# Transportation Racism Affirmative

Table of Contents

[Transportation Racism Affirmative 1](#_Toc329182479)

[Transportation Racism 1AC 4](#_Toc329182480)

[Observation One – Transportation Racism 5](#_Toc329182481)

[Observation Two – The plan 10](#_Toc329182482)

[Observation Three – Solvency 11](#_Toc329182483)

[Observation Four – Impact Calculus 14](#_Toc329182484)

[Inherency 18](#_Toc329182485)

[Inherency – Minorities Rely on Intercity Public Transportation 19](#_Toc329182486)

[Inherency – Unequal Transportation Funding Now 20](#_Toc329182487)

[Inherency – Rail Transit Fails Now 25](#_Toc329182488)

[Advantage – Transportation Racism 26](#_Toc329182489)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Apartheid Internal 27](#_Toc329182490)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Discrimination Internal 30](#_Toc329182491)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Exclusion Internal 32](#_Toc329182492)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Gentrification Internal 33](#_Toc329182493)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Humans Rights Internal 34](#_Toc329182494)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Quality of Life Internal 35](#_Toc329182495)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – LA Proves 36](#_Toc329182496)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Livelihood Internal 39](#_Toc329182497)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Marginalization Internal 40](#_Toc329182498)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Poverty Internal 41](#_Toc329182499)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Racism Internal 42](#_Toc329182500)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Residential Segregation Internal 46](#_Toc329182501)

[Transportation Racism Advantage – Sprawl Internal 47](#_Toc329182502)

[Impact Calculus 48](#_Toc329182503)

[Impact Calc – Culture Impact 49](#_Toc329182504)

[Impact Calc – Global Apartheid 50](#_Toc329182505)

[Impact Calc – Reject Worst Case Logic 51](#_Toc329182506)

[Impact Calc – Help Other First 52](#_Toc329182507)

[Impact Calc – Intervening Actors 55](#_Toc329182508)

[Impact Calc – No Extinction 58](#_Toc329182509)

[Impact Calc – No Power Wars 60](#_Toc329182510)

[Impact Calc – Prefer Direct Consequences 64](#_Toc329182511)

[Impact Calc – Probability Over Magnitude 65](#_Toc329182512)

[Impact Calc – Racism Causes Dehumanization 67](#_Toc329182513)

[Impact Calc – Reject Racism 68](#_Toc329182514)

[Impact Calc – Survival Logic Bad 70](#_Toc329182515)

[Impact Calc – Structural Violence OW 71](#_Toc329182516)

[Solvency 73](#_Toc329182517)

[Solvency – Critical Mobility 74](#_Toc329182518)

[Solvency – Public Transit Funding - 75](#_Toc329182519)

[Solvency – Equity Key 77](#_Toc329182520)

[Solvency – Federal Investment Key 78](#_Toc329182521)

[Solvency – Inclusion 80](#_Toc329182522)

[Solvency – Policy Key 81](#_Toc329182523)

[Solvency – Poverty 82](#_Toc329182524)

[Solvency – Racism 85](#_Toc329182525)

[Solvency – Sustainable Public Transportation 86](#_Toc329182526)

[Solvency – K2 Sustainability 87](#_Toc329182527)

[Solvency – Transportation Equity 89](#_Toc329182528)

[2AC – AT 90](#_Toc329182529)

[AT – Courts CP 91](#_Toc329182530)

[AT – Business is in the City 92](#_Toc329182531)

[AT – No Riders 93](#_Toc329182532)

[AT – States CP 94](#_Toc329182533)

[AT – CRT K 97](#_Toc329182534)

[Transportation Racism Negative 99](#_Toc329182535)

[Case Neg Cards 100](#_Toc329182536)

[Inherency – Funding Solved Now 101](#_Toc329182537)

[AT – Transportation Racism – Not Intentional 102](#_Toc329182538)

[AT – Transportation Racism – Alt Causes 103](#_Toc329182539)

[AT – Transportation Racism – Inevitable 104](#_Toc329182540)

[AT – Transportation Racism – Exclusion Inevitable 105](#_Toc329182541)

[AT – Transportation Racism – In Group/Out Group Inevitable 106](#_Toc329182542)

