects through existing and new self-sustaining financing mechanisms can help mitigate public funding shortfalls. Successful mechanisms leverage capital markets and require borrowers to use revenues from projects to repay the financing, making capital available to lend for new projects. If federal funds help capitalize and sustain infrastructure-financing mechanisms, then those funds must be separate from trust fund revenues dedicated to core transportation programs. 2.2.5 Certainty and Stability The design of federal funding mechanisms must maintain reliable, long-term funding certainty. The ability of state and local governments to plan and execute long-term, multi-year projects hinges on predictable federal funding. 2.2.6 Program Reforms Reforming and restructuring federal transportation programs may improve them provided restructuring preserves core federal programs, limits federal requirements that preempt state spending flexibility, and prohibits earmarks that diminish core program funding. Federal transportation programs and funding should provide maximum flexibility to the states for implementation and innovation because of our diversity of geography, population, and priorities. 2.2.7 Project Delivery Streamlined project delivery that reduces approval and completion times and improves efficiencies, while achieving the intent that underlies critical environmental, planning and design, and procurement reviews, requires a federal commitment. 2.2.8 Public Transportation An ongoing, strong federal role is critical to help fund and deliver diverse public transportation solutions for metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas across the country.

#### 5) Turn: Federalism is code for racist neoliberalism. The notion of devolution has been used to block civil rights, encourage elite consumption patterns, and accelerating deindustrialization. That’s Gengs and Farmer.

#### 6) No Indian modeling

Hindustan Times 6 [“Bihar Governor's indictment brings focus back on Sarkaria recommendations”January 24, 2006. Lexis]

The foundations of federalism in India were laid down on the grounds of concern for the unity and integrity of a culturally diverse nation. In view of historical experiences of disruptive and disintegrative sectarian forces and the political context of partition prevailing at the time of independence, the founding fathers of the Indian Constitution wanted to strengthen the Union against possible disintegrative pressures. The perceived basis of structuring the federation was "administrative convenience." Unlike the American and the (erstwhile) Soviet constitutions, the states had no inherent, not even notional, right to secede from the Union or demand self-determination. In fact the Union in India was empowered to frustrate any such separatist or secessionist pressures if and when they arose.The devolution of powers between the Central Government and States was laid down in separate lists prepared for this purpose. Accordingly, the list of the states' "exclusive" powers includes: public order; police; education; local government; roads and transport; agriculture; land and land revenue; forests; fisheries; industry and trade (limited); state Public Service Commissions; and Courts (except the Supreme Court). The states can also make laws along with the centre (provided the two do not clash), on subjects included in a "Concurrent List." These subjects include: criminal laws and their administration; economic and social planning; commercial and industrial monopolies; shipping and navigation on the inland waterways; drugs; ports (limited); courts and civil procedures. The arrangement for distribution of powers between the Union and the states has remained generally stable.Over the decades, political developments have necessitated a review of Centre-State relations at intervals, but no concrete or landmark changes has emerged. The preference has been for maintaining existing conventions as explained by the country's founding fathers.

#### 7) Federalism Destroys effective environmental regulations

Buzbee 6 [Professor of Law at Emory, 2006 William. “CONTEXTUAL ENVIRONMENTAL FEDERALISM” http://www.law.nyu.edu/journals/envtllaw/issues/vol14/1/v14\_n1\_buzbee.pdf]

The “contextual environmental federalism” analysis that I call for stands in contrast to many other scholars’ approaches to environmental federalism. In articulating how environmental regulation should be designed, an array of modes of argument and forms of proof are commonly used to support particular preferred mixes of federal, state and local roles. Much of this debate over environmental federalism seeks to resolve these issues through:• constitutional argument, • semi-historical normative arguments,• historical examples, • empirical data, or • theoretical analysis. The question typically boils down to whether federal environmental regulation, or sometimes federal environmental primacy, is appropriate or necessary. These various approaches reach a few somewhat predictable conclusions. While few argue that the federal environmental role is unconstitutional, one common strain among scholars and policymakers is the idea that, due either to constitutional presumptions or the diversity of circumstances among the states, the regulatory norm should be a limited federal role unless some compelling alternative rationale justifies federal leadership. Sometimes these arguments rely on a mix of theory and anecdotally based empiricism,3 but more often this is offered as an argument from first principles. No federal role is called for, unless a compelling justification is found.4 This argument is often rooted in what is sometimes referred to as the “matching principle” or “subsidiarity” conceptions. Under this logic, matching the level of government most commensurate with the regulatory ill is the best way to ensure the correct amount and form of regulation. Typically, people espousing this position emphasize the geographical dimensions of an environmental ill to argue that it counsels for a primary state or local regulatory role.5 As I explored in a recent work on the implications of the “regulatory commons,” and will discuss more fully below, this literature in the environmental area makes fundamental conceptual errors in failing to consider the several dimensions in which regulatory challenges and effective regulatory responses exist.6 Others see the federal government, at least since 1970 and the explosion of federal environmental legislation, as the most innovative and primary protector of the environment and are wary of federal surrender of that role.7 As with arguments for state and local primacy, proponents of federal environmental leadership also utilize theoretical political-economy arguments in support of a substantial, often primary, federal role. They note several reasons to be wary of significant or primary state environmental standard setting. They point to race-to-the-bottom risks, where jurisdictions competing for business and jobs and eager to keep taxes low will be tempted to sacrifice softer environmental concerns for the more immediate, tangible, monetary benefits of under-regulation.8 Even where two competing states share a preference for a clean and safe environment, interstate competition may lead both to sacrifice environmental protectiveness. Professor Engel’s work provides a powerful empirical and theoretical refutation of Dean Revesz’s contention that although interjurisdictional competition for business may sacrifice environmental protection, it will nevertheless enhance social welfare.9 Critics of any reflexive allocation of regulatory power to states also point out that many environmental risks far outstrip any state or local government’s reach.10 This problem of scale links to the argument that economies of scale inherent in gathering environmental data and deriving effective pollution control techniques justify the current level of federal involvement.11 Furthermore, it has been argued that since larger units of government are less susceptible to regulatory surrender, the interest group dynamics and skewed resources at play in environmental regulation require federal level control.12 Some make the modest and less controversial point that if one desires a cleaner environment, then one may prefer a leading federal role because that is the level of government where environmental advocates have been most successful over the last thirty years of the environmental movement.13

#### 8) Environment Outweighs all

Chen 2K [Jim - Prof of law U of Minneasota, Now Dean of Law School at Louisville “Globalization and Its Losers:, 9 Minn. J. Global Trade 157’ HeinOnline, I’ll email you the article if you don’t have the database]

Conscious decisions to allow the extinction of a species or the destruction of an entire ecosystem epitomize the "irrevers- ible and irretrievable commitments of resources" that NEPA is designed to retard.312 The original Endangered Species Act gave such decisions no quarter whatsoever;313 since 1979, such decisions have rested in the hands of a solemnly convened "God Squad."314 In its permanence and gravity, natural extinction provides the baseline by which all other types of extinction should be judged. The Endangered Species Act explicitly acknowledges the "esthetic, ecological, educational, historical, recreational, and scientific value" of endangered species and the biodiversity they represent.315 Allied bodies of international law confirm this view:316 global biological diversity is part of the commonly owned heritage of all humanity and deserves full legal protec- tion.317 Rather remarkably, these broad assertions understate the value of biodiversity and the urgency of its protection. A Sand County Almanac, the eloquent bible of the modern environmental movement, contains only two demonstrable bio- logical errors. It opens with one and closes with another. We can forgive Aldo Leopold's decision to close with that elegant but erroneous epigram, "ontogeny repeats phylogeny."318 What concerns erns us is his opening gambit: "There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot."319 Not quite. None of us can live without wild things. Insects are so essential to life as we know it that if they "and other land-dwelling anthropods ... were to disappear, humanity probably could not last more than a few months."320 "Most of the amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals," along with "the bulk of the flowering plants and ... the physical structure of most forests and other terrestrial habitats" would disappear in turn.321 "The land would return to" something resembling its Cambrian condition, "covered by mats of recumbent wind-pollinated vegetation, sprinkled with clumps of small trees and bushes here and there, largely devoid of animal life."322 From this perspective, the mere thought of valuing biodiver- sity is absurd, much as any attempt to quantify all of earth's planetary amenities as some trillions of dollars per year is ab- surd. But the frustration inherent in enforcing the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) has shown that conservation cannot work without appeasing Homo economicus, the profit-seeking ape. Efforts to ban the interna- tional ivory trade through CITES have failed to stem the slaugh- ter of African elephants.323 The preservation of biodiversity must therefore begin with a cold, calculating inventory of its benefits. Fortunately, defending biodiversity preservation in human- ity's self-interest is an easy task. As yet unexploited species might give a hungry world a larger larder than the storehouse of twenty plant species that provide nine-tenths of humanity's cur- rent food supply.324 "Waiting in the wings are tens of thousands of unused plant species, many demonstrably superior to those in favor."325 As genetic warehouses, many plants enhance the pro- ductivity of crops already in use. In the United States alone, the lates phylogeny" means that the life history of any individual organism replays the entire evolutionary history of that organism's species. genes of wild plants have accounted for much of "the explosive growth in farm production since the 1930s."326 The contribution is worth $1 billion each year.327 Nature's pharmacy demonstrates even more dramatic gains than nature's farm.328 Aspirin and penicillin, our star analgesic and antibiotic, had humble origins in the meadowsweet plant and in cheese mold.329 Leeches, vampire bats, and pit vipers all contribute anticoagulant drugs that reduce blood pressure, pre- vent heart attacks, and facilitate skin transplants.330 Merck & Co., the multinational pharmaceutical company, is helping Costa Rica assay its rich biota.33' A single commercially viable product derived "from, say, any one species among... 12,000 plants and 300,000 insects ... could handsomely repay Merck's entire investment" of $1 million in 1991 dollars.332 Wild animals, plants, and microorganisms also provide eco- logical services.333 The Supreme Court has lauded the pes- ticidal talents of migratory birds.334 Numerous organisms process the air we breathe, the water we drink, the ground we stroll.335 Other species serve as sentries. Just as canaries warned coal miners of lethal gases, the decline or disappearance of indicator species provides advance warning against deeper environmental threats.336 Species conservation yields the great- est environmental amenity of all: ecosystem protection. Saving discrete species indirectly protects the ecosystems in which they live.337 Some larger animals may not carry great utilitarian value in themselves, but the human urge to protect these charis- matic "flagship species" helps protect their ecosystems.338 In- deed, to save any species, we must protect their ecosystems.339 Defenders of biodiversity can measure the "tangible eco- nomic value" of the pleasure derived from "visiting, photograph- ing, painting, and just looking at wildlife."340 In the United States alone, wildlife observation and feeding in 1991 generated $18.1 billion in consumer spending, $3 billion in tax revenues, and 766,000 jobs.341 Ecotourism gives tropical countries, home to most of the world's species, a valuable alternative to subsis- tence agriculture. Costa Rican rainforests preserved for ecotour- ism "have become many times more profitable per hectare than land cleared for pastures and fields," while the endangered go- rilla has turned ecotourism into "the third most important source of income in Rwanda."342 In a globalized economy where commodities can be cultivated almost anywhere, environmen- tally sensitive locales can maximize their wealth by exploiting the "boutique" uses of their natural bounty. The value of endangered species and the biodiversity they embody is "literally . . . incalculable."343 What, if anything, should the law do to preserve it? There are those that invoke the story of Noah's Ark as a moral basis for biodiversity preser- vation.344 Others regard the entire Judeo-Christian tradition, especially the biblical stories of Creation and the Flood, as the root of the West's deplorable environmental record.345 To avoid getting bogged down in an environmental exegesis of Judeo- Christian "myth and legend," we should let Charles Darwin and evolutionary biology determine the imperatives of our moment in natural "history."346 The loss of biological diversity is quite arguably the gravest problem facing humanity. If we cast the question as the contemporary phenomenon that "our descend- ants [will] most regret," the "loss of genetic and species diversity by the destruction of natural habitats" is worse than even "energy depletion, economic collapse, limited nuclear war, or con- quest by a totalitarian government."347 Natural evolution may in due course renew the earth with a diversity of species approximating that of a world unspoiled by Homo sapiens - in ten mil- lion years, perhaps a hundred million.348

#### 9) Case outweighs:

#### a) Systemic impacts: 70,000 people a year will die from the environmental harm done by lack of mass transit. Prioritize definitive impacts over the negative’s constructed scenarios. That’s Bullard.

#### b) Probability and timeframe: The escalating crises of neoliberal capitalism ensures inevitable extinction from imperial warfare and environmental collapse. The only alternative is to challenge current capitalist practices. The most recent financial crisis ensures this will happen sooner than their impacts. That’s Harvey.

#### c) Racism is the trump card: Their disad impacts are INEVITABLE as long as we don’t come to grips with the racist politics of the status quo and dismantle them. Every act of biopolitical violence from Rwanda to the holocaust was caused by and ignored because of a failure to act to help people who are excluded and in the worst form of suffering. That’s Duarte.

### 1AR Federalism AT Impacts

#### Russia doesn’t model

Trenin 6 **[Dmitri Foreign Affairs July/August “Russia Leaves the West” Lexis]**

As President Vladimir Putin prepares to host the summit of the G-8 (the group of eight highly industrialized nations) in St. Petersburg in July, it is hardly a secret that relations between Russia and the West have begun to fray. After more than a decade of talk about Russia's "integration" into the West and a "strategic partnership" between Moscow and Washington, U.S. and European officials are now publicly voicing their concern over Russia's domestic political situation and its relations with the former Soviet republics. In a May 4 speech in Lithuania, for example, U.S. Vice President Dick Cheney accused the Kremlin of "unfairly restricting citizens' rights" and using its energy resources as "tools of intimidation and blackmail." Even as these critics express their dismay, they continue to assume that if they speak loudly and insistently, Russia will heed them and change its ways. Unfortunately, they are looking for change in the wrong place. It is true, as they charge, that Putin has recently clamped down on dissent throughout Russia and cracked down on separatists in Chechnya, but more important changes have come in Russia's foreign policy. Until recently, Russia saw itself as Pluto in the Western solar system, very far from the center but still fundamentally a part of it. Now it has left that orbit entirely: Russia's leaders have given up on becoming part of the West and have started creating their own Moscow-centered system.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

**Deudney 91** [Hewlett Fellow in Science, Technology, and Society at the Center for Energy and

Environmental Studies, Princeton (Daniel, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Ebsco]

Poverty Wars. In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil. then war. If groups at all levels of affluence protect their standard of living by pushing deprivation on other groups class war and revolutionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market systems could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.9 If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are warprone because of their ideological fervor and isolation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modern era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930 increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. Power Wars. A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs firther. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War 11, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states.C ontemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products and surplus wealth.

## 

## Capitalism Kritik 2AC

#### 1. Aff outweighs and turns the kritik:

#### a. Racism: The exclusive focus on capitalism without recognition of its uneven development and racialized character ensures that any anti-capitalist movement will reproduce the same racial divisions of the status quo. B. Only the focus on the complexity of city life allows us to simultaneously address racism and neoliberalism.

#### Privilege: The rejection of single-issue politics for global revolution is only available to those not restricted by racist transit politics of the status quo. Their revolution will be the revolution of the middle class, ensuring the failure of the alternative. Transit justice is a prerequisite to the alternative. That’s Grengs, Mann, and Young.

#### c. Urban ethics: we must begin our politics from historical givens, which means grappling with the reality of the city as a space of difference and openness. Only by creating an ideal of the unoppressive city can we have a definite understanding of what is required for true political advocacy. That’s Young.

#### 2. Turn: Resistance requires positive creation of new systems to be effective

Patrick Reinsborough 2003 (has been involved in campaigns for peace, the environment, and social justice for over twenty years. He co-founded the smartMeme strategy & training project in 2002 and with his colleague has trained over 3,000 organizers and partnered with over 100 high impact organizations to frame issues, strengthen alliances and win critical campaigns. Patrick was previously the Organizing Director of the Rainforest Action Network where he mobilized thousands of people to confront corporations who destroy the environment and violate human rights. Patrick's work has incorporated a range of creative tactics including brand busting, cross-cultural alliance building, markets campaigning and nonviolent direct action. DE-COLONIZING THE REVOLUTIONARY IMAGINATION Journal of aesthetics and politics August 2003 volume 1, issue 2 http://www.joaap.org/1/de\_colonizing/index.html)

Our movements must evolve past mere mobilizing and into real transformative organizing. Transformative organizing is more than just making the protest ghetto louder and bigger. It is the nuts and bolts business of building alternatives on a grassroots level, and creating our own counter legitimacy to replace the institutions of corporate society. Real organizing is giving people the skills and analysis they need to ground the struggle to reclaim our planet at both ends of the social change spectrum - the structural and the individual; the creation of new identities and the transformation of whole communities. It is essential that we don't waste all our energy just throwing ourselves at the machine. Resistance is only one piece of the social change equation. It must be complimented by creation. Movements need institutions that can be the hubs to help sustain our momentum for the long haul and we cannot allow these institutions to be limited by the baggage of the "professional" world. We have to actually plant the seeds of the new society within the shell of the old. Exciting work is being done around the concept of Dual power strategies. These are strategies that not only confront illegitimate institutions but simultaneously embody the alternatives, thereby giving people the opportunity to practice self-governance and create space for new political realities. Examples of inspiring dual-power strategies are taking place across the world, particularly in Latin America. From indigenous autonomists in Mexico, to the landless movement in Brazil to Argentina's autoconvocados (literally "self-convened") people's movements are resisting the corporate take over of their lives by defiantly living the alternatives. 22 In the creation of these alternatives - the holistic actions of community transformation that go far beyond any of the limiting boundaries of professionalized social change - we see a vision of direct action at the point of assumption. Actions that reveal new possibilities can challenge the assumptions of the corporate monoculture and create infectious, new political spaces. We can fight the doomsday economy by devoking the apocalpyse with visions of a life affirming future. In doing so we lay claim to a radical's best ally - hope. But our hope must not be the naivete of denial but rather the foresight of transformative visions that through our work can become real.

#### 3. Perm: Embrace the 1AC as an instance of a global anti-capitalist movement.

#### Autonomous anti-capital movements fail—only combining social mobilization with political action can unite large populations and create a political driving force

Callinicos and Nineham 07 - \*Alex Callinicos, Director of the Centre for European Studies at King’s College London, Editor of International Socialism AND \*\* Chris Nineham, founding member of the UK Stop the War Coalition, former drummer for the indie pop band The June Brides, helped mobilize thousands in protests in Genoa (“At an impasse? Anti-capitalism and the social forums today”, 2 July 07, in the International Journal of Socialism, <http://www.isj.org.uk/?id=337>, IWren)

This understanding has to involve an open break with the ideology of autonomous social movements. Too often the left has taken its stand within the framework of that ideology, whether for tactical reasons or from principled agreement. But a break is required by an honest appreciation of the interplay between political parties and social movements. The truth is that cooperation between the two actually strengthens both. However much retrospect is coloured by Bertinotti’s subsequent right turn, the high points of the European movement at Genoa and Florence were informed by this cooperation, involving not merely Rifondazione but also smaller parties of the radical left such as the LCR and the Socialist Workers Party as well as more radical elements of Italy’s centre-left Left Democrats. The same is true at a global level. The peak so far reached by the WSF took place, not at any of the Porto Alegre Forums, but in Mumbai in January 2004, infused as it was by both a strong anti-imperialist consciousness and the movements of India’s vast poor. But the two key organisations of the Indian left—the Communist Party (Marxist) and the Communist Party of India—alongside various Maoist organisations, played a critical role both in making the forum possible and in restraining themselves from trying to dominate the forum or competing too openly among themselves. An honest reappraisal of the relationship between parties and movements would allow the social forums to play to their strengths. The two most successful forums—Florence and Mumbai—were ones where opposition to the “war on terror” was a dominant theme. Saying this does not mean returning to the tedious and sterile argument—either the war or the “social question”. Opposition to both neoliberalism and war are constitutive themes of the anti-capitalist movement. But recognition of both the principled significance and the mobilising power of anti-imperialism needs to be built into how the social forums operate. This was proved by the success of last year’s “polycentric” WSF in Caracas, Venezuela. It was taken for granted among the tens of thousands of mainly Latin American activists assembled there that the US poses a real and present threat to the gains being made by movements in Bolivia, Venezuela and Ecuador. President Hugo Chávez echoed many others when he spoke there of the importance of the movement against the Iraq war in weakening the US’s ability to act in what it regards traditionally as its own backyard. Yet the Caracas forum also showed up the limitations of the WSF process. It should have been possible, for example, to launch a very high profile, high powered campaign from the forum calling on all the movements round the world to pledge defence of the gains of the Chavista experience so far. Many present were suggesting it. But because of the autonomist principles so jealously guarded by the WSF leadership, no such centralised initiative was taken. In breaking out of this impasse, it will be necessary to define precisely what the radical left is within the movement. This is no simple matter. The big Indian Communist parties, despite the very positive role they played in the Mumbai WSF, participate in neoliberal coalitions at the all-India and state levels: the Left Front government in West Bengal has violently clashed with workers and peasants in recent months. The sorry record of Rifondazione has already been discussed. A much more principled organisation, the LCR, has kept aloof from the anti-capitalist movement as an organisation, because of its acceptance of a version of the ideology of autonomous social movements (although individual LCR members such as Christophe Aguiton, Pierre Rousset and Sophie Zafari have played important roles in the movement at global and/or European levels). Documents of the left within the movement tend to espouse versions of radical reformism. The Bamako Appeal’s first plank is, “For a multipolar world founded on peace, LAW and negotiation”.26 Amin’s pronouncements are sometimes redolent of nostalgia for the high tide of Third World nationalism between the 1950s and 1970s: “The reconstruction of a ‘front of the countries and peoples of the South’ is one of the fundamental conditions for the emergence of ‘another world’ not based on imperialist domination”.27 Another important figure on the left of the movement, Walden Bello of Focus on the Global South, shows a similar approach in his calls for “deglobalisation”.28 Such formulations do not sufficiently address the reality that confronting imperialism as a system will require global social transformation based on the collective power and organisation of the oppressed and exploited in the North as well as the South. None of this should prevent cooperation among different forces on the left seeking to give the anti-capitalist movement a more coherent and strategically focused direction. Such cooperation is essential. But it needs to be accompanied by open debate about the nature of the enemy that we are confronted with and of the alternatives that we should be seeking.29 Striking the right balance between disagreement and cooperation once again requires a break with the ideology of autonomous social movements. This ideology conceives social movements as a neutral space somehow beyond politics. But fighting neoliberalism and war is necessarily a highly political affair, and nowhere is free of the antagonisms of wider capitalist society. The development of the movements necessarily generates political disagreements that cannot be kept separate from party organisations. The emergence of new anti-capitalist political formations that are at least partly the product of movements of resistance—Portugal’s Left Bloc, the Left Party in Germany, Respect in Britain—shows the extent to which activists recognise the need for a political voice as part of the development of opposition to neoliberalism and war. We believe that the concept of the united front, developed by the revolutionary Marxist tradition, provides a better guide to building democratic, dynamic movements than does the model that has prevailed so far. A united front involves the coming together of different forces around a common but limited platform of action. Precisely because they are different, these forces will have disagreements about political programme; they may also differ over how to pursue the common actions that have brought them together. But so long as they come together round limited and relatively specific aims, such alliances can be politically inclusive and maximise the chances of practical campaigning agreement. Because they are focused round action, they can be a testing ground for different tactics and strategies. This is the way to break movements away from abstract position taking or sectarian point scoring, so providing a framework in which political debate and practical organising can fruitfully interplay. Constructing such united fronts is not easy: it requires initiative and clear leadership on the one hand, and openness and humility on the other. But at a time when the anger against neoliberalism is growing everywhere and so many people are reassessing their political loyalties, it seems to us that the anti-capitalist left needs urgently to try such methods if it is to reach out and connect with its potential audience. There is unlikely to be agreement between the different tendencies in the movement in the short or medium term over general political alternatives. But we can reach constructive agreement on the many issues—opposition to neoliberalism and war—that unite a large spectrum of forces. It is precisely this kind of unity in action that many people are looking for in the current situation. Through the experience of such campaigning, new political coalitions can emerge. Moreover, the left within the movement, whether revolutionary or reformist, should working together in order to fight to give the movement a more strategic and focused direction.

#### Perm solves: pragmatism of place is key to anti-capitalist organizing.

David Harvey, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

The co-revolutionary theory laid out earlier would suggest that there is no way that an anti -capitalist social order can be constructed without seizing state power, radically transforming it and reworking the constitutional and institutional framework that currently supports private property, the market system and endless capital accumulation. Inter-state competition and geoeconomic and geopolitical struggles over everything from trade and money to questions of hegemony are also either far too significant to be left to local social movements or cast aside as too big to contemplate. How the architecture of the state-finance nexus is to be reworked, along with the pressing question of the common measure of value given by money, cannot be ignored in the quest to construct alternatives to capitalist political economy. To ignore the state and the dynamics of the inter-state system is therefore a ridiculous idea for any anti-capitalist revolutionary movement to accept. The fourth broad trend is constituted by all the social movements that are not so much guided by any particular political philosophy or leanings but by the pragmatic need to resist displacement and dispossession (through gentrification, industrial development, dam construction, water privatisation, the dismantling of social services and public educational opportunities, or whatever). In this instance the focus on daily life in the city, town, village or wherever provides a material base for political organising against the threats that state policies and capitalist interests invariably pose to vulnerable populations. Again, there is a vast array of social movements of this sort, some of which can become radicalised over time as they come to realise more and more that the problems are systemic rather than particular and local. The bringing-together of such social movements into alliances on the land (like the landless movement in Brazil or peasants mobilising against land and resource grabs by capitalist corporations in India) or in urban contexts (the right to the city movements in Brazil and now the United States) suggest the way may be open to create broader alliances to discuss and confront the systemic forces that underpin the particularities of gentrification, dam construction, privatisation or whatever. Driven by pragmatism rather than by ideological preconceptions, these movements nevertheless can arrive at systemic understandings out of their own experience. To the degree that many of them exist in the same space, such as within the metropolis, they can (as supposedly happened with the factory workers in the early stages of the industrial revolution) make common cause and begin to forge, on the basis of their own experience, a consciousness of how capitalism works and what it is that might be done collectively. This is the terrain where the figure of the 'organic intellectual' leader, made so much of in the early twentieth -century Marxist writer Antonio Gramsd's work, the autodidact who comes to understand the world first hand through bitter experiences, but shapes his or her understanding of capitalism more generally, has a great deal to say. To listen to the peasant leaders of the MST in Brazil or the leaders of the anticorporate land grab movement in India is a privileged education. In this instance the task of the educated discontented is to magnify the subaltern voice so that attention can be paid to the circumstances of exploitation and repression and the answers that can be shaped into an anti-capitalist programme.

#### 4) Individual action cedes power to the extreme right—turns their argument

Boggs 97 [Carl, National University, Los Angeles, Theory and Society, “The great retreat: Decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America”, December, Volume 26, Number 6, http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/m7254768m63h16r0/fulltext.pdf]

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here – localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post-modernism, Deep Ecology – intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved – perhaps even unrecognized – only to fester more ominously in the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or sidestep these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions. 74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people’s lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites– an already familiar dynamic in many lesser-developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise – or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society. 75

#### 6) Even if the aff fails, our refusal of neoliberal existence is a reason to vote aff: it transforms our political consciousness and creates a desire for autonomous action.

Meg Wade 2011 (Occupy Wall Street activist, <http://joaap.org/issue8/GrassrootsMegWade.htm> Journal of Aesthetics and Protest GRASSROOTS MODERNISM AS AUTONOMOUS ETHOS AND PRACTICE)

We should judge DIY practices not solely by their economic consequences or surface political effects, but by their potential to transform individual and collective psychologies. They provide a means for a return to a human sphere of action, a route out of the cycles of panic, depression, and alienation exemplified not just by today's infoworkers but by many engaged in traditional forms of organizing and political action. Too often we bemoan the apathy or passivity of those who do not participate in these traditional forms of reform and resistance. But these forms themselves use the apparatuses of semiocapitalism. They may temporarily mobilize thousands for worthwhile ideals. But they result in the same cycles of anxiety, and fail to produce what is critical: a desire for autonomous action. This is foundational for any political movement that is not either apathetic, fatalistic, or submissive. It allows for movement towards economic independence, which removes the fear bred by reliance on governments and corporations for daily survival. Grassroots modernism, partially manifested as an autonomous technoculture, carves out space for autonomous desire. As an ethos and practice, it offers us both psychological and practical tools with which to confront the techniques of our domination. It provides a confidence and belief in one's own capacity to produce, to think, and to want, beyond the disciplined desires of consumerism, and the skills to physically transform the world in which we live, and which shapes our future desires and capabilities for action. Without the conscious understanding of itself as an attitude of critique, this may become yet another coopted subculture. But if taken as an ethos, connected to a powerful daily practice of transforming our own material conditions, it may indeed provide a means for a growth of capabilities, at last disconnected from intensifying power relations; a means for a future autonomy and a present hope.

#### 7) The ethics of urban mobility resists mere instrumental understandings of transportation, allowing for new forms of belonging and political action.

Ole B. Jensen professor of Urban Theory in the Department of Architecture and Media Technology at Aalborg University, Denmark 2009 (Mobilities Volume 4, Issue 1, 2009 Special Issue: The Road Less Travelled? New Directions in Children's Mobility Flows of Meaning, Cultures of Movements – Urban Mobility as Meaningful Everyday Life Practice 139-158)

Mobility practices can be understood as ‘communities of practices’ relating to underlying rationalities (Patton, 2004; Jensen, 2006). To Patton the situation is often one of ‘incommensurability’ between the competing and divergent rationality forms (Patton, 2004). Convincingly this is captured by the notion that car drivers long for the open road with as few ‘obstacles’ as possible, whereas, e.g., the pedestrian is attracted to streets full of people – and thus ‘friction’. However, seen from a political point of view the question is what does it take to make them ‘commensurable’, to make dialogue possible? In Patton's analysis the direction to mutual understanding goes via a notion of ‘technological pluralism’ in an attempt to design infrastructures for social heterogeneity (Patton, 2004, p. 211). Here we do not disagree; however, major challenges lie in what Patton defines as ‘inertias’ – physically, institutionally, economically, socially and culturally (Patton, 2004, p. 205). The philosophical underpinning of a mobility politics of multiplicity must be one that acknowledges the ‘Other’ without necessarily reaching consensus. A new politics of the armature may thus have to be formulated within the vocabulary of an ‘agonistic’ notion of political articulation (Mouffe, 2005). However, before aiming at articulating a mobile politics we should pay attention to the intricate way mobility relates to politics in everyday life: Much of what goes on in the everyday spaces of the city is not about participation in politics with a conventional capital P. Rather, it is about new kinds of molecular politics which vie for public attention, sometimes succeeding in creating wider social and political effects (Amin & Thrift, 2002, p. 158). Mobility becomes related to a ‘molecular politics’ in this perspective as the practices and movements are placing and displacing actors, making connections and disconnects, constructing experiences or dispensing with experience all dependent on how and where we move. Thus the armatures and the vehicles operating within them are sites not only of identity‐making and culture but also of contestation and politics. Multiple examples from the literature show the armatures and the flows they host as fields of contestation. For example, the case of the LA Bus Riders Association (Soja, 2000), the social construction of the ‘tramp’ (Cresswell, 2001), graffiti as subversive and political action in the street (Cresswell, 1996), the socially segregating effects of the Bangkok Sky Train (Jensen, 2007), the phenomenon of transportation racism in America (Bullard et al., 2004), and the contested forms of automobility (Böhm et al., 2006). Some authors notice the bottom‐up character of some types of mobile politics and speak of ‘grassrooting’ the practices of mobile politics (Castells, 2005), and how an intricate relationship between bodies, networks, flows, identities and protest surfaces in the People's Global Act (PGA) in India (Routledge, 2005). De Certeau pointed to the relationship between everyday life practices and the political. He distinguished between ‘tactics’ and ‘strategies’ seeing the former as the ‘other’ and often subversive everyday life response to the latter that springs from political, economic and scientific rationalities. Furthermore, to de Certeau the many ordinary practices of everyday life like walking, talking and moving about are tactical in their character (de Certaeu, 1984, p. xix). This perspective also leads towards an understanding of mobility linked to the political, or in de Certeau's words: ‘The act of walking is to the urban system what speech act is to language or to statements uttered’ (ibid., p. 97). Furthermore, Bonham (2006) talked of ‘dissonant travellers’ and how the restriction of the study of urban travel to a story about transport has ‘silenced a multiplicity of travel stories which spill out and are beyond the origin and destinations of each trip. Travel stories might be told in many different ways’ (Bonham, 2006, p. 7). These perspectives on mobility and politics suggest that urban armatures are diverse and subject to many different underlying rationales. Meeting points, exchanges and flows of communication may be commercial and less oriented towards building public spheres (like the commercial billboards alongside the urban freeway). However, this does not rule out a potential for re‐thinking the relation of armatures to notions of the public realm. Furthermore, the multiple mobile and electronic agoras that the moving urbanite may be engaged with during the travel makes the need for a new vocabulary even more urgent. We are linked‐in‐motion and thus not just passively being shuffled across town. There is a basic assumption behind this way of thinking about urban mobility that is very important. Being‐on‐the‐move is a contemporary everyday life condition in the city and should as such be re‐interpreted. We must think in terms of ‘dwelling in motion’ (Urry, 2007) rather than dwelling as static phenomenon drawing its connotation from notions of lingering, staying and remaining (Norberg‐Schulz, 1976, p. 135). In the mobile everyday life practices we even inhabit the car as a site of work and interaction (Laurier, 2004). At present there is a risk of only seeing the rationalistic and logistic potential in the new infra‐scapes of contemporary mobility (Jensen & Richardson, 2004, p. 51). But urban mobility is much more than transport. Furthermore, we would argue that not only does a large part of our contemporary urban everyday life take place in armatures and between nodes but also that the quality of the interaction (or its potential) is underestimated, both as a social environment of meaningful interaction but also as a new public domain creating cultures of movement. The notion of ‘public domain’ is here understood as: ‘places where exchange between different social groups is possible and also actually occurs’ (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 11). The political potential of the armatures transforms the notion of the ‘Polis’ and opens up an understanding of the city as a ‘difference machine’: The city is not a container where differences encounter each other; the city generates differences and assembles identities … the city is a battle‐ground through which groups define their identity, stake their claims, wage their battles and articulates citizenship rights, obligations and principles … The city as a difference machine relentlessly provokes, differentiates, positions, mobilizes, immobilizes, oppresses, liberates. Being political means being of the city. There is no political being outside the machine (Isin, 2002, p. 26, italics in original). Ideas of the ‘good city’ hinge not only on mobility as a public good but more profoundly on the understanding of flow spaces as potentially political and meaningful. As Amin argues, the public arena and public culture in general have not been reducible to the urban for a long time (Amin, 2006, p. 1011). Let us against this theoretical background consider examples of political valorisations of the armatures and flow spaces in the contemporary city. Here we find a different understanding of cities and the political that shifts from the ‘static agora’ to an understanding of the potentials of the multiple arenas of flow that the city is made up of – from trams and buses to subways and airports. Seen in this perspective, ‘streets’ are as important as ‘squares’. One example of such re‐configuration of the armature spaces is the Pearl River Delta freeway, China. Here, in the shadow of the highway, lies the world's biggest market: A large open market exists under the highway. It is the world's biggest market where you can find anything: World Cup medals, American flags for the commemoration of 9/11, designer T‐shirts, Nike shoes, Burberry Bears, DVDs, furniture, cars, toys, etc. This frenetic rhythm of consumption and continuous turnover of products emphasises the ephemeral condition – a cult of desire … In the shadow of the highway, economic activities interact freely with social patterns (Guiterrez & Portefaix, 2003, p. 227). In the city of flows armatures may have potential as ’public domains’ and thereby sites of meaningful interaction. The challenge is to understand armatures as potential supporters of civil society, and politically to re‐valorise armatures as sites of social interaction, or in the words of Calabrese: Today's spaces of mobility are ‘rooms’ which users and participants can identify with and even take psychological possession of without the need for legal ownership. Spaces of mobility need to go beyond the boundaries of standard democratic formality. They could become sites of the city's contested spaces of heterotopias. To empower the grassroots communities (and) to nurture the capability of reflection … In the final analysis, it is about pluralism. It is about the tolerance of difference, about creative rebelliousness. This is the essence of those spaces (Calabrese, 2003, p. 349). The whole point about re‐interpreting the armature is to see potentials for new public domains within the armatures. What could be termed ‘politicised armatures’ are then understood as potential sites of resistance, meaningful social communication and interaction – not just generic non‐places. This potential seems to exist as this analysis of the ring road of Beijing suggests: The highway has become a public space full of business opportunities. It is inevitable that media gradually infiltrate this space … There are plenty of possibilities in which the media can promote the ring road space, with more than commercial intentions. As we drove around the ring roads to shoot the film, we noticed that there were many political slogans and publicity slogans … Business, politics and culture are mixed together to produce an urban ramble (Yan et al., 2003:, p. 97). There is a need for letting go of the understanding of the agora as something static and fixed. We need a concept for the mobile agora so to speak, or put differently: The expanded and mobile city implies a new agenda for the design of public space, not only in relation to the urban centres or in the new residential districts, but especially in the ambiguous in‐between areas … Furthermore, we seem to think too much about public space in the sense of fixed and permanent physical spaces, and we give insufficient consideration to the way in which public domain comes into being in flux, often extremely temporarily (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, pp. 14 and 16). There seems to be a general understanding of the airport as a particularly significant symbol of the new mobilities configurations (Adey, 2007; Hannam et al., 2006). Augé found the airport as the site par excellence of the much quoted ‘non‐place’ (Augé, 1995). Koolhaas (1995) see the airport as the epitome of the ‘generic city’ and as an indication of a situation where the airport may come to resemble the city, but more significantly where the city resembles the airport. Accordingly, the ‘Aviopolis’ makes for ideal laboratory conditions (Fuller & Harley, 2004, p. 11). This case is illustrative of the need for a more nuanced understanding than the ‘non‐place’ notion. Hannam et al., claim: ‘the airport does in fact possess a specific contingent materiality and considerable social complexity’ (Hannam et al., 2006, p. 6). Adey argues for seeing the airport as configured by a well‐planned relationship between mobility and immobility (e.g., waiting, shopping, airplane watching) (Adey, 2007). In this context the interesting theme is the quality of interaction with technologies and co‐travellers from the point of a meaningful transit space. As Adey rightly claims, many types of activities that do not per se relate to travelling take place at the airport. Thus, the airport holds the potential to become a public domain where not only consumerist behaviour takes place. Needless to say, airports also function by means of highly complex and sophisticated systems of selection, exclusion, power, and control (Graham & Marvin, 2001). What have not been discussed much in the academic literature though are the potential for such armatures to become politicised and filled with meaning that transcends the cool business‐rationales or the pervasive state power and control. Read makes the following observation on the practice of talking to colleagues on the train as another example of a public domain created in an armature: I inhabit simultaneously many spaces, many complex relations, and it is no longer obvious that the space of my most social and personal life will be most local. Many – no, all – of these spaces I inhabit adhere to and merge with coherent movement or communications networks, and clearly this is where many new social condensers will be emerging – at the urban, regional and even international nodes, as well of course as in telephonic and electronic space (Read, 2005, pp. 202–203). The notion of ‘social condensers’ in relation to urban travel is highly important and points in the direction of a less bounded and territorially delimited way of relating to places and other fellow humans. As argued, the notion of ‘elective belonging’ (Savage et al., 2005) also proved useful to show how the network and mobilities are reconfiguring our ‘sense of place’ and belonging. Another case in point would be the ‘Tokyo Ring’ where a distinct mobility culture is created as the trains make up another ‘room’ for the everyday life in Tokyo (Ohno, 2003, p. 167). Not at all like other Japanese cities, Tokyo has its own distinct mobility culture where the subway dominates over the use of the car due to the way the city is configured (ibid., p. 165). The metro expands the 12 million‐inhabitants urban core into a 32 million‐inhabitants commuting area. Next to cell phoning, emailing, sleeping and reading the easiest way of spending time in the train is appreciating the ads which are pasted everywhere (ibid., p. 168). In Tokyo the rails have not only become the ordinary scene for the everyday life of the inhabitants, but, just as important, have become the chief navigating icon and structure that any mobile urbanite would orient her or himself towards: Railway lines seem to have become the most appropriate spatial reference frame for this huge city. In Tokyo the train system is more than mere transportation infrastructure. It provides a communicative framework for the geographical space. Train lines can be seen as boulevards in contemporary Tokyo life … The railway system allows the Tokyoites to skip the hierarchical territory structure completely. Amazingly, the system is open to everyone, and it can be accessed from almost any point in Tokyo. Its rhizomatic structure allows routes to be travelled in an infinite number of combinations (Ohno, 2003, pp. 170–178). What is being challenged is the sedentary logics of such thinking as ‘all kinds of things happen at motorway interchanges, at airports, or at points that are attractive’ (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 32). Pleasure, ‘Fun’ and Flow – From Urban Transport to Urban Travel? Urban travel is not just about getting from point A to point B. It is about producing and re‐producing the city and the self in a complex relationship involving mobility cultures and different types of mobility knowledge (Jensen, 2006, p. 161). But there is more to urban travel than increased knowledge mastering. The mobility practices are part of the daily identity construction of the mobile urbanites as well as there are aesthetic experiences and emotive attachments to be made. In the words of Ascher ‘Transport, is no longer simply a means of getting from A to B: it is a part of life in its own right, which deserves to be valued as such. Movement should also be a pleasure’ (Ascher, 2003, p. 23). Much has been written on mobility as ‘right’ (Urry, 2000) but the mobility as pleasure seems to be a less discussed dimension to it (at least when the issue is non‐exotic everyday life travels). There is an overlooked affective principle at work when urban travel works at its best. This was in fact noticed by Lynch as an important impetus to city planning and design: Travel can be a positive experience; we need not consider it pure cost … Travel can be a pleasure, if we pay attention to the human experience: the visual sequences, the opportunities to learn or to meet other people (Lynch, 1981, p. 274).

### Capitalism K 1AR evidence

#### Plan key to alternative solvency: pragmatic engagement with social institutions overcome the bias against theory in government.

David McClean 2001 (lecturer in philosophy, Rutgers University “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope” Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy http://www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm)

Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?"

The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) **This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions,** into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but **where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions** actually **function in the** actual **world before howling for their overthrow commences**. **This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed,** and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

#### Refusal to engage the state results in genocide and nuclear war.

Martin Shaw 2001, Professor of IR @ U. Sussex, Review of International Studies, October 2001, [www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/unfinished.pdf](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/unfinished.pdf)

From these political fundamentals, strategic propositions can be derived. First, **democratic movements cannot regard non-governmental organizations and civil society as ends in themselves. They must aim to civilize local states, rendering them open, accountable and pluralistic, and curtail the arbitrary and violent exercise of power**. Second, democratizing local states is not a separate task from integrating them into global and often Western-centred networks. **Reproducing isolated local centres of power carries with it classic dangers of states as centres of war**.84 Embedding global norms and integrating new state centres with global institutional frameworks are essential to the control of violence. (To put this another way: the proliferation of purely national democracies is not a recipe for peace.)

Third, while the global revolution cannot do without the West and the UN, neither can it rely on them unconditionally. We need these power networks, but we need to tame them too, to make their messy bureaucracies enormously more accountable and sensitive to the needs of society worldwide. This will involve the kind of ‘cosmopolitan democracy’ argued for by David Held.85 It will also require us to advance a global social-democratic agenda, to address the literally catastrophic scale of world social inequalities. This is not a separate problem: social and economic reform is an essential ingredient of alternatives to warlike and genocidal power; these feed off and reinforce corrupt and criminal political economies. Fourth, **if we need the global-Western state, if we want to democratize it and make its institutions friendlier to global peace and justice, we cannot be indifferent to its strategic debates. It matters to develop international political interventions, legal institutions and robust peacekeeping as strategic alternatives to bombing our way through zones of crisis**. It matters that international intervention supports pluralist structures, rather than ratifying Bosnia-style apartheid.86

As political intellectuals in the West, we need to have our eyes on the ball at our feet, but we also need to raise them to the horizon. **We need to grasp the historic drama that is transforming worldwide relationships between people and state, as well as between state and state. We need to think about how the turbulence of the global revolution can be consolidated in democratic, pluralist, international networks of both social relations and state authority**. We cannot be simply optimistic about this prospect. Sadly, it will require repeated violent political crises to push Western and other governments towards the required restructuring of world institutions.87 **What I have outlined is a huge challenge; but the alternative is to see the global revolu- tion splutter into partial defeat, or degenerate into new genocidal wars—perhaps even nuclear conflicts**. The practical challenge for all concerned citizens, and the theoretical and analytical challenges for students of international relations and politics, are intertwined.

## 

# \*\*\*Negative\*\*\*

## 1NC Advantage Frontline

#### 1) Political and economic predictions are accurate

Wolfers 7 [Justin, Assistant Professor of Business and Public Policy at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, “Best Bet for Next President: Prediction Markets,” December 31, Wall Street Journal, http://bpp.wharton.upenn.edu/jwolfers/Press/WSJcolumn/1-Best%20Bet%20for%20Next%20President.pdf]

As the 2008 presidential race heats up, voters are overwhelmed by a flood of new data: Who is ahead in the polls? Who is winning the "money race"? How are the dynamics of the race likely to respond as the candidates tack left and right, advertising strategies change, and we learn whose Web site is drawing more eyeballs? Political prediction markets provide us -- the consumers of this information -- with a way to cut through this clutter. A prediction market is a bit like the stock market, except that you are buying shares whose value depends on the success of a political candidate, rather than the profits earned by a corporation. And just as stock prices are a useful barometer of the health of a company, so too the price of a prediction contract is a barometer of the health of a political campaign. Alternatively, for those schooled on the Strip rather than the Street, prediction markets allow you to bet on the election, just as Vegas bookies allow you to bet on a football game. And the uncanny ability of the betting line to predict football outcomes also holds in the political domain. It is the accuracy of market-generated forecasts that led the Department of Defense to propose running prediction markets on geopolitical events. While political rhetoric about "terrorism futures" led the plug to be pulled on that particular experiment, the original insight -- that markets can help make sense of vast amounts of disparate information-- remains valid. Experimental prediction markets were established at the University of Iowa in 1988, and they have since amassed a very impressive record, repeatedly outperforming the polls. Research by economic historians has documented betting on elections over a century ago, and the impressive forecasting record of prediction markets was also evident in the period before scientific polling was adopted. More recently, in the 2004 primaries, prediction markets pointed to the disintegration of Howard Dean's candidacy in advance of the fateful Iowa caucuses. In the 2004 presidential election, the market favorite won the Electoral College in all fifty states; in 2006 the markets also picked every Senate race. How do these markets work? Right now, you can buy a $1 bill for 44 cents; the only catch is that you only get the $1 if Hillary Clinton is our next President. The fact that this $1 bill is selling for 44 cents tells us that "the market" believes her to have a 44% chance of winning the presidency, a number that has risen sharply as she has become more likely to win the Democratic nomination. Interestingly, prediction markets have long suggested a strong showing for Ms. Clinton, even as popular commentators had earlier dismissed her as unelectable, much as they did prior to her successful New York senate race in 2000. In a truly efficient prediction market, the price will come to reflect the influence of all available information. For instance, those discouraged by Ms. Clinton's recent polling in New Hampshire are probably selling, while those who believe endorsements by the Iowa Register are crucial are buying; Ms. Clinton's campaign to increase her likeability may lead some to buy, while recent mis-steps by her campaign may lead others to sell. Economists influenced by the possibility of a recession are buying various Democrats, while political scientists schooled in the incumbency advantage are probably buying Republicans. Through this process of different people trading based on their own observations aboutthe race, prediction markets prices come to aggregate disparate pieces of information into a single summary measure of the likelihood of various outcomes. Moreover, if this market operates efficiently, it will appropriately summarize all of this information and the price will become the most statistically accurate forecast of the election outcome. Two other characteristics also distinguish prediction markets. First, they respond to all sorts of news beyond shifts in public opinion, including changes in campaign staff, political re-positioning, and performance on the trail. Second, prediction markets are forward-looking, while polls are often backward-looking. For instance, Fred Thompson continues to do well in national polls largely due to name recognition, while prediction markets have discounted this advantage, understanding that candidates like Mike Huckabee will become better known through the campaign. Indeed the markets currently believe that Mr. Thompson is less likely to win the Republican nomination than fringe candidate Ron Paul. Beyond Mr. Thompson, polling data for Republican candidates is much more consistent with the markets, suggesting a four-way race in which Messrs. Giuliani and Romney are the leading candidates, with Messrs. McCain and Huckabee not too far behind. The markets predicted Mr. Huckabee's surge a few weeks before the polls, and it appears to have come at the expense of Mr. Romney. The big story this week, though, is John McCain, who has resurrected his campaign. The market now judges him to be a clearly credible alternative.

#### 2) Claims that neoliberalism is the root cause of social ills is fear-mongering and based on flawed world-views

Ams & Forbes 11/03/09 [ELIZABETH AMES is founder of BOLDE Communications, which advises corporate and individual clients on communications strategies AND Steve Forbes, “How Capitalism Will Save Us,” http://www.forbes.com/2009/11/03/capitalism-greed-recession-forbes-opinions-markets.html]

We all know the Rap **on** capitalism**: That it** is fundamentally greedy and immoral**. That it enables the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor.** That open markets are Darwinian places where the most ruthless unfairly crush smaller competitors and where the cost of vital products **and services** like health care and energy are almost beyond the reach of those who need them. Capitalism has also been blamed for a range of social ills--from air pollution to obesity**. Not only have educated, successful people bought into capitalism's bad Rap, but** the Rap is taught in our schools. It has molded the thinking and analyses of **our most influential** opinion leaders, writers, thinkers, and policy makers **of both political parties. Long before the stock market meltdown, before AIG executives and automotive CEOs were being tarred and feathered by Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike regularly blamed "overpaid" executives and "Wall Street greed" for the problems ailing America's economy. Antibusiness bias has long been rampant at our top universities, where Marx occupies iconic stature, where** free-market thinkers are seldom taught**--and where** careers in nonprofit sectors like academia or the arts are widely regarded as morally superior to those in "money-grubbing" private industry**. The Rap is pervasive in the entertainment industry. Scheming business executives are a favorite villain in the story lines of television and motion pictures--ranging from films like Erin Brockovich to TV programs like Dirty Sexy Money. Even some of capitalism's leading beneficiaries have bought into the Rap. Warren Buffett, number two on the 2009 annual Forbes list of world billionaires, has asserted that his wealth as the world's most successful investor is "disproportionate." At the World Economic Forum in 2008, Bill Gates called for, in the words of the Wall Street Journal, a "revision of capitalism." Gates told reporter Robert Guth that he believed that the fruits of capitalism--i.e., advances in areas such as health care, technology, and education--were not reaching the world's poor and primarily helped the rich.** Capitalism's bad Rap has helped to shape a lot of bad economic policy. People who believe it look to government to "create jobs," whereas the most powerful job-creating machine has always been the private se**ctor. They believe that the best way to generate more revenues for government is through raising taxes on the so-called rich and on "profit-hungry" corporations. Yet history shows, time and again, that** punishing the entrepreneurs and businesses that create jobs and capital is a sure route to economic devastation**, while lowering taxes--not with one-shot reductions that politicians like, but by substantially cutting rates--is always the best economic stimulus. Thanks to capitalism's bad rap, people bash big private-sector companies like Wal-Mart for supposedly excessive "market power," while they are blind to the massive market power of government and its role in today's economic disasters. The two biggest examples: the central role of government-created mortgage behemoths Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in the subprime-mortgage meltdown and financial crisis and the mammoth impact of giant government insurers Medicare and Medicaid in shaping today's dysfunctional health-care market. Partly because of the Rap on capitalism, many people today are convinced that the way to economic health is protectionist policies that supposedly preserve jobs--when such policies have been shown, not only in the United States, but in nations around the globe, to be job killers. The emotionally charged rhetoric of the Rap has precluded a clear-eyed understanding of the fundamental principles of economic behavior. People don't understand, for example, how markets work in the Real World or, for that matter, how wealth is created.** They believe "wealth" is solely something "greedy" rich people make for themselves--when it is also the source of the capital that is invested in new businesses that create jobs. The drumbeat against "greed" and "free markets" **on the part of the media and politicians** has also served to prevent a clear understanding of just what really constitutes a "free" market. **Thus,** people blame capitalism for economic disasters such as the mortgage meltdown **and the astronomical cost of health insurance--when** they have in fact been caused by government not allowing markets to function. **Because of the Rap, people are blind to the Reality--that far from having failed,** democratic capitalism is the world's greatest economic success story. No other system has improved the lives of so many people**. The turmoil of the past few years by no means mitigates the explosion of prosperity that has taken place since the early 1980s, when President Ronald Reagan enacted promarket reforms to free the economy from the Carter-Nixon stagnation of the 1970s. Those reforms--lowering tax rates and loosening regulations--unleashed job-creating capital. The result: a roaring economy that produced a flood of innovations--from personal computers and cellular phones to the Internet. Indeed, we may one day look back on the period of 1982 to 2007 as an economic golden age. Many conveniences we take for granted today--from automatic teller machines and DVD players to home computers and CAT scans--did not exist or were not widely used as recently as the 1970s and early '80s. It's not just that we have more and better gizmos. All you have to do is watch an old movie from the 1970s. Even when the past is glamorized by Hollywood, it's obvious--looking at everything from appliances to cars to homes--that living standards back then were lower. We've come a long way. Not only "the rich" but people of all incomes today are doing better.** No system has been as effective as capitalism in turning scarcity into abundance**. Think of computers. Forty years ago, only business and government could afford the old massive mainframes. A single machine filled an entire room. Today the BlackBerry device in the palm of your hand has even more computing power than those old machines. Thanks to capitalism, Americans as a nation are living dramatically better and longer than they did at the beginning of the twentieth century. In The Greatest Century That Ever Was: 25 Miraculous Trends of the Past 100 Years, noted economist Stephen Moore and the late business professor Julian Simon make the powerful observation that since the early twentieth century, life expectancy has increased; infant mortality rates have fallen tenfold. Major killer diseases--from tuberculosis to polio, typhoid, and pneumonia--have in most parts of the world been, if not eradicated, drastically reduced; agricultural productivity has soared. The environment is also cleaner in many parts of the world. Air quality has improved about 30 percent in American cities since 1977. Not only that, Moore and Simon write, "the affordability and availability of consumer goods have greatly increased. Even most poor Americans have a cornucopia of choices that a century ago the Rockefellers and the Vanderbilts could not have purchased." Until the credit crisis, tens of millions of people a year worldwide were joining the middle class. Between 2003 and 2007, the growth of the American economy alone exceeded the size of the entire Chinese economy. We grew the equivalent of China in four and a half years. China's growth rates are higher--but they're coming from a much smaller base.** Free-market economic reforms--especially since the fall of the Berlin wall--have brought an unprecedented explosion of wealth **to India, China, Brazil, and nations in central and eastern Europe as well as in Latin America and Africa. Capitalism has helped to usher in an era of wealth and economic growth that failed foreign-aid programs since World War II were never able to accomplish. In China, for example, over two hundred million people now have discretionary income. The country has a burgeoning middle class. The current recession should be seen historically as an interruption, not an end, of this extraordinary economic expansion. Along with bringing prosperity to millions,** democratic capitalism has undermined political tyranny and promoted democracy and peace between nations of the world. It is, without doubt, the world's most moral system. **This last statement may raise eyebrows in an era that has seen scandals from the collapse of Enron to the devastation of personal and charitable wealth caused by Bernard Madoff. That is not to minimize the crimes of individuals like Madoff and others or the damage they cause. As we explain, the off-the-charts criminality of individuals like Madoff no more reflects the immorality of free enterprise than the murderous crimes of a Ted Bundy or a Jeffrey Dahmer reflect a fundamental breakdown of democratic society. Democratic capitalism, as a system, is more humane than government-dominated economies, including those in countries that are otherwise democracies.** Nations that liberalize their economies, that allow people greater economic self-determination, end up moving, sooner or later, toward democracy**. Since the nations of the world began to liberalize their economies in the mid-1980s, the percentage of democratically elected governments has surged from 40 percent to more than 60 percent today. China, for example, is not yet a Western-style democracy. But the nation is freer today than it was during the era of Mao Tse Tung and the repressive Cultural Revolution.** Despite all the gloom and doom voiced by its critics, the free-enterprise system is--and has always been--the best way to unleash the creativity, inventiveness, and energy of people and mobilize them to meet the wants and needs of others**. That's because** free-market transactions**, far from being driven by greed,** are about achieving the greatest possible mutual benefit, not only for the parties directly involved but eventually for the rest of society.

#### 3) The status quo solves racism.

Social Issues Digest 7 [Wiseto Social Issues Digest is a magazine published by The Gale Group, “Racism in America is on the Wane” http://socialissues.wiseto.com/Articles/FO3020630253/]

The twentieth century saw remarkable changes in race relations. Jim Crow laws and fears of "miscegenation" were standard in 1900**. By the late 1960s, the Supreme Court** decisions in Brown v. Board **of Education** and Loving v. Virginia **(1967) had** abolished school segregation **and laws banning interracial marriage, and** the Civil Rights movement **had** gathered momentum**. In the twenty-first century,** racism continues to wane**.** Some claim systematic racism **still** exists, decrying such practices as "racial profiling" **by law enforcement and alleging "environmental racism" by businesses and government. Upon examination,** most **of these** claims are exaggerated. **John Derbyshire argues that "**overwrought sensitivities"are encouraged **by "unscrupulous mountebanks" trying** to use race for political gain**. He negates theories of racial profiling as racist, illustrating it is a realistic reaction to data, such as Department of Justice statistics showing that, in 1997, 60 percent of robbery victims reported black assailants. Blacks were also eight times as likely to commit homicide as non-blacks (including Hispanics). He argues, "…equality before the law does not…guarantee equal outcomes for any law-enforcement process, only that a citizen who has come under reasonable suspicion will be treated fairly." The Supreme Court agreed that if "...race is only one factor in a generalized approach to the questioning of suspects, it may be considered." Jim F. Couch and others state careful study of accusations that minority residential areas are more likely to have hazardous-waste dumpsites and toxic pollution from industrial plants are fallacious, explaining that "…in the first comprehensive study of toxic-waste facilities to use census-tract data, D.L.** Anderton and colleagues did not find any nationally consistent correlation between minorities and pollution.**" Another study found "…**economic factors rather than race itself account for apparent environmental racism**."** Little data supports allegations of systemic racism, and much evidence shows the contrary**.** Despite isolated incidents of true racism and bigotry, **Murdock believes that** America has made "tremendous progress…from churches to the ballot box to the bedroom**" and that "**Americans of various ethnicities are proving that-**--to paraphrase Rodney King---**we all can just get along**." He states** racism has been "decreasing" for years and **that** America teaches tolerance. This **view** is supported by much empirical evidence**. Murdock notes the achievements of black politicians elected by majorities of white voters, something he asserts would not happen in a land of "white bigots"; a steady decrease in anti-Semitism, illustrated by decreasing anti-Semitic crimes and acceptance of Jews in show business and intermarriages between Jews and gentiles; and growing rates of intermarriage in general. Orlando Patterson agrees with Murdock, stating that** racism "will soon disappear in America," due to **the ongoing** hybridization of culture caused by immigration and migration patterns**, sociological developments, intermarriage, and biotechnology. "**By the middle of the twenty-first century," he states, "the social virus of race will have gone the way of smallpox**." Though racism has not been completely erased from American consciousness, the past 100 years prove how much society can progress.** Within the next century, racism in America faces extinction**.**

#### 4) Transit racism is a myth: the disparate impact is an illusion of bad statistics.

Joe R. Hicks vice president of [Community Advocates](http://www.cai-la.org/) and David A. Lehrer president of Community Advocatesand 2011 (http://www.city-journal.org/2011/eon0401jhdl.html

The Bus Has Left the Station: California’s liberal Ninth Circuit rejects a specious civil-rights lawsuit.)

This February, the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals—widely seen as one of the more liberal federal courts in the nation—issued its ruling in Darensburg v. Metropolitan Transit Commission, a lawsuit brought by poor, largely minority riders of public buses in the San Francisco Bay Area. The plaintiffs had alleged that, since a large majority of the city’s bus riders were nonwhite, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s preference for rail-expansion projects over bus-expansion projects was racially biased and a violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The court ruled against the plaintiffs and [issued](http://westlawnews.thomson.com/California_Litigation/News/2011/02_-_February/9th_Circuit_finds_no_proof_that_emphasis_on_rail_expansion_over_buses_hurts_nonwhite_riders/) a stinging rebuke to their lawyers. Is it possible that, even in California, courts long tolerant of questionable claims of racial discrimination may finally be running out of patience? Sylvia Darensburg, the primary plaintiff in the case, is an African-American mother of three who lives in East Oakland and relies on public buses as her primary form of transportation. Darensburg, [said](http://sfbayview.com/2011/transit-case-raises-question-can-the-poor-ever-find-justice/) the Equal Justice Society—a San Francisco–based activist organization that advocated on behalf of the plaintiffs, though it wasn’t involved in the case itself—“experiences the reality of transit inequality.” She “endures” long waits for the two buses she rides and has to walk 12 blocks from home to the nearest bus stop. The plaintiffs argued that while nearly 80 percent of Bay Area bus riders were people of color, the region’s rail service predominantly benefited white riders. So the Metropolitan Transit Commission’s disproportionate funding of rail projects was biased. But the court discovered that, in fact, over 51 percent of rail riders were members of minority groups. “The evidence shows that Bay Area minorities already benefit substantially from rail service,” the court said, adding that “no court could possibly determine whether MTC’s long-term expansion plan will help or harm the region’s minority transit riders.” It concluded: “Not only does Plaintiffs’ statistical evidence fail to prove discrimination, but their circumstantial evidence does not support any inference” that the transit company was motivated by racial bias. Most significantly, the court shed the notion, prevalent for decades, that presumes that policy actions that affect broad swaths of people often contain a hidden agenda targeting minorities and the poor. The court concluded instead that, barring dispositive evidence that minorities and the poor were truly victims, the court’s role should be minimal. It gave the benefit of the doubt to a body politic that has matured and become far more tolerant than it was just 40 years ago. What the architects of the civil rights movement struggled for was equality of opportunity, not equality of outcomes. It would be nice, of course, if people who rode buses invariably found them easily accessible and on time. That won’t always be the case anywhere—but it doesn’t mean that race- or class-based discrimination is responsible. As Ninth Circuit judge John T. Noonan wrote in his concurring opinion: “The notion of a Bay Area board bent on racist goals is a specter that only desperate litigation could entertain.”

#### 5) Health impact inevitable: Obama suspended EPA enforcement

Frances Beinecke, president of the National Resource Defense Council, 2011 (http://www.commondreams.org/view/2011/09/02-12 Obama Administration Delays Life-Saving Smog Standards)

Today the Obama Administration made a decision that will endanger the health of tens of thousands of Americans. Its choice to delay stronger standards for smog lets polluters off the hook and leaves Americans with sicker family members and higher medical costs. [US President Barack Obama withdrew a new set of draft air quality standards. (AFP/File, Saul Loeb)] US President Barack Obama withdrew a new set of draft air quality standards. (AFP/File, Saul Loeb) Smog standards exist because smog is dangerous to human health. It causes respiratory illness, cardiac disease, and premature death. Though we have made progress in reducing this harmful pollution in American skies, we haven’t licked the problem yet. The stronger smog standards would have saved up to 4,300 lives and avoid as many as 2,200 heart attacks every year. They would have made breathing easier for the 24 million Americans living with asthma. And they also would have created up to $37 billion in health benefits annually. By failing to deliver these health and economic benefits to the American people, President Obama has come down on the side of polluters and those extreme forces who deny the value of government safeguards.

## 2NC Advantage Answers

### Ext #1: Predictions

#### Models reduce human error and lead to better predictions – even Tetlock’s study concludes that models can help expert predictions

Rieber 4 Professor at Georgia State University [Steven, "How Statistical Models Can Help Intelligence Analysts," http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/0/7/3/6/0/pages73607/p73607-1.php]

A related point is that the models minimize random error. Human judgment is of course imperfect, and we often fail to treat like cases alike. The statistical models are boringly consistent: they always give the same weight to the same variables. This is not to say that the models are perfect predictors. They are far from perfect, and so are human experts. But using the models reduces one source of error that many experts without the models are subject to, namely random variation in their judgments. In addition to minimizing random error, the models can help counter the types of cognitive biases which plague much expert judgment. For example, many experts tend to overpredict by large margins. One study examined the accuracy of physicians’ predictions of bacteremia (bacteria the bloodstream). 6 When the doctors judged a patient 60% likely to have bacteremia, the actual probability was 12%. And when doctors were 100% certain of a diagnosis of bacteremia, they were correct only 40% of the time. Predictions by a statistical model are very unlikely to consistently overpredict a type of event. That is because the models are formed on the basis of large samples of similar events – and large samples generally do not undergo sudden and radical change in their basic characteristics. So when experts use the model to supplement their own judgment, they will be less likely to overpredict. Overprediction is one sort of cognitive bias. Another is overextremity (also known as overconfidence). While overprediction involves overestimating the probability in both low and high probability judgments, overextremity means overestimating at high probabilities and underestimating at low probabilities. A set of judgments is overextreme when the judge is overconfident that likely events will occur and overconfident that unlikely events will not occur. Many experts in international affairs have been shown to exhibit overextremity bias. Over the last 20 years Philip Tetlock of UC Berkeley has asked numerous experts to make predictions about events such as the future of the Soviet Union and South Africa. 7 Over all, when experts were 90% confident that an event would occur, they were correct only 59% of the time. And when the experts were 90% confident that an event would not occur, they were correct only 78% of the time. This is a classic case of overextremity bias. Tetlock also tested the results of simple mechanical predictors. As expected, these exhibited no overextremity bias. Thus, using the model can help counter overextreme predictions. Statistical models can help experts predict more accurately. This is because the models use only the relevant variables, they assign the correct values to the variables, they base their predictions on all the data rather than just the most memorable data, they minimize random error, and are not subject to cognitive biases. There exist promising models for predicting foreign events such as civil war, interstate war, and state failure.

#### Extinction outweighs everything else—if our probability is greater than a billionth of one percent we should win – it outweighs the probability and systemic impacts

BOSTROM 11 (Nick, Prof. of Philosophy at Oxford, The Concept of Existential Risk (Draft), http://www.existentialrisk.com/concept.html)

Holding probability constant, risks become more serious as we move toward the upper-right region of figure 2. For any fixed probability, existential risks are thus more serious than other risk categories. But just how much more serious might not be intuitively obvious. One might think we could get a grip on how bad an existential catastrophe would be by considering some of the worst historical disasters we can think of—such as the two world wars, the Spanish flu pandemic, or the Holocaust—and then imagining something just a bit worse. Yet if we look at global population statistics over time, we find that these horrible events of the past century fail to register (figure 3). But even this reflection fails to bring out the seriousness of existential risk. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is not that they would show up robustly on a plot like the one in figure 3, causing a precipitous drop in world population or average quality of life. Instead, their significance lies primarily in the fact that they would destroy the future. The philosopher Derek Parfit made a similar point with the following thought experiment: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. … The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second. (10: 453-454) To calculate the loss associated with an existential catastrophe, we must consider how much value would come to exist in its absence. It turns out that the ultimate potential for Earth-originating intelligent life is literally astronomical. One gets a large number even if one confines one’s consideration to the potential for biological human beings living on Earth. If we suppose with Parfit that our planet will remain habitable for at least another billion years, and we assume that at least one billion people could live on it sustainably, then the potential exist for at least 1018 human lives. These lives could also be considerably better than the average contemporary human life, which is so often marred by disease, poverty, injustice, and various biological limitations that could be partly overcome through continuing technological and moral progress. However, the relevant figure is not how many people could live on Earth but how many descendants we could have in total. One lower bound of the number of biological human life-years in the future accessible universe (based on current cosmological estimates) is 1034 years.[10] Another estimate, which assumes that future minds will be mainly implemented in computational hardware instead of biological neuronal wetware, produces a lower bound of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1071 basic computational operations).(4)[11] If we make the less conservative assumption that future civilizations could eventually press close to the absolute bounds of known physics (using some as yet unimagined technology), we get radically higher estimates of the amount of computation and memory storage that is achievable and thus of the number of years of subjective experience that could be realized.[12] Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than the value of 1018 human lives. This implies that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives. The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly. Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any “ordinary” good, such as the direct benefit of saving 1 billion lives. And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1 billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential risk—positive or negative—is almost certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.

### Ext #2: Neolib not bad

#### Growth solves ecological collapse

Zey, 1998 [Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute, Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. 2nd Edition, pp. 37-38]

Third, growth itself contains the **solutions** to the problems it produces. Supporting this principle is the World Bank’s 1992 report “Development and the Environment,” which blatantly states that growth is a powerful antidote to a number of ills plaguing Third World countries, including the pollution that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, the resulting prosperity also facilitates the developments of **technologies** that lead to cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation’s per capita income rises to about $4000 in 1993 dollars, it produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it can afford technology like catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, “We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy.” He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as Eastern Europe can be traced to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure environmental safety “we need a sound economy on a global basis.” So the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth. The World Bank estimated that every dollar invested in developing countries will grow to $100 in fifty years. As that happens, these countries can take all the necessary steps to invest in pollution-free cars, catalytic converters, and other pollution-free technologies, such as the cleanest of all energy sources, nuclear power.

#### Cap key to incentive for warming innovations

Clark and Lee 4 (J.R. and Dwight, professor of economics and occupies the Probasco Chair of Free Enterprise at the University of Tennessee, professor of economics and occupies the Ramsey Chair of Private Enterprise at the University of Georgia, The Independent Review, Vol VIII, No.4, Spring 2004, “Global Warming and Its Dangers”, http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir\_08\_4\_clark.pdf)

Once individuals are convinced that global warming is a problem, they automatically assume that it demands a government solution. Although we believe that global warming has been exaggerated by those who stand to gain from larger bureaucratic budgets and from more government controls over private decisions, we cannot render an informed judgment as to how serious a problem it might be. However, based on our understanding of how markets transmit dispersed information on changing conditions and motivate people to coordinate their responses to those conditions in the most appropriate ways, we are convinced that any problem of global warming will be dealt with better through market incentives than with government mandates. People tend to regard global warming as a problem that should be attacked directly by imposing restrictions on market behavior in an attempt to reduce temperature increases. Almost universally ignored is the argument that a superior solution emphasizes the best response to whatever changes in temperature occur rather than attempts to prevent those changes. Further, even if people acknowledge the importance of appropriate responses to temperature changes, few appreciate the ability of market incentives to inform and motivate such responses; nor do they recognize that government mandates undermine those responses by distorting market incentives or by rendering them completely inoperable. Even if government mandates were to be more effective than market incentives in reducing global warming, market incentives probably would still be more effective in reducing the harm of global warming by motivating a better response to a worse situation. Moreover, in the long run, reliance on the informed flexibility of the market will do more than government controls to reduce greenhouse gases. No sensible person denies that markets do a far better job than governments in promoting and utilizing technological advances that constitute our best hope for reducing dependence on fossil fuels and for creating the wealth that increases both our demand and our ability to deal with a wide range of environmental problems, including global warming.

### Ext #3: No Racism

#### SQ solves racism—if it doesn’t the aff won’t remedy the alt causes but psychology makes some racism inevitable

McWhorter 8 [John McWhorter is the author ofThe Power of Babel: A Natural History of Language, among other books, and has taught linguistics at Cornell and the University of California, Berkeley. He is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute. “The End Of Racism?,” Nov 5 http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=3374]

The question is whether the total eclipse of racism is either possible or necessary. It is neither, **and Barack Obam**a's victory is a lesson in how **the word** racism has drifted **beyond its core meaning** into something more calisthenic than proactive**. It was one thing when legalized segregation and disenfranchisement were outlawed in the mid-60s. This was a massive undertaking, but people devoted their lives--sometimes literally--to making it happen. It was something else when, in the wake of this,** racism became socially taboo in most segments of American society**. Sure, there are lapses. But** anyone who thinks there has been anything short of a seismic shift in America's racial relations since the 60s should take a look at Mad Men. The **very** fact that it is news that there remain people who wouldn't vote for a black man shows that we live in a different world **than 40 years ago. The new frontier, however, is apparently people's individual psychologies: Not only must we not legislate racism or socially condone it, but no one is to even privately feel it. The problem is** we can't entirely reach people's feelings. The social proscription has changed a lot of minds, **especially of younger people who never knew the old days.** But an America where nobody harbors racist sentiment? The very notion goes against everything we know about human hardwiring: Distrust of the other is inherent to our cognition**.** Psychology has provided us with no method for rewiring brains to eliminate that**. After describing one of countless studies revealing subliminal racial bias, Nicholas Kristof recently intoned "there's evidence that when people become aware of their unconscious biases, they can overcome them." Oh, really? "Can," OK--but how often do they? How do we reach everybody? Do we mean overcoming bias so thoroughly that a test looking for what's "out there" would not still reveal it?** It's a utopian pipe dream**. Now, if this racism of the scattered and subliminal varieties were the obstacle to achievement that Jim Crow and open bigotry were, then we would have a problem. But yesterday, we saw that this "out there" brand of racism cannot keep a black man out of the White House. Might it not be time to allow that our obsession with how unschooled and usually aging folk feel in their hearts about black people has become a fetish?** Sure, there are racists. There are also rust and mosquitoes, and there always will be. Life goes on. **I know--what about "societal" racism? Well, if we can now relax about the backward folk "out there," then maybe Obama in the White House can help open up an honest discussion about the role racism does not play in black communities' problems. Obama has come in for some criticism for not putting forth a "black" agenda--i.e., one designed to combat "racism" in various ways. It's because he knows that paradigm has no useful application to our times.** The harsher penalization of crack than powdered cocaine that has put so many black people in jail needs revision, but it was not created by racists: The Congressional Black Caucus helped pass it. **Newark's schools are not failing because of racism, when New Jersey funds them as liberally as schools in the suburbs and most of the teachers and staff are black. America has problems and our new president knows it. However,** is America's main problem still "the color line" as W.E.B. DuBois put it 105 years ago? **The very fact that the president is now black is a clear sign that** it is no longer our main problem, and **that** we can, **even as morally informed and socially concerned citizens,** admit it.