[AT – Structural Violence – No Escalation 108](#_Toc329182543)

[Turn – Reinforces Racism 109](#_Toc329182544)

[Solvency – Cant Solve Equity 110](#_Toc329182545)

[Impact Calc 111](#_Toc329182546)

[1NC – AT – Impact Calculus 112](#_Toc329182547)

[2NC – Impact Calc Extensions 114](#_Toc329182548)

[Offcase Cards 118](#_Toc329182549)

[Disad Helpers 119](#_Toc329182550)

[War Turns Racism 120](#_Toc329182551)

[War Turns Oppression 122](#_Toc329182552)

[War Turns Culture 124](#_Toc329182553)

[War Turns Movements 126](#_Toc329182554)

[Misc 127](#_Toc329182555)

[CP – Minority Cars 128](#_Toc329182556)

[Transportation Infrastructure K 129](#_Toc329182557)

[Transportation Racism K – Ext. 130](#_Toc329182558)

[1NC – CRT K 131](#_Toc329182559)

[2NC – CRT K – Alt Solves 133](#_Toc329182560)

[2NC – CRT K – Law Fails 134](#_Toc329182561)

## Transportation Racism 1AC

### Observation One – Transportation Racism

#### First, transportation racism exists now—unequal funding for public transit systems is fueling racism and transportation apartheid

**Bernstein and Solomon, 2011**

[Andrea and Nancy, American Radio Works contributors/producers, “Back of the Bus: Mass transit, race, and inequality.” 2-18-2011, Originally broadcast date, online, <http://transportationnation.org/backofthebus/>] /Wyo-MB

“**Transportation** in Atlanta **has always been mired in race and racism,”** says Robert Bullard, director of the Environmental Justice Center at Clark Atlanta University. When Atlanta began building its commuter rail system in the 1970s, white communities like Clayton County wanted no part of it. “**Public Transit was equated with black people and poor people and crime and poverty**. And when the Metropolitan Atlanta Transportation Authority was created MARTA, it was a running joke that MARTA” – he spells it out – M-A-R-T-A – “stood for moving Africans rapidly through Atlanta.” “**It’s transportation apartheid,**” he says. “One guy told me it takes him about 30 minutes to get here from where he lives, but if ladies are walking, it probably takes them longer,” McMillan said, as she walked from the bus to her car parked at the Home Depot. “Because I have walked, and it takes me about 40 minutes to walk from where I live to the bus stop.” **More than half a century after Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabam**a, prompting an 11-month boycott that led to integration of that city’s bus system, **African Americans and Latinos are still struggling with an unequal transit system. It’s a struggle that stretches far back**. In 1896, a case over segregated rail cars made it to the U.S. Supreme Court Case. It was that case – Plessy v. Ferguson – that legalized the infamous concept of “separate but equal.” It would take more than half a century for the legal precept to be overturned in the 1954 case, Brown v. Board of Education. **But while the civil rights movement was playing out at schools, colleges, lunch counters and voting booths, a seemingly unrelated move by the federal government would change the way blacks and whites lived together for the next half century.** In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower signed legislation that funded **the interstate highway system**. It was a seemingly unconnected event, but one that **had enormous ramifications**. “At the same time we were doing Brown v. Board of Education and trying to integrate the school system,” says Angela Glover Blackwell, the head of PolicyLink, “**we were investing billions of dollars in a highway system that segregated the nation by allowing people to be able to run away from urban areas that were integrated to suburban areas that were all white.”** One of the communities that was destroyed was the Rondo neighborhood in St. Paul, Minnesota. Before the highway tore through that neighborhood, Rondo Avenue was a bustling commercial thoroughfare, chock-a-block with barber shops, churches, and shoe stores. But in 1956, crews began leveling houses on Rondo Avenue to make way for Interstate 94. Nathanial Khaliq was 13 years old then. “There were cop cars everywhere,” he recalls, “And when I walked into the house, these guys had axes and sledgehammers. They were knocking holes in the walls, breaking the windows, tearing up the plumbing – you know, just to make sure he didn’t try to move back in there. I was crying because it looked like something bad was happening.” Ora Lee Patterson also grew up in Rondo. “To own your own home after you couldn’t vote, you weren’t considered as a human being – and then to see what happened with the freeway, and when they came through and gave them nickels and dimes for their property? They never gave those people what their houses were worth. Never.” It was, Patterson and Khaliq’s families were assured, just good urban planning. But Marvin Anderson, a retired attorney and law librarian, spent years searching for evidence the government purposely selected the site of the freeway for all the wrong reasons. In 1993, he unearthed a letter to the editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The writer, a city engineer, Claude Thompson, admitted the government chose the route for I-94 because it was in the city’s low-income black neighborhood. **Following the mass exodus of the middle class to American suburbs, cities experienced a gradual deterioration of schools and increasing poverty. Even today, transportation funding continues to help the suburbs at the expense of cities**. **Eighty percent of all transportation dollars are spent on roads. The remaining 20 percent is spent on mass transit.**