### Ext #4: No Transit Racism

#### No transit racism: minorities already benefit from new rail projects

Casey Miner 2011 (Back of the Bus: The Courts Weigh In on Transportation Equity

By | 03/01/2011 – 6:23 pm http://transportationnation.org/2011/03/01/back-of-the-bus-the-courts-weigh-in-on-transportation-equity/)

(San Francisco–Casey Miner, [KALW News](http://www.kalwnews.org/)) If you’ve had a chance to listen to [Back of the Bus](http://transportationnation.org/backofthebus/), you know a little something about civil rights and Bay Area transportation. The quick version: local transit advocates believe money goes disproportionately to big rail projects like the Oakland Airport Connector at the expense of the local bus service used primarily by low-income and minority riders. Last month the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals [ruled on that topic](http://docs.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/ca9/09-15878/920110216/) — and it says the transit advocates are wrong.  But you can bet the story won’t end here. “Although Plaintiffs’ statistical evidence shows that minorities make up a greater percentage of the regional population of bus riders than rail riders, it does not necessarily follow that an expansion plan that emphasizes rail projects over bus projects will harm minorities,” wrote Judge Barry G. Silverman. Roughly two-thirds of the region’s bus-riders are members of minority groups, compared to just over half of rail riders. “Plaintiffs’ theory forecloses altogether the possibility that MTC could devise any rail-centered expansion that could benefit minority transit riders, while the evidence shows that Bay Area minorities already benefit substantially from rail service.” In the case, Darensburg, et. al v. Metropolitan Transportation Commission, advocates alleged that [MTC](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/) — the Bay Area’s regional transportation planning body — consistently allocated funds in a way that benefited rail services like BART while neglecting bus service AC Transit. The Ninth Circuit disagreed, essentially saying that there was no way for the court to predict the future with sufficient accuracy to determine how– or how much — a transit project might affect those groups. “Plaintiffs’ intentional discrimination claim relies on drawing equivalences, between 1) bus riders and minorities, and 2) between rail riders and whites, that are not borne out by the data,” wrote Silverman. “Simply because minorities represent a greater majority of bus riders as opposed to rail riders, the rejection of a particular new bus expansion project in favor of a new rail expansion project will not necessarily work to the detriment of minorities.” Judge Silverman’s argument is essentially that there’s too much complexity in regional transit ridership to draw sharp racial distinctions — some bus lines carry predominantly white riders, while some rail projects underway in the region go through predominantly minority areas. In his concurring opinion, Judge John T. Noonan took that argument a step further.

#### Obama already focusing on solving transit racism

Angie Schmitt, newspaper reporter-turned planner/advocate, 2011 (In Tight Times for Transit Budgets, FTA Warns Agencies Not to Discriminate March 15 http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/03/15/in-tight-times-for-transit-budgets-fta-warns-agencies-not-to-discriminate/)

Local transit agencies that are planning service cuts and fare hikes as a result of budget constraints have been warned: cost-cutting measures shouldn’t unfairly affect people of color. Peter Rogoff, head of the Federal Transit Administration, sent out a letter to local transit authorities last week reminding them of their duty to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which “prohibits federally-funded programs and services from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin.”

### Ext #5: Health impact inevitable

#### Air pollution inevitable: indoor pollution

Beth Buczynski June 13, 2012 (<http://www.care2.com/causes/is-your-kitchen-more-polluted-than-a-big-city.html> Is Your Kitchen More Polluted Than A Big City?)

Big cities are the poster children for air pollution. We’ve all seen pictures of the smog hanging around Los Angeles, or the clouds of fumes coming from New York City’s army of yellow taxi cabs. Just moving to the suburbs won’t keep you safe though. According to a new study, however, the worst air pollution is a lot closer to home. A study by the University of Sheffield has found that the air we breathe inside our own homes can have pollutant levels three times higher than the outdoor environment in dense urban areas and along busy roads. “We spend 90 percent of our time indoors and work hard to make our homes warm, secure and comfortable, but we rarely think about the pollution we might be breathing in,” said Professor Vida Sharifi, who led the research. “Energy is just one source of indoor pollution, but it is a significant one. And as we make our homes more airtight to reduce heating costs, we are likely to be exposed to higher levels of indoor pollution, with potential impacts on our health.” The researchers compared a rural house with two apartments, one in Sheffield city and the other in an urban location next to a busy road. The rural house had an electric stove while both apartments used gas appliances. Samples were taken outside and inside the properties, from each kitchen, over a four week period. The average particle concentrations measured by the research team in the kitchens of both apartments with gas cookers were higher than the levels set by the Government as its objective for outdoor air quality in both London and England. Although the U.S. acknowledges the hazards of indoor air quality, especially where chemical-based cleaners and fragrances are used on a regular basis, it too lacks enforceable safety standards. The closest thing to come out of the EPA is a voluntary guidance document, Healthy Indoor Environment Protocols for Home Energy Upgrades, that provides a set of best practices for improving indoor air quality in conjunction with energy retrofit work in homes.

#### Can’t solve air pollution: Canada

Mike De Souza June 12, 2012 (<http://www.canada.com/health/Budget+cuts+threaten+federal+green+plan+oilsands+coal+scientist/6770451/story.html#ixzz1xj4R7iDB> Budget cuts threaten federal green plan for oilsands and coal: scientist)

Budget cuts to a team of smokestack pollution specialists at Environment Canada could jeopardize the Harper government's efforts to crack down on pollution from industries such as the oilsands and coal-fired electricity generation, warns a University of Guelph professor, who worked with the special unit of federal scientists. Environment Minister Peter Kent has suggested, through a spokesman, the government could replace his department's expertise by relying on outside sources such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). But Bill Van Heyst, an associate professor in environmental engineering who specializes in air quality, said the Environment Canada scientists provide a level of independence as well as unique expertise on Canadian industrial practices that the government would have trouble finding elsewhere as it attempts to boost environmental monitoring efforts in the oilsands region. "If you don't have a legitimate background in air quality or air quality testing then it's really easy to make mistakes, and those mistakes are going to make everybody look, in the long run, really bad," Van Heyst said in an interview with Postmedia News. A spokesman for Kent said the government doesn't believe the team's work would be critical to new environmental policies affecting the oilsands and coal electricity generating sectors. He also said that the department's enforcement branch would intervene "if we suspect that the information we are receiving (from company reports) is incorrect." Van Heyst said he has worked with some privately funded smokestack sampling companies that also have expertise, but warned these specialists face obstacles when hired directly by a private company from industry. "The thing with using non-government specialists is you could have a company saying they're running at 100 per cent capacity, but really only running at 70 per cent," said Van Heyst. "The stack testers from a private engineering company wouldn't know that. Whereas I think with the Environment Canada team, there's that level of government authority there and they would have the process knowledge to verify capacity. It adds weight. It adds credibility to stack testers being there." Kent's office has estimated it would save $718,000 annually by eliminating its internal research capabilities on industrial emissions measurements. It also estimated it would need to spend about $115,000 to obtain and analyze data from other external sources, such as the EPA. Van Heyst recognized the credibility of the EPA's research capabilities, but noted its expertise would not come cheap. In his work, he said his university would have paid Environment Canada tens of thousands of dollars from his own research funds a few years ago on a project that analyzed the impact of emissions from crematoriums for animals. "If you have to pay the EPA, you're just looking at huge costs to bring in another team," Van Heyst said. "This (Environment Canada) team has a track record. They have a history of working together. They know industry in Canada. They know our extremes in terms of temperature, winter conditions. The EPA may not be as aware of some of the extreme climate conditions that we have to go through, because they simply don't come across them as frequently." All seven members of the smokestack sampling team at Environment Canada have received notices their jobs will be eliminated as part of millions of dollars in proposed federal cuts to scientific research and monitoring of Canada's air, wildlife, water and oceans. Kent has warned Parliament in a recent report that budget cuts put his department at risk of losing the scientific expertise it needs to counter ecological threats and protect Canada's ecosystems. But he also has suggested that changes in the government's scientific capacity were part of a shift of its resources to the West, highlighting the new oilsands monitoring efforts.

## 

## 1NC Solvency Frontline

#### 1) Their movement can’t solve: business is stronger, and longstanding features of American politics ensures their movement for change fails.

Frances Fox Piven 2001 (distinguished Professor of Political Science and Sociology at The Graduate Center, City University of New York. 577; 26 The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Globalization, American Politics, and Welfare Policy)

But is it true that economic globalization is the force behind welfare rollbacks? Not according to the evidence. Although the argument that the welfare state impedes a global economy is louder and shriller in the United States, and although the United States has been the leader in actual social program cutbacks, the United States is far from a leader in economic globalization (Page, Simmons, and Greer 2000). Because imports and exports account for a smaller share of our gross domestic product, the American economy is in fact less exposed to international trade than are most European countries with export-oriented open economies. Moreover, while U.S. multinationals are indeed leaders in overseas investments, most of their investments are in Western Europe (Tabb 1997). If competitive pressures were in fact the underlying reason for social program cutbacks, we would expect American investors to be seeking out locations with lower taxes and lower wages. In fact, when our big corporations invest abroad, it is mainly in Western countries with higher wages and higher tax levels. What the American example actually suggests, I believe, is a model of a country adapting not to globalization but rather to the impact of politics, of class politics, and specifically, of a business class on a roll as it moves to use public policy to shore up private profits (Helleiner 1994, 1997). Of course, business is not the whole story. The path for a business political mobilization was smoothed by the weakness of popular opposition, especially during the past three decades. That weakness is partly owed to longstanding features of American politics: fragmented, weak political parties that privilege interest groups; the feebleness of organized labor; a political ideology with which the essentially mystical neo- liberal argument about the necessary power and autonomy of markets, an updated version of laissez- faire, resonates easily; and a popular political culture deeply infused with racism and with sexual obsessions, as the debate over welfare showed once again.

#### 2) No transit democracy: the system is broken

Margaret Okuzumi, executive director of BayRail Alliance, 2007 (<http://urbanhabitat.org/node/317> Power and Accountability in Transit Governance. Moving the Movement for Transportation Justice Vol. 12 No. 1 Spring)

Democracy is not a spectator sport.” But what happens when you get into the game and participate, only to find that the rules have been rigged against you? Such is the dilemma of transit activists in Santa Clara County, California. The basic principles for creating a government that works are violated at the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). Good faith efforts by activists to impact the agency’s decisions have been derailed by a fundamentally flawed structure. VTA has an annual operating budget of over $300 million and a capital budget of several billion dollars over a 30-year period. In the face of this huge resource, VTA is the least cost-effective transit agency in the country. Fares continue to increase while services are cut. The agency’s top priority is extending BART to San Jose, and VTA has agreed to let BART put a lien on monies that are currently used to pay for about a third of the county’s bus services, in order to operate the proposed BART line. If your community does not currently have a public transit agency but is in the process of forming one, take note. Special districts like transit agencies, especially multi-jurisdictional ones, are trickier to set up in an accountable fashion than, say, a city council in a new city. While individual personalities do matter in government, structure matters more. Well-meaning elected officials cannot overcome a broken system. A governing structure that distributes power equitably in the community is much more likely to produce policy decisions that uphold the community’s best interests than one that concentrates power in just a few hands.

### Ext #1: Movements fail

#### Their movement will fail: they have no mechanism of organizing, which will cause frustration and drop-outs.

RACHEL RYBACZUK, 2009 (graduate student at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst The Search For Self-Fulfillment: How Individualism Undermines Community Organizing http://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses/278/)

Former CANN participants would speak passionately about the need to fight for the neighborhood, but stopped coming to meetings. Elaine, a longtime resident in the Green Street Neighborhood explained that she got involved because, “it was really local...I feel like that’s exactly the kinds of things that I’m interested in. And because it’s housing it’s like, a right, in my opinion. It had to do with affordability which really, it’s social justice, it feels really important”. Paul, a recent transplant to the city had a strong belief in community and the power of groups to create change. Even though he didn’t live in the targeted neighborhood he felt strongly about participating: “From a social standpoint, these are my neighbors. We have to stick up for each other. If we don’t...if *I* don’t, then I’m a hypocrite. From an economic standpoint it’s obvious. If these places that are affordable get kicked out, then the whole place just goes up in prices”. Heather, another former member who also didn’t live in the neighborhood stressed the affordability of housing as a key issue and one she felt called to participate in, citing her own past difficulty trying to find an affordable apartment and current financial insecurity and subsequent inability to buy a home in Northampton because of high real estate prices. Her passion for CANN’s struggle reflected her own housing and financial insecurity. By my accounts, these are well-meaning people who want to make change— people with strong communication skills and experience working in groups. They are people with awareness of social problems and who have a sense of what should be done to make things better—for themselves and others. They are similar to the individuals Lichterman describes as “agents of social change” who “align themselves with a larger political movement of ‘progressive’ or left-liberal politics by politicizing their everyday lives” (1996:24). What I found in interviews with these core activists who dropped out was that their initial motivation gave way to frustration with the process of the group or the organizing itself. CANN was not living up to their individual expectations or satisfying their personal interests or goals. Their initial motivations included the following: it’s important because it’s local; housing is a right; class and economic justice; it is critical to stand up for others; to connect with neighbors; be part of a community. Rather than stay and steer the course of CANN they dropped out in order to tend to personal matters and spoke of activities they worked on instead: starting an astrology group, envisioning an intentional community, gaming, and working on an anti-war publication. Their original passions were not sustainable in the face of tedious group dynamics. The individual’s preferences trumped the need for group solidarity in this community organizing effort.

#### No solvency: The Aff’s movement has no internal resources to influence policy or external opportunities to push politics. Our evidence is empirical.

Vernon L. Bates 2000 (professor of sociology, Pacific University, “The Decline of a New Christian Right Social Movement Organization: Opportunities and Constraints” Review of Religious Research, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Sep., 2000), pp. 19-40 SMO = social movement organization)

As will be demonstrated, it is generally accepted within the OCA, among members of the Oregon Republican Party, and among other interested parties in Oregon such as journalists, public figures, and academics that the OCA reached its peak in influence over the Republican Party and politics in general in the State of Oregon sometime in 1994. Their lessened political influence was also accompanied by internal weakness. For example, the scarcity of monetary resources led to an attempt to sell their headquarters, a downsizing of their staff, a reduction in the number of phone lines in the office, and restrictions on their travel (Lon Mabon, OCA Director, interview, May 28, 1997). The following statements attest to these conditions: "OCA meetings have declined in numbers and they are not as visible in this place (the legislature), certainly not as visible in this session as in prior sessions and I think that has been more or less a straight line of decline in the three terms I've been here." (Representative Bob Stedman (R), Oregon House of Representatives, interview, July 2, 1997) "An anti-abortion proposal sponsored by the Oregon Citizens Alliance probably won't make the November ballot, and the leader of the conservative Christian political group says his organizations future is in doubt. " (Mayes 1998) "True believers of the Oregon Citizens Alliance may decide Saturday to try and rally the conservative organization one more time but the air has gone out of the OCA. It is tempting to celebrate..., but that would accomplish little other than to motivate the remaining supporters to cling stubbornly to the remnants of what was once among the most powerful grass-roots groups in Oregon. " (Caldwell 1998) "A year later (1996), the Oregon Citizens Alliance, one of the country s first and most successful religious-based, grass-roots political organizations is poised on the brink of going out of business. Membership has fallen by nearly a third, to 2,500. " (O'Keefe 1996) "The OCA has definitely diminished in influence. The ideology of the OCA is alive and well in the Republican Party in Oregon but the OCA is diminished in influence because of bad behavior and bad press. " (Perry Atkinson, Vice Chair of the Oregon Republican Party, phone interview, June 24, 1997) In evaluating this decline I will attempt to elucidate the structural and cultural conditions (external forces) and individual and group social dynamics (internal forces) that played a role in this transformation of the OCA. External forces include the following: 1) changes in the political opportunity structure, 2) the failure of formal political initiatives, and, 3) a cultural schism within the Republican Party between members of the OCA and the Oregon Republican Party over the importance of the OCA's orthodox religious master frame in setting policy. Internal forces to be considered are: 1) an organizational structure and strategic and tactical initiatives that constrain efforts to move in new directions, and 2) limits on organizational mobility due to member recruitment strategies. In combination these variables influence one another, lessen the ability of the OCA to raise funds, and together reinforce the decline.

### Ext #2: No Transit democracy

#### Local elites will coopt the plan to reinforce neoliberalism.

Stephanie Farmer, professor of sociology, Roosevelt University and Sean Noonan, professor of sociology, Harper College 2011 (Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 10 (2011) 73-84 Post-Neoliberalism or Deepened Neoliberalism? The Chicago Public Transportation Service and Elite Response during the Great Stagnation)

The crisis of public transit infrastructure and service provoked a political response on the part of local elites to reverse the last twenty years of austerity politics dominating the fate of public transit. However, the Central Area Plan and the tax increase to adequately fund transit services should not be taken as evidence of the reversal of neoliberalism. Rather these actions reveal how the capitalist class strategically wields the state as an instrument of its class power. When public transit was perceived as an excessive social cost cutting into prof- itability and hindering accumulation in the 1980s and 1990s, local elites opted for fiscal austerity. In contrast, when public transit was seen as useful for valorizing urban real estate, assisting the circulation of goods and people, and attracting the professional-managerial class (who regard public transit as a quality of life issue) local elites opted for socialized state investment for new public transit construction. The conflicting actions on the part of Chicago’s power elite supports Harvey’s claim that elites are not so much committed to neoliberalism as an ideology, but rather deploy neoliberal policies and prac- tices when they are effective strategies to assert their interests. When neoliberal policies interfered with growth plans, Chicago’s elites abandoned neoliberal principles in favor of a more ‘interventionist’ Keynesian style state.

## 

## 1NC Framework

#### A. Interpretation: Affirmatives must defend only the implementation of plan by the federal government.

#### 1. “Resolved” before a colon reflects a legislative forum

Army Officer School ’04 (5-12, “# 12, Punctuation – The Colon and Semicolon”, http://usawocc.army.mil/IMI/wg12.htm)

The colon introduces the following: a. A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis. b. A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.) c. A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it? d. A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment. e. After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f. The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock g. A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:" Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.

#### 2. United States federal government only refers to the national government

Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, June 1, 2004, pg.716.

Federal government. 1. A national government that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of power in exchange for the right to participate in national politics matters – Also termed (in federal states) central government. 2.the U.S. government – Also termed national government. [Cases: United States -1 C.J.S. *United States* - - 2-3]

#### B. Violation: They claim solvency off of their discursive endorsement of movements.

#### C. Standards

#### 1. Ground: Government action is key to disadvantages, kritik links, and counterplan competition. Advocating extra-governmental action gives the affirmative an unfair ground advantage, as well as destroys clash, which is the key internal link to in-round education.

#### 2. Education: Fiat is key to being informed citizens, without it we never learn about the political process and don’t take responsibility for the possible bad outcomes of our actions. Simulating policy solves all their offense, allowing people a safe space to test new ideas

Joyner, Professor of International Law at Georgetown, 1999 [Christopher C., “Teaching International Law,” 5 ILSA J Int'l & Comp L 377, l/n]

Use of the debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences. Debates, like other role-playing simulations, help students understand different perspectives on a policy issue by adopting a perspective as their own. But, unlike other simulation games, debates do not require that a student participate directly in order to realize the benefit of the game. Instead of developing policy alternatives and experiencing the consequences of different choices in a traditional role-playing game, debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience. Having the class audience serve as jury helps each student develop a well-thought-out opinion on the issue by providing contrasting facts and views and enabling audience members to pose challenges to each debating team. These debates ask undergraduate students to examine the international legal implications of various United States foreign policy actions. Their chief tasks are to assess the aims of the policy in question, determine their relevance to United States national interests, ascertain what legal principles are involved, and conclude how the United States policy in question squares with relevant principles of international law. Debate questions are formulated as resolutions, along the lines of: "Resolved: The United States should deny most-favored-nation status to China on human rights grounds;" or "Resolved: The United States should resort to military force to ensure inspection of Iraq's possible nuclear, chemical and biological weapons facilities;" or "Resolved: The United States' invasion of Grenada in 1983 was a lawful use of force;" or "Resolved: The United States should kill Saddam Hussein." In addressing both sides of these legal propositions, the student debaters must consult the vast literature of international law, especially the nearly 100 professional law-school-sponsored international law journals now being published in the United States. This literature furnishes an incredibly rich body of legal analysis that often treats topics affecting United States foreign policy, as well as other more esoteric international legal subjects. Although most of these journals are accessible in good law schools, they are largely unknown to the political science community specializing in international relations, much less to the average undergraduate. By assessing the role of international law in United States foreign policy- making, students realize that United States actions do not always measure up to international legal expectations; that at times, international legal strictures get compromised for the sake of perceived national interests, and that concepts and principles of international law, like domestic law, can be interpreted and twisted in order to justify United States policy in various international circumstances. In this way, the debate format gives students the benefits ascribed to simulations and other action learning techniques, in that it makes them become actively engaged with their subjects, and not be mere passive consumers. Rather than spectators, students become legal advocates, observing, reacting to, and structuring political and legal perceptions to fit the merits of their case. The debate exercises carry several specific educational objectives. First, students on each team must work together to refine a cogent argument that compellingly asserts their legal position on a foreign policy issue confronting the United States. In this way, they gain greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas faced by policy makers. Second, as they work with other members of their team, they realize the complexities of applying and implementing international law, and the difficulty of bridging the gaps between United States policy and international legal principles, either by reworking the former or creatively reinterpreting the latter. Finally, research for the debates forces students to become familiarized with contemporary issues on the United States foreign policy agenda and the role that international law plays in formulating and executing these policies. n8 The debate thus becomes an excellent vehicle for pushing students beyond stale arguments over principles into the real world of policy analysis, political critique, and legal defense.

#### 3. Extra-Topicality: Allowing them to claim solvency or advantages off of personal discourse is extra topical and a voting issue for fairness: it allows them to shift their advocacy in the 2AC and moot predictable 1NC ground.

#### D. Framework is a voting issue for fairness and education.

### 2NC Framework First

#### This is a prior question that must be resolved first – it is a pre-condition for debate to occur

Shively, 2000 – Assistant Prof Political Science at Texas A&M

(Ruth Lessl, Partisan Politics and Political Theory, p. 181-2)

The requirements given thus far are primarily negative. The ambiguists must say "no" to-they must reject and limit-some ideas and actions. In what follows, we will also find that they must say "yes" to some things. In particular, they must say "yes" to the idea of rational persuasion. This means, first, that they must recognize the role of agreement in political contest, or the basic accord that is necessary to discord. The mistake that the ambiguists make here is a common one. The mistake is in thinking that agreement marks the end of contest-that consensus kills debate. But this is true only if the agreement is perfect-if there is nothing at all left to question or contest. In most cases, however, our agreements are highly imperfect. We agree on some matters but not on others, on generalities but not on specifics, on principles but not on their applications, and so on. And this kind of limited agreement is the starting condition of contest and debate. As John Courtney Murray writes: We hold certain truths; therefore we can argue about them. It seems to have been one of the corruptions of intelligence by positivism to assume that argument ends when agreement is reached. In a basic sense, the reverse is true. There can be no argument except on the premise, and within a context, of agreement. (Murray 1960, 10) In other words, we cannot argue about something if we are not communicating: if we cannot agree on the topic and terms of argument or if we have utterly different ideas about what counts as evidence or good argument. At the very least, we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it. For instance, one cannot have an argument about euthanasia with someone who thinks euthanasia is a musical group. One cannot successfully stage a sit-in if one's target audience simply thinks everyone is resting or if those doing the sitting have no complaints. Nor can one demonstrate resistance to a policy if no one knows that it is a policy. In other words, contest is meaningless if there is a lack of agreement or communication about what is being contested. Resisters, demonstrators, and debaters must have some shared ideas about the subject and/or the terms of their disagreements. The participants and the target of a sit-in must share an understanding of the complaint at hand. And a demonstrator's audience must know what is being resisted. In short, the contesting of an idea presumes some agreement about what that idea is and how one might go about intelligibly contesting it. In other words, contestation rests on some basic agreement or harmony.

### 2NC Policymaking Good

#### Focusing on the details and inner-workings of government policy-making is productive – critical approaches can’t resolve real world problems like poverty, racism and war

McClean, 01 – Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Molloy College, New York (David E., “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm)

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

### 2NC Roleplaying Good

#### Role playing overcomes polarization and teaches students political jargon necessary to form critical opinions

SCHAAP 2005 (Andrew, University of Melbourne, Politics, Vol 25 Iss 1, February)

While every subject has its jargon, the object of study in political theory is the jargon itself. Perhaps because of its abstract nature, political theory often polarises politics students: it either alienates or inspires them. Role playing offers one valuable technique to overcome this divide by demonstrating in practice why we cannot do without theories of politics. By participating in this role play, students experienced at first hand how arguments made from within five traditions of political philosophy come into conflict in relation to the issue of human rights. Even self-avowed pragmatists have their own theories – only they are implicitly assumed rather than explicitly articulated. In role playing the pragmatists' self-deception is exposed: they are forced to declare their (imagined) hands and hold their (assigned) theories open to scrutiny. Once drawn into the game, in this way, they are on their way to becoming political theorists.

### 2NC Fairness Good

#### The preservation of equal ground and compliance with democratically agreed upon topic norms is crucial to instill an ethic of tolerance and respect for alterity – the idea that the 1AC is more important than giving the other side a chance to talk is the root of bigotry and intolerance

Muir, 93 – Department of Communications at George Mason (Star A., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate,” Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 26, No. 4. Gale Academic Onefile)

Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values— tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one's own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. 5' The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance. At a societal level, the value of tolerance is more conducive to a fair and open assessment of competing ideas. John Stuart Mill eloquently states the case this way: Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right. . . . the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race. . . . If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of the truth, produced by its collision with error."\*' At an individual level, tolerance is related to moral identity via empathic and critical assessments of differing perspectives. Paul posits a strong relationship between tolerance, empathy, and critical thought. Discussing the function of argument in everyday life, he observes that in order to overcome natural tendencies to reason egocentrically and sociocentrically, individuals must gain the capacity to engage in self-refiective questioning, to reason dialogically and dialectically, and to "reconstruct alien and opposing belief systems empathically."\*- Our system of beliefs is, by definition, irrational when we are incapable of abandoning a belief for rational reasons; that is, when we egocentrically associate our beliefs with our own integrity. Paul describes an intimate relationship between private inferential habits, moral practices, and the nature of argumentation. Critical thought and moral identity, he urges, must be predicated on discovering the insights of opposing views and the weaknesses of our own beliefs. Role playing, he reasons, is a central element of any effort to gain such insight. Only an activity that requires the defense of both sides of an issue, moving beyond acknowledgement to exploration and advocacy, can engender such powerful role playing. Redding explains that "debating both sides is a special instance of role-playing,""" where debaters are forced to empathize on a constant basis with a position contrary to their own. This role playing, Baird agrees, is an exercise in reflective thinking, an engagement in problem solving that exposes weaknesses and strengths,\*\* Motivated by the knowledge that they may debate against their own case, debaters constantly pose arguments and counter-arguments for discussion, erecting defenses and then challenging these defenses with a different tact."\*' Such conceptual flexibility, Paul argues, is essential for effective critical thinking, and in turn for the development of a reasoned moral identity. A final point about relativism is that switch-side debate encourages fairness and equality of opportunity in evaluating competing values. Initially, it is apparent that a priori fairness is a fundamental aspect of games and gamesmanship."\* Players in the game should start out with equal advantage, and the rules should be construed throughout to provide no undue advantage to one side or the other. Both sides, notes Thompson, should have an equal amount of time and a fair chance to present their arguments. Of critical importance, he insists, is an equality of opportunity."\*^ Equality of opportunity is manifest throughout many debate procedures and norms. On the question of topicality—whether the affirmative plan is an example of the stated topic—the issue of "fair ground" for debate is explicitly developed as a criterion for decision. Likewise, when a counterplan is offered against an affirmative plan, the issue of coexistence, or of the "competitiveness" of the plans, frequently turns on the fairness of the affirmative team's suggested "permutation" of the plans. In these and other issues, the value of fairness, and of equality of opportunity, is highlighted and clarified through constant disputation. The point is simply that debate does teach values, and that these values are instrumental in providing a hearing for alternative points of view. Paying explicit attention to decision criteria, and to the division of ground arguments (a function of competition), effectively renders the value structure pluralistic, rather than relativistic.

### 2NC Reps don’t Matter

#### Representations are irrelevant—they still default to objectivity and don’t change how we conceive IR just recognize past changes.

Mearsheimer, 95. John (International Relations professor at the University of Chicago), The False Promise of International Institutions in International Security Vol 19 Number 3 Winter, pp 43-44.

The main goal of critical theorists is to change state behavior in fundamental ways, to move beyond a world of security competition and war and establish a pluralistic security community. However, their explanation of how change occurs is at best incomplete, and at worst, internally contradictory.155 Critical theory maintains that state behavior changes when discourse changes. But that argument leaves open the obvious and crucially important question: what deter- mines why some discourses become dominant and others lose out in the marketplace of ideas? What is the mechanism that governs the rise and fall of discourses? This general question, in turn, leads to three more specific questions: 1) Why has realism been the hegemonic discourse in world politics for so long? 2) Why is the time ripe for its unseating? 3) Why is realism likely to be replaced by a more peaceful communitarian discourse? Critical theory provides few insights on why discourses rise and fall. Thomas Risse- Kappen writes, "Research on. . . 'epistemic communities' of knowledge-based transna- tional networks has failed so far to specify the conditions under which specific ideas are selfected and influence policies while others fall by the wayside." 156 Not surprisingly, critical theorists say little about why realism has been the dominant discourse, and why its foundations are now so shaky. They certainly do not offer a well-defined argument that deals with this important issue. Therefore, it is difficult to judge the fate of realism through the lens of critical theory. Nevertheless, critical theorists occasionally point to particular factors that might lead to changes in international relations discourse. In such cases, however, they usually end up arguing that changes in the material world drive changes in discourse. For example, when Ashley makes surmises about the future of realism, he claims that "a crucial issue is whether or not changing historical conditions have disabled longstanding realist rituals of power." Specifically, he asks whether "developments in late capitalist society;" like the "fiscal crisis of the state," and the "internationalization of capital," coupled with "the presence of vastly destructive and highly automated nuclear arsenals [has] de- prived statesmen of the latitude for competent performance of realist rituals of power?" 157 Similarly, Cox argues that fundamental change occurs when there is a "disjuncture" between "the stock of ideas people have about the nature of the world and the practical problems that challenge them." He then writes, "Some of us think the erstwhile dominant mental construct of neorealism is inadequate to confront the chal- lenges of global politics today."158 It would be understandable if realists made such arguments, since they believe there is an objective reality that largely determines which discourse will be dominant. Critical theorists, however, emphasize that the world is socially constructed, and not shaped in fundamental ways by objective factors. Anarchy, after all, is what we make of it. Yet when critical theorists attempt to explain why realism may be losing its hegemonic position, they too point to objective factors as the ultimate cause of change. Discourse, so it appears, turns out not to be determinative, but mainly a reflection of developments in the objective world. In short, it seems that when critical theorists who study inter- national politics offer glimpses of their thinking about the causes of change in the real world, they make arguments that directly contradict their own theory, but which appear to be compatible with the theory they are challenging.159 There is another problem with the application of critical theory to international relations. Although critical theorists hope to replace realism with a discourse that emphasizes harmony and peace, critical theory per se emphasizes that it is impossible to know the future. Critical theory, according to its own logic, can be used to undermine realism and produce change, but it cannot serve as the basis for predicting which discourse will replace realism, because the theory says little about the direction change takes. In fact, Cox argues that although "utopian expectations may be an element in stimulating people to act ... such expectations are almost never realized in practice."

## 

## 1NC States CP

#### Text: The fifty states of the United States of America, the District of Columbia, and all United States territories should substantially increase their funding of regional transport systems that give priority to fulfilling the needs of transit-dependent users by increasing user fees on automobile travel.

#### States are uniquely situated to solve for transportation infrastructure.

Daniel Horowitz, Deputy Political Director at The Madison Project, January 19, 2012 ([Devolve Transportation Spending to States](http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/01/19/devolve-transportation-spending-to-states/) IHS = Interstate Highway system http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/01/19/devolve-transportation-spending-to-states/)

One of the numerous legislative deadlines that Congress will be forced to confront this session is the expiration of the 8th short-term extension of the 2005 surface transportation authorization law (SAFETEA-LU).  With federal transportation spending growing beyond its revenue source, an imbalance between donor and recipient states, inefficient and superfluous construction projects popping up all over the country, and burdensome mass transit mandates on states, it is time to inject some [federalism](http://www.redstate.com/derkrieger/2012/02/02/why-federalism/) into transportation spending. Throughout the presidential campaign, many of the candidates have expressed broad views of state’s rights, while decrying the expansion of the federal government.  In doing so, some of the candidates have expressed the conviction that states have the right to implement tyranny or pick winners and losers, as long as the federal government stays out of it.  Romneycare and state subsidies for green energy are good examples.  The reality is that states don’t have rights; they certainly don’t have the power to impose tyranny on citizens by forcing them to buy health insurance or regulating the water in their toilet bowels – to name a few.  They do, however, reserve powers under our [federalist](http://www.redstate.com/chrysostom15/2012/01/09/statist-means-federalist/) system of governance to implement legitimate functions of government.  A quintessential example of such a legitimate power is control over transportation and infrastructure spending. The Highway Trust Fund was established in 1956 to fund the Interstate Highway System (IHS).  The fund, which is administered by the DOT’s Federal Highway Administration, has been purveyed by the federal gasoline tax, which now stands at 18.4 cents per gallon (24.4 for diesel fuel).  Beginning in 1983, Congress began siphoning off some of the gas tax revenue for the great liberal sacred cow; the urban mass transit system.  Today, mass transit receives $10.2 billion in annual appropriations, accounting for a whopping 20% of transportation spending.  Additionally, the DOT mandates that states use as much as 10% of their funding for all sorts of local pork projects, such as bike paths and roadside flowers. As a result of the inefficiencies and wasteful mandates of our top-down approach to transportation spending, trust fund outlays have exceeded its revenue source by an average of $12 billion per year, even though the IHS – the catalyst for the gasoline tax – has been completed for 20 years.  In 2008, the phantom trust fund was bailed out with $35 billion in general revenue, and has been running a deficit for the past few years.  Congress has not passed a 6-year reauthorization bill since 2005, relying on a slew of short-term extensions, the last of which is scheduled to expire on March 31. Short-term funding is no way to plan for long-term infrastructure projects.  In their alacrity to gobble up the short-term money before it runs out, state and local governments tend to use the funds on small time and indivisible projects, such as incessant road repaving, instead of better planned long-term projects. It’s time for a long-term solution, one which will inject much-needed federalism and free-market solutions into our inefficient and expensive transportation policy. It is time to abolish the Highway Trust Fund and its accompanying federal gasoline tax.  Twenty years after the completion of the IHS, we must devolve all transportation authority to the states, with the exception of projects that are national in scope.  Each state should be responsible for its own projects, including maintenance for its share of the IHS.  Free of the burden of shouldering special interest pork projects of other states, each state would levy its own state gas tax to purvey its own transportation needs.  If a state wants a robust mass transit system or pervasive bike lanes, let the residents of that state decide whether they want to pay for it.  That is true federalism in action. The most prudent legislation that would transition responsibility for transportation spending back to the states is Rep. Scott Garrett’s STATE Act ([HR 1737](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/thomas)).  Under this legislation, all states would have the option to opt out of the federal transportation system and keep 16.4 cents of their federal gasoline tax contribution.  States would have the ability to use that money to raise their state gasoline tax and direct those funds more efficiently for their own needs.  States would be free to use the funds for vital needs, instead of incessant repaving projects that are engendered by short-term federal stimulus grants, and which cause unnecessary traffic juggernauts.  States could then experiment with new innovations and free-market solutions that open up infrastructure projects to the private sector.  The Tenth Amendment is not just a flag-waving principle; it works in the real world. It takes a lot of impudence on the part of the President to blame Republicans for crumbling infrastructure.  It is his support for a failed central government system that is stifling the requisite innovations that are needed to deal with state and local problems. There is no issue that is more appropriate for state solutions than transportation spending.  Every Republican member should co-sponsor the STATE ACT so we can put an end to three decades of flushing transportation down the toilet.  Also, with the news that Rick Perry will head up Newt Gingrich’s Tenth Amendment initiatives, this might be a good time to advocate for federalist solutions in transportation and infrastructure.  When Obama starts ascribing blame for our “crumbling infrastructure” during his State of the Union Address, Perry and Gingrich should use their megaphone to pin the blame on the donkey’s stranglehold over the transportation needs of states. With only two months until the authorization for the federal gas tax expires, most other proposals will only further entrench the power of the federal government.  [Call your members](http://clerk.house.gov/member_info/mcapdir.aspx) of Congress and ask them to co-sponsor Scott Garrett’s HR 1737 and stand for bold conservative solutions.

#### States can use a variety of sources to increase transportation funding

David Burwell, director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment and Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative, 2009 (with editorial assistance and additional writing and research by Darren Springer, Greg Dierkers, and Sue Gander at the NGA Center for Best Practices; Innovative State Transportation http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Each state is facing the challenges of rising demand and inadequate revenue to some degree. However, they each have unique needs and strategic goals and objectives. In states with less population and traffic density, certain user-fee solutions may not be as feasible as they would be in more densely populated states and regions. Governors are pursuing varied options to address these challenges, and states are pioneering new means of planning for and funding and financing transportation. Some states have worked to increase or index their motor fuel taxes to overcome purchasing power declines and to increase revenue for transportation projects. Some states also are increasing vehicle registration fees and looking to general fund revenues to fund transportation. More broadly, states are pursuing a number of innovative funding and financing options that also can help to reduce demand. Options that are discussed in this report include: • Debt financing strategies, including state infrastructure banks; • Tolling, vehicle miles traveled fees, congestion pricing, and other user fees; • Public-private partnerships that leverage private capital and expertise; and • Freight-specific strategies. Considering the magnitude of the challenge, many states will need to consider all of these options to meet their transportation needs. As states consider which solutions to pursue, a priority is examining funding and financing options that also reduce demand. High fuel prices provide an incentive for drivers to carpool, combine trips, reduce or eliminate unnecessary trips, and consider transit alternatives. However, to more effectively manage demand, states—in coordination with federal and local partners—can implement direct user fee systems such as congestion pricing (charging users a variable toll to use a road based on how congested it is). Such strategies provide additional incentives to users to reduce miles traveled, avoid peak period trips, and shift to alternative modes. Many states are also looking at ways to increase coordination between land use planning and transportation projects to help manage demand and ensure that transportation expenditures are consistent with state growth and development objectives.

### States 2NC Solvency Extensions

#### States can use User fees to fund transportation.

David Burwell, director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment and Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative, 2009 (with editorial assistance and additional writing and research by Darren Springer, Greg Dierkers, and Sue Gander at the NGA Center for Best Practices; Innovative State Transportation http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Tolling and Fees The use of tolls—a charge for passage across a bridge or along a road—to fund and finance transportation in the United States is older than the national highway system. While tolls currently provide only a small share of total transportation revenue, many states are revisiting the use of tolls to help generate needed revenue, address capacity expansion, and manage urban congestion. Complementary to tolling, states are exploring user fees: directly charging users for the time and point of access, miles driven, or even the parking spaces they use. As with tolls, these user fees can allow state and local officials to access private capital, leverage existing public assets, and price transportation facilities to encourage more efficient use of transportation assets. Innovative approaches to tolling and fees include enhanced use of traditional toll authorities, congestion pricing, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fees, and variable parking fees. Some of these approaches may not be as well-suited to less densely populated regions but could be more widely implemented in more densely populated regions. Enhancing Traditional Toll Authorities The most widely deployed user fees in the United States are tolls. Since the 1990s, several factors have led to resurgent interest in tolling. These include (1) revenues from fuel taxes rising more slowly than program costs, (2) widespread adoption of technological advances in electronic toll collection systems, and (3) the interest in pricing schemes to reduce demand and improve system performance by efficiently allocating scarce road space. In addition, tolling has the ability to leverage an early infusion of capital to advance major projects more quickly than with a pay-as-you-go strategy. While other nations rely heavily on toll revenues, in the United States, toll revenues represent only about 5 percent of total highway user fees and taxes. In contrast, toll revenues in Spain represent 46 percent of the road network budget. In Norway, the figure is 32 percent of the entire surface transportation budget, including metropolitan transit.56 While toll revenues fund only a small share of state transportation infrastructure, they remain widespread. Toll facilities in the United States account for nearly 5,100 miles of roads, bridges, and tunnels. There are currently 101 toll roads or bridges in the United States operated by 85 different regional, state, and local agencies or entities. Of these entities, 55 are special tollway, bridge, tunnel, or port authorities specifically designated for operating the facility. Nine are state departments of transportation, and 18 are local governments. Other entities include a parks authority and a public development corporation. In some U.S. metropolitan areas, regional agencies are responsible for the key highway facilities. They provide policy oversight for the facility and have the authority to set toll rates, sell bonds, and approve budgets and contracts, as well as a number of other responsibilities. For states with toll authorities, the use of toll revenues remains a key policy issue. About 90 percent of the toll revenue collected by toll agencies and entities is dedicated to the facility on which it is collected. Almost one-third of the revenue is spent on capital; one-quarter goes to operations, maintenance, and administration; one-third is for interest and bond retirement; and 11 percent is transferred elsewhere. Figure 5 describes the uses of revenues from tolled facilities. While bond covenants require that toll revenues be applied first to debt service and bond retirement, an increasing number of toll authorities are expanding the types of activities fundable with toll receipts. In addition some tolling entities operate more than just the toll facilities. In these entities the revenues are shared among the various operating entities and may be used for other state needs. In the New York City area, the regional Port Authority operates bridges, tunnels, bus terminals and bus lines, port facilities, and the main airports. In 2007, more than $15 million in revenue from the New Jersey Turnpike Authority was transferred to other public purposes.57 Another example of expanded use of toll revenues is the San Francisco Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) in California. BATA, created by the state in 1997, administers and collects and allocates the revenues from seven state-owned bridges. The authority, which shares the same governing board with the region’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, must prioritize the toll revenues to those bridges but it also can reprogram funds for other regional projects, including transit and roadway improvements. 58 As highlighted in Box 1, new tolling technology has helped enable wider deployment of such toll projects. In Texas, the Central Texas Turnpike Project uses tolls and a variety of bonding and credit enhancement tools to fund an entire system of multiuse corridors (e.g., road, transit, pipelines, broadband, etc.) located throughout the state.59 Because of the variety of uses for toll revenue, states are seeking to develop new toll projects. These projects tend to be on newly constructed facilities in fast-growing states and represent a large portion of major new highway mileage.i As such, Texas and Florida are among the leading states in building new tollways, with a combined 67 projects underway and 23 new projects in operation. States wishing to adopt new tolls often do so through legislation. According to the FHWA, state legislation to authorize toll roads share some common provisions: (1) creation of an authority or commission; (2) delineation of the district within which the entity operates; (3) details and legal issues about the entity’s governing board; (4) authority to issue bonds and to set and raise tolls; (5) the ability to invest bond proceeds to cover operating, maintenance, and repair obligations; and (6) constraints on the use of the funds.62 Congestion Pricing Congestion pricing is a relatively new tolling approach whereby roadway use is priced to reduce demand to most efficiently use the road’s capacity and to raise revenue. The core principle of congestion pricing is that the price of accessing available roadway capacity should be higher at the places and the times of day when demand for highways (and thus the benefit from using them) is greatest. If a bridge toll, for example, is raised during periods of highest congestion, travelers are more likely to delay less essential trips to off-peak hours, use less crowded alternate routes, use public transit, or form car pools.63 Congestion pricing has been adopted in some heavily congested U.S. metropolitan areas and is under consideration elsewhere. Variations include tolling the entire roadway (usually a bridge or tunnel), tolling one or more existing lanes (while remaining lanes remain untolled), tolling new capacity (one or more lanes), and imposing a “cordon fee” that charges any vehicle that enters a designated area, such as a city center. Benefits of congestion pricing include reducing demand at peak times, which in turn helps to extend the life of the existing infrastructure. For instance, the FHWA found that two congestion priced lanes can move the same amount of peak traffic three times as quickly as four untolled lanes.64 According to U.S. DOT, congestion pricing, if adopted in all areas of major congestion, could reduce the need for new roadway capacity by $20 billion.65 Additionally, U.S. DOT suggests that increased use of tolling could help states tap into up to an estimated $400 billion in private capital through the use of public-private partnerships (discussed further in the next chapter).66

#### Federal involvement in transportation bad: multiple reasons

Gabriel Roth civil engineer and transportation economist. He is currently a research fellow at the Independent Institute 2010 (http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0 Federal Highway Funding CATO Institute)

Today, gasoline taxes and other revenues flowing into the FHTF total about $36 billion annually. Congress spends the money on highways and many other activities, often inefficiently. The following sections discuss six disadvantages of federal highway financing, and thus indicate the advantages of devolving highway financing to the states and private sector. 1. Funds Used Inefficiently and Diverted to Lower-Priority Projects Federal aid typically covers between 75 and 90 percent of the costs of federally supported highway projects. Because states spend only a small fraction of their own resources on these projects, state officials have less incentive to use funds efficiently and to fund only high-priority investments. Boston's Central Artery and Tunnel project (the "Big Dig"), for example, suffered from poor management and huge cost overruns.21 Federal taxpayers paid for more than half of the project's total costs, which soared from about $3 billion to about $15 billion.22 Federal politicians often direct funds to projects in their states that are low priorities for the nation as a whole. The Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 1980s, "Tip" O'Neill, represented a Boston district and led the push for federal funding of the Big Dig. More recently, Representative Don Young of Alaska led the drive to finance that state's infamous "Bridge to Nowhere," discussed below. The inefficient political allocation of federal dollars can be seen in the rise of "earmarking" in transportation bills. This practice involves members of Congress slipping in funding for particular projects requested by special interest groups in their districts. In 1982, the prohibition on earmarks in highway bills in effect since 1914 was broken by the funding of 10 earmarks costing $362 million. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan vetoed a highway bill partly because it contained 121 earmarks, and Congress overrode his veto.23 Since then, transportation earmarking has grown by leaps and bounds. The 1991 transportation authorization bill (ISTEA) had 538 highway earmarks, the 1998 bill (TEA-21) had 1,850 highway earmarks, and the 2005 bill (SAFETEA-LU) had 5,634 highway earmarks.24 The earmarked projects in the 2005 bill cost $22 billion, thus indicating that earmarks are consuming a substantial portion of federal highway funding. The problem with earmarks was driven home by an Alaska bridge project in 2005. Rep. Don Young of Alaska slipped a $223 million earmark into a spending bill for a bridge from Ketchikan—with a population of 8,900—to the Island of Gravina—with a population of 50. The project was dubbed the "Bridge to Nowhere" and created an uproar because it was clearly a low priority project that made no economic sense. 2. Funds Diverted to Non-Highway Activities Since 1982, increasing amounts of revenues from the FHTF have been diverted to non-highway uses. The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 raised the federal gas tax by five cents, with one-fifth of the increase dedicated to urban transit. The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act substituted "flexibility" and "intermodalism" for the "dedication" of fuel taxes to highways. That wording change meant that any transportation-related activity could lay claim to highway money. Under the most recent highway authorization—SAFETEA-LU of 2005—transportation scholar Randal O'Toole figures that only about 59 percent of highway trust fund dollars will be spent on highways.25 Funds from the FHTF will go to mass transit (21 percent), earmarks (8 percent), and a hodge-podge of other activities such as bicycle paths (12 percent). Note, however, that some of the earmark funds will also go to highways. The main diversion is to rail transit, which can be a very inefficient mode of transportation, as discussed in a related essay. Most Americans do not use rail transit and should not have to subsidize expensive subways and rail systems in a small number of major cities that prohibit the use of more modern and effective transit methods, such as shared taxis. As the FHWA table (www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/safetea- lu\_authorizations.xls) indicates, Congress allocates highway money to truck parking facilities, anti-racial profiling programs, magnetic levitation trains, and dozens of other non-road activities. O'Toole finds that the House version of upcoming transportation authorization legislation would reduce the highway portion of FHTF spending to just 20 percent. It would add high-speed rail at 10 percent, fund transit at 20 percent, and provide about 50 percent of the funds to the states to spend on "flexible" projects and earmarks.26 3. Federal Intervention Increases Highway Costs The flow of federal funding to the states for highways comes part-in-parcel with top-down regulations. The growing mass of federal regulations makes highway building more expensive in numerous ways. First, federal specifications for road construction standards can be more demanding than state standards. But one-size-fits-all federal rules may ignore unique features of the states and not allow state officials to make efficient trade-offs on highway design. A second problem is that federal grants usually come with an array of extraneous federal regulations that increase costs. Highway grants, for example, come with Davis-Bacon rules and Buy America provisions, which raise highway costs substantially. Davis-Bacon rules require that workers on federally funded projects be paid "prevailing wages" in an area, which typically means higher union wages. Davis-Bacon rules increase the costs of federally funded projects by an average of about 10 percent, which wastes billions of dollars per year.27 Ralph Stanley, the entrepreneur who created the private Dulles Greenway toll highway in Virginia, estimated that federal regulations increase highway construction costs by about 20 percent.28 Robert Farris, who was commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Transportation and also head of the Federal Highway Administration, suggested that federal regulations increase costs by 30 percent.29 Finally, federal intervention adds substantial administrative costs to highway building. Planning for federally financed highways requires the detailed involvement of both federal and state governments. By dividing responsibility for projects, this split system encourages waste at both levels of government. Total federal, state, and local expenditures on highway "administration and research" when the highway trust fund was established in 1956 were 6.8 percent of construction costs. By 2002, these costs had risen to 17 percent of expenditures.30 The rise in federal intervention appears to have pushed up these expenditures substantially. 4. Funds are Misallocated Across States Some states persistently receive more federal highway funding than they pay into the federal Highway Trust Fund. The Federal Highway Administration publishes Highway Statistics each year, showing the amounts the fund receives from each state and the allocation paid to each state from the fund.31 Supporters of federal highway financing use these figures to demonstrate how supposedly beneficial the current system is to all states. However, the receipts-and-allocations data presented in Highway Statistics are misleading. The FHWA divides the dollar amounts of the apportionments and allocations for each state by the amount of revenue paid into the fund by each state. The result is a ratio that overstates the benefits of the federal highway system to individual states for a number of reasons: Interest. Larger amounts are taken out of the trust fund than paid in —in other words, the grand total ratio exceeds 100 percent. For the whole period 1956–2008, the excess from the FHTF was around 13 percent, and for 2008 it was 32 percent.32 The excess is the result of interest earned on the fund's balances. But the interest on unspent balances does not represent additional resources that the federal government provides to the states. Minimum guarantee. The 1998 TEA-21 legislation included a "minimum guarantee" that no state would receive less than 90.5 percent of the amount it paid into the trust fund. The 2005 SAFETEA-LU reauthorization raised the minimum guarantee to 92 percent. To implement the guarantee from 1998, $35 billion—16 percent of the total authorized—was set aside to increase the shares of those states that, under the traditional formulas, received less than 90.5 percent of what they paid into the fund. Yet some of this money also went to states that were already receiving more than they paid into the fund, thereby doing little to remedy prior disparities. As there was no such guarantee before 1998, this rule's effect on total distributions over time cannot be gauged from data provided by the Federal Highway Administration. Exclusion of Mass Transit Account and non-road uses. The FHWA data excludes payments that are transferred to the Mass Transit Account and to other non-road uses. As these make up over 30 percent of fuel tax revenues, the data from the FHWA overstate the benefits of the federal highway program. A better way of showing the inequities between the states is to compare each state's share of money taken out of the highway trust fund as a ratio of the share it paid in.33 If a state's receipts were 3 percent of the whole, and its contribution 2 percent, the share ratio would be 1.5. I have presented such calculations elsewhere and found that there are substantial winner and loser states from the Highway Trust Fund.34 Similarly, a recent analysis by Ronald Utt found that half of the states are shortchanged by the current highway trust fund allocations.35 The Congressional Research Service notes that struggles over recent highway bills have focused on these interstate inequities (rather than on ways to make federal expenditures more productive), with the donor states tending to be in the South and Midwest and the donee states tending to be in the Northeast, Pacific Rim, and West.36 Finally, note that these analyses do not take into account the increased costs in every state from federal regulations and administrative costs. If these were taken into account, road users in very few states would derive any net benefits from federal highway financing. 5. Private Solutions Are Discouraged By subsidizing the states to provide seemingly "free" highways, federal financing discourages the construction and operation of privately financed highways. A key problem is that users of private highways are forced to pay both the tolls for those private facilities and the fuel taxes that support the government highways. Another problem is that private highway companies have to pay taxes, including property taxes and income taxes, while government agencies do not. Furthermore, private highways face higher borrowing costs because they must issue taxable bonds, whereas public agencies can issue tax-exempt bonds. The Dulles Greenway is a privately financed and operated highway in Northern Virginia, which cost investors about $350 million to build.37 The Greenway must compete against nearby "free" state highways. It has been tough going, but the Greenway has survived for 15 years. Typical users of the Greenway pay 36 cents in federal and state gasoline taxes per gallon to support the government highways, plus they pay Greenway tolls, which range from $2.25 to $4.15 per trip for automobiles using electronic tolling.38 If the Greenway and other private highways were credited the amounts paid into state and federal highway funds, their tolls could be lowered and more traffic would be attracted to them. That would make better use of private capacity as it could develop in coming years and relieve congestion on other roads. Unfortunately, the proposed version of new highway legislation by the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure would add new federal regulatory barriers to toll roads in the states.39 Section 1204 of the bill would create a federal "Office of Public Benefit" to ensure "protection of the public interest in relation to highway toll projects and public-private partnership agreements on federal-aid highways." This new office would be tasked with reviewing and approving or disapproving proposed toll rate increases on these projects, among other interventionist activities. This would completely flip around the idea of road tolling as a decentralized market-based mechanism and turn it into a central planning mechanism. 6. Innovation Is Discouraged One of the promising advances to relieving urban congestion is High-Occupancy or Toll (HOT) highways. Networks of HOT lanes can be structured for use by vehicles with payment of variable tolls combined with buses at no charge. The tolls are collected electronically and set at levels high enough to ensure acceptable traffic conditions at all times. A current obstacle to expanding HOT lane programs is that it is difficult to add tolls to roads constructed with federal funds. The first HOT lanes in the United States were introduced in 1995 on California's State Route 91 near Anaheim. The California Private Transportation Company conceived, designed, financed, constructed, and opened two pairs of "express lanes" in the median of a 10-mile stretch of the highway.40 Express lane users pay tolls by means of identifiers, similar to those used by EZPass systems, with the payments debited electronically from accounts opened with the company. Following the lead of the private sector, California's public sector implemented a similar project on Route I-15 north of San Diego. It has also proven popular. The rates charged on the I-15 lanes are varied automatically in real time to respond to traffic conditions. HOT lanes have also been implemented in Denver and Minneapolis, and are planned for the Washington, D.C., area. Payments for the use of roads can now be made as easily as payments for the use of telephones, without vehicles having to stop. Such changes in payment methods can have profound effects on the management and financing of roads. If the federal government removed itself from highway financing, direct payments for road use could be made directly to state governments through tolls. These sorts of tolls are already in place in New York and New Jersey. An even better solution would be payment of tolls for road use directly to private highway companies, which would cut out government financing completely. This is now technically feasible. Following the success of the HOT lanes in Southern California, many other projects are being pursued across the country. One project is in Northern Virginia. Fluor-Transurban is building and providing most of the funding for HOT lanes on a 14-mile stretch of the Capital Beltway. Drivers will pay to use the lanes with electronic tolling, which will recoup the company's roughly $1 billion investment. HOT lane projects are attractive to governments because they can make use of existing capacity and because the tolls can pay for all or most of the costs.41 Such networks offer congestion-free expressways for those wanting to pay a premium price, in addition to reducing congestion on other roads and creating faster bus services. There are many exciting technological developments in highways, and ending federal intervention would make state governments more likely to seek innovative solutions. Technological advances—such as electronic tolling—have made paying for road services as simple as paying for other sorts of goods. In a world where a fuel tax that is levied on gasoline is an imperfect measure of the wear-and-tear each driver puts on roads, it is vital to explore better ways to finance highways.

### States 2NC AT: Perm

#### The perm sends a bad signal of federalism

#### A) They strike down the plan and still allow federal government action which destroys solvency.

#### B) The perm is cooperative federalism

Posner '98 (Paul L. Adjunct Professor at the Graduate Public Policy Program at John Hopkins University, The Politics of Unfunded Mandates: Whither Federalism)

Ironically, the very success state and local governments enjoy in modifying mandates helped legitimate the federal regulatory presence itself. Federal mandate programs were arguably strengthened and made more effective by promoting state and local cooperation in their implementation. State and local authority over the delivery of federally mandated programs were enhanced by it. However, the authority and autonomy of state and local governments over their own public services and values was ultimately undermined as federal programs have grown to encounter a growing share of state and local resources and legal authority. This confirms the validity of the inclusive authority or coercive federalism model discussed in Chapter 2. Participation in federal programs, although better than unilateral projection of federal power, does not protect the structural integrity of state and local governments from federal encroachment. The cooperative approach to mandates helped promote federalism values in choosing *how* to mandate, but it did not generally inform the decision about whether to mandate - a decision that may be best explained by the coercive model of federalism.

#### C) COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM IS A BAD SIGNAL AND DESTROYS SOLVENCY

Greve, PhD in Government at Cornell University,2000 (Michael S., Winter 70 Miss. L.J. 557, lexis)

As the intra-governmental conspiracy moves onward and upward, expanding political commitments produce further interdependencies and conflict. The ineluctable tendency is towards a pathology that German scholars and high-brow journalists call Politikverflechtung, meaning a political meshing or entanglement. n33 Political scientists and legal scholars have shown that cooperative federalism produces, first, a loss of transparency and, consequently, rising civic discontent. As government grows and the range of cooperative arrangements expands, transparency, accountability, and responsibility diminish exponentially. Second, cooperative federalism stifles political competition and, consequently, political innovation and economic growth. Germany's Financial Constitution, and in particular the commands to harmonize living conditions and to equalize financial resources across the various states, diminishes every state's incentive to improve its lot by providing a favorable economic climate. It systematically punishes wealthy, successful states, while rewarding the basket cases. n34 Finally, [\*568] cooperative federalism produces political paralysis. Instead of enhancing the states' autonomy, it rewards the most intransigent participant. In the end, every player becomes a holdout, and reform becomes impossible. Scholars, journalists, and leading politicians have tagged cooperative-federalist arrangements as a principal cause of Germany's Reformstau (reform jam, as in "traffic jam")--that is, Germany's inability to adjust its institutions and policies to the demands of a modern, global economy. n35

#### Perm still links: cooperative federalism is just code for federal control.

Glicksman 2006 [Robert Prof of law, University of Kansas, Wake Forest Law Review, Modern Federalism Issues And American Business: Article & Essay: From Cooperative To Inoperative Federalism: The Perverse Mutation Of Environmental Law And Policy 41 Wake Forest L. Rev. 719, pg LEXIS]

In recent years, various new state environmental programs have provided concrete evidence of the ability of the states to make meaningful contributions to environmental protection. These programs highlight the value of what Chris Schroeder has referred to as "the availability of concurrent governments capable of providing a meaningful forum for public concerns." n418 The existence of overlapping federal and state authority to adopt environmental protection programs allows citizens to have access to multiple forums for seeking government assistance in promoting the protection of health, safety, and the environment. n419 Despite the rise of environmental activism at the state level, the model of cooperative federalism reflected in federal environmental and natural resource management legislation has faltered, not flourished. On the one hand, the authority of the federal government (or the willingness of the federal government to exercise that authority) has declined as a result of the combined effects of the decisions of the courts, Congress, and federal administrative agencies. On the other hand, these same actors have placed significant obstacles in the path of state or local efforts to pick up the slack created by the federal government's withdrawal from its previous role as prime environmental policymaker. Through doctrines such as the dormant Commerce Clause, preemption, and regulatory takings, the federal courts have constrained the ability of state and local governments to achieve levels of environmental and resource protection that exceed those required by federal legislation. Congress has blocked supplemental state and local measures in some instances. Federal agencies have interpreted their enabling acts to have that effect even if the statutes do not explicitly so provide. Perhaps the most perverse trend of all completely turns cooperative environmental federalism on its head by delegating to the states the authority to carve out exceptions from federal environmental mandates.

### States 2NC AT: Theory

#### 1. COUNTER-INTERPRETATION: THE NEGATIVE GETS ONE COUNTERPLAN THAT TESTS A WORD IN THE PLAN WITH A NET BENEFIT WITH LITERATURE.

#### A) SOLVES ALL YOUR CLAIMS OF ABUSE: YOU CAN GENERATE OFFENSE AGAINST THE NET BENEFIT

#### B) KEY TO TOPIC SPECIFIC EDUCATION: IF WE CANNOT TEST THE AFF’S AGENT, WE LOSE CORE EDUCATION ON AN ENERGY TOPIC.

#### 2. LIT CHECKS -THERE'S LIT ABOUT MULTISTATE ENACTMENT OF UNIFORM LAWS, FROM INTERSTATE COMPACTS OR WATER SHARING OR GUN PERMITS TO INTERSTATE COORDINATION AND UNIFORM IMPLEMENTATION OF CHILD SUPPORT LAWS

#### 3. RECIPROCAL - AFF PLAN IMPLIES FIAT BETWEEN CONGRESS, EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, AND PRESUMED ACTIONS OF SUB AGENCIES AND LOWER FEDERAL COURTS UPHOLDING THE PLAN - ALL ASSUMED IMPLEMENTATING AGENTS

#### 4. KEY TO TESTING THE RESOLUTION - MULTISTATE ACTION IS CRITICAL TO TEST USFG IN THE RESOLUTION FORCING THEM TO JUSTIFY FEDERAL ACTION, ESPECIALLY ON AN ALTERNATIVE ENERGY TOPIC WHERE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN RELYING ON VOLUNTARY MEASURES FOR YEARS.

#### 5. CRITICAL TO NEG FLEX - BEING ABLE TO IMAGINE STATE IMPLEMENTATION IS CRITICAL TO NEG STRATS TO ATTACK THE PLAN AT MULTIPLE LEVELS.

#### 6. ERR NEG - STATES CPs ARE TRADITIONAL NEG GROUND ON DOMESTIC TOPICS - ALL THE CP TO ENABLE US TO BALANCE AFF BIASES LIKE SPEAKING FIRST AND LAST AND INFINITE PREP

#### 7. YOU DIDN’T LOSE ANY GOOD GROUND: INCENTIVES CREATE A STATE RACE TO THE TOP, NOT RACE TO THE BOTTOM, AND WE ENGAGED YOU ON THOSE TURNS.

#### 8. REJECT THE ARGUMENT NOT THE TEAM. NO IN ROUND ABUSE AND DON’T VOTE ON POTENTIAL ABUSE.

### States 2NC: AT: Links to Politics

#### Federal government policies blocked by partisanship, this is not the case with the states

Krane, 2007 [Dale, University of Nebraska at Omaha, “The Middle Tier in American Federalism: State Government Policy Activism During the Bush Presidency”, p.467-468]

To the four policy areas discussed, one could easily add many others such as anti- Iraq war resolutions, medical marijuana, state highway franchises, payday lending restrictions, human trafficking, junk food in schools, ‘‘windy-day’’ funds, and hospital report cards. This heightened level of state policy activity requires some explanation. Common to each of the state policy examples is bipartisan support in contrast to the highly factionalized political environment in Washington. The political divisions in the national capital are not solely the product of a classic ‘‘deadlock of democracy’’ associated with a government divided among the political parties (Burns 1963). Rather the policy gridlock has been caused by significant ideological differences among congressional Republicans that occur within each chamber as well as across the two institutions. While it is the case today that votes on the final version of legislation exhibit higher levels of party unity than in the past, nevertheless, powerful and successful opposition to many of Bush’s initiatives came from different groups within his party’s congressional delegation. It is, after all, in the mark-up sessions where most of the critical policy battles are waged. So, ‘‘although Republicans controlled all three branches of the federal government, this officially ‘unified’ government behaved as if it were a ‘divided’ government’’ (Krane 2004, 52). The Middle Tier in American Federalism 467 The polarization in Washington does not replicate itself automatically at the state level because state governments operate under constitutional constraints such as balanced budget and debt limit requirements that do not apply to the federal government. Further, the ‘‘culture wars’’ among party elites that play out on the national stage do not offer as much political gain at the state level where politics hews closer to middle-of-the road positions (Wolfe 1998; Fiorina, Abrams, and Pope 2005). Evidence for this can be seen in the states where the governor belongs to the minority political party—a ‘‘red’’ (i.e., Republican) governor in a ‘‘blue’’ (i.e., Democratic) state or a ‘‘blue’’ governor in a ‘‘red’’ state (Egan 2005). Governor Schwarzenegger (R-CA) labels his pragmatic mix of policy stances as ‘‘post-partisan,’’ and one can identify other governors who transcend traditional party positions—for example, Governor Elliot Spitzer (D-NY) (Steinhauer 2007). Pragmatism rather than polarization typifies state governments as compared to the current situation at the federal level. William Pound, executive director of the U.S. Conference of State Legislatures, asserts ‘‘In recent years as we have seen gridlock in Washington, you have seen the pressure building on the states to do something’’ (quoted in Steinhauer 2007). Too many observers of American federalism succumb to a ‘‘top-down’’ perspective which blinds one to its noncentralized institutional matrix that ‘‘. . . allows different political interests and organizations to pursue their policy objectives at different venues within the matrix created by the horizontal and vertical divisions of authority’’ (Dinan and Krane 2006, 365). When polarization at the national level limits the ability of groups to gain their policy preferences, they naturally will gravitate to state and local governments. State activism becomes more likely as Nathan and Derthick (1987) observed ‘‘when all or part of the national Government is controlled by conservatives, as it has been recently, people who seek to experiment in social policy are inclined to concentrate at the state level.’’

## 

## 1NC Federalism DA

#### Unique link: States are becoming more responsible for transportation; plan reverses current trends.

Bruce Katz, Vice-President and Director Metropolitan Policy Program, February 16, 2012 (Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz)

As the 2012 presidential election unfolds, and the debate over the future of the American economy comes into sharper relief, it is essential that both candidates articulate a federalist vision for economic renewal. While past federalist eras have been defined by their means—the way that different levels of government interact—the current economic imperative necessitates federalism that is defined by co-delivering particular ends, specifically a new vision for the national economy. Over the past three years, a growing chorus of business leaders and mainstream economists has embraced a post-recession growth model, a “next economy,” where the United States exports more and wastes less, innovates in what matters, produces more of what we invent and ensures that the economy actually works for working families. In summary terms, the next economy should be fuelled by innovation, to spur growth not only through idea generation but the virtuous interplay of invention, commercialization and manufacturing. It should increasingly be powered by low-carbon energy, to position the United States at the vanguard of the next, innovation-led industrial revolution. It should be driven by exports, to take advantage of rising global demand for quality products and services. And, it should be opportunity rich, so that working families can earn wages sufficient to attain a middleclass life. This ambitious macro vision largely comes to ground in the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas, which already generate more than three-quarters of the nation’s gross domestic product. These communities dominate economically, since they concentrate and agglomerate the innovative firms, talented workers, risk-taking entrepreneurs and supportive ecosystems of universities, community colleges and business associations that drive modern economies. While Washington dithers and delays, metros and their states are embracing the next-economy model and innovating in ways that build on their distinctive competitive assets and advantages: With federal innovation funding at risk, metros like New York and states like Ohio and Tennessee are making sizable commitments to attract innovative research institutions, commercialize research and grow innovative firms. With the future of federal trade policy unclear, metros like Los Angeles and Minneapolis/St. Paul and states like Colorado and New York are reorienting their economic development strategies toward exports, foreign direct investment and skilled immigration. With federal energy policy in shambles, metros like Seattle and Philadelphia are cementing their niches in energy-efficient technologies, and states like Connecticut are experimenting with Green Banks to help deploy clean technologies at scale. With federal transportation policy in limbo, metros like Jacksonville and Savannah and states like Michigan are modernizing their air, rail and sea freight hubs to position themselves for an expansion in global trade. What unites these disparate efforts are intentionality and purpose. After decades of pursuing fanciful illusions (becoming “the next Silicon Valley”) or engaging in copycat strategies, states and metros are deliberately building on their special assets, attributes and advantages, using business planning techniques honed in the private sector. The bubbling of state and metro innovation is pervasive and viral—crossing political, regional, jurisdictional and sectoral lines. It offers an affirmative and practical counterpoint to a Washington that has increasingly become hyper-partisan and overly ideological and gives the next President an opportunity to engage states and metropolitan areas as true, working partners in the quest to restructure the economy.

#### India is modeling US federalism now.

William J. Antholis managing director of the Brookings Institution and a senior fellow in Governance Studies January 24, 2012 (In India, Two States, but One Nation http://www.brookings.edu/up-front/posts/2012/01/24-india-state-antholis)

But in a continent-wide federation, national identity is almost a requirement. Secession becomes much less likely when identity no longer conforms directly with geography. The rights of minorities — religious, ethnic, economic— can be less easily cast aside. So it just may be that India is now comfortable enough with a national identity that it is allowing local voices to flourish. That was James Madison's vision for the U.S. Constitution in his Federalist Paper #10. Madison called for a continent-wide republic that would prevent hostile local "factions" (that is, state governments) either from oppressing or from seceding. America’s challenge was that we started out with exceptionally strong states. Despite a common language and cultural heritage, as well as a short but sturdy constitution, our major flaw was that we lacked a national government. Madison wanted to shift some power from the states to the national government, but then in turn limit that central government with the separation of powers. This included incorporating the echo of federalism in our Senate — equal representation for each state, regardless of size. Keep in mind, at the founding, Senators were elected by state legislatures. They were seen as Ambassadors to Washington. The downsides of America’s “strong states” federalism have been obvious. The unresolved tension between the Federal government and the states was only finally settled by a terrible civil war. And even after the war, the Senate has been the “cooling saucer” (in Madison’s phrase), giving small states leverage in legislation—especially treaties. That has limited America’s ability to act on a range of national and international priorities. But the positives also should not be forgotten. Strong state governments have left a legacy of local control that has led to (relatively) productive city and state political systems. States are the laboratories of democracy. And they groom national leaders in both political parties. India is now experimenting with moving in that direction. Fearing secession, oppression and civil war, Nehru built a very strong and authoritative central state. Now, after six decades of mosaics and cultural melting, the question is not whether to empower states. The question is how, when, and over what issues should authority be returned to Indian states and cities.

#### Federalism key to resolve Kashmir crisis

Rafiq Dossani Senior Research Scholar at The Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University. and Srinidhi Vijaykumar 2009 (Indian Federalism and the Conduct of Foreign Policy in Border States: State Participation and Central Accommodation since 1990 Domestic Politics and Indian Foreign Policy, A. Mattoo and H Joseph (eds), New Delhi: Routledge, 2009)

The issue of Kashmiri autonomy has long been a central concern of both Indian and Pakistani foreign policy. The two countries have fought three wars over the region in the past half century since independence. The people of Kashmir began to play an increasingly important role in the conflict in the 1980s. Before this point, the conflict in Kashmir was generally associated with cross-border infiltration from Pakistan and denial of democratic processes by India—both external factors. Since the mid 1980s, however, the Kashmiri conflict has assumed an internal dimension, as insurgents within the state have waged guerrilla war, and various factions have called for independence. In the past decade, separatists’ groups demanding independence from the Indian Union have been on the rise, along with others who demand a return to pre-1953 levels of autonomy. Kashmir has only recently, in 2002, had what most cite as its first fair and free elections since 1987. These have facilitated a more ‘federal’ relationship, instead of one in which the center exercises direct rule or rule by proxy. James Manor (1998), in his article about the viability of the Indian federalist system, argues that one of the principal reasons that relations between New Delhi and the states have tended to remain manageable is the existence of political institutions that ‘can still make the politics of bargaining work’. He points out that ‘Political competition has a number of different outlets. Not only are there elections for national and state legislative assemblies; there are also positions of influence available in three tiers of decentralized, elected councils, and in numerous quasi-official boards, cooperatives. ...The existence of so many opportunities to capture at least some power persuades parties and politicians to remain engaged with elections and logrolling, even when they are defeated in some arenas’ (op.cit.:23). This lack of political competition characterized elections in Jammu and Kashmir between 1987 and 2002. Previously, there had been no viable alternative to the National Conference (NC), which was backed by the center. In the 2002 elections, the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) performed well and, in alliance with the Congress party, formed the government, taking over from the NC.13 Despite the boycott of the elections by the independence-seeking Hurriyat and other parties, it finally seemed that democracy was at work.

#### Kashmir conflict results in nuclear extinction

Ghulam Nabi Fai Executive Director, Kashmiri American Council, 2001 (Washington Times, 7-8)

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe.