#### Second, the privileging of highway funding over public transit is fueling residential segregation and income inequality

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

The previous section examined the direct effects of transportation policies on low-income minorities’ finances and their ability simply to get around. This section examines the indirect effects of transportation policies. One of the central indirect effects is the reinforcement of residential segregation. The form that we currently think of as “the city” is a product of both land use and transportation investment decisions. Highway investments in combination with federal housing and lending policies leading to post–World War II suburbanization played a significant role in “white flight” from central cities to suburbs, which had a profound impact in defining urban form and racial segregation patterns.96 Highway investment encourages the development of suburbs located increasingly farther away from central cities and has played an important role in fostering residential segregation patterns and income inequalities.97 Inequitable or inefficient land use patterns such as those resulting in residential segregation often are reinforced by policies, such as transportation investment decisions, that were established several decades ago. As many researchers have documented, residential segregation greatly influences minorities’ access to housing, education, and economic opportunities.98 More research, however, needs to be performed examining the relationship between transportation policies and residential segregation and how it should be addressed.

#### Third, this transportation racism has fueled uburbanization and gentrification that have marginalized the urban poor, they cannot respond due to a lack of political clout ensuring segregation and inequality

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

This massive migration to the suburbs did not occur evenly among all groups, however; it was primarily a white phenomenon.32 The migration to the suburbs by whites throughout the twentieth century left a vacuum in the central city to be filled by low-income, primarily minority migrants 33 who relocated to cities during a large, prolonged wave of rural-to-urban migration that began prior to World War I and continued intermittently throughout much of the twentieth century.34 Because high-income families dominated-and continue to dominate-the suburban demographic composition, minorities by and large did not participate in suburban migration until the 1970s and, even then, continued to be underrepresented in the suburban population.35 This history, in addition to current social preferences and prejudices that favor housing homogeneity-such as discriminatory lending practices36-has led many American cities to be segregated by race and income.37 One result of this urban-to-suburban shift is that residents of the central city, disproportionately minorities and low-income earners, have little convenient access to good jobs, essential services such as medical care, and shopping, much of which has followed higher income residents to the suburbs.38 Because zoning laws separate residential from commercial districts, the businesses that remain may be out of walking distance, especially for the elderly.39 Exacerbating this situation is the scarcity of transportation options near low-income areas in many central cities.40 This lack of transportation not only limits access to local services and shop-ping, but also isolates low-income communities from more prosperous areas in other parts of the city and beyond. Furthermore, while the highways necessary to connect suburbs and exurbs41 to the central city occasionally pass through affluent areas, they are more likely to pass through poor minority areas,42 destroying and dividing neighborhoods43 and making travel by foot unsafe in the process.44 Thus, for many poor residents with an automobile, meaning that **cars have become an unaffordable necessity.**45 During the 1980s and 1990s, various pressures, including increased housing costs and a decreased quality of life, led suburbanites to seek new housing options.46 One response was the birth of exurbs, adding even greater complexity to the transportation problem by diverting funding to the provision of highways over an even greater area.47 Another was gentrification, or the purchase and renovation of low-cost homes in the central city, generally by young, higher-income professionals.48 Although gentrification brought with it increased economic development, it also put severe economic pressure on those with low incomes by increasing housing values and, thus, the cost of home rental and purchase, as well as property taxes.49 In many cases, dilapidated suburbs became the only affordable housing option, pushing low-income and minority residents away from the recovering central city to suburbs with the same dearth of services that had been previously lacking in the central city, but with even fewer transportation options. Other negative effects of the predominant transportation regime in most American cities span class, race, and age. These include increased commuting times50 and transportation costs,51 environmental degrada-tion,52 and impeded economic development.53 Nonetheless, the greatest effects of American landscape development and the resulting transportation regime burden the urban poor.54 Through the processes of industrialization, urbanization, suburbanization, segregation, gentrification, and the growth of car dependence, the United States has evolved from a collection of small, self-sufficient, and closely knit urban and rural communities to an interdependent urban society in which mobility is essential, but access to transportation, especially for the urban poor, is limited. That the socioeconomic effects of suburbanization and car dependence on the urban poor have not been legally addressed may be a symptom of the fact that the effects of these processes have become apparent only within the last half-century.55 Furthermore, the groups most directly disadvantaged by this process historically **suffer from a lack of political power**,56 **leaving them with a reduced ability to press for legislative change.**