### Federalism Uniqueness

#### Obama has reversed the tide in favor of states rights: now is the crucial time to decide federalism’s future.

Peter Harkness founder and publisher emeritus of GOVERNING, former editor and deputy publisher of the Congressional Quarterly news service.,2012 (January, What Brand of Federalism Is Next?, Potomac Chronicle, http://www.governing.com/columns/potomac-chronicle/gov-col-what-brand-of-federalism-is-next.html)

In Governing’s first issue almost 25 years ago, John Herbers, who had just retired as a national correspondent for The New York Times, wrote a cover story heralding the advent of a largely unplanned, unpredicted new federalism, where more responsibility and authority were being devolved down to the states and their localities as the Reagan administration reduced the federal imprint on American governance. State and local management capacity had improved substantially, he wrote, since Washington had relied on those bureaucracies to manage federal money rather than expand its own. States and localities raised as much in new taxes as the administration had cut. And perhaps most surprising in the context of what we are experiencing today, there had been “a sharp decline in ideological or partisan divisions among state and local public officials, a result of the growing belief among Democrats and Republicans alike that certain public outlays for social and economic programs are likely to save money in the long run.” Indeed, coming out of the recession of 1980-82, states in the subsequent four years grew their revenues by one-third, to $228 billion. And that didn’t include mushrooming cash inflows from nontax sources like lotteries, which had expanded into a majority of the states. Because the national economy was humming along quite nicely and the tax base had significantly expanded, state and local governments experienced what would be an almost three-decade run of solid increases in tax revenue -- interrupted slightly by two mild recessions. The political side of it didn’t go quite as Herbers had imagined. Many states took a leadership role on national policy matters from the time Governing launched through the end of the Clinton presidency in January 2001. The most prominent trophy on their mantel probably was the national welfare reform law in 1996 that grew out of programs started by Republican governors in Michigan and Wisconsin. Relations with the feds during that period were sometimes a bit rocky, but there was little doubt that Washington and the country were headed in the same general direction. The surprise came later, with the election of the George W. Bush administration, which showed no interest in following the traditional conservative, states-rights script. What followed was the No Child Left Behind education law, the Real ID Act, a wave of pre-emptions of state regulations and thinly disguised mandates (which supposedly had been banned). Meanwhile, the White House Office of Intergovernmental Affairs was a sham -- a purely political operation manned by junior staffers whose sole interest was promoting the administration’s policies rather than working with state or local officials. Washington lobbyists pushed for more centralization, with the idea that their industries could cut a better deal at the federal level and avoid a patchwork of statutes and regulations. It was what Don Borut, executive director of the National League of Cities, called “coercive federalism,” or when he was being more blunt, “shift-and-shaft federalism.” Plenty has changed since the Bush years, of course. The Great Recession has weakened the revenue base of most states and localities, and a rising tide of partisanship and ideological rigidity has swamped both Washington and many of the states. The mixture has been toxic. In this atmosphere, the Obama administration has pursued a very unique mixture of collaborative and coercive strategies in dealing with states and localities, making it hard to define just what kind of federalism we’re seeing. The health-care, education and financial regulation reform bills, the climate change proposal and the massive financial stimulus bill all represented an aggressive use of federal power, some of it unprecedented and some pre-empting state regulations. But there was a difference: Collaboration and sensitivity to state prerogatives was built into the mix. In an analysis in the publication Publius by political scientists Paul Posner and Tim Conlan of George Mason University, the authors noted that “the most significant feature of Obama’s approach to intergovernmental relations thus far may be his hybrid model of federal policy innovation and leadership, which mixes money, mandates and flexibility in new and distinctive ways.” Under this “nuanced federalism,” plenty of carrots are mixed in with the sticks. Even with the health-care reform plan, they noted, progressive states were allowed to exceed minimum federal standards and conservative ones could avoid participating in almost any facet of the system, using the feds as a backstop. By most accounts, both from the federal officials who ran it and the state and local officials they worked with, the massive Recovery Act stimulus effort was an extraordinarily successful collaboration between all three levels of government. States enjoyed unusual flexibility in how they spent much of the billions in funding the act provided, and Washington was able to rely on a state and local infrastructure to get the cash out the door fast. So what brand of federalism will we see next? Will it be the kind John Herbers foresaw as Governing was launched? Or will a mixture of this crippling recession, massive cutbacks in discretionary federal spending, and continued political dysfunction at the national and state levels render the system paralyzed? I’m hoping for the former, but can’t say that I’m too optimistic.

#### Obama increasing federalism now.

Bruce Katz, Vice-President and Director Metropolitan Policy Program, February 16, 2012 (Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz)

The time for remaking federalism could not be more propitious. With Washington mired in partisan gridlock, the states and metropolitan areas are once again playing their traditional roles as “laboratories of democracy” and centers of economic and policy innovation. An enormous opportunity exists for the next president to mobilize these federalist partners in a focused campaign for national economic renewal. Given global competition, the next president should adopt a vision of collaborative federalism in which: the federal government leads where it must and sets a robust platform for productive and innovative growth via a few transformative investments and interventions; states and metropolitan areas innovate where they should to design and implement bottom-up economic strategies that fully align with their distinctive competitive assets and advantages; and a refreshed set of federalist institutions maximize results by accelerating the replication of innovations across the federal, state and metropolitan levels. Current State: Obama Federalism and the Republican Response Our federal republic diffuses power among different layers of government and across disparate sectors of society. States are the key constitutional partners, because they have broad powers over such market-shaping policy areas as infrastructure, innovation, energy, education and skills training. But other sub-national units, particularly major cities and metropolitan areas, are also critical, because they concentrate and agglomerate the assets that drive prosperity and share governance with economy-shaping actors in the corporate, civic, university and other spheres. Against this backdrop, federalism has always been a living, ever-evolving practice, a dynamic rather than static arrangement. Alice Rivlin charted three different phases of federalism in her path-breaking 1992 book Reviving the American Dream: From 1789 to about 1933, all levels of government were small by modern standards, but the states were clearly more important than the federal government, except possibly in time of war. Moreover, the two levels of government usually ran on separate tracks, each in control of its own set of activities. Scholars called the arrangement “dual federalism.” From the Great Depression through the 1970s, all levels of government expanded their activities, but power shifted to Washington. The federal government took on new responsibilities, and the distinction between federal and state roles faded. Scholars talked about “cooperative federalism.” By the beginning of the 1980s, the drive for centralization had peaked, and power began shifting back to state capitals. No new concept emerged of how responsibilities should be divided. The current era has been called a period of “competitive federalism,” meaning the federal government and the states are competing with each other for leadership in domestic policy. During each of these periods, federalism was at the center of national political discourse: analyzed, debated, labeled and litigated. President Roosevelt’s grand battles with the Supreme Court in 1937 were essentially over federalist divisions of power. President Nixon used the term “New Federalism” to describe his ambitious mix of agency formation, program consolidation and management reforms. One of President Reagan’s earliest acts was to create a Presidential Advisory Committee on Federalism that included governors, state legislators, mayors, county officials and members of the U.S. House and Senate. As befits a former law professor, President Obama’s approach to federalism is studied and multi-dimensional, defying simple categorization. On one level, the severity of the economic crisis required aggressive federal action to, among other things, stimulate the economy, mitigate the fiscal impact of the Great Recession on states and localities, rescue the auto sector and provide a new regulatory regime for the financial industry. The first 18 months of the administration rivaled the New Deal in the economic scope and reach of federal actions. Beyond the urgent economic response, however, the Obama approach to federalism has been situational, bold and directional in some areas of domestic policy, permissive and supportive in others. The Race to the Top effort in elementary and secondary education shows President Obama at his most ambitious. States were asked to compete for a comparatively tiny amount of federal education resources. In exchange for these funds, states were required to undertake a series of significant and controversial undertakings: raise the caps on charter schools; use one of four prescribed strategies to improve the performance of low-achieving schools; and develop promotion standards for teachers based on student achievement. Race to the Top is a clear example of how the carrot of federal spending can reinvent how states carry out a critical role of government. Tennessee, New York, Florida and Ohio won competitive grants in the range of $400 million to $700 million, awards that are a mere fraction of these state’s annual education budgets, which range from $5.2 billion to $19.4 billion. This provides a new twist on the conventional notion of state innovation. As Marcia Howard, executive director of Federal Funds Information for States stated, “Rather than states being the laboratories of democracy [by] themselves, some of them will become the federal government’s laboratories of democracy.” In other areas of domestic policy, President Obama has used a softer, more subtle touch. On the programmatic front, President Obama has worked to enable states and localities to tackle structural challenges in integrated ways. The administration’s Sustainable Communities Initiative—a partnership among the Department of Transportation, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)— has, for example, given cities and metropolitan areas resources, information and tools to make sharper connections between housing, transportation and environmental resources. On regulatory matters, President Obama has used federal actions to set a “floor rather than a ceiling” on a range of consumer protection, clean energy and environmental matters. This has left room for the states to innovate on auto emission standards in California, for example, and to seek redress for mortgage abuses through the States Attorney Generals. To date, President Obama’s approach to economic restructuring has tended toward the more permissive, enabling end of the federalist spectrum. The administration has, for example, set a national goal of doubling exports, but it has not sought to influence the way states organize themselves to engage globally. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act made sizable investments in the clean economy but left states and localities alone to set their own platforms for clean economy growth. Other efforts to catalyze and leverage regional innovation clusters, using competitive grant programs, have been relatively small in size and scope.

### Federalism Links

#### The plan is an unconstitutional assertion of federal authority in transportation.

William D. Duncombe Professor, Public Administration and International Affairs, Syracuse University and Yilin Hou Professor of Public Finance, University of Georgia, 2010 (http://ssrn.com/abstract=1744123 SUBSTANTIATION OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE– Patterns of Governance and Public Finance in Development: An Analytical Comparison of the United States and China)

There is little doubt that growth in transportation infrastructure and economic growth were strongly linked in the U.S. over the last two centuries. All three levels of government have played an important role in shaping the expansion of transportation systems. Three key elements characterize the transportation infrastructure investment process in the U.S. First, there has been a lack of federal and state government infrastructure planning linked to economic development planning. The planning that has occurred, such as the emergence of highway planning in the last century, tends to be focused more narrowly on one transportation mode. Second, the federal government has had to take a more limited role in the expansion of infrastructure because of concerns about unconstitutional expansion of federal power. Instead, the federal government has tended to influence infrastructure decisions through the use of federal grants and regulations of specific transportation modes. Third, the financing of infrastructure has often evolved in a haphazard fashion which resulted in significant inefficiencies and waste. Differences in financing mechanisms by mode of transportation has created price distortions which has lead to inefficient allocation of government resources. In particular, several recent reports have highlighted the underinvestment in railroads relative to highways because of the differences in financing mechanisms (Transportation Research Board 2009; National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission 2007).

#### Transportation federalism increasing now due to declining federal funding.

David Burwell, director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment. 2007 (with editorial support from Darren Springer, John Ratliff, and Joanna Liberman Turner. Environment, Energy & Natural Resources February, 2007 State Policy Options for Funding Transportation financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/Background Documents/0702transportation.pdf)

Although transportation finance is a responsibility distributed among all levels of government, it is possible that with the completion of the major highway construction programs of the last half of the twentieth century, the federal role in financing new capital construction will level off or even recede. However, the need continues to grow for construction of new transportation facilities, system integration, and reconstruction of the built system itself. With increasing financing needs and a receding federal commitment to meeting those needs, transportation finance will most likely become a more prominent state policy issue in the future.

#### States are increasing their responsibility for transportation.

David Burwell, director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment. 2007 (with editorial support from Darren Springer, John Ratliff, and Joanna Liberman Turner. Environment, Energy & Natural Resources February, 2007 State Policy Options for Funding Transportation financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/Background Documents/0702transportation.pdf)

States face two significant and immediate challenges with respect to transportation finance. First, investment is insufficient to meet demand. A recent National Chamber Foundation of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce study estimates that $222 billion (2005 dollars) in public investment in highways and transit is needed annually simply to maintain our current surface transportation system. Present total annual investment in the system is about $177 billion, far short of that amount. Moreover, the Chamber study estimates that an annual public investment of $288 billion (2006 dollars) is needed to advance the system to a level that enhances the nation’s economic productivity. Estimates of future transportation needs are even higher.1 Second, there are concerns that in the near future federal policy may shift away from grant support to the states for transportation. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that the growth in entitlement programs, as the baby boom generation ages, requires “a fundamental reexamination of all federal programs, including those for highways,” and it predicts that federal grant assistance for transportation may decline or even terminate in the future.2 The GAO has even questioned “whether a federal role is still needed, whether program funding can be better linked to performance, and whether program constructs are ultimately sustainable.”3 Given these constraints, the prospects for future inflation-adjusted increases in federal transportation assistance are uncertain. The federal-state partnership in transportation finance is entering a period of transition. In the future, states may bear more responsibility for funding transportation systems. While the states and other stakeholders continue to work to determine the appropriate federal role in transportation finance, states can use new financing tools, as well as federal policies allowing (and even encouraging) states to impose tolls on federal-aid highways and bridges to meet some of their transportation finance needs. These new financing tools and tolling strategies can help manage highway capacity, fight congestion, and improve total system performance. In addition, a variety of demand-side strategies are available to help states reduce their financing needs by diffusing demand across the entire transportation network, taking trips off congested facilities, and managing transportation for a broader array of societal outcomes. Among the tools at states’ disposal to address demands for increased transportation capacity are the following: • Tax-based strategies for increasing revenue. • Tolls and road-pricing strategies. • Debt financing. • Asset leases. • Strategies to shift transportation finance responsibilities to other levels of government. • Strategies to reduce the growth in travel demand. It is not within the scope of this Issue Brief to discuss what role the federal government should play in transportation finance. This Issue Brief is intended to provide information and policy options to governors and states, based on current policy trends. Background—The Changing State and Federal Relationship Responsibility for construction, operation, and maintenance of our national transportation network of highways, transit facilities, ports, airports, passenger rail, and nonmotorized transportation (bicycle and pedestrian facilities) is distributed across federal, state and local governments. States and localities play the largest role, both in system finance and in terms of owning and managing highway, road, and bridge networks, as well as some transit, port, airport, and commuter rail facilities. In 2004, of the approximately $177 billion in public funds spent on highway and transit facilities at all levels of government, states revenues represented 52 percent of expenditures; federal grants 28 percent; local governments and special tax districts generated 15 percent; and toll facilities (some of which are state owned) 5 percent.4 Federal transportation assistance is financed primarily through the federal gasoline tax.5 The most recent federal surface transportation authorization, enacted in August 2005, provides $284.6 billion in federal transportation grant assistance over five years,6 a spending increase of approximately 30 percent over the previous authorization. However, few new revenue sources were added in this law. The result is that the federal Highway Trust Fund is projected to run a deficit by 2009. This deficit could be covered either by (1) higher federal gas taxes to replenish the Fund, or (2) additional funding from the general account. Given the constraints on the federal budget mentioned above, the states likely will bear an increasing share of the responsibility for financing future transportation needs. States are already taking steps to address a potentially decreasing federal role in transportation finance, but they face several challenges in making this transition. Higher state match levels will likely be required, as federal grant funding for the federal-aid system declines.7 There may be more system bottlenecks across all modes as congestion increases, especially in metropolitan areas, where 79 percent of the U.S. population lives.8 Another challenge is the growing need for system reconstruction, as the Interstate Highway System reached its 50-year anniversary in 2006. Land costs are rising rapidly, and construction and materials costs are both rising faster than the rate of inflation. As costs for maintenance are rising, transportation investments are offering reduced productivity gains, which have declined from more than 20 percent annually in the 1960s to less than 5 percent in the 1990s. In addition, there is legislative and popular resistance to both new state and local fuel taxes and transportation fees such as tolls, especially absent assurance that increased expenditures will significantly improve system performance. Finally, states face reduced buying power as a result of slower growth of gasoline tax revenues, as automakers increase fuel efficiency and offer vehicles using alternative fuels.

### Federalism AT: governors want the plan

#### Governors want flexibility.

National Governors Association May 11, 2012 (May 11, 2012 letter - Surface Transportation Reauthorization http://www.nga.org/cms/home/federal-relations/nga-letters/economic-development--commerce-c/col2-content/main-content-list/may-11-2012-letter----surface-tr.html

**Program Reforms and Project Streamlining**. Governors believe that reforming and restructuring federal transportation programs may improve them provided it preserves core federal programs and limits federal requirements that preempt state flexibility. We support provisions to streamline project delivery that reduce approval and completion times and improve efficiencies, but also achieve the intent underlying critical environmental, planning and design, and procurement reviews. Governors acknowledge the commitment from Congress to implement outcome-oriented performance measures throughout the programs governed under a new federal surface transportation authorization. We urge conferees to approach performance measures as an opportunity for intergovernmental partnership, not top-down mandates, because many states already apply state-specific measures to assess performance. Governors believe that states, not the federal government, should establish specific performance targets that track national goals, and that performance metrics must be clear, measurable, customer-focused, and attainable. We look forward to working closely with all conferees to help advance a new authorization that delivers a comprehensive national strategy for surface transportation infrastructure. A cooperative intergovernmental partnership is critical to the success of our nation’s surface transportation system.

### Federalism Impacts: India extension

#### India models US federalism: History proves

Grandle 3 [J.D. Washington College of Law, 2003 Brooke B.,– American University, “Choosing to Help or to Advance Their Agenda,” 24 Women's Rights L. Rep. 83, Summer, Lexis]

One source of inspiration for the Indian Constitution was the United States, 150 although India made several key decisions that significantly distinguish the two Constitutions and resulting forms of government. India adopted the idea of a Supreme Court from the United States and also decided to create three branches of federal government like the United States. However, India incorporated a bicameral parliamentary government modeled after Great Britain. 151 An additional significant difference with the United States is the strong centrist nature of the Indian federal government. India is also a federal system with power divided between the state and national levels. 152 However, the Indian governing system is a strong centrist system where unity is considered necessary to keep all components together. 153 Unlike the United States where residuary power is vested in the states, the Indian Constitution gives residuary power to the Parliament. 154

Indian Federalism key to conflict prevention and management  
Indo Asian News, 2007 [India to host grand global meet on federalism L/N, Nov. No Author Given]

New Delhi, Nov. 1 -- From heads of state and government to experts and activists, around 1,000 people from the world will take part in an international conference on federalism here next week. Conference leaders say the Nov 5-7 meet - the fourth in a series organised by the Canada-based Forum of Federations - will provide a platform for exchanges of ideas that can prove useful to countries in turmoil such as Sri Lanka. For a country where federalism as a concept has proved greatly successful, the Indian contingent will include Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Enhanced Coverage LinkingPrime Minister Manmohan Singh, -Search using: Biographies Plus News News, Most Recent 60 Days Congress president Sonia Gandhi, opposition leader L.K. Advani and Home Minister Shivraj Patil. "The most important thing is it provides a unique learning event - from practitioners, for practitioners," Rupak Chattopadhyaya of Forum of Federations told IANS. "They come together to share each other's experience." Among the foreign participants will be Presidents Micheline Calmy-Rey of Switzerland and Ahmed Abdallah M. Sambi of Comoros, Vice President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria and Prime Minister Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia, which is to hold the fifth edition of the International Conference on Federalism. There will be high-level teams from Bosnia, Canada, Germany, Mexico, Austria besides Pakistan and Nepal. Iraq, Sudan, Malaysia, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Libya and the United Arab Emirates will also be taking part. Sri Lanka, where a Tamil homeland campaign raging since 1983 refuses to end, is sending two senior cabinet ministers, Mahinda Samarasinghe and Rauff Hakeem. Two Tamil politicians will also attend: K. Vigneswaran and Gajendran Ponnambalam. Another Sri Lankan minister, Tissa Vitharana, who is battling against tremendous odds to evolve a national consensus on a power sharing formula, may also come. "The Indian experience is very important in federalism," said Chattopadhyaya. "India is seen as an emerging economy. But Indian federalism is the real success story of the last 60 years." Amaresh Singh, deputy secretary in the home ministry, which is coordinating the event, said federal form of governance as an idea was in vogue today. "Countries that practice federalism constitute 40 percent of the global population. Now we have this concept being looked into by countries in turmoil. The conference provides a place to learn from each other's experiences." There will be a total of 35 sessions when government leaders, administrators, scholars, experts and activists will have intense discussions on federalism and better governance. "The objective is to promote a dialogue on the renewal and development of federalism and greater cooperation among practitioners of federalism in pursuit of good governance," an Indian official explained.

### Impacts: Economy Module

#### Federalism key to economy.

Bruce Katz, Vice-President and Director Metropolitan Policy Program, February 16, 2012 (Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz)

At the most basic level, the U.S. needs more jobs— 12.1 million by one estimate—to recover the jobs lost during the downturn and keep pace with population growth and labor market dynamics. Beyond pure job growth, the U.S. needs better jobs, to grow wages and incomes for lower- and middle-class workers and reverse the troubling decades-long rise in inequality. To achieve these twin goals, the U.S. needs to restructure the economy from one focused inward and characterized by excessive consumption and debt, to one globally engaged and driven by production and innovation. It must do so while contending with a new cadre of global competitors that aim to best the United States in the next industrial revolution and while leveraging the distinctive assets and advantages of different parts of the country, particularly the major cities and metropolitan areas that are the engines of national prosperity. This is the tallest of economic orders and it is well beyond the scope of exclusive federal solutions, the traditional focus of presidential candidates in both political parties. Rather, the next President must look beyond Washington and enlist states and metropolitan areas as active co-partners in the restructuring of the national economy. Remaking the economy, in essence, requires a remaking of federalism so that governments at all levels “collaborate to compete” and work closely with each other and the private and civic sectors to burnish American competitiveness in the new global economic order.

#### Nuclear war

The Baltimore Examiner 9 [“Will this recession lead to World War II,” 2/26, http://www.examiner.com/x-3108-Baltimore-Republican-Examiner~y2009m2d26-Will-this-recession-lead-to-World-War-III]

Could the current economic crisis affecting this country and the world lead to another world war? **The answer may be found by looking back in history**. One of the causes of World War I was the economic rivalry **that existed between the nations of Europe. In the 19th century France and Great Britain became wealthy through colonialism and the control of foreign resources. This forced other up-and-coming nations (such as Germany) to be more competitive in world trade which led to rivalries and ultimately, to war**. After the Great Depression ruined the economies of Europe in the 1930s, fascist movements arose to seek economic and social control. **From there fanatics like Hitler and Mussolini took over Germany and Italy and led them both into World War II. With most of North America and Western Europe currently experiencing a recession**, will competition for resources and economic rivalries with the Middle East, Asia, or South American cause another world war? Add in nuclear weapons and Islamic fundamentalism and things look even worse. Hopefully the economy gets better before it gets worse and the terrifying possibility of World War III is averted. However sometimes history repeats itself.

### Impacts: Russia module

#### RUSSIA IS CENTRALIZING CONTROL NOW, AND THIS WILL SPLIT RUSSIA AND CAUSE CIVIL WAR. U.S. FEDERALISM SIGNAL IS MODELED AND SOLVES.

TALBOTT, 4 (Strobe, president of the Brookings Institution and deputy US secretary of state from 1994-2001, "The strains of Putin's Clampdown," Financial Times, 9/27, l/n)

Mr Putin is attempting a Russian version of the Chinese model, strengthening political controls while opening the country up to market forces. He - and Russia - may not be able to have it both ways. Economic and political freedom are inextricably linked. A genuine rule-of-law society, which is a precondition for economic progress, requires a system of checks and balances that is impossible when power is concentrated in one office. If Russia is to survive as a unitary state, it must resume its development as a federal and democratic one. The essence of democratic federalism is maximum self-governance at the local or provincial level. People are more likely to respect - and obey - authority if they feel it reflects their interests and is invested in leaders they have chosen. Federalism makes a virtue of diversity. Russia is vastly diverse. The tsars and the commissars tried to impose unity and order by a more brutal version of the methods Mr Putin is now applying. They failed, and so may he. The proximate cause for the recent crisis is the decade-old war in Chechnya. Mr Putin hopes to restore Moscow's writ over Chechnya and prevent other actual or potential secessionists from following the Chechens' lead. On the first score, it is hard to imagine that Chechnya will ever again, in any meaningful sense, be governed by Moscow. Whether it is too late for Ingushetia, Dagestan, Karachaevo-Cherkessia and other corners of Russia's North Caucasus that are not yet household words - whether Russians' nightmare of their country going the way of the Soviet Union comes true - depends on how long Mr Putin's misguided experiment in hyper-centralisation lasts. That, in turn, could depend, in some measure, on what Mr Putin hears from other leaders, especially fellow members of the Group of Eight - and most of all from his counterpart in the White House. While Mr Putin is representative of a widespread Russian resistance to westerners' "preaching", he still wants to be treated as a full member of this club of leading democracies, and he regards the US as its de facto chairman. Officials in Moscow say that, despite muted criticism from Washington, the policy of the Bush administration is more "understanding" than that of the European Union. Mr Bush's UN speech confirmed their satisfaction on that score. The west has a huge stake in how Russian democracy evolves in the coming years. If we learned nothing else from the 20th century, it is that the nature of Russia's internal regime determines its external behaviour. A Russia that rules its own people by force and edict rather than consent and enfranchisement is virtually certain, sooner or later, to intimidate its neighbours and to make itself one of the world's problems rather than a contributor to their solution.

#### Russian civil war leads to nuclear war with the US

Steven R. David, Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, Foreign Affairs Jan 1999

Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

### AT: Environment Impact turn

#### States use incentives now to encourage alternative energy

Diane Rahm, 2006, Public Administration Professor, University of Texas @ San Antonio, Sustainable Energy and the States: essays on politics, markets and leadership, ed. D. Rahm, p. 11

The states have, over the course of the last several decades, established an array of programs to advance renewable energy, conservation, and energy efficiency. Although the programs established by the states differ from one state to the next, most states have put in place an array of financial incentives, regulations, and subsidies to support renewable energy, conservation, and energy efficiency.

#### Most species survive even during mass extinctions—total collapse is impossible

Boutler 2 [Michael, professor for paleobiology at the Natural History Museum and the University of East London. Launched Fossil Record 2, editor Palaeontological Association, secretary International Organisation of Palaeobotany and UK representative at the International Union of Biological Sciences, "Extinction: Evolution and the End of Man" p. 170-171]

**The same trend of long-drawn-out survival of the final relicts has been further considered by Bob May's group at Oxford, particularly Sean Nee. The Oxford group arc vociferous wailers of gloom and doom:** 'Extinction episodes**, such as the anthropogenic one currently under way,** result in a pruned tree of life**.' But they go on to argue that** the vast majority of groups survive this pruning, so that evolution goes on, albeit along a different path if the environment is changed**. Indeed,** the fossil record has taught us to expect a vigorous evolutionary response when the ecosystem changes significantly. This kind of research is more evidence to support the idea that evolution thrives on culling. The planet did really well from the Big Five mass-extinction events**. The** victims' demise enabled new environ­ments to develop and more diversification took place **in other groups of animals and plants.** Nature was the richer for it**. In just this same way** the planet can take advantage from the abuse we are giving it. The harder the abuse, the greater the change to the environment**. But it also follows that it brings forward the extinctions of a whole selection of vulnerable organisms.**

### 

## 1NC Capitalism K

#### Thesis: There is a specter haunting the politics of the 1AC: the specter of capitalism. Despite their proclamations of radical resistance, the affirmative is trading in the politics of interpassivity, where all their frenetic energy serves as an ideological screen to allow the logic of capital to remain unchallenged.

Zizek 02—Professor of Philosophy @ Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana [Slavoj, “Revolution at the Gates”, pg 167-172]

The problem lies in the further implicit qualifications which can easily be discerned by a “concrete analysis of the concrete situation”, as Lenin himself would have put it. “Fidelity to the democratic consensus” means acceptance of the present liberal-parliamentary consensus, which precludes any serious questioning of the way this liberal-democratic order is complicit in the phenomena it officially condemns, and, of course, any serious attempt to imagine a different sociopolitical order. In short, it means: say and write whatever you like — on condition that you do not actually question or disturb the prevailing political consensus. Everything is allowed, solicited even, as a critical topic: the prospect of a global ecological catastrophe; violations of human rights; sexism, homophobia, anti-feminism; growing violence not only in faraway countries, but also in our own megalopolises; the gap between the First and the Third World, between rich and poor; the shattering impact of the digitalization of our daily lives ... today, there is nothing easier than to get international, state or corporate funds for a multidisciplinary research project on how to fight new forms of ethnic, religious or sexist violence. The problem is that all this occurs against the background of a fundamental Denkverbot: a prohibition on thinking. Today’s liberal-democratic hegemony is sustained by a kind of unwritten Denkverbot similar to the infamous Berufsverbot (prohibition on employing individuals with radical Left leanings in the state organs) in Germany in the late 1960s — the moment we show a minimal sign of engaging in political projects which aim seriously to challenge the existing order, the answer is immediately: “Benevolent as it is, this will inevitably end in a new Gulag!” The ideological function of constant references to the Holocaust, the Gulag, and more recent Third World catastrophes is thus to serve as the support of this Denkverbot by constantly reminding us how things could have been much worse: “Just look around and see for yourself what will happen if we follow your radical notions!” What we encounter here is the ultimate example of what Anna Dinerstein and Mike Neary have called the project of disutopia: “not just the temporary absence of Utopia, but the political celebration of the end of social dreams”.2 And the demand for “scientific objectivity” amounts to just another version of the same Denkverhot: the moment we seriously question the existing liberal consensus, we are accused of abandoning scientific objectivity for outdated ideological positions. This is the “Leninist” point on which one cannot and should not concede: today, actual freedom of thought means freedom to question the prevailing liberal-democratic “post-ideological” consensus — or it means nothing. The Right to Truth The perspective of the critique of ideology compels us to invert Wittgenstein’s “What one cannot speak about, thereof one should be silent” into “What one should not speak about, thereof one cannot remain silent”. If you want to speak about a social system, you cannot remain silent about its repressed excess. The point is not to tell the whole Truth but, precisely, to append to the (official) Whole the uneasy supplement which denounces its falsity. As Max Horkheimer put it back in the l930s: “If you don’t want to talk about capitalism, then you should keep silent about Fascism.” Fascism is the inherent “symptom” (the return of the repressed) of capitalism, the key to its “truth”, not just an external contingent deviation of its “normal” logic. And the same goes for today’s situation: those who do not want to subject liberal democracy and the flaws of its multiculturalist tolerance to critical analysis, should keep quiet about the new Rightist violence and intolerance. If we are to leave the opposition between liberal-democratic universalism and ethnic/religious fundamentalism behind, the first step is to acknowledge the existence of liberal fundamentalism: the perverse game of making a big fuss when the rights of a serial killer or a suspected war criminal are violated, while ignoring massive violations of “ordinary” people’s rights. More precisely, the politically correct stance betrays its perverse economy through its oscillation between the two extremes: either fascination with the victimized other (helpless children, raped women . . .), or a focus on the problematic other who, although criminal, and so on, also deserves protection of his human rights, because “today it’s him, tomorrow it’ll be us” (an excellent example is Noam Chomsky’s defence of a French book advocating the revisionist stance on the Holocaust). On a different level, a similar instance of the perversity of Political Correctness occurs in Denmark, where people speak ironically of the “white woman’s burden”, her ethico-political duty to have sex with immigrant workers from Third World countries — this being the final necessary step in ending their exclusion. Today, in the era of what Habermas designated as die neue Unubersichtlichkeit (the new opacity),~ our everyday experience is more mystifying than ever: modernization generates new obscurantisms; the reduction of freedom is presented to us as the dawn of new freedoms. The perception that we live in a society of free choices, in which we have to choose even our most “natural” features (ethnic or sexual identity), is the form of appearance of its very opposite: of the absence of true choices. The recent trend for “alternate reality” films, which present existing reality as one of a multitude of possible outcomes, is symptomatic of a society in which choices no longer really matter, are trivialized. The lesson of the time-warp narratives is even bleaker, since it points towards a total closure: the very attempt to avoid the predestined course of things not only leads us back to it, but actually constitutes it — from Oedipus onwards, we want to avoid A, and it is through our very detour that A realizes itself. In these circumstances, we should be especially careful not to confuse the ruling ideology with ideology which seems to dominate. More than ever, we should bear in mind Walter Benjamin’s reminder that it is not enough to ask how a certain theory (or art) positions itself with regard to social struggles — we ask how it actually functions in these very struggles. In sex, the true hegemonic attitude is not patriarchal repression, but free promiscuity; in art, provocations in the style of the notorious “Sensation” exhibitions are the norm, the example of art fully integrated into the establishment. Ayn Rand brought this logic to its conclusion, supplementing it with a kind of Hegelian twist, that is, reasserting the official ideology itself as its own greatest transgression, as in the title of one of her late non-fiction books: “Capitalism, This Unknown Ideal”, or in “top managers, America’s last endangered species”. Indeed, since the “normal” functioning of capitalism involves some kind of disavowal of the basic principle of its functioning (today’s model capitalist is someone who, after ruthlessly generating profit, then generously shares parts of it, giving large donations to churches, victims of ethnic or sexual abuse, etc., posing as a humanitarian), the ultimate act of transgression is to assert this principle directly, depriving it of its humanitarian mask. I am therefore tempted to reverse Marx’s Thesis 11: the first task today is precisely not to succumb to the temptation to act, to intervene directly and change things (which then inevitably ends in a cul-de-sac of debilitating impossibility: “What can we do against global capital?”), but to question the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates. In short, our historical moment is still that of Adorno: To the question “What should we do?” I can most often truly answer only with “I don’t know.” I can only try to analyse rigorously what there is. Here people reproach me: When you practise criticism, you are also obliged to say how one should make it better. To my mind, this is incontrovertibly a bourgeois preiudice. Many times in history it so happened that the very works which pursued purely theoretical goals transformed consciousness, and thereby also social reality. If, today, we follow a direct call to act, this act will not be performed in an empty space — it will be an act within the hegemonic ideological coordinates: those who “really want to do something to help people” get involved in (undoubtedly honourable) exploits like Mediecins sans frontieres, Greenpeace, feminist and anti-racist campaigns, which are all not only tolerated but even supported by the media, even if they seemingly encroach on economic territory (for example, denouncing and boycotting companies which do not respect ecological conditions, or use child labour) — they are tolerated and supported as long as they do not get too close to a certain limit.6 This kind of activity provides the perfect example of interpassivity: of doing things not in order to achieve something, but to prevent something from really happening, really changing. All this frenetic humanitarian, Politically Correct, etc., activity fits the formula of “Let’s go on changing something all the time so that, globally, things will remain the same!”. If standard Cultural Studies criticize capitalism, they do so in the coded way that exemplifies Hollywood liberal paranoia: the enemy is “the system”, the hidden “organization”, the anti-democratic “conspiracy”, not simply capitalism and state apparatuses. The problem with this critical stance is not only that it replaces concrete social analysis with a struggle against abstract paranoiac fantasies, but that — in a typical paranoiac gesture — it unnecessarily redoubles social reality, as if there were a secret Organization behind the “visible” capitalist and state organs. What we should accept is that there is no need for a secret “organization-within-an-organization”. the “conspiracy” is already in the “visible” organization as such, in the capitalist system, in the way the political space and state apparatuses work.8 Let us take one of the hottest topics in today’s “radical” American academia: postcolonial studies. The problem of postcolonialism is undoubtedly crucial; however, postcolonial studies tend to translate it into the multiculturalist problematic of the colonized minorities’ “right to narrate” their victimizing experience, of the power mechanisms which repress “otherness,” so that, at the end of the day, we learn that the root of postcolonial exploitation is our intolerance towards the Other, and, furthermore, that this intolerance itself is rooted in our intolerance towards the “Stranger in Ourselves”, in our inability to confront what we have repressed in and of ourselves — the politico-economic struggle is thus imperceptibly transformed into a pseudopsychoanalytic drama of the subject unable to confront its inner traumas. . . . (Why pseudo-psychoanalytic? Because the true lesson of psychoanalysis is not that the external events which fascinate and/or disturb us are just projections of our inner repressed impulses. The unbearable fact of life is that there really are disturbing events out there: there are other human beings who experience intense sexual enjoyment while we are half-impotent; there are people submitted to terrifying torture.. . . Again, the ultimate truth of psychoanalysis is not that of discovering our true Self, but that of the traumatic encounter with an unbearable Real.) The true corruption of American academia is not primarily financial, it is not only that universities are able to buy many European critical intellectuals (myself included — up to a point), but conceptual: notions of “European” critical theory are imperceptibly translated into the benign universe of Cultural Studies chic. At a certain point, this chic becomes indistinguishable from the famous Citibank commercial in which scenes of East Asian, European, Black and American children playing is accompanied by the voice-over: “People who were once divided by a continent ... are now united by an economy” — at this concluding highpoint, of course, the children are replaced by the Citibank logo. The great majority of today’s “radical” academics silently count on the long-term stability of the American capitalist model, with a secure tenured position as their ultimate professional goal (a surprising number of them even play the stock market). If there is one thing they are genuinely afraid of, it is a radical shattering of the (relatively) safe life-environment of the “symbolic classes” in developed Western societies. Their excessive Politically Correct zeal when they are dealing with sexism, racism, Third World sweatshops, and so on, is thus ultimately a defence against their own innermost identification, a kind of compulsive ritual whose hidden logic is: “Let’s talk as much as possible about the necessity of a radical change, to make sure that nothing will really change!” The journal October is typical of this: when you ask one of the editors what the title refers to, they half-confidentially indicate that it is, of course, that October — in this way, you can indulge in jargonistic analyses of modern art, with the secret assurance that you are somehow retaining a link with the radical revolutionary past.. . . With regard to this radical chic, our first gesture towards Third Way ideologists and practitioners should be one of praise: at least they play their game straight, and are honest in their acceptance of the global capitalist co-ordinates — unlike pseudo-radical academic Leftists who adopt an attitude of utter disdain towards the Third Way, while their own radicalism ultimately amounts to an empty gesture which obliges no one to do anything definite. There is, of course, a strict distinction to be made here between authentic social engagement on behalf of exploited minorities (for example, organizing illegally employed chicano field workers in California) and the multiculturalist/postcolonial “plantations of no-risk, no-fault, knock-off rebellion” which prosper in “radical” American academia. If, however, in contrast to corporate multiculturalism”, we define “critical multiculturalism” as a strategy of pointing out that “there are common forces of oppression, common strategies of exclusion, stereotyping, and stigmatizing of oppressed groups, and thus common enemies and targets of attack,” I do not see the appropriateness of the continuing use of the term “multiculturalism”, since the accent shifts here to the common struggle. In its normal accepted meaning, multiculturalism perfectly fits the logic of the global market.