#### Fourth, transportation is, and empirically has, evolved to prioritize and legitimize white flight and the relocation of business which disenfranchises minorities. This demonstrates how access to mobility is controlled along race and class lines

Dombroski 2005 [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, Columbia Law Review, Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

Given the likelihood that provision of transportation will continue to be a duty of government, the real issue is whether the transportation provided unfairly benefits some groups and not others. The Fourteenth Amendment declares that states shall not "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."182 This phrase has been interpreted to require that "equal protection and security should be given to all under like circumstances in the enjoyment of their personal and civil rights" and that "no impediment should be interposed to the pursuits of anyone except as applied to the same pursuits by others under like circumstances."183 Although the Fourteenth Amendment was intended to eliminate racial discrimination,184 it has also been interpreted to prohibit, to a lesser degree, intentional disparate treatment on account of economic status.185 The modern American transportation system, because of its preference for transportation projects that primarily enable auto mobility, benefits whites and wealthier individuals to the exclusion of minorities and those with low incomes.186 This disparate benefit was acknowledged in academic transportation literature as far back as the 1920s.187 While this situation has obviously improved, race is linked to wealth,188 and wealth is clearly linked to the ability to purchase a car. Although American cities bore signs of segregation prior to the advent of the automobile, the proliferation of highways into urban areas beginning in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to further segregation.189 The dominance of the automobile enabled suburbanization, white flight, and the subsequent movement of businesses and services from the central city.190 By enabling suburbanization, segregation, and urban decay, the preference for highways and roads over rail and mass transportation systems disproportionately benefited whites over minorities. Thus, if it exists at all, the de facto right to transportation exists to varying degrees based on race. Unfortunately, this inequality does not necessarily give rise to a cause of action under the Equal Protection Clause for several reasons.

#### Fifth, Public transportation remains mired in Apartheid style policies that perpetuate racial exclusion

EJRC, 2004

[Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “Suburban Sprawl and transporation racism.” The Black Commentator, 9-23-2004, Issue 106, Online, [http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106\_transportation\_racism.html#](http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html)] /WFI-MB

In the United States, all communities do not receive the same benefits from transportation advancements and investments. "Suburban sprawl is in part driven by race and class dynamics. Transportation spending has always been about opportunity, fairness, and equity," according to Clark Atlanta University professor Robert D. Bullard. The modern civil rights movement has its roots in transportation. For more than a century, African Americans and other people of color have struggled to dismantle transportation apartheid policies that use tax dollars to promote economic isolation and social exclusion. The decision to build highways, expressways, and beltways has far-reaching effects on land use, energy policy, and the environment. Similarly, the decisions by county commissioners to limit and even exclude public transit to job-rich suburban economic activity centers have serious mobility implications for central city residents. Writing in the Foreword to Dr. Bullard’s and Angel O. Torres’s book, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Highways to Equity, Congressman John Lewis (D-GA) states, "Our struggle is not over. Today those physical signs are gone, but the legacy of "Jim Crow" transportation is still with us. Even in a city like Atlanta, Georgia, a vibrant city with a modern rail and public transit system, thousands of people have been left out and left behind because of discrimination. Like most other major cities, Atlanta’s urban center is worlds apart from its suburbs."