#### This is especially evident in the valorization of mass transit; rather than a challenge to economic theory, mass transit has a central role in classical economic thought, creating low-wage labor positions while increasing the pool of human competition by making all goods and services within reach.

Nicholas Low 2003 (Low, N.P. (2003) ‘Is Urban Transport Sustainable?’ in Making Urban Transport Sustainable, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan Chapter 1 pp. 1-22.

Sustaining the economy has been the principal task of governments throughout the developed world since the end of the Second World War. It’s easy to see why investment in transport infrastructure is such an appealing way of spending taxes and borrowed funds. It addresses a very concrete problem experienced by voters: traffic congestion. It supports the growth of personal mobility. Investments in roads seem to realize, in an immediate sense, the potential of the private car which has acquired more than just practical value for its owner (Sheller and Urry, 2000). Investment in public transport can be argued to reduce road traffic congestion, as in the famous case of London’s Victoria Underground Line. Now ‘sustainability’ itself is being brought in to plead the case for new transport infrastructure. Investment in transport supports business in two ways. It acts as a stimulus to the large sectors of industry involved in construction and transport. And it offers to reduce the costs of all businesses in transporting goods. It appeals to the orthodox economists who advise governments. It doesn’t require any real change in government thinking and therefore appears to carry minimum short-term political risk. In short, investment in transport infrastructure serves the immediate interests and beliefs of voters, businesses, bureaucrats and politicians. The support of professional engineers, trades unions, and sectors of the investment industry add further weight to the nexus of arguments in favour of transport investment as a means of sustaining the economy. In order to sustain the economy and enhance the productivity of private capital, it is argued, there is a need for investment in transport infrastructure (see, for example, Aschauer, 1989, 1990; EC, 1993). Of course such investment has a multiplier effect from the construction involved, but theoretically the causal link between transport infrastructure per se and economic growth remains to be proved (Gramlich, 1994; Vickerman, 1998: 132). Rothengatter (1994: 116) claims as an external benefit of transport infrastructure: ‘improving accessibility to remote regions may foster regional development and produce interregional multiplier effects’. Vickerman (1998: 153) argues that the relationship between infrastructure and eco- nomic growth is a complex one: ‘Often it is intra-regional variations and access to local and regional networks which may be as critical for locations in peripheral regions as their actual peripherality’. But, as Whitelegg points out in Chapter 7, such empirical evidence as there is suggests no geographic link between transport investment and economic success. Black (2001: 2) regards the notion as a myth. While there are situations in the developing world (remote regions) where transport infrastructure investments may lead to economic growth ‘it is unlikely that these conditions exist any longer for [the developed world]’. The proposition that arguments in favour of transport investment are specious and contradictory tends to be eclipsed by the fact that, well, the world economy has been sustained. The world has not experienced a Great Depression on the scale of that of the 1930s, a global economic crisis with vast social and political repercussions – not yet. In view of that fact, and in view of the supporting interests of the key players in the economy and pol- itics, what is perhaps surprising is that transport policy is changing, however slowly (see Chapters 2, 6, 13 and 14). It is changing at least partly because there is a dawning awareness in some departments of government and busi- ness that something is wrong with the economic calculations. The ‘some- thing’ is the assumption underlying those calculations that the environment is an unlimited cornucopia. It is as if orthodox economists have looked at the environment through the eyes of an individual and have seen that its scale is so vast that nothing the individual can do will have any appreciable impact on it. The sustainability of an economy without environmental limits is one thing, but what if the economy as a social whole becomes so big that it actually presses up against the limits of what the environment can provide? Transportation economics is concerned mainly with efficiency and allocation (Button, 1977; Small, 1992). An efficient allocation is one in which the kind of commodities, and how much of each, is produced coincides with what and how much is demanded under any given distribution of the capacity to pay in the population. Normatively speaking, what type of and how much transportation is provided should be no more than and no different from what is demanded by the aggregate of consumers (under budget constraints) when each weighs up all the benefits and costs to him or her individually. The problem is how to get all the costs bearing down on the individual (or organisation) who receives the benefits, that is to internalize the costs. From the point of view of environmental sustainability, this sounds rather good in principle because it minimizes the use of resources for a given social outcome. Road pricing to internalize the costs of congestion is the classic case and has been praised by environmentalists (Jacobs, 1991: 146). Arguing in favour of the use of economic instruments in infrastructure provision (as opposed to infrastructure use), Rothengatter (1994) posits that transport infrastructure is a ‘club good’ in that its supply stimulates agents to seek additional ‘rents’ by free riding and ‘as a consequence, excess demands for infrastructure capacity are generated’ (122). This merely recognizes theoretically what has already been established empirically, which in turn was suggested by common sense: that building better road systems generates additional demand to use them (see SACTRA, 1994). However, there is a more compelling reason why economists applaud technical infrastructure solutions. The political value at the heart of micro- economics is the belief in the virtue of competition. Space limits competition and interferes with the perfection of the market. The larger the population that can be brought into competition, the better. The connection between transportation, the growth of business and the growth of cities was discussed in one of the seminal texts of urban geography The City by Park, Burgess and McKenzie. Transportation systems are seen naturalistically as a part of human ecologies. McKenzie quotes Hadley: ‘It is this quickening and cheapening of transportation that has given such stimulus in the present day to the growth of large cities. It enables them to draw cheap food from a far larger territory and it causes business to locate where the widest business connection is to be had, rather than where the goods or raw materials are most easily produced’ (McKenzie, 1967: 69 n2).1 Transport negates the effect of space and enlarges the competing population of firms and households by bringing more people and products within reach of one another. This view of the world infuses the publications of the European Commission (see Chapter 13 of this volume). The American economist Paul Krugman (1999: 85) writes with delight about ‘globalization’ which puts fresh vegetables from Zimbabwe on the tables of Londoners. Whitelegg writes not with delight but dismay about the 150 gram pot of strawberry yoghourt which is responsible for moving one lorry 9.2 metres in the process of production (Whitelegg, 1997: 39 citing research by Böge, 1995). Both are tales of spatial expansion and flexibilisation, principles of the globalization of the market economy: the ever increasing choice of location of production of anything and everything. Economic rationality contains two kinds of problem for transport sustainability, one external, to do with the subject matter (transport), and one internal to the theory of economics itself. The external problems have to do with the nature of transport. First, the disaggregation entailed in the market mechanism tends to work against the technical co-ordination (intermodal, intertemporal and geographical) required by an effectively functioning transport system. Rothengatter (1994: 125) points to the prob- lem of natural monopolies in transport networks, but the matter goes deeper than that. The technical efficiency of a transport system depends on the smooth integration of all its elements (Vuchic, 1999: 295). For instance, feeder bus timetables must be co-ordinated with train timetables. Ticketing systems must be network-wide. Encouragement of transit use must be accompanied by encouragement of walking and cycling, and discouragement of car use for journeys where transit supplies a viable alternative. Equally importantly, while some parts of the use of transport systems can be subjected to market mechanisms, including the use of roads, the creation of transport systems cannot – or at least is not. Transport infrastructure investment is enormously lumpy, it has very long-term effects on the land use and production process, social needs do not quickly adapt to changes in transport provision and, while benefits are individualized, transport systems incur huge external environmental costs, some of which are almost unmeasurable (the cost of greenhouse gas emissions for example). If all the social and environmental costs of road systems were actually internalized in a price for road use, the result would probably be that only the rich could use the roads, thus violating social sustainability (see below). Second, increasing transport infrastructure feeds back into more spatially dispersed patterns of land use. Land use patterns have been shaped over decades by government provision of infrastructure to accommodate motor vehicles. If economizing on transport is needed – as it is – it must be led by government with infrastructure and logistical policies which enable such economizing.

#### Granting more access to the centers of capital and putting the racialized surplus labor in greater competition is the flip side of the global violence and militarism that is constitutive of modern capital. The affirmative ensures that both militarism at home and abroad remain the primary experience of the laboring classes.

Michael McIntyre and Heidi J. Nast 2011 (Bio(necro)polis: Marx, Surplus Populations, and the Spatial Dialectics of Reproduction and “Race” Volume 43, Issue 5, pages 1465–1488, November 2011)

This collection of papers re-examines Marx's notion of surplus populations in light of contemporary capitalism and a world marked by tremendous global shifts in fertility rates, almost unprecedented rates of outmigration to hegemonic nation-states and enclaves, heightened levels of investment in (and hyper-exploitation of) formerly colonized nations, and massive degradation of the environment. Taken together, these processes trace the current configuration of Anibal Quijano's “coloniality of power”, a concept that, as Marion Werner (this issue) tells us, “indexes the ways that capitalist accumulation is constituted through the reworking of hierarchies of racialized and gendered difference, thus redrawing the social and spatial boundaries between hyper-exploited wage work and the people and places cast out from its relations” (Quijano 2000; Werner this issue). What is most remarkable about all of these processes is how thoroughly racialized they are, and how thoroughly intertwined racial formations have become with regimes of reproduction. Arguably, “race” has never been deployed so variably nor constructed so contingently and quixotically in the subordination of truth to power and life to death as it has since the beginning of the long downturn of the 1970s and its heightening into global recession and industrial restructuring in the 1980s (McIntyre this issue; Nast and Elder 2009; Winant 1994, 2001). One cannot, therefore, understand surplus populations without understanding how the geographical dynamics of accumulation have become increasingly racialized. Nor can one understand the shifting forms of racialization without taking into account the hierarchical regimes of reproduction that constitute them (cf Gilmore 2002). There are two main ways to engage a collection as empirically rich and wide-ranging as this one. We might begin by talking about how the collection came into being and rehearse both the body of literature to which each paper belongs and the substantive contributions that it makes. We have chosen, instead, to use the introduction as a means for building a meta-theoretical framework through which the essays might come into productive relation with one another. In this way, the articles propel us into thinking beyond the empirical confines of any one article and into new ways of conceptualizing how surplus populations, reproduction, and race have been geographically interconnected. To accomplish this, we look at capitalism over the longue durée, not to totalize, but to complicate ways of thinking about how exploitation has worked dialectically through different geographical scales and governmentalities. We argue that colonization and imperialism worked from the outset through racially ontologized hierarchies of space, which permitted the hyper-exploitation of certain (colorized) bodies and lands, but not others. The racially hierarchical organization of global space and the cheapening of racialized bodies were made possible through differing regimes of governmentality which, calling upon the works of Foucault (2010) and Mbembe (2003), we below refer to as biopolitical and necropolitical, respectively. In either case, the regulation of reproduction proves key. Beginning in the 1970s, with the relocation of highly developed industry overseas (producing what we call neo-industrialization), reproduction's meaning, importance, regulation, and governance fundamentally changed. For a variety of reasons, fertility rates fell in many de-industrializing and neo-industrializing contexts, eventually reaching (or going below) replacement levels. By contrast, fertility rates in many impoverished regions remained comparatively high. This difference provided valuable grist for the making of surplus populations and new kinds of racialized geographies of hyperexploitation. In de-industrializing regions, whiteness continues to be biopolitically exalted even as non-white populations grow in absolute and relative terms. The power of whiteness derives in large part from corporate revenues gained overseas through racially inflected forms of foreign direct investment. But it also draws strength from the hegemonic cultural practices of the privileged (and privileging) social formations from where foreign direct investment derives and with which it is integral and consonant. These practices are inscribed in a variety of vernacular spaces tied to privileged (and privileging) forms of consumption and are possible to the extent that there is a continuum between the kind of consumption of goods and services that is done purely for consumption sake (eg eating food) and the consumption of good and services that produce higher income (or extract surplus) for the benefit of the person consuming. For instance, undocumented workers allow many persons to hire labor that they could not otherwise afford. This labor might be used to renovate an apartment building or house, allowing an owner to benefit from higher rent or a higher purchasing price. The (hyper)exploitation of the undocumented worker both allows the owner to live at a higher class level than they would otherwise be able to do and makes possible profits that can be invested accordingly. The massive racial subsidies derived from racialized hyperexploitative production overseas are thus in keeping with the hyperexploitation of racialized labor domestically, the ties between the two deepening and complicating the geographical contours and formations of “race” (below). Reproductive regimes in certain neo-industrializing regions, meanwhile, have been thrown into racialized flux. Such flux has been subtended both by state mandates (eg China and Vietnam), and free-market pressures (eg Eastern Europe and Mexico). Surplus populations have resulted in the latter case not only from heightened industrial efficiencies, but through displacement from traditional lands, forced migration, and glocal conflicts. Today, the gathering of these surpluses threatens to put an end to capitalism's “spatial fix”, despite any forceful shoring up of the body biopolitic through hypermilitarization (below). We begin this paper by introducing two geographical concepts that we think are analytically useful in terms of thinking about how racialized hierarchies of surplus populations have been spatially, politically and economically made. The first we call the necropolis, after Mbembe 's (2003) work on “necropolitics”, a form of governmentality distinct from, and opposed to, Foucault's (2010) biopolitics. The necropolis is, in the first instance, a space of negation and the socially dead, produced by expropriations and alienations in and outside European nation-states. By contrast, we refer to the second as the biopolis, after Foucault's “biopolitics”, a form of governmentality that presumes that the sovereign subject must be conserved and shored up in order for the modern nation-state to thrive. Necropolis and biopolis, while initially geographically distinct, have always made one another “through specific histories of accumulation, disinvestment, violence, dispossession, and resistance”(Werner this issue). Operating materially and psychically, this dialectic was bent to shore up sovereign European lands and subjects (Nast and Elder 2009). Having introduced these two key concepts, we trace in broad terms the socio-spatial dialectics that have obtained between the biopolis and the necropolis. In so doing, we point to two possible unities we call the bio(necro)polis and necro(bio)polis, designations that emphasize the geographical fluidity of accumulation and racialized difference.2 The dialectic also allows us to see how surplus populations have always been tied to a reproductive racial politics in which certain lands and persons could reasonably be disregarded and treated as waste.3 Last, we offer speculative notes on the potential of neoliberal capitalism to collapse any spatial distinction between biopolis and necropolis, invaginating exploitation's spatial ordering to produce a necro(bio)polis of global proportions. This necro(bio)polis can be found not only in obvious centers of new, rapid industrialization such as Shanghai, but also in areas previously considered disconnected from the global economy. Dennis Arnold and John Pickles (this issue) show, for instance, how states, NGOs, and both international and regional agencies have intervened in the Greater Mekong Sub-region, in areas as previously peripheral to capitalist accumulation as the Thai–Burmese border. In so doing, they temporarily stabilize a regime of accumulation in East and Southeast Asia. In the end, we argue that surplus populations are the effect of racially striated regimes of biological reproduction, and that the workings of capitalism must be understood in terms of the linked contradictions of reproduction and race. Marx makes reproduction central to value theory when he notes that the worker's wage must not only pay for the survival of the worker, but for the reproduction of the working class (Marx 1990 [1976]:275–277). Engels made similarly radical theoretical assertions about the primacy of the maternal and childbearing when he theorized the origins of the patriarchal family, private property, and the state (Engels 2000 [1884]). We build on both their insights to show how there have been multiple, racialized political economies of maternal or biological “surplus”. As Merrill (this issue) avers, these political economies have been articulated through “the hegemonic production of racialized populations” in a spatial regime that codes nations and bodies along axes that may be as diverse as gender, racial difference, productivity, reproductivity (fecundity), technological advancement, and patriarchal fitness (among others). Together, these codings constitute the coloniality of power that inscribes imperial body-space. Merrill (this issue) shows how such an imperial body space is constituted in northern Italy, where glocal racial formations have coded Africa as “an integrated space of inferiority and difference … where African women migrants have been popularly classified as prostitutes, those who sell themselves and are sold as commodities, and as the most expendable of all human populations, the most easily exploited” (see also Merrill 2006). Biopolis England's first industrial proletariat was created by enclosure and displacement.4 As Engels (1987 [1845]) shows, the earliest generations of mill workers suffered a kind of living death, their mortality of little concern as long as capital could draw labor from the countryside's dispossessed. Many of the most exploited laborers were Irish who had long been racialized through earlier rounds of conquest and displacement. Similarly, Merrill (this issue) shows how, early on in the industrial life of Italy, southern Italians, long racialized and exploited, were hyper-exploited in the factories of the north. In both cases, racialization was a political and economic accomplishment, an instrumental and exploitative device honed over time and place.5 Nonetheless, there was a certain proxemics advantageous to early class conflict. In the early industrial city, workers and capitalists lived in close proximity, unlike the case of most neo-industry. This proximity, crossed with the logic of capital accumulation, produced an alienated intimacy “in which every individual is a totality of needs and only exists for the other person, as the other exists for him, insofar as each becomes a means for the other” (Marx 1988:128 as cited by Hudson this issue). This alienated intimacy, while grounded in the necessarily exploitative relationship of capital to labor, eventually provided for a certain spatial regime of bargaining between capital and labor, facilitating labor's capture of a larger portion of the value it creates for capital (Allen 2001; cf Gilmore 2002:16). Such proportionalities could obtain, however, only because of the necropolis’ hyper-exploitation. The racialized negation of the necropolis effected an invisible subsidy for the biopolis, helping further to shore up wages. Marx divided surplus populations into three categories: latent, made up of those with insecure employment; floating, composed of those cycling rapidly in and out of the labor force; and stagnant, comprised of those only rarely employed.6 Within the biopolis, the majority of the surplus laboring population is either latent or floating. Here, labor is periodically (systematically) shed through a bipolarity in which workers are drawn into the labor force during economic expansion and excreted during downturns. Such labor has likewise been stranded through spatial and technical reconfigurations of capital investment that have made workers redundant. By contrast, racially denigrated sections of the working class make up most of the stagnant surplus population. These have historically been deployed for strikebreaking or other instrumental purposes—often to the detriment of otherwise racially privileged workers (Norwood 2002; Whatley 1993). Their irregular employment, relative poverty, and negative instrumentality have resulted in these workers being cast as predatory, criminal, or dangerous (Lewis 1995; Roediger 1991). During periods of capitalist downturn, when the floating surplus population of the biopolis expands significantly, at least modest biopolitical measures are taken to insure the racialized survival of those made temporarily redundant; this, so that their labor remains available once growth resumes. Even during more extended periods of capitalist crisis within the biopolis, when long-term unemployment threatens to transform the floating surplus population into a (racially denigrated) stagnant population, whiteness works to hold such stagnation at bay. In particular, white workers’ privileged embeddedness in, and symbolic value to, the body biopolitic gives them a competitive edge over racially denigrated members of the stagnant surplus population, should employment levels rise. Outside the biopolis, the situation is often reversed. Here, most surplus populations are stagnant rather than latent or floating. Michelle Yates (this issue) reminds us of this fact when she points to how many “third world” (necropolitan) cities, today, are overwhelmed by stagnant surplus populations, displaced from the countryside, with little chance of ever being employed. “Once relegated as permanent surplus, meaning that capital no longer needs these populations as labor, these populations are little more than human waste, excreted from the capitalist system.”7 Necropolis Historically, the necropolis was borne through displacements, enclosures, and containments, both in the context of slavery, the colony and (initially) the nation-state, albeit to vastly differing geographical degrees. Dispossession has preceded capital accumulation everywhere.8 The enclosures of England turned the peasantry into an agricultural (and later industrial) wage-labor force, whereas the conquest of Ireland dispossessed the Irish of most of the best land in favor of English (and to a lesser degree Scottish) landlords, thereby creating a diaspora of Irish wage-laborers. Later waves of colonization would repeat Irish dispossession on a global scale.9 In the southern USA the plantation system likewise served to enclose, displace, and capture, its racist topography and consequent misery rejuvenated during the Clinton era (Woods 1998). The authors in this collection trace accumulation through dispossession into the present, whether in the Thai–Burma border zone around Mae Sot (Arnold and Pickles this issue), the IT parks and corridors in Delhi and Bangalore (Gidwani and Reddy this issue), or the Dominican–Haitian borderlands (Werner this issue).10 Accumulation through dispossession is often glossed as “development” (Rodney 1972). Lack of industry can be, and often is, coded as a racial characteristic, a way of marking necropolitical subjects as inherently wasteful and stagnant (surplus), in need of colonial (or neo-colonial) coercion to make them productive (see Gidwani 2008:ch 1). As an example, Gidwani and Reddy (this issue) show how the colonial authorities of British India coded any land not immediately in agricultural production as “waste”, left unimproved by an insufficiently industrious Indian population. The land settlements of British India simultaneously determined property rights in land and the colonial state's revenue rights from that land. Though these land settlements varied from one province (and sometimes even one district) to the next, they were invariably constructed around and justified by discourses that privileged the population represented as best suited to “improve” this “waste” land and put it to productive (and therefore taxable) use (see also Guha 1963). We also see this in Britain's early-nineteenth-century fashioning of the concept of terra nullius, a legal device where lands not belonging to any modern (European) sovereign nation were seen as wastelands best brought into productivity through foreign occupation (Borch 2001). The racial marking of lands and bodies continues to be a way of rendering certain bodies superfluous: Arnold and Pickles (this issue) note that the Burmese laboring bodies in Thailand are paid less than half the Thai minimum wage, while simultaneously being represented as a racial threat to the Thai national body; Werner (this issue) notes the denigratory racialization of Haitian laborers by Dominican managers in the Ouanaminthe special economic zone (SEZ) along the Haiti–Dominican Republic border—and this between populations that, in the biopolis, are equally denigrated as African; while Merrill (this issue) shows how the racial cheapening of African industrial workers in northern Italy has allowed southern Italians to re-imagine themselves as white and for all Italians to re-imagine themselves as ethnically unified. In the USA, such cheapening qua racialization has long taken place in the context of African American, Mexican American, and Mexican migrant lives (eg de Oliver 2004, 2001; Gilmore 2007; Mitchell 1996; Pulido 1996; Woods 1998, 2010) as well as the lives of other such diverse groups as the Chinese, Japanese, southern Italians, Irish, Greeks, and “Arabs”.11 Whereas capitalists attended, however inadequately, to the problem of biological and social reproduction in the biopolis, no such concern extended to the necropolis. So long as surplus laboring populations were sufficiently large, little regard was given to the symbolic or practical course of local reproduction. Thus the populations of the Americas were largely extirpated (primarily, though not exclusively, through disease) with those remaining frequently subjected to coercive labor regimes such as encomienda. Even as the indigenous population shrank, the Spanish and Portuguese changed their treatment of indigenous persons but little, turning instead to the transatlantic slave trade to meet their continuing labor needs. Whether purchased or conquered, then, necropolitical subjects were rendered a free gift of nature to be taken and used at will.12 Motherhood became an externality, the costs of which were to be absorbed by subaltern networks of caring labor within and beyond the household and on marginal lands allowed workers for purposes of reproduction. The necropolis consequently experienced the wasting of bodies and lands without measure (Davis 2001; Mbembe 2003; Winant 1994). Werner, Yates, and Hudson (this issue) all refer to Melissa Wright's exemplary study, Disposable Women and Other Myths of Global Capitalism (2006), which shows how factories in the export zones of Mexico and China use up the laboring capacity of women in highly accelerated and calculated fashion. Arnold and Pickles (this issue) call attention to the unregistered and therefore unprotected migrant laborers of Mae Sot who endure “precarious employment without clear-cut employment contract or social protection”, all for a wage of scarcely more than $2 per day. Gidwani and Reddy (this issue) paint a Dickensian portrait of the “squalid” conditions in the slums of Bangalore and Delhi. Merrill (this issue) reports the insouciance with which “the Italian public watches television news report of the bodies and body parts of dark skinned immigrants being lifted out of the seas”. From the colonial past to the neoliberal present, the lives of necropolitical subjects have been wasted through forms of racialized hyper-exploitation determined via a calculus of death. Race has become the final arbiter of waste and wastage. Facilitated by geographical estrangement from the biopolis, little heed is paid to the needs of labor to reproduce itself. Instead, the over-riding concern is to subject workers to the most accelerated form of exploitation possible to optimize profit. Bio(necro)polis The biopolis and necropolis do not merely sit opposite one another; they constitute a spatial dialectical unity. Within this dialectic, colonies subsidized the biopolis on a massive scale: slavery and the sugar plantations of Haiti helped pay for the Palace of Versailles; the human and environmental life wasted in the Belgian Congo helped embellish Brussels and establish the Union Minière's dominance within the Congo's colonial economy; British exploitation in India and Africa built the Docklands of London and provided the flora with which to cultivate Kew Gardens; while revenues from the slave trade allowed the Brown family to build a formidable Brown University.13 The biopolis could not have emerged without massive transfers of value over hundreds of years from the necropolis. These transfers are most immediately evident in the unusually large rates of profit from certain biopolitical enterprises placed in the necropolis, and from the more ever-present mechanism of unequal exchange (Emmanuel 1972; Lewis 1954). Unequal exchange, as Lewis and Emmanuel noted, transfers surplus by lowering prices rather than raising profits. As such, it constitutes a subsidy to both labor and capital in the biopolis. Race and Waste: The Spatial Dialectics of Labor Race has always been the primary indicator of necropolitical body-space. The racially marked body is, first and foremost, geographically marked and economically cheapened (Nast and Elder 2009). Race inscribes the coloniality of power and place onto the body. Colonial projects of conquest commanded “race” into existence, creating worlds for hyper-exploitation. As Laura Hudson (this issue) notes, the sphere of racialized hyper-exploitation today demands a form of colonial sovereignty grounded in the constant deployment of surveillance and violence. Colonial sovereignty overwrites racial difference with a narrative of a “war without end” characterized by bunkers and checkpoints that monitor and control a resistant, dominated population that cannot be fully absorbed into the institutions of the state. Taken by force, colonial lands are built upon the blood and bones of the colonized, both those killed in the struggle for sovereignty and those consigned to die in impoverished and invisible excluded spaces of native towns. Today, race simultaneously consigns some workers to the secondary labor markets of advanced capitalist economies; divides the population of the biopolis from that of the necropolis; and divides managers from production workers, especially in borderlands and (above all) in the SEZs located in those borderlands (Arnold and Pickles, Werner this issue). It also marks certain immigrant populations for hyper-exploitation, especially those without legal status (Arnold and Pickles, Merrill this issue). Because race works in the registers of signification and structure (Winant 1994), the racially marked body-space always appears bearing multiple stigmata. “Race” is literally absent because it refers to a nonexistent biological substrate, but this absence forces a presence upon lives through the topoi it structures. Race is, as Winant (1994:267) so eloquently put it, both “a present absence and an absent presence”; its contradictions realized through the spaces and bodies it calls to order.14 The physical and signifying structures of race have consistently worked to attenuate hegemonic citizenries’ identification with the subaltern. Subaltern lands and bodies are symbolically and practically cast (to varying degrees) as that which has no legitimate juridical or ontological status. The necropolis at its worst is cast as that which is beyond modern time and space—an entity without value, even as the hyper-exploitation of its “primitive” lands and peoples brings great wealth to biopolitans. Necropolitans residing in the biopolis are similarly devalued. As we see in this collection, whether in Thailand or in Italy, labor unions have at best subsumed alliances with Burmese or African workers under the category of class, unable to deal adequately with the specifically racial component of worker exploitation; at worst unions have actively mobilized anti-immigrant sentiment (Arnold and Pickles, Merrill this issue). The surplus laboring population, “whose misery,” as Marx notes (1990 [1976]:798), “is in inverse ratio to the amount of torture it has to undergo in the form of labor”, is disproportionately composed of workers racially marked as non-white, necropolitans chief among them. Their irregular employment becomes a convenient focus of white proletarian resentment. Members of the surplus laboring population working long hours for low wages are resented for undercutting white workers’ wages. Those who lack employment, and thus endure misery (privation), are resented for their putative refusal to undergo torture in the form of labor. “In a particularly cruel twist”, McIntyre (this issue) notes, “race becomes a marker not just of irregularly offered employment, but a marker that one deserves the misery to which one is consigned”. Canalized, criminalized, ostracized, stigmatized, the necropolis—that spatiality through which the necropolitan is defined or constituted—becomes a reserve of multifarious material proportions: of negative symbolic potential and death's liminal pleasures; a reserve of labor (as noted in chapter 25 of Capital); a nature reserve open for appropriation; a reserve of potentially fecund land for settlers; and a reserve of waste land for colonialism's human and environmental detritus. The “reserve” part of “reserve pool of labor” can therefore not be separated from the materiality and spatiality of the reservation per se—of the Bantustans, Native Towns, hinterlands, boys’ quarters, ghettos, and favelas. In this sense, the necropolis is a peculiar “spatiality-for” the benefit of the biopolis. Here, all that is, is situated symbolically beyond the real, making the necropolitan apparitional. But, as in the case of all negation, there is always that which exceeds or resists it. Thus, the apparitional carries within it the threat of the real, provoking new rounds of fear and negation, and new attempts to move the apparitional back into the shadows. The workings of this spatiality-for are apparent in Marion Werner's paper (this issue) on the Ouanaminthe SEZ along the Haitian–Dominican border, supported by both governments, local and global capital, and the World Bank. Here, beside the aptly named “Massacre River”, site of Trujillo's 1937 ethnic cleansing, Haitians enter a fenced in and heavily guarded border trade zone to work in factories run by Dominican managers. Not only do the latter rarely stay long, they deploy racial hierarchies to denigrate Haitian workers and justify their exploitation. Meanwhile, the Dominican Republican state, in an attempt to recuperate losses endured by the migration of factory jobs to Haiti, promotes the Dominican Republic as a space populated by those fitted for skilled work. Thus, a set of racial distinctions, policed through at times extraordinary violence and given form through a regime of tight spatial controls, separates two Afro-Caribbean populations, both subject to long-term US occupation and repeated US-led military intervention. In so doing, the border has become a racialized ontological device through which to exact glocal forms of economic subordination. The spatialization of race through which economic extraction takes place speaks additionally to political contradictions (Winant 1994) in that they point to ontologized differentiations and hierarchies of space and of racial ontologies rendered through hierarchies of space (Nast and Elder 2009). From modern colonization's beginnings, the contradictions between the necropolis and biopolis have been made and managed through opposed governmentalities that have allowed for politically distinct appropriations and economies of land and labor. Whereas the biopolis has been ruled modally through consent, the necropolis has been ruled through violence (Guha 1989). And whereas the spatial form of the biopolis is the nation, this entity is antithetical to the “spatiality-for” of the necropolis, and is therefore something against which the biopolis has had to be guarded (Nast and Elder 2009). The papers in this collection vividly illustrate the continuing disparity in such racialized modalities of governmentality and space. In Mae Sot, Burmese workers are paid shockingly low wages even as they have registration fees deducted from their wages. They are also forced periodically to bribe local police, and they face physical intimidation, even murder, if they protest (Arnold and Pickles this issue). African immigrants to Italy who are lucky enough to arrive alive (as Merrill this issue notes, not all do) are relegated to a world of precarity, working for employers who refuse “to ‘regularize’ immigrant workers” by “paying taxes, social security and health benefits, and abiding by labor laws”. Haitian workers in Ouanaminthe who have attempted (with modest success) to better their wages and working conditions through work stoppages have had to battle mass firings, lockouts, and military repression (Werner this issue). Meanwhile, in the world of mercenaries and corporate private armies, troops from South and Southeast Asia are assigned the most dangerous and badly paid grunt work, while their commanders—retired elite soldiers from the USA, the UK, or South Africa—rake in immensely higher pay (Cowen and Siciliano this issue). Our discussion thus far has shown how surplus value is differentially extracted across the biopolis and the necropolis, and how these regimes of differential extraction draw on and are constituted by racialized hierarchies whose force and meaning extend far beyond narrowly economistic measures of exploitation. These hierarchies simultaneously help constitute regimes of differential sovereignty that determine whether capital will extract surplus value primarily through hegemonic norms and consent, or through direct force and dominance (Guha 1989). Re-scaling the Biopolis: Doin’ the Hustle The various financial interests spun out of (and through) de-industrialization and neo-industry opened up new modalities for capitalist profit and political gain that would soon become mainstream. Such mainstreaming had to do with the fact that biopolitical industrialization provided a racially coherent and affirming basis not only for (white) subjectivity and social life, but for the nation, through which both of the latter were interpellated. These facts provided for a significant reserve of psychical-material capital by which whiteness could (“naturally”) look after its own. One of the key mechanisms permitting such subjective resolve is the way that racialized corporate and state interests have historically entrained education for racialized hegemonic ends. With de-industrialization, the profile of higher education has been transformed from engineering to business, computer science, digital media, and information technologies (eg Ronchi 2003; Williams 2010). New cadres of racialized workers have subsequently emerged, albeit through much more complex geographical regimes of surplus accumulation and governance. The knowledge economy has permitted a different sort of biopolitical subject to emerge, one able to engage in surplus value extraction through privileged and internationalized means of consumption (above); and one that regards labor (including its own) as eminently made up of bits that are substitutable, exchangeable, replaceable, and uncertain. Subjects are culturally encouraged to think of themselves as sites of capital with “skill sets” that can (and should) be regularly “upgraded”—or, as dynamic reservoirs for capitalization, ready to be drawn on in multiple locations for variable periods of time and for certain purposes. The racialized class advantages of such a subject are complex and are addressed here briefly and anecdotally in terms of the privileged “hustle” and the undocumented worker.15 Our first example is taken from Wall Street. It involves a 70 hour per week employee of Goldman Sachs who relies on an undocumented caregiver to relieve them of parental labor at a rate allowing net financial gain. Goldman Sachs also benefits. For in the employee's hiring of the undocumented worker, it is able to employ a skilled worker from whom surplus value can be extracted. The firm consequently benefits doubly: from exploiting its worker and from the effective salary subsidy that come from the undocumented person's hyper-exploitation—not unlike the benefits to be had in the biopolis from earlier rounds of slavery and colonization. Our second example involves those with some access to capital who might play the stock market from home via the Internet, compare prices and contract product delivery internationally—for personal or small-scale retailing purposes, or run an e-retail business. In calling on already-existing and considerable networks of social capital, high levels of informational literacy and/or education, relatively substantial assets and access to credit, whiteness has managed to stay afloat and find new means of cultural material reproduction. At the same time, the changing subjectivity of the biopolitan signals a fundamental shift in the geography of class. Whereas industrial capitalists and workers formerly occupied the same nation—their proximity compelling certain concessions and enabling the creation of unions—the necropolitan industrial workforce today is separated transnationally from hegemonic sites of finance capital and capital accumulation. This separation is yet another of the factors that warrants distinguishing between industry of the past and neo-industry in the present. Through ongoing sanctions against (labor's) transnational migration, foreign capitalists and investors have been able to use national borders both to distance themselves from hyperexploited industrial labor and to fix it in its disadvantaged (and disadvantaging) place. Such place-fixing has helped prevent the kinds of collective struggles that historically raised labor's value. To ensure the economic viability of these re-configurations, a range of militarizing strategies and devices have been deployed. Militarization, like related investments in informational strategies and devices, have allowed for vast domains of employment to be generated, particularly in hegemonic nation states. As Cowen and Siciliano argue (this issue), the military has become one of the central places where the surplus labor of whites, generated as a result of de-industrialization, has been salvaged and given new life. In the process, white working class masculinity has been resuscitated and re-tooled. Whereas the iron man of industry formerly was charged with the day-to-day administration and security of the biological nuclear family and home, today's iron man is de-industrialized, his bodily ego re-fitted for the machinery of war and re-oriented offensively beyond the nation. This new man is “deployed” rather than employed, military training bent on asserting the primacy of the homeland, corporation and empire (Killian and Agathangelou 2005). The knowledge economy within hegemonic nations has therefore become meshed into the world of munitions, weaponry, surveillance systems, and machinic stealth—afforded in part by state expropriation of “public” fortunes (cf Gilmore 2002). Ordered through ranking systems and elaborate fetishistic modes of dress, conduct, and demeanor, the new machinic man is disciplined to assume an outward-bound and proprietary (imperial) disposition. Militarization has, as Cowen and Siciliano (this issue) aver, become the new workfare of hegemonic nation-states, its presence expanding throughout state, public, and private domains. These latter include the varied corridors of travel and social life, private and public property, and geographical regions deemed of strategic political and economic interest. Ever growing amounts of work are thus to be had in national and international armed forces and through private military contractors—Singer's (2003)“corporate warriors”. Militarism is likewise to be found at “home” in the vast armies of security guards operating in shopping malls, state buildings, places of retail and corporate life, prisons, civic institutions, high-rises, office complexes, gated communities, as well as in transportation venues and loci, such as public transit lines, airports, sea ports, national and international borders, immigration venues, warehouses, and so on. In any case, the deployed are more alienated from the means of production and reproduction than the employed in that they work not to produce but to secure the properties and interests of others. As with the proto-fascist Freikorps, the muscularity of militarized manhood is celebrated through racialized paternalistic images and practices, cultivated via images of war and impending danger (Theweleit 1987–1989).

#### Thus, our alternative is embracing a global anti-capitalist movement: instead of settling for the band-aid solutions of the affirmative and resolving the crises of capitalism, we must recognize that out of the misery of our current crisis, a genuine alternative can emerge.

David Harvey, Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the [City University of New York](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_University_of_New_York), 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

While nothing is certain, it could be that where we are at now is only the beginning of a prolonged shake-out in which the question of grand and far- reaching alternatives will gradually bubble up to the surface in one part of the world or another. The longer the uncertainty and the misery are prolonged, the more the legitimacy of the existing way of doing business will be questioned and the more the demand to build something different will escalate. Radical as opposed to band-aid reforms to patch up the financial system may seem more necessary. If, for example, we are now witnessing a return of a repressed 'Keynesian moment: but one that is oriented to bailing out the upper classes, then why not redirect it to the working classes that Keynes originally targeted (not, it should be remembered, out of political but economic necessity)? Ironically, the more such a political turn is taken the more likely the economy will regain some semblance of at least temporary stability. The capitalist fear is, however, that any move in this direction will ignite a sense of re-empowerment for the deprived, the discontented and the dispossessed that will encourage them to take matters further(as they did towards the end of the 1960s). Give them an inch, it is said, and they will take a mile. It will in any case require that the capitalists willingly give up some of their individual wealth and power to save capitalism from itself. Historically they have always fiercely resisted doing that. The uneven development of capitalist practices throughout the world has produced, however, anti-capitalist movements all over the place. The state-centric economies of much of east Asia generate different discontents compared to the churning anti-neoliberal struggles occurring throughout much of Latin America, where the Bolivarian revolutionary movement of popular power exists in a peculiar relationship to capitalist class interests that have yet to be truly confronted. Differences over tactics and policies in response to the crisis among the states that make up the European Union are increasing even as a second attempt to come up with a unified EU constitution is underway. Revolutionary and resolutely anticapitalist movements, though not all are of a progressive sort, are also to be found in many of the marginal zones of capitalism.Spaces have been opened up within which something radically different in terms of dominant social relations, ways of life, productive capacities and mental conceptions of the world can flourish. This applies as much to the Taliban and to communist rule in Nepal as to the Zapatistas in Chiapas and indigenous movements in Bolivia or the Maoist movements in rural India, even as they are worlds apart in objectives, strategies and tactics. The central problem is that in aggregate there is no resolute and sufficiently unified anti -capitalist movement that can adequately challenge the reproduction of the capitalist class and the perpetuation of its power on the world stage. Neither is there any obvious way to attack the bastions of privilege for capitalist elites or to curb their inordinate money power and military might. There is, however, a vague sense that not only is another world possible - as the alternative globalisation movement began to proclaim in the 1990S (loudly after what became known as the battle of Seattle in 1999, when the meetings of the World Trade Organization were thoroughly disrupted by street action) - but that with the collapse of the Soviet empire another communism might also be possible. While openings exist towards some alternative social order, no one really knows where or what it is. But just because there is no political force capable of articulating, let alone mounting, such a programme, this is no reason to hold back on outlining alternatives. Lenin's famous question 'What is to be done?' cannot be answered, to be sure, without some sense of who might do it and where. But a global anti-capitalist movement is unlikely to emerge without some animating vision of what is to be done and why. A double blockage exists: the lack of an alternative vision prevents the formation of an oppositional movement, while the absence of such a movement precludes the articulation of an alternative. HoW, then, can this blockage be transcended? The relation between the vision of what is to be done and why, and the formation of a political movement across particular places to do it, has to be turned into a spiral. Each has to reinforce the other if anything is actually to get done. Otherwise potential opposition will be for ever locked down into a closed circle that frustrates all prospects for constructive change, leaving us vulnerable to perpetual future crises of capitalism, with increasingly deadly results. The central problem to be addressed is clear enough. Compound growth for ever is not possible and the troubles that have beset the world these last thirty years signal that a limit is looming to continuous capital accumulation that cannot be transcended except by creating fictions that cannot last. Add to this the facts that so many people in the world live in conditions of abject poverty, that environmental degradations are spiralling out of control, that human dignities are everywhere being offended even as the rich are piling up more and more wealth under their command, and that the levers of political, institutional, judicial, military and media power are under such tight but dogmatic political control as to be incapable of doing much more than perpetuating the status quo. A revolutionary politics that can grasp the nettle of endless compound capital accumulation and eventually shut it down as the prime motor of human history requires a sophisticated understanding of how social change occurs. The failings of past endeavours to build socialism and communism are to be avoided and lessons from that immensely complicated history plainly must be learned. Yet the absolute necessity for a coherent anti-capitalist revolutionary movement must also be recognised. The fundamental aim of that movement has to be to assume social command over both the production and distribution of surpluses. Let's take another look at the theory of co-evolution laid out in chapter 5. Can this form the basis for a co-revolutionary theory? A political movement can start anywhere (in labour processes, around mental conceptions, in the relation to nature, in social relations, in the design of revolutionary technologies and organisational forms, out of daily life or through attempts to reform institutional and administrative structures including the reconfiguration of state powers). The trick is to keep the political movement moving from one sphere of activity to another in mutually reinforcing ways. This was how capitalism arose out of feudalism and this is how something radically different - call it communism, socialism or whatever - must arise out of capitalism. Previous attempts to create a communist or socialist alternative fatally failed to keep the dialectic between the different activity spheres in motion and also failed to embrace the unpredictabilities and uncertainties in the dialectical movement between the spheres. Capitalism has survived precisely by keeping that dialectical movement going and by embracing the inevitable tensions, including crises, that result. Imagine, then, some territory within which a population wakes up to the probability that endless capital accumulation is neither possible nor desirable and that it therefore collectively believes another world not only is but must be possible. How should that collectivity begin upon its quest to construct alternatives? Change arises out of an existing state of affairs and it has to harness the possibilities immanent within an existing situation. Since the existing situation varies enormously from Nepal, to the Pacific regions of Bolivia, to the de industrialising cities of Michigan and the still booming cities of Mumbai and Shanghai and the damaged but by no means destroyed financial centres of New York and London, so all manner of experiments in social change in different places and at different geographical scales are both likely and potentially illuminating as ways to make (or not make) another world possible. And in each instance it may seem as if one or other aspect of the existing situation holds the key to a different political future. But the first rule for an anti-capitalist movement is: never rely on the unfolding dynamics of one moment without carefully calibrating how relations with all the others are adapting and reverberating. Feasible future possibilities arise out of the existing state of relations between the different spheres. Strategic political interventions within and across the spheres can gradually move the social order on to a different developmental path. This is what wise leaders and forward-looking institutions do all the time in local situations, so there is no reason to think there is anything particularly fantastic or utopian about acting in this way. It must first be clearly recognised, however, that development is not the same as growth. It is possible to develop differently on the terrains, for example, of social relations, daily life and the relation to nature, without necessarily resuming growth or favouring capital. Perm? David Harvey, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the [City University of New York](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_University_of_New_York), 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228) It is false to maintain that growth is a precondition for poverty and inequality reduction or that more respectful environmental policies are, like organic foods, a luxury for the rich. Secondly, transformations within each sphere will require a deep understanding of both the internal dynamics of, for example, institutional arrangements and technological change in relation to all the other spheres of action. Alliances will have to be built between and across those working in the distinctive spheres. This means that an anti-capitalist movement has to be far broader than groups mobilizing around social relations or over questions of daily life in themselves. Traditional hostilities between, for example, those with technical, scientific and administrative expertise and those animating social movements on the ground have to be addressed and overcome. Thirdly, it will also be necessary to confront the impacts and feedbacks (including political hostilities) coming from other spaces in the global economy. Different places may develop in different ways given their history, culture, location and political-economic condition. Some developments elsewhere can be supportive or complementary, while others might be deleterious or even antagonistic. Some inter-territorial competition is inevitable but not all bad. It depends on what the competition is about - indices of economic growth or the liveability of daily life? Berlin, for example, is a very liveable city but all the usual capitalist-inspired indices of economic success depict it as a backward place. Land values and property prices are lamentably low, which means that people of little means can easily find not bad places in which to live. Developers are miserable. If only New York or London were more like Berlin in that regard! There have to be, finally, some loosely agreed upon common objectives. Some general guiding norms can be set down. These might include respect for nature, radical egalitarianism in social relations, institutional arrangements based in some sense of common interests, democratic administrative procedures (as opposed to the monetised shams that now exist), labour processes organised by the direct producers, daily life as the free exploration of new kinds of social relations and living arrangements, mental conceptions that focus on self-realisation in service to others and technological and organisational innovations oriented to the pursuit of the common good rather than to supporting militarised power and corporate greed. These could be the co-revolutionary points around which social action could converge and rotate. Of course this is utopian! But so what! We cannot afford not to be.

### 2NC Framework:

#### The question regarding the plan is “does it confirm or contradict the communist hypothesis.” If we win a link argument, you should reject the affirmative because they reduce life to a barbaric ratrace and stand opposed to universal emancipation.

Alain Badiou, former Chair of Philosophy at École normale supérieure, 2008. [The Meaning of Sarkozy, pp. 97-103]

I would like to situate the Sarkozy episode, which is not an impressive page in French history, in a broader horizon. I Let us picture a kind of Hegelian fresco of recent world history - by which I do not, like our journalists, mean the triad Mitterrand-Chirac-Sarkozy, but rather the development of the politics of working-class and popular emancipation over nearly two centuries. Since the French Revolution and its gradually universal echo, since the most radically egalitarian developments of that revolution, the decrees of Robespierre's Committee of Public Safety on the 'maximum' and Babeuf's theorizations, we know (when I say 'we', I mean humanity in the abstract, and the knowledge in question is universally available on the paths of emancipation) that communism is the right hypothesis*.* Indeed, there is no other, or at least I am not aware of one. All those who abandon this hypothesis immediately resign themselves to the market economy, to parliamentary democracy - the form of state suited to capitalism - and to the inevitable and 'natural' character of the most monstrous inequalities. What do we mean by 'communism'? As Marx argued in the 1844 *ManUJcriptJ,* communism is an idea regarding the destiny of the human species. This use of the word must be completely distinguished from the meaning of the adjective 'communist' that is so worn-out today, in such expressions as 'communist parties', 'communist states' or 'communist world' - never mind that 'communist state' is an oxymoron, to which the obscure coinage 'socialist state' has wisely been preferred. Even if, as we shall see, these uses of the word belong to a time when the hypothesis was still coming-to-be. In its generic sense, 'communist' means first of all, in a negative sense - as we can read in its canonical text *The Communist ManijeJto* - that the logic of classes, of the fundamental subordination of people who actually work for a dominant class, can be overcome. This arrangement, which has been that of history ever since antiquity, is not inevitable. Consequently, the oligarchic power of those who possess wealth and organize its circulation, crystallized in the might of states, is not inescapable. The communist hypothesis is that a different collective organization is practicable, one that will eliminate the inequality of wealth and even the division of labour: every individual will be a 'multi-purpose worker', and in particular people will circulate between manual and intellectual work, as well as between town and country. The private appropriation of monstrous fortunes and their transmission by inheritance will disappear. The existence of a coercive state separate from civil society, with its military and police, will no longer seem a self-evident necessity. There will be, Marx tells us - and he saw this point as his major contribution - after a brief sequence of 'proletarian dictatorship' charged with destroying the remains of the old world, a long sequence of reorganization on the basis of a 'free association' of producers and creators, which will make possible a 'withering away' of the state. 'Communism' as such only denotes this very general set of intellectual representations. This set is the horizon of any initiative, however local and limited in time it may be, that breaks with the order of established opinions - the necessity of inequalities and the state instrument for protecting these - and composes a fragment of a politics of emancipation. In other words, communism is what Kant called an 'Idea', with a regulatory function, rather than a programme. It is absurd to characterize communist principles in the sense I have defined them here as utopian, as is so often done. They are intellectual patterns, always actualized in a different fashion, that serve to produce lines of demarcation between different forms of politics. By and large, a particular political sequence is either compatible with these principles or opposed to them, in which case it is reactionary. 'Communism', in this sense, is a heuristic hypothesis that is very frequently used in political argument, even if the word itself does not appear. If it is still true, as Sartre said, that 'every anti-communist is a swine', it is because any political sequence that, in its principles or lack of them, stands in formal contradiction with the communist hypothesis in its generic sense, has to be judged as opposed to the emancipation of the whole of humanity, and thus to the properly human destiny of humanity. Whoever does not illuminate the coming-to-be of humanity with the communist hypothesis - whatever words they use, as such words matter little - reduces humanity, as far as its collective becoming is concerned, to animality. As we know, the contemporary - that is, the capitalist name of this animality - is 'competition'. The war dictated by self-interest, and nothing more. As a pure Idea of equality, the communist hypothesis has no doubt existed in a practical state since the beginnings of the existence of the state. As soon as mass action opposes state coercion in the name of egalitarian justice, we have the appearance of rudiments or fragments of the communist hypothesis. This is why, in a pamphlet titled *De l'UJeologie,* which I wrote in collaboration with the late lamented Francois Balmes and was published in 1976, we proposed to identity 'communist invariants'f Popular revolts, such as that of the slaves led by Spartacus, or that of the German peasants led by Thomas Munzer, are examples of this practical existence of communist invariants. However, in the explicit form that it was given by certain thinkers and activists of the French Revolution, the communist hypothesis inaugurates political modernity. It was this that laid low the mental structures of the *ancien regime,* yet without being tied to those 'democratic' political forms that the bourgeoisie would make the instrument for its own pursuit of power. This point is essential: from the beginning, the communist hypothesis in no way coincided with the 'democratic' hypothesis that would lead to present-day parliamentarism. It subsumes a different history and different events. What seems important and creative when illuminated by the communist hypothesis is different in kind from what bourgeois-democratic historiography selects. That is indeed why Marx, giving materialist foundations to the first effective great sequence of the modern politics of emancipation, both took over the word 'communism' and distanced himself from any kind of democratic 'politicism' by maintaining, after the lesson of the Paris Commune, that the bourgeois state, no matter how democratic, must be destroyed. Well, I leave it to you to judge what is important or not, to judge the points whose consequences you choose to assume against the horizon of the communist hypothesis. Once again, it is the right hypothesis, and we can appeal to its principles, whatever the declensions or variations that these undergo in different contexts. Sartre said in an interview, which I paraphrase: If the communist hypothesis is not right, if it is not practicable, well, that means that humanity is not a thing in itself, not very different from ants or termites. What did he mean by that? If competition, the 'free market', the sum of little pleasures, and the walls that protect you from the desire of the weak, are the alpha and omega of all collective and private existence, then the human animal is not worth a cent. And it is this worthlessness to which Bush with his aggressive conservatism and crusader spirit, Blair the Pious with his militarist rhetoric, and Sarkozy with his 'work, family, country' discipline, want to reduce the existence of the immense majority of living individuals. And the 'Left' is still worse, simply juxtaposing to this vacant violence a vague spirit of charity. To morbid competition, the pasteboard victories of daddy's boys and girls, the ridiculous supermen of unleashed finance, the coked-up heroes of the planetary stock exchange, this Left can only oppose the same actors with a bit of social politeness, a little walnut oil in the wheels, crumbs of holy wafer for the disinherited - in other words, borrowing from Nietzsche, the bloodless figure of the 'last man. To put an end once and for all to May '68 means agreeing that our only choice is between the hereditary nihilism of finance and social piety. It not only means accepting that communism collapsed in the Soviet Union, not only acknowledging that the Parti Communiste Francais has been wretchedly defeated, but also and above all it means abandoning the hypothesis that May '68 was a militant invention precisely aware ofthe failure of state'communism'. And thus that May '68, and still more so the five years that followed, inaugurated a new sequence for the genuine communist hypothesis, one that always keeps its distance from the state. Certainly, no one could say where all this might lead, but we knew in any case that what was at stake was the rebirth of this hypothesis. If the thing that Sarkozy is the name of succeeds in imposing the necessity of abandoning any idea of a rebirth of this kind, if human society is a collection of individuals pursuing their self-interest, if this is the eternal reality, then it is certain that the philosopher can and must abandon the human animal to its sad destiny. But we shall not let a triumphant Sarkozy dictate the meaning of our existence, or the tasks of philosophy. For what we are witnessing in no way imposes such a renunciation of the communist hypothesis, but simply a consideration of the moment at which we find ourselves in the history of this hypothesis.

## 2NC Links

### Solidarity

#### The 1AC’s calls for solidarity is the ultimate of consumerist practice: the act of reading the 1AC is not revolutionary, but rather is the minimum action we can take, absolving us of any responsibility for anti-capitalist politics.

Bruckner 2K – Philosophy at the Sorbonne [Pascal, Tears of the White Man, The Divine Child, and Evil Angels, The Temptation of Innocence, 2000, p. 285- 88)

That is what happens when, through carelessness, we ignore the elementary law of any engagement: a minimal knowledge of the terrain, of the populations that one aims to help, of the players involved.) Better yet: our habits as consumers transform us, thanks to the products we choose, into instantaneous patrons. How many chocolate bars, coffee brands, fast foods, body lotions and jeans sponsor some humanitarian cause, taking part in the great crusade of the heart? By exercising a little care in our shopping, we can express our active benevolence from sunrise to sunset, we can sprinkle our benevolence over the world the way we mist a plant to refresh it. Do you want to help the homeless, for example? Wear an *Agnes B* T-shirt. To protect an Amazonian tribe? Drink Stentor coffee. To stop violence, discrimination and spite? Buy Benetton. Then you will be doing good without even knowing it, the was Monsieur Jourdain made prose. There isn’t a moment of the day when we don’t have an opportunity to express our all-consuming altruism. What object, even the most commonplace- pants, toothpaste, candy- couldn’t be incorporated into the sphere of charity? Gone is the rigor of yesteryear, gone are our obsolete scruples: we without having to lift our little finger. Everything I wear, use, drink or eat dispenses help and consolation somewhere around me, as if by magic. Alms are included in the purchase. This is a kind of absentminded, automatic goodness that lavishes comfort in spite of us. The virtues of commitment are reconciled with the conveniences of torpor. This charity without obligation is the most pleasant thing there is: for now I can be selfish and generous, detached and engaged, passive and active. And how can we fail to appreciate the companies that guarantee to us that wearing their clothes, using their body lotion, eating their food can cure, even in a negligible way, the miseries of the world and discharge our concern? You might say there is no harm in it, that this scattershot approach (inevitable when we are suffocating under causes) is preferable to inertia. But doing this very little bit becomes an alibi for not doing anything more. The extraordinary abnegation of some (who are usually appointed to appease our remorse) must not make us forget the apathy or tepidity of the majority. One should not confuse the avowed and publicized ideal with the accomplished ideal, we must work to reduce the distance that separates the two. In this respect our society is no worse than another; but it is characteristic of our time and its sentimental rhetoric that we no longer dare to acknowledge indifference as such and we speak the language of sacrifice, with hand on heart. Coldness, insensitivity return at the end of a speech inflated with fine words and great principles; it is with the smile of love that we leave the other to die. In this way we encourage a kind of peaceful selfishness that has digested its own criticisms and believes itself to be eminently good. Buying solidarity with a pair of jeans or a yogurt represents concern for others the way prostitution represents love. You will excuse me if I point out that charity cannot be amusing, that it must be “a little severe,” as the founders of SOS-Sahel say, or risk degenerating into jokes and pleasantries. Applying the criteria and methods of consumerism to charity makes the ethical field look easy. When the market puts itself at the service of morals and claims to promote mutual aid and solidarity, it is morals that ends up serving the market, because it has become profitable. When benevolence becomes mechanical, when generosity spreads everywhere like a gas, it disappears through dissolution, it ceases to wrench us out of our easy satisfaction. Having become ridiculous, this reflex “saintliness” brings discredit as well as confusion because it wins out over other more sincere attitudes. Through these counterfeits, our societies consume their ideals in the literal sense of the term, ridiculing them by celebrating them. And then our spirit of fraternity dies, not by drying up but by being drowned out in a simulacrum of brass bands and finer feelings.

### Single Issue Focus

#### The affirmative is only attacking the symptom of capital dispossession. We must refuse the call for easy reform and dedicate ourselves to the real task of anti-capitalist movement building.

Patrick Reinsborough 2003 (has been involved in campaigns for peace, the environment, and social justice for over twenty years. He co-founded the smartMeme strategy & training project in 2002 and with his colleague has trained over 3,000 organizers and partnered with over 100 high impact organizations to frame issues, strengthen alliances and win critical campaigns. Patrick was previously the Organizing Director of the Rainforest Action Network where he mobilized thousands of people to confront corporations who destroy the environment and violate human rights. Patrick's work has incorporated a range of creative tactics including brand busting, cross-cultural alliance building, markets campaigning and nonviolent direct action. DE-COLONIZING THE REVOLUTIONARY IMAGINATION Journal of aesthetics and politics August 2003 volume 1, issue 2 http://www.joaap.org/1/de\_colonizing/index.html)

Our planet is heading into an unprecedented global crisis. The blatancy of the corporate power grab and the accelerating ecological meltdown is evidence that we do not live in an era where we can afford the luxury of fighting the symptoms. As is often noted, crisis provides both danger and opportunity. The extent that these two opposing qualities define our era will be largely based on the appeal and breadth of the social movements which arise to address the crisis. This essay is part of my own struggle to explore a politics that is commensurate with the scale of the global crisis. In part it was inspired by a profound strategy insight I received while watching a circling bird of prey. The raptor seemed to spend hours calmly drifting on the breezes, waiting and watching, then suddenly made a lightning quick dive to seize its prey. Had I only witnessed the raptor’s final plunge, I might not have realizing that it took hours of patient surveillance for the raptor to be in the right place to make a seemingly effortless kill. I was struck by what a clear metaphor the raptor’s circling time is for what our movements need to do in order to be successful. Social change is not just the bird of prey’s sudden plunge—the flurry of direct confrontation - but rather the whole process of circling, watching, and preparing. Analysis is the most import tool in the social change toolbox. It is this process of analysis— the work to find the points of intervention and leverage in the system we are working to transform— that suggests why, where and how to use the other tools. Many of us are impatient in our desire for change and particularly, those of us from privileged backgrounds, are often times unschooled in the realities of long-term struggle. I often recall the Buddhist saying “The task before us is very urgent so we must slow down.” This essay is my effort as an organizer who has been deeply involved in a number of recent global justice mass actions, to “slow down” a bit and explore some new analytical tools. My hope is that this essay will incite deeper conversations about strategies for building movements with the inclusiveness, creativity and depth of vision necessary to move towards a more just and sane world. To do so, let’s begin by asking why aren’t more global north movements coming forward with systemic critiques? Why despite the increasingly obvious nature of the crisis, isn’t there more visible resistance to the corporate take over of the global political system, economy and culture? The answer to this question lies in our exploration of how pathological values have shaped not only the global system but also our ability to imagine true change. The system we are fighting is not merely structural it’s also inside us, through the internalization of oppressive cultural norms which define our worldview. Our minds have been colonized to normalize deeply pathological assumptions. Thus often times our own sense of self-defeatism becomes complicit with the anesthetic qualities of a cynical mass media to make fundamental social change unimaginable. As a consequence activists frequently ghettoize themselves by self-identifying through protest and failing to conceive of themselves as building movements that can actually change power relations. All too often we project our own sense of powerlessness by mistaking militancy for radicalism and mobilization for movement building. It seems highly unlikely to me that capitalism will be smashed one widow at a time. Likewise getting tens of thousands of people to take joint action is not an end in itself, rather only the first step in catalyzing deeper shifts in Western culture. Our revolution(s) will really start rolling when the logic of our actions and the appeal of our disobedience is so clear that it can easily replicate and spread far beyond the limiting definition of “protester” or “activist”. To do so, our movements for justice, ecology and democracy must deepen their message by more effectively articulating the values crisis underlying the corporate system. We must lay claim to life-affirming, common sense values and expose one of the most blatant revolutionary truths of the modern era: the corporate rule system rooted in sacrificing human dignity and planetary health for elite profit is out of alignment with an increasing number of people’s basic values. This is the domain of post-issue activism— the recognition that the roots of the emerging crisis lie in the fundamental flaws of the modern order and that our movements for change need to talk about re-designing the whole global system— now. Post-issue activism is a dramatic divergence from the slow progression of single-issue politics, narrow constituencies and band-aid solutions. Traditional single-issue politics, despite noble and pragmatic goals, is not just a strategic and gradualist path to the same goal of global transformation. Rather the framework of issue-based struggle needs to affirm the existing system in order to win concessions and thus inhibits the evolution of more systemic movements. Too often we spend our time campaigning against the smoke rather than clearly alerting people to the fact that their house is on fire. Post-issue activism is the struggle to address the holistic nature of the crisis and it demands new frameworks, new alliances and new strategies. We must find ways to articulate the connections between all the “issues” by revealing the pathological nature of the corporate take over. To do so we must rise to the challenge of going beyond (rather than abandoning) single-issue politics. We have to learn to talk about values, deepen our analysis without sacrificing accessibility and direct more social change resources into creating political space for a truly transformative arena of social change. To explore de-colonizing the revolutionary imagination, we must reference the history of colonization. The word colonialism comes from “colonia” a Latin word for rural farmstead. When the armies of the Roman empire conquered the peoples of Europe they seized the land and created colonias to control the territory. A thousand years later Europe came to be controlled by leaders who went on to mimic this cruelty, and force Western civilization ("a disease historically spread by sharp swords"1 ) upon the rest of the world. Colonialism is not just a process of establishing physical control over territory, it is the process of establishing the ideologies and the identities - colonies in the mind - that perpetuate control. Central to this process has been the manufacture of attitudes of racism, nationalism, patriarchal manhood, and the division of society into economic classes. If we are to take seriously de-colonizing the revolutionary imagination then we must examine how these attitudes, shape the way we conceive of social change. Likewise we must remember that analysis is shaped by experience and that those who suffer directly as targets of these manufactured attitudes of oppression often live the experiences which create clear analysis. Effective revolutions listen. In facing the global crisis, the most powerful weapon that we have is our imaginations. But first we must liberate ourselves from the conceptual limitations we place on social change. As we expand the realm of the possible we shape the direction of the probable. This means directly confronting the myths and assumptions that make a better world seem unattainable. To that end this essay endeavors to explore some tools to help us unshackle our imaginations and deepen the momentum of the global justice movements into a political space to fundamentally re-design the global system.

### Consumption

#### The focus on greater access to the pleasures of the city is the worst form of consumer fetishism that dooms us to an environmental doomsday.

Patrick Reinsborough 2003 (has been involved in campaigns for peace, the environment, and social justice for over twenty years. He co-founded the smartMeme strategy & training project in 2002 and with his colleague has trained over 3,000 organizers and partnered with over 100 high impact organizations to frame issues, strengthen alliances and win critical campaigns. Patrick was previously the Organizing Director of the Rainforest Action Network where he mobilized thousands of people to confront corporations who destroy the environment and violate human rights. Patrick's work has incorporated a range of creative tactics including brand busting, cross-cultural alliance building, markets campaigning and nonviolent direct action. DE-COLONIZING THE REVOLUTIONARY IMAGINATION Journal of aesthetics and politics August 2003 volume 1, issue 2 http://www.joaap.org/1/de\_colonizing/index.html)

At the center of the ever-growing doomsday economy is a perverse division of resources that slowly starves the many while normalizing over-consumption for the few. Maintaining control in a system that creates such blatant global injustice relies on the age old tools of empire: repression, brutality and terror. Multinational corporations have long since learned how to “constructively engage” with known repressive regimes and put “strong central leadership” to work for their profit margins. Whether its US approved military dictatorships or America’s ever growing incarceration economy, the naked control that is used to, criminalize, contain and silence dissent among the have-nots is obvious. But this brutality is just one side of the system of global control. Far less acknowledged is that in addition to the wide spread use of the stick the global system relies heavily on the selective use of the carrot. The entire debate around globalization has been framed to insure that the tiny global minority who makes up the over-consumption class never connects their inflated standard of living with the impoverishment of the rest of the world. Most people who live outside the small over-consumption class can’t help but be aware of the system’s failings. But for the majority of American (global north) consumers the coercion that keeps them complicit with the doomsday economy is not physical; it is largely ideological, relying heavily on the mythology of America. It is this control mythology which buys people’s loyalty by presenting a story of the world that normalizes the global corporate take over. In this story America is the freest country in the world and corporate capitalism is the same as democracy. The interests of corporations are represented as serving popular needs (jobs being the simplistic argument) and the goal of US foreign policy is presented as a benevolent desire to spread democracy, promote equality and increase standards of living. This control mythology prevents people from seeing how pathologized the global system has become. Much of this story is merely crude propaganda that relies on American’s notorious ignorance about the world but elements of the control mythology have become so deeply imbedded in our lives that they now define our culture. Among these most deep ceded elements of the control mythology is the ethic of an unquestioned, unrestrained right to consume. Consumerism is the purest drug of the doomsday economy. It epitomizes the pathology— the commodification of life’s staples and the human and cultural systems that have been created to sustain collective life. Children’s author Dr. Suess provides a simple eloquent critique of consumerism in his cautionary tale The Lorax when he describes how the forests gets destroyed to make useless disposable objects appropriately called “thneeds”. A slick businessman markets “thneeds” and maximizes production until the forest is entirely destroyed. This is the essence of consumerism— creating artificially high rates of consumption by getting people to believe they need excessive or useless things. Over-consumption (invented in America but now exported around the planet) is the engine that drives the doomsday economy. Bigger. Faster. Newer. More! More! More! We live in a culture of information saturation which constantly redefines an increasingly insane world as normal. Media advocacy group, TV Free America estimates that the average American watches an equivalent of 52 days of TV per year. 9 As corporations have seized the right to manufacture and manipulate collective desire, advertising has grown into a nearly $200 billion a year industry and become the dominant function of mass media. Feminist media critic Jean Kilbourne estimates that each day the average North American is bombarded by 3000 print, radio and television ads. 10 This media saturation plays heavily into the control mythology by over digesting information, thereby shrinking our attention spans to the point where we can no longer re-assemble the story of the global crisis. The doomsday economy’s elevation of consumerism to the center of public life, is causing massive psychological damage to people around the world. Advertyising works because it subtly assaults a customer’s self esteem to get them to buy more unnecessary stuff. This process is fundamentally de-humanizing. The culture-jamming magazine Adbusters has re-hashed William S.. Burroughs to give us the concept in a slogan: “The Product is You.” The result is a pathologized global monoculture which fetishizes over-consumption, self-gratification and narcissism. Although this may insure ongoing profits for the corporations who manage the “culture industry” it also prevents people from recognizing the impacts of their over-consumption on communities and ecosystems around the world. The control mythology masks the realities of the doomsday economy by narrowing the popular frame of reference to the point that it's impossible to see beyond the next up-grade of pre-packaged lifestyle. The omni-present commodification of all aspects of life turns freedom into “image branding” and “product placement” while the distinction between citizen and consumer becomes more blurred. The army of one. Individual purchasing power. America open for business. How else could we get to the point where the United Nations estimates that nearly 1 in 6 people on the planet do not get their basic daily calorie needs meet, but in America shopping is still presented as entertainment. 11 Increasingly in the corporatized world a person’s rights are defined by their purchasing power— access to health care, education, a nutritious diet, mental stimulation, or nature are all a factor of how much money you have. The right to over-consume becomes the centerpiece of the new unspoken Bill of Rights of America, Inc. A country of the corporations, by the corporations, and for the corporations. The unification of Europe looks ready to follow a similar path- towards a United States of Europe. The cancer spreads…. Consumerism is the manifestation of our pathological re-programming to not ask questions about where all the “stuff” comes from. The American bootstrap mythology (as in, “pull yourself up by”…) relies on our ecological illiteracy to believe that everyone could live the “american” over-consumption life style if they only worked hard enough. The cancer cell operates as if it were not part of a larger organism. The fully conditioned consumer thinks only in terms of themselves, acting as if there were no ecological limits in the world. The twisted logic of consumerism continue to function as a control mythology even as much of the affluence of working America has been siphoned off by corporate greed. A complex range of sophisticated anesthetics (dare I say bread and circuses…?) helps bolster the control mythology by keeping people distracted. Whether its the digital opium den of 500 channel cable TV, the cornucopia of mood altering prescription drugs or now the terror-induced national obsession with unquestioning patriotism, there’s little opportunity for people to break the spell of modern consumerism. The mythology of prosperity still holds even as the reality becomes more and more illusive. For now perhaps, but for how much longer? As author and media theorist James Bell writes, “images of power crumble before empires fall.” There are many signs that the empty materialism of modern consumer life is leaving many ordinary people discontent and ripe for new types of political and cultural transformation.

### Green Consumption

#### Responsible consumption of transportation is a smokescreen that allows the inertia of capital to continue.

Lyle K Grant 2011 (professor of psychology, Athabasca University The Behavior Analyst Fall; 34(2): 245–266. Can We Consume Our Way Out of Climate Change? A Call for Analysis)

The problem of climate change is analyzed as a manifestation of economic growth, and the steady-state economy of ecological economics is proposed as a system-wide solution. Four classes of more specific solutions are described. In the absence of analysis, cultural inertia will bias solutions in favor of green consumption as a generalized solution strategy. By itself, green consumption is a flawed solution to climate change because it perpetuates or even accelerates economic growth that is incompatible with a sustainable culture. Addressing climate change requires an integration of regulatory, energy efficiency, skill-based, and dissemination solutions. Behavioral scientists are encouraged to work with others in ecological economics and other social sciences who recognize cultural reinvention as a means of achieving sustainability. The Behavior Analyst published a special section in its Fall 2010 issue in which the editors took the initiative to seek solutions to the problem of climate change. Invited contributors were instructed to avoid analyzing the nature of the problem and instead provide concise 1,000-word solutions (Heward & Chance, 2010). Placing a priority on solutions rather than analysis reflects a sincere impulse to solve a recognized problem without further delay, as well as recognition that behavior analysis has historically been a rich source of solutions to environmental problems. However, this relative priority might imply that analysis serves only to delay solutions rather than to inspire them. Discounting the value of analysis is also a point of departure from the contemporary practice in behavior analysis of conducting a functional analysis to identify existing functional relations prior to treatment selection. Much of the value of analysis is to understand and define problems in a way that facilitates solutions. Numerous analyses have led to the conclusion that excessive and growing consumption, exacerbated by an expanding world population, contributes to global climate change and other problems of sustainability (Leggett, 2005; McKibben, 2007, 2010; Nevin, 2005; Schor, 2010; Skinner, 1987; Swim et al., 2010). Recognizing the underlying problem as one of overconsumption has several consequences including the realization that climate change is driven by larger cultural factors or metacontingencies (Glenn, 1986, 1991) that elevate economic growth over the longer term well-being of the planet and its inhabitants. Nevin (2005) analyzed this larger cultural issue from a behavioral perspective and concluded that the rich reinforcement of affluent societies has made their consumption resistant to change, leaving us with a problem that has self-perpetuating features. Although the contributors to the special section offered many imaginative solutions, the solutions were disproportionately focused on reducing carbon emissions through green consumption and were mainly concerned with making energy use more efficient. The notion that green consumption is an unambiguous and singularly effective solution to climate change is in some respects more of a manifestation of the problem of cultural inertia than it is a solution. As a unitary solution, green buying has been critically analyzed as an approach that (a) is a weak and convenient business-as-usual method designed more to maintain resource-intensive economic growth than to solve environmental problems (Rogers, 2010; Yanarella, Levine, & Lancaster, 2009); (b) ignores the longer term rebound effects of energy efficiency improvements in increasing energy use (Grant, 2010; Owen, 2010; Sorrell, 2007); (c) fosters the illusion that buyers have done their part to solve climate change merely through purchases (Begley, 2010); (d) reflects a dogma of consumer sovereignty that shifts responsibility for environmental problems to individuals who act in a free market rather than to corporate interests that motivate consumption and profit from it (Maniates, 2002); (e) neglects opportunities to cease endless economic growth and make a transition to a sustainable steady-state economy with a more equitable distribution of wealth (Daly, 1996); and (f) overlooks possibilities for cultural reinvention based on a transition from an economic age to a cultural age (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Grant, 2010; Mill, 1848; Schafer, 2008; Scitovsky, 1989; Skinner, 1976).

### The City

#### The desire for inclusion in modernity ties the affirmative even closer to investment in resolving the crises of capitalism. Only repudiation of the modernity inherent in the desire for the city can allow real alternatives to flourish.

Khristopher Flack 2011 (freelance writer and Farm-to-School Coordinator in northern Vermont. Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, Anywhere is Everywhere: Reclaiming Community through production in the Rural Northeast <http://joaap.org/issue8/flack.htm>)

After being expected to hold our breaths through the budget debate, the debt ceiling debate, and the whims of the stock market to see if our lives can continue or not, we are realizing—as millions across the country are realizing—that our sense of community and whatever's inside each of us personally is the most capable engine for generating dependable, fresh steps forward. These are some of the only things that can't be borrowed, borrowed against, speculated on, lost, sold, or turned into a derivative. As such, there is nothing to lose. The dream of “modern society” or “the modern world” has proven itself not only disappointing and unattainable, but insultingly impersonal. Let these old paradigms stagnate or not. We are redefining modernity as the reclamation and revaluing of our everyday lives and the fundamental acts which compose them: growing and eating food, working together, creating something local to us that can coexist or be independent of “The World.” By cultivating this place-based modernity, we simultaneously assume a new meaning of modernity and let go of the concept altogether. In this choice we find the power and autonomy of localized living. Yet unlike the back to the land movement, the autonomy cultivated by grassroots modernism is a byproduct, not the priority. Rather than retreating from the community to a refugee camp for likeminded people, the grassroots modernist sees him or herself as part of an intentional community already, and insists on calibrating those intentions to confront the challenge of staying put, refusing to be chased from his or her community by the threats of failing systems. By mustering the courage to initiate the transformations we want to see, and forging a progressive, local agenda with what’s available, we each find ourselves enjoying a sense of autonomy as part of a community, without having had to dissolve the community and separate to find it. As we’re transcending previous concepts of communal living we’re also embracing cooperation that transcends specialization and old enemies by creating new friendships. The land for Fresh Start is owned by the most notorious landlord in the city, who no one expected to support a project like ours before we approached him; the Mayor himself couldn’t believe we wanted to “give a garden to those people.” But as the ones who traditionally do not profit from the divisions between The Powerful and The Powerless, it’s in our best interest to assume our own power and prove to traditionally dominant parties that there are ways forward that benefit everyone. The landlord was happy to have a garden in a lot that couldn’t be developed any other way; the Mayor, regardless of how he feels about the neighborhood, is no doubt happy about all the positive attention the garden has brought to the city. The same is true across the community, where the city planner's time is worth as much as the time of the neighbor who manages the garden and the artist’s technical expertise is enhanced by the neighbor’s insight. In a climate of grassroots modernism, “The Man” is de-capitalized maybe so, maybe no. Is this the best word?, joining everyone else on the pavement, where we find a mutual interest in shifting from The Powerful vs. The Powerless to a more nuanced, joint identity as The Empowered. Khris and Zak Khris and Zak work the garden. And so, our innovation isn’t really in our projects —community gardens, collective living, and art aren’t new. Our innovation is in adapting our highest, most creative aspirations to the needs of our particular place and insisting to ourselves and each other that those aspirations can be the basis of viable lives. Accordingly, grassroots modernity needs no authorization or endorsement. It happens organically, as soon as we realize our ability to reclaim our everyday lives, as a handful of us in Newport are trying to reclaim a 20x10 patch of grass at the end of Eastern Avenue to plant a few berry bushes, a ½ acre in the shadow of the water tower to grow veggies, 5,000 square feet of lawn across the street from a lawnmower repair shop for pear trees. But grassroots modernity is destined for the graveyard of manifestoes if it finds itself culturally owned—and eventually dropped— by the Austins, Portlands, Brooklyns, and West Phillys of the world. There are no capitals of the country we are looking to create, and in some sense, there is no country. There is no President of the United States to heave all our hopes on, or all our disappointment; there is no Congress or Senate to be frustrated with. My heart does not plunge when the stock market plunges. My worth and the worth of my ambitions and my potential do not fluctuate with the dollar. We are looking to create individual communities and clusters of communities that innovate ways to meet their specific needs and ambitions, who relate to one another the way people ideally would, as different, unique beings with unique skills and passions, with a set of core, mutually understood values. And if we are serious about working toward the spread of this way of living on a global or even regional scale, then we all have to learn to see the evolutionary potential in wherever we are right now, or at least consider bringing our energies and ideas to places that no one would expect to carry the banner of any major or minor movement. All the time, friends ask me “Why Newport? These are great ideas, but don’t you think they’d be better off elsewhere?” Newport is elsewhere and it is also anywhere, and by changing anywhere, change everywhere will come.

## Impacts

### Dedev

#### It’s try or die – collapse has to happen to prevent extinction

Brent 11 – frequent contributor to Countercurrents, expert on population issues

(Jason, “Billions Of Humans Will Die Horribly,” http://www.countercurrents.org/brent090111.htm)

The simple questions become can the earth provide those resources to humanity in 2050 when the resources used between 1950 and 2050 are taken into consideration and if the earth can provide the resources for how long can they be provided? While no one can provide an absolute answers to those questions, it would be the height of folly for humanity to gamble its survival on the ability for the earth to provide in 2050 8.41 times the resources it provided in 1950 and it would be extremely foolish for humanity to gamble its survival that the earth could continue providing those resources for any length of time. Humanity has two choices---reduce population or reduce the per capita usage of resources, There are no other choices. If humanity does not reduce population and/or reduce per capita usage of resources, the earth will be unable to supply the resources civilization needs to function and the population will be reduced by nature--by war, starvation, disease, ethnic cleansing and other horrors.

#### That solves their offense better

Trainer 90 [Senior Lecturer at University of New South Wales Ted, “Whatever happened to development?”, Social Alternatives, 1990, Vol. 9 No. 3, EBSCO]

There is now a considerable literature concerned with the sustainable, alternative or conserver society, arguing that there are viable and attractive alternative technologies, economic structures and lifestyles to which the developed countries and the Third World could move. The one basic set of principles holds for both; any vision of a just world order must be framed in terms of a general form of social organisation which all people can share. For the Third World, alternative or appropriate development basically means the reaffirmation of development based on village and regional self-sufficiency. 1. Focus on the concept of appropriateness. Totally reject the definition of, development as growth; that is, as an indiscriminate increase in business turnover. That inevitably results in mostly inappropriate development. Seek to develop those things most likely to raise the overall quality of life in view of local and global ecological, resource, justice and other considerations. Deliberately try to prevent much of the development that would occur if market forces and the profit motive were allowed to determine development. (This does not mean there can be no place for these factors). 2. Totally abandon Western affluence as a goal of development. Aim at the achievement of low but comfortable living standards for all on the lowest reasonable levels of non-renewable resource consumption. Abandon the idea of endlessly increasing material living standards; aim to achieve low but adequate and stable levels. Attend to the concept of "sufficiency"; conventional development theory is incapable of concluding "there has now been enough development here". Minimise industrialisation. Aim for decentralised light industry serving rural areas, with as little heavy industry as possible. 3. Most important: Maximise local economic self-sufficiency, via the development of integrated, small-scale regional economies, whereby a variety of small producers can provide most of the goods and services needed in the area, mostly using locally available inputs. Make the village and its surrounding region the basic unit for development thinking. Use locally available resources, especially native plants that will flourish in the area and provide a wide range of goods, materials and medicines. Help the people to set up small banks, markets, distribution systems, manufacturing plants to be controlled by, and to serve small local regions. Seek to minimise transport and trade and dependence on external inputs, especially on outside sources of capital. Aim at the maximum reasonable amount of self-sufficiency and independence at all levels village, regional, state and national. Minimise the need to export non-essential goods in order to import necessities. Thus maximise independence from the treacherous global economy. 4. Use appropriate technologies, mostly low, intermediate and alternative technologies processing locally available resources. Develop largely selfmaintaining low input systems such as permacultures. 5. Keep involvement in trade to a carefully considered minimum; restricting unnecessary imports and therefore minimising the need to export. 6. Focus on ecological sustainability. Restore forests and soils and ecosystems to become abundant and selfregenerating maintaining sources of 'community', materials, water, fuel. 7. Seize the opportunities appropriate development gives for the preservation and restoration of cultural uniqueness. Prevent the 'Losangelisation' of the planet. 8. Strive to replace material values and incentives with moral incentives. Emphasise the importance of nonmaterial factors in a high quality of life. Discourage individual enrichment. Promote as major sources of life satisfaction things like arts and crafts, building community, personal growth, restoring ecosystems, developing abundant local sources of food and materials. In short, encourage conserversociety values. Connections with the issue of land use The foregoing analysis has drastic implications regarding land use. It flatly contradicts the accelerating trend towards monocultural and export cropping in the Third World. In many countries more than half the land grows crops to export to rich countries. In Senegal 80% of the arable land grows one export crop, peanuts. The justification for using quality land for export-cropping derives directly from conventional "growth and trickle down" development theory. When development is defined in terms of growth of GNP it makes sense to devote agricultural resources to producing those items that will realise most return on investment and maximise national earnings in the international economy. It also makes sense that when the International Monetary Fund comes in to "rescue" an ailing economy its package of recommendations includes cranking-up export earnings through, among other things, stimulating more export cropping. Similarly, one can understand that conventional development theory enables the debt problem to put pressure on forests, the soil, and other environmental resources. When the supreme goals are to do with dollar balances it is very tempting to increase the export of logs in order to reduce the debt. The failure of conventional developments should long ago have become apparent as its primary effect was to gear existing development resources, especially land, to the interests of the rich few. It is now obvious that the historically minute trickle-down effects constitute no justification for continued acceptance of a development model in which probably 80% of Third World land is in the hands of 3% of Third World landowners. If there is one thing that 40 years of development experience has shown it is that enabling and encouraging the rich to increase their wealth does not lead to increased trickle-down benefits for the poor. In fact this approach draws more and more of the existing land and other development resources into producing for the benefit of Third World elites, transnational corporations and consumers in developed countries. The implications for agricultural land use deriving from the appropriate development principles noted above are fairly self-evident. Obviously it makes far more sense for the land to be farmed by villagers to provide inputs to the highly self-sufficient village economy, with the minimum amount of exporting into the national economy in order to pay for necessary imports. Much land around villages should be put into commonly owned permaculture systems to provide inputs for local small craft industries, and to provide free food and materials for all. Far more people could be supported on an area of intensively planted village gardens and forests than on the wages paid to workers on the same area of export plantation. (This does not mean that present population densities in relation to land availability are sub-optimal; in most Third World regions densities are probably well above long term sustainable levels.)

## Alt

### 2NC

#### Direct and violent confrontation with capitalism is necessary for its demise

David Harvey, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the [City University of New York](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_University_of_New_York), 2010 (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

Revolutionary transformations cannot be accomplished without at the very minimum our changing our ideas, abandoning our cherished beliefs and prejudices, giving up various daily comforts and rights, submitting to some new daily regimen, changing our social and political roles, reassigning our rights, duties and responsibilities, and altering our behaviours to better conform to collective needs and a common will. The world around us - our geographies - must be radically reshaped, as must our social relations, the relation to nature and all of the other spheres of action in the co- revolutionary process. It is understandable, to some degree, that many prefer a politics of denial to a politics of active confrontation with all of this. It would also be comforting to think that all of this could be accomplished pacifically and voluntarily, that we would dispossess ourselves, strip ourselves bare, as it were, of all that we now possess that stands in the way of the creation of a more socially just, steadystate social order. But it would be disingenuous to imagine that this could be so, that no active struggle would be involved, including some degree of violence. Capitalism came into the world, as Marx once put it, bathed in blood and fire. Although it might be possible to do a better job of getting out from under it than getting into it, the odds are heavily against any purely pacific passage to the promised land.

#### We must reject the aff’s reformist politics for direct anti-capitalist action. The pragmatism of the 1AC blocks real and radical redesign of the system away from capitalist destruction.

Patrick Reinsborough 2003 (has been involved in campaigns for peace, the environment, and social justice for over twenty years. He co-founded the smartMeme strategy & training project in 2002 and with his colleague has trained over 3,000 organizers and partnered with over 100 high impact organizations to frame issues, strengthen alliances and win critical campaigns. Patrick was previously the Organizing Director of the Rainforest Action Network where he mobilized thousands of people to confront corporations who destroy the environment and violate human rights. Patrick's work has incorporated a range of creative tactics including brand busting, cross-cultural alliance building, markets campaigning and nonviolent direct action. DE-COLONIZING THE REVOLUTIONARY IMAGINATION Journal of aesthetics and politics August 2003 volume 1, issue 2 http://www.joaap.org/1/de\_colonizing/index.html)

It’s essential that we frame our ideas in such a way that as people wake up to the crisis they have the conceptual tools to understand the systemic roots of the problem. Over the next decade as the global crisis becomes more visible we won’t have to do much to convince people about the problem. Rather our job will be to discredit the elite’s band-aid solutions and build popular understanding of the need for systemic solutions. Whether we are talking about genetic pollution, financial meltdowns or nuclear accidents if we haven’t framed the issue in advance even the most dramatic breakdowns in the system can be “crisis-managed” away without alerting the public to the system’s fundamental failings. If we do the work to challenge the control mythology and undermine the flawed assumptions then people will know whom to blame. As we build a public awareness of the values crisis it helps shift the debate away from reform and towards re-designing the global system. This is the strategy of leap frogging, a way of dealing with the political road-blocks we find crippling almost any basic progress on confronting the glaring problems of our times. Leap-frogging is one way of confronting colonized imaginations and entrenched power holders by defining issues in such a way that public consciousness leap-frogs over limiting definitions and elite solutions. This means having the skill and courage to articulate design flaws and avoiding concessions that dead end in inadequate reforms. It is essential that as the crisis becomes self- evident we are building mass awareness of the system’s design-flaws. This process of leap-frogging the elite framing of the problem prepares people to accept the dramatic changes necessary to make another world possible. There are any number of macro-issues that when framed correctly can help us name the system. Global warming, commodification of basic human needs from health care to water, the rate of technological change, increasing racism, the spread of genetic pollution, ongoing violence against women - are just a few examples which can tell the story of values crisis. The challenge is not what issue we work on but how we avoid being pulled into the regulatory and concessionary arenas that dictate single issue politics. Knowing that the rules of the political game are already stacked against us, the anti-corporate rule mobilizations of the past few years have chosen to expand our political framework by taking our actions into the streets. The politics of protest and confrontation have created new political space but how can we insure that this builds towards a truly transformative arena of struggle? vii. direct action at the point of assumption Direct action— actions that either symbolically or directly shift power relations— is an essential transformative tool. Direct action can be both a tactic within a broader strategy or a political ethic of fundamental change at the deepest level of power relations. Every direct action is part of the larger story we are re-telling ourselves about the ability of collaborative power to overcome coercive power. As we endeavor to link systemic change with tangible short term goals we must seek out the points of intervention in the system. These are the places where when we apply our power— usually through revoking our obedience — we are able to leverage change. Direct action at the point of production was one of the original insights of the working people’s labor union movement. Labor radicals targeted the system where it was directly effecting them and where the system was most fetishisticly concerned to make its profits at the expense of the dignity and rights of working people. Modern resistance movements have continued to target the system at its most blatant— the “point of destruction”. We become the frontline resistance by placing our bodies in the way of the harm that is happening. Whether its plugging the effluent pipes that dump poison on a neighborhood, forest defenders sitting in trees marked for cutting or indigenous peoples defending their ancestral homelands, direct action at the point of destruction embodies values crisis. It polarizes the debate in an effort to attract the spotlight of public attention to a clear injustice. But tragically the point of destruction is often times far out of the public eye and the values confrontation is made invisible by distance, imbedded patterns of bias or popular ignorance. Frequently the impacted communities have little political voice so in order to provide support we must find other points of intervention. Inspiring “point of consumption” campaigns have been used by many movements as ways to stand in solidarity with communities fighting at the point of destruction. This is the realm of consumer boycotts, attacks on corporate brand names and other campaigns which target the commercial sector as a way to shut down the markets for destructive products. Activists have confronted retailers selling sweatshop products and forced universities to cancel clothing contracts. Likewise forest activists have forced major chains to stop selling old growth forest products by doing direct actions aimed at companies media profiles and market share. Attacking the point of consumption expands the arena of struggle to mobilize consumers made complicit in the injustice of the globalized economy by their own purchasing decisions. These strategies can be based on a very shallow analysis of “ethical shopping” or a more profound rejection of the consumer identity altogether. The “point of decision” has always been a common and strategic venue for direct action. Whether its taking over a slumlord’s office, a corporate boardroom or the state capital many successful campaigns have used direct action to put pressure on the decision makers they are targeting. Much of the mass action organizing of the past few years has been largely aimed at re-defining popular perceptions of the “point of decision”. The actions at WTO and World Bank meetings, G8 summits and Free Trade negotiating sessions have helped reveal the corporate take-over by showing that it is these new institutions of corporate rule that have usurped decision making power.All of these points of intervention in the system are important and the best strategies unite efforts across them. Increasingly as the global financial sector has becoming the “operating system” for the planet the pathological logic of doomsday economics has replaced specific points of decision in driving the corporate take over. We aren’t just fighting acts of injustice or destruction but rather we are fighting a system of injustice and destruction. In recognizing this we must expand our efforts to intervene in physical space with similar initiatives in cultural and intellectual space. How can we side step the machine and challenge the mentality behind the machine? In other words we need to figure out how to take direct action at the “point of assumption”. Targeting assumptions— the framework of myths, lies, and flawed rationale that normalize the corporate take over— requires some different approaches from actions at the other points of intervention. “Point of assumption” actions operate in the realm of ideas to expose pathological logic, cast doubt and undermine existing loyalties. Successful direct action at the point of assumption identifies, isolates and confronts the big lies that maintain the status quo. A worthy goal for these types of actions is to encourage the most important act that a concerned citizen can take in an era defined by systematic propaganda – QUESTIONING! Direct action at the point of assumption is a tool to de-colonize people’s revolutionary imaginations by linking analysis and action in ways that re-frame issues and create new political space. Whether we’re radically deconstructing consumer spectacles, exposing the system’s propaganda or birthing new rhetoric we need actions that reveal the awful truth— that the intellectual underpinnings of the modern system are largely flawed assumptions. Direct action at the point of assumption is an effort to find the rumors that start revolutions and ask the questions that topple empires. The first action of the radical ecology group Earth First! is a great example of direct action at the point of assumption. In 1981, at a time when many wilderness preservation groups were fighting new dam construction, Earth First! did a symbolic “cracking” of Glen Canyon Dam by unfurling a 300 ft long plastic wedge from the top of the dam. This created an image of a fissure down the dam’s face. 17 This simple symbol sent a powerful message that rather than just stopping new dams wilderness advocates should be calling for the removal of big dams and the re-wilding of dammed rivers. Within the industrial paradigm of dominating nature the question of removing a mega-dam was an unthinkable thought— it was beyond the realm of imagination. The “cracking” action however challenged that assumption and created a new political space and a powerful image to forward that agenda. Likewise as the anti-car movement has grown groups like Reclaim the Streets have taken effective direct actions at the point of assumption to make the idea of car free cities imaginable. Reclaim the Streets groups showed what a better world could look like with actions that occupy car clogged streets and transform them into people friendly space with music, festivity, comfy furniture and in some cases even grass and plants. Similarly activists around the world have taken creative “Buy Nothing Day” actions to attack the assumptions of consumerism by calling for a 24 hour moratorium on consumer spending on the busiest shopping day of the year. This simple idea, often popularized with ridicule and humorous spectacle has led to many successful effort to define consumerism itself as an issue. Direct action at the point of assumption has taken many forms— creating new symbols, embodying alternatives or sounding the alarm. The Zapatista ski mask is a well known example of a symbol which functioned as direct action at the point of assumption . The ski masks, repeatedly worn by the Zapatista insurgents and particularly their spokesman Sub-commandante Marcos, created a symbol for the invisibility of Mexico’s indigenous peoples. Marcos’s has eloquently written of the irony that only with the ski masks on— the symbol of militant confrontation— was the government able to see the indigenous peoples it had ignored for so long. In Argentina the “cacerolazos”— the spontaneous mass banging on cacerolas (saucepans) - has become a tactic which has helped topple several governments since the popular uprising began in December of 2001. The simple inclusive direct action of banging a saucepan has created a dramatic new space for people from many different backgrounds to unite in resisting neoliberalism and structural adjustment. It broke the assumption that people will simply accept the actions of a government that ignores them. 18 Direct action at the point of assumption provides us with many new opportunities to expand the traditional political arenas because it is less reliant on specific physical space than other points of intervention. This gives us the opportunity to choose the terms and location of engagement. Effective point of assumption actions can transform the mundane into a radical conversation starter. For instance putting a piece of duct tape across a prominent logo on your clothing can invite a conversation about corporate commodification. Media activist James Bell writes about “Image Events”, events whether actions, images or stories that “simultaneously destroy and construct [new] meaning”. Image events either replace existing sets of symbols or re-define their meaning through the “dis-identification” of humor or shock. 19 A simple application of this concept can be seen in what Adbuster’s magazine founder Kalle Lasn has dubbed “culture jamming” to describe methods of subverting corporate propaganda by juxtaposing new images or co-opting slogans. 20 For instance when McDonald’s hyper-familiar golden arches are over layed with images of starving children or Chevron’s advertising slogan is rewritten to say “Do people kill for oil?” the power of corporate images are turned back upon themselves. This type of semiotic aikido exploits the omni-prescence of corporate advertising to re-write the meaning of familiar symbols and tell stories that challenge corporate power. These skills have been artfully applied in billboard liberations, guerilla media campaigns and creative actions but tragically they often remain in a limited media realm. We need to expand guerilla meme tactics to connect with long-term strategies to build grassroots power. The reliance of many mega-corporations on their branding has been widely acknowledged as an Achilles heel of corporate power. Indeed effective grassroots attacks on corporate logos and brand image have forced corporations to dump multi-million dollar advertising campaigns and sometimes even concede to activist’s demands. However not only are there many powerful industries that do not depend on consumer approval but we no longer have time to go after the corporations one at a time. Our movements need to contest the corporate monopoly on meaning. We must create point of assumption actions seek to jam the controlling mythologies of consumer culture, the American empire and pathological capitalism. Concerted direct action at the point of assumption in our society could be an effort to draw attention to the design errors of the modern era and encourage wide spread dis-obedience to oppressive cultural norms. We need to openly plot attacks on the symbolic order of anti-life values. This could take the form of challenging the idea of corporate rule, our separation from nature, the concepts of unlimited growth, unchecked industrialism and consumer identities. What would this look like? Where are the points of assumption? What are the big lies and controlling myths that hold corporate rule in place? How can we exploit the hypocrisy between the way we’re told the world works and the way its actually works to name the system, articulate values crisis and begin de-colonizing the collective imagination? We need easily replicatable actions, new symbols and contagious memes that we can combine with grassroots organizing and alternative institution building to expand the transformative arena of struggle. viii. beware the professionalization of social change The worst thing that can happen to our movements right now is to settle for too little. But tragically that is exactly what is happening. We are failing to frame the ecological, social and economic crisis as a symptom of a deeper values crisis and a pathological system. Too many of our social change resources are getting bogged down in arenas of struggle that can’t deliver the systemic shifts we need. Most of the conventional venues for political engagement – legislation, elections, courts, single issue campaigns, labor fights – have been so co-opted by elite rule that its very difficult to imagine how to use strategies that name the system, undermine the control mythology or articulate values crisis from within their limited parameters. One of the most telling symptoms of our colonized imaginations has been the limited scope of social change institutions. Most social change resources get directed towards enforcing inadequate regulations, trying to pass watered-down legislation, working to elect mediocre people or to win concessions that don’t threaten the current corporate order. One of the main reasons that so many social change resources get limited to the regulatory, electoral and concessionary arenas is the fact that much of social change has become a professionalized industry. The NGO – non-governmental organization – a term made popular by the United Nations policy discussion process have become the most familiar social change institution. These groups are frequently made up of hard working, under-paid, dedicated people and NGOs as a group do lots of amazing work. However we must also acknowledge that generally the explosion of NGO's globally is a loose attempt to patch the holes that neoliberalism has punched in the social safety net. As government cedes its role in public welfare to corporations, even the unlucrative sectors have to be handed off to someone. A recent article in the Economist revealingly explains the growth of NGO's as "… not a matter of charity but of privatiziation." 21 My intention is not to fall into the all too easy trap of lumping the thousands of different NGOs into one dismissable category but rather to label a disturbing trend particularly among social change NGO's. Just as service oriented NGO's have been tapped to fill the voids left by the state or the market, so have social change NGO's arisen to streamline the chaotic business of dissent. Let's call this trend NGOism, that terrifyingly widespread conceit among professional "campaigners" that social change is a highly specialized profession best left to experienced strategists, negotiators and policy wonks. NGOism is the conceit that paid staff will be enough to save the world. This very dangerous trend ignores the historic reality that collective struggle and mass movements organized from the bottom up have always been the springboard for true progress and social change. The goal of radical institutions – whether well funded NGOs or gritty grassroots group – should be to help build movements to change the world. But NGOism institutionalizes the amnesia of the colonized imagination and presents a major obstacle to moving into the post-issue activism framework. After all who needs a social movement when you've got a six figure advertising budget and “access” to all the decision makers? A professional NGO is structured exactly like a corporation, down to having employee payroll and a Board of Directors. This is not an accident. Just like their for-profit cousins this structure creates an institutional self-interest which can transform an organization from being a catalyst for social change into being a limit. NGOism views change in reference to the status quo power relations by accepting a set of rules written by the powerful to insure the status quo. These rules have already been stacked against social change. NGOism represents institutional confusion about the different types of power and become overly dependant on strategies that speak exclusively to the existing powers – funding sources, the media, decision makers. As a consequence strategies get locked in the regulatory and concessionary arenas – focused on “pressure” – and attempt to re-direct existing power rather than focusing on confronting illegitimate authority and revealing systemic flaws. Frequently political pragmatism is used as an excuse for a lack of vision. Pragmatism without vision is accepting the rules that are stacked against us while vision without pragmatism is fetishizing failure. Like a healthy ecosystem our movements need a diversity of strategies. We need to think outside the box and see what new arenas of struggle we can explore. The question shouldn't be what can we win in this funding cycle but rather how do we expanding the debate to balance short and long term goals? Particularly as the mythology of American politics as free and democratic has been undermined by the blatant realities of corporate dominance, people’s confidence in the facades of popular rule like voting, lobbying and the regulatory frame work has waned. More and more activists have turned to campaigns which directly confront destructive corporations. This is an essential strategy for revealing the decision making power which corporations have usurped but unfortunately most of these NGO led efforts to confront individual destructive corporations are failing to articulate an analysis of the system of corporate control. This is an extremely dangerous failure since in pursuing concessions or attempting to re-direct corporate resources it risks making multi-national corporations the agents of solving the ecological crisis. This is a flawed strategy because by their very nature corporations are incapable of making the concessions necessary to address the global crisis. There is no decision maker in the corporate hierarchy with the power to transform the nature of the corporate beast, and confront its identity as an extraction-profit making machine. The CEO who has an epiphany about the need to re-define her corporation as a democratic institution whose decision making extends beyond the limited fiduciary interests of shareholders will find herself on the wrong side of a century of corporate law. Beyond being ineffective these campaigns obscure the real democracy issues underlying the crisis and run the risk of legitimizing corporate control. This is not to say that corporate campaigns and winning concessions is merely “reformist” and therefore not important. The simplistic dichotomy of reform versus revolution often hides the privilege of “radicals” who have the luxury of refusing concessions when it’s not their community or ecosystem that is on the chopping block. A more important distinction is which direction is the concession moving towards? Is it a concession that releases pressure on the system and thereby legitimizes illegitimate authority? Or is it a concession that teaches people a lesson about grassroots power building and therefore brings us closer to systemic social change? NGOism creates ripe conditions for going beyond mere ineffectiveness and into out-right complicity with the system. Time and time again we've seen the social change NGO's grow into becoming a part of the establishment and become a tool to marginalize popular dissent by lending legitimacy to the system. Whether its World Wildlife Fund giving a green seal of approval to oil companies or the AFL-CIO supporting the phony “war on terrorism”, NGO's can easily become an obstacle to transformative change. The professionalization of social change requires extensive resources and thus in this cynical era of mail-order mobilizing and feel-good-from-your-armchair activism its become cliché to point out that NGO agendas can often get shaped by their funding needs. Whether NGOs are reliant on a membership base or institutional funders, NGO's are often forced to build a power base through self-promotion rather than self-analysis. Not only does this dilute NGO agendas to fit within the political comfort zone of those with resources, it fundamentally disrupts the essential process of acknowledging mistakes and learning from them. This evolutionary process of collective learning is central to fundamental social change and to have it de-railed by professionalization threatens to limit the depth of the change that can be created. When a system is fundamentally flawed there is no point in trying to fix it – we need to re-design it. That is the essence of the transformative arena – defining issues, re-framing debates, thinking big. We must create political space to harness the increasingly obvious global crisis into real change towards a democratic, just and ecologically sane world.

## AT: Perm

#### The affirmative’s social movement is the biggest impediment to the anti-capitalist movement. their action, while noble, only reforms the system, when only an outright rejection of the it can solve for oppression and injustice.

Herod, typesetter, writer, lecturer, and non-sectarian social critic, 2004 (James, Getting Free 4th ed. Online, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm)

The so-called New Social Movements, based on gender, racial, sexual, or ethnic identities, cannot destroy capitalism. They haven’t even tried. Except for a tiny fringe of radicals in each of them, they have been trying to get into the system, not overthrow it. This is true for women, black, homosexual, and ethnic (including native) identities, as well as all the other identities — old people, the handicapped, welfare mothers, and so forth. Nothing has derailed the anti-capitalist struggle during the past quarter century so thoroughly as have these movements. Sometimes it seems that identity politics is all that is left of the left. Identity politics has simply swamped class politics. The mainstream versions of these movements (the ones fighting to get into the system rather than overthrow it) have given capitalists a chance to do a little fine tooling, by eliminating tensions here and there, and by including token representatives of the excluded groups. Many of the demands of these movements can be easily accommodated. Capitalists can live with boards of directors exhibiting ethnic, gender, and racial diversity, as long as all the board members are pro-capitalist. Capitalists can easily accept a rainbow cabinet as long as the cabinet is pushing the corporate agenda. So mainstream identity politics has not threatened capitalism at all. These have been liberal movements, and have sought only to reform the system, not abolish it.

#### Reform within the system replicates Stalinist terror and oppression.

Kissoon 09 [Roshan, “Negation of the Negation”, http://www.countercurrents.org/kissoon160109.htm]

The Nepali revolution has not won, but neither has it lost. There does not seem an imminent danger to the CPN Maoist led government, yet also the government does not seem completely safe. Some believe the Nepali revolution signals the first of a new cycle of revolutions inspired by the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. Others believe the Nepali revolution signals the last of the cycle of revolutions inspired by the Bolsheviks in Russia. We may think of this cycle as starting in Russia, then China, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, etc, through to Peru and Nepal. I think the latter correct-future revolutions must take a different form, and move away from the Bolshevik or Marxist Leninist model of revolution. Thus far, Marxist Leninist revolutions in the various countries have ended the 'feudal relations of production', and replaced it with 'capitalist relations of production'. Simply put, the Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Cuban etc revolutions have created modern capitalist nation states, not communism. I think the leaders of the CPN-Maoist implicitly recognise this, hence Dr.Bhattarai's statement in the US to 'leave communism to our grandchildren'. The limitations of the Nepali revolution show the limitations of the Marxist-Leninist theory as well as practice. The science of Marxism has, indeed, discovered the laws of society that can explain how one form of society changes into another form of society. Marxist historians have revolutionised the study of history in every area, from the early origins of humanity to the modern world. Historical materialism can explain and shed light on all periods of human history. Historical materialism does not seem able, however, to explain itself. In those periods of history when Marxism itself played a decisive and dominant role; historical materialism does not seem able to explain nor understand. This seems a contradiction inside the Marxist system, and the inability to resolve this contradiction prevents the Communist movement from advancing ahead. For example, Marxists constantly say that the 'masses are the real creators of history', as an explicit challenge to the 'great man' hypothesis of bourgeois history. However, in all the Marxist-Leninist revolutions we see again the 'great man'; the great Lenin, the great Stalin, the Great Mao etc, without whom the revolution would not have succeeded. This seems a glaring contradiction. Again, consider the following questions about the USSR. The simplest and best explanation is simply that the Russian, Chinese, Cuban, and Vietnamese revolutions were bourgeois revolutions, and not proletarian revolutions. I think the Nepalese revolution can change the feudal relations of production and introduce capitalist relations through agrarian reform or revolution. If the Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese etc revolutions created modern capitalist states, then why should the Nepalese Communists, following their examples, go further? The bourgeois nature of all the forms of Marxism-Leninism seems clearest in the form of organisation. The Leninist idea of a centralised, authoritarian, hierarchal party led by professional revolutionaries, a party that seeks to centralise all power in one organisation, proves extremely effective for an underground struggle, such as an urban insurrection or a Peoples War. However, this form of party, a 'democratic centralist' party, does not belong exclusively to Marxist-Leninists. Any political ideology can use this form of organisation for any ends whatsoever. In Nepal, many of the Terai and Madhesi armed groups, some led by former Maoist commanders, use the 'democratic centralist' form of party. The LTTE in Sri Lanka and many other nationalist and even Islamic groups across the world also use the 'democratic centralist' form of organisation. Even some NGOs and multi-national companies use this form of organisation. Undoubtedly, this form of organisation proves extremely effective for struggle. Otto Ruhle, a German Marxist of the early 20th century, in a provocative essay entitled ' The struggle against Fascism begins with the struggle against Bolshevism', argued that Hitler and Mussolini only copied the Bolshevik model for their Fascist ideology, because the party and state structure of Fascism bears remarkable similarities, in form, to the Bolshevik party and state. Mao Zedong seemed aware of this, as he often warned that if the political line of a Communist party changes, the party itself can turn into its opposite, a Social Fascist party, or Fascism presenting itself as Socialism. A Fascist party and a Communist party share the same form of organisation, but the ideological content appear as opposite. Mao seemed aware that the 'democratic centralist' party would centralise not just power in one place, but also wealth in one place, in the party itself. Thus, after a revolution, the new bourgeoisie would emerge from inside the party. Mao did not seem able, however, to condemn the 'democratic centralist' form of the party, probably because he himself led such a party! Simply put, 'democratic centralism' is not very democratic, but very centralised. The Marxist-Leninist tendency to centralise all power in one place, in one person, has proved both effective and ineffective. This tendency seems effective in countries like Nepal, where many people can neither read nor write, and the political tradition demands a single strong leader. In the leader, the people find a reflection of themselves, a leader who can say what they wish to say, and lead them to where they cannot go themselves. However, this form of leadership causes many problems, as the leader becomes more than human, and the person of the leader becomes inseparable from the political line. The tendency of the leader to put their own families and friends in positions of power and to not know 'when' to leave power presents a big problem. The failure of Cuba, after the long reign of Fidel Castro, to find another leader apart from Raul Castro, Fidel's brother, represents a failure of this tendency. The examples of North Korea and Zimbabwe also testify to this failure.

#### The perm cares more about the implementation of the plan and doesn’t have ethics as the a priori issue, and engages in concrete action to “make things better”. This makes capitalism inevitable.

Johnston 04—Assistant Professor of Philosophy [Adrian, “The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief,” http://zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/8/24]

The height of Žižek’s philosophical traditionalism, his fidelity to certain lasting truths too precious to cast away in a postmodern frenzy, is his conviction that no worthwhile praxis can emerge prior to the careful and deliberate formulation of a correct conceptual framework. His references to the hybrid Lacanian-Badiouian notion of the act-event (qua agent-less occurrence not brought about by a subject) are especially strange in light of the fact that he seemingly endorses the view that theory must precede practice, namely, that deliberative reflection is, in a way, primary. Furthermore, the political aims of Žižek’s own theoretical endeavor are obviously not of an orthodox communist nature. He doesn’t urge the simple reenactment of the sort of revolution embarked upon by Lenin. Nor is he, as some have alleged, merely interested in being an anti-capitalist and nothing more (an accusation alluding to his abandonment of the positive Marxist project).116 For Žižek, the foremost concrete task to be accomplished today isn’t some kind of rebellious acting out, which would, in the end, amount to a series of impotent, incoherent outbursts.117 Instead, given the contemporary closure of the socio-political imagination under the hegemony of liberal-democratic capitalism, he sees the liberation of thinking itself from its present ideological constraints as the first crucial step that must be taken if anything is to be changed for the better. In a lecture given in Vienna in 2001, Žižek suggests that Marx’s call to break out of the sterile closure of abstract intellectual ruminations through direct, concrete action (thesis eleven on Feuerbach—“The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it”) must be inverted given the new prevailing conditions of late-capitalism. Nowadays, one must resist succumbing to the temptation to short-circuit thinking in favor of acting, since all such rushes to action are doomed; they either fail to disrupt capitalism or are co-opted by it.

#### Pragmatism is a link—makes confronting the system impossible.

Zizek 04—Professor of Philosophy @ Institute for Sociology in Ljubljana [Slavoj, “Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle”, p. 113-114]

Thus the present crisis compels us to rethink democracy itself as today’s Master-Signifier. Democracy qua ideology functions principally as the space of a virtual alternative: the very prospect of a change in power, the looming possibility of this change, makes us endure the existing power relations – that is to say, these existing relations are stabilized, rendered tolerable, by the false opening. (In a strict homology, subjects accept there economic situation if it accompanied by an awareness of the possibility of change – ‘good luck is just around the corner’.) The opponents of capitalist globalization like to emphasize the importance of keeping the dreams alive: global capitalism is not the end of history, it is possible to think and act differently – what, however, if it is this very lure of a possible change which guarantees that nothing will actually change? What if it only full acceptance of the desperate closure of the present global situation that can push towards actual change? In this precise way, the virtual alternative displays an actuality of its own; in other words, it is a positive ontological constituent of the existing order.