#### Sixth, we must reject every instance of racism

Joseph Barndt, Co-Director, Crossroads, DISMANTLING RACISM, 1991, p. 155-156

The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust: the effects of uncontrolled power privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison, will inevitably destroy us. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger point of self-destruction seems to be drawing even more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonialism, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction, may be reaching a point of no return. A small and predominately white minority of the global population derives its power and privilege from the suffering of the vast majority of peoples of color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.

#### Seventh, Racism is the root cause of violence

Foucault '76 [Michel, Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-1976, p. 254-257 Trans. David Macey]

What in fact is racism? It is primarily a way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power's control: the break between what must live and what must die. But racism does make the relationship of war-"If you want to live, the other must die" - function in a way that is completely new and that is quite compatible with the exercise of biopower. On the one hand, racism makes it possible to establish a relationship between my life and the death of the other that is not a military or warlike relationship of confrontation, but a biological-type relationship: "The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more Ias species rather than individual-can live, the stronger I will be, the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate." There is a direct connection between the two. In a normalizing society, race or racism is the precondition that makes killing acceptable. When you have a normalizing society, you have a power which is, at least superficially, in the first instance, or in the first line a biopower, and racism is the indispensable precondition that allows someone to be killed, that allows others to be killed. And we can also understand why racism should have developed in modern societies that function in the biopower mode; we can understand why racism broke out at a number of .privileged moments, and why they were precisely the moments when the right to take life was imperative. Racism first develops with colonization, or in other words, with colonizing genocide. If you are functioning in the biopower mode, how can you justify the need to kill people, to kill populations, and to kill civilizations? By using the themes of evolutionism, by appealing to a racism. War. How can one not only wage war on one's adversaries but also expose one's own citizens to war, and let them be killed by the million (and this is precisely what has been going on since the nineteenth century, or since the second half of the nineteenth century), except by activating the theme of racism

### Observation Two – The plan

#### The USFG should substantially increase its investment for public transit infrastructure in metropolitan areas

### Observation Three – Solvency

#### First, public transit funding is necessary to solve racial injustice and unequal access to opportunitity

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

The following are some recommendations that follow from the issues raised in the report and from what we know from existing research. Implementation of these recommendations would help address the racial injustices created by transportation policies across the country and advance the national—and constitutional—goal of equality. 1. Increase funding for public transportation, and develop new programs and support existing programs that improve minorities’ mobility. Public transportation is a public service that should be supported. Also, support programs focusing on the needs of lowincome and minority transit users to provide reliable connections to job sites and other necessary destinations. For example, the Job Access and Reverse Commute programs support a number of promising efforts to connect low-wage workers to jobs and services, but additional funding is needed to examine which of these efforts are most effective and most likely to be successfully replicated. Also, a handful of significant research identifies increased access to cars as having a positive impact on the ability of minorities to gain access to and retain employment, which suggests that pilot programs that help low-income minorities access cars when public transit is inadequate should be developed

#### Second, Federal investment in public transportation infrastructure is key

Williams, 2011

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

Washington, DC- American Public Transportation Association (APTA) President William Millar today urged Congress to increase federal investment in public transportation and detailed ways for Congress to more efficiently target investments to improve and expand America’s public transit systems. In testimony before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure’s Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, Millar called on leaders in Congress to promote growth and innovation in public transit, especially by passing a well funded six year multimodal surface transportation bill. “New federal investment would produce much-needed progress toward bringing our nation’s public transportation infrastructure up to a state of good repair and building the capacity for millions of new riders,” Mr. Millar said in prepared testimony. He noted that the U.S. Department of Transportation has estimated that more than $78 billion is needed to bring existing transit infrastructure up to a state of good repair. Highlighting the dire situation facing public transportation, Millar told the Subcommittee about the results of new research which found that rising gas prices will directly lead to a massive increase in ridership on public transit systems around the country. “The volatility of the price at the pump is another wakeup call for our nation to address the increasing demand for public transportation services,” Millar said. Millar also discussed new options for public transit funding including public-private partnerships and other types of innovative financing, but cautioned that “new financing tools do not replace the need for expanded federal investment.”

#### Third, Access to transportation is a necessity—now is a key time to work to break down transportation discrimination

Bullard 04

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

More than one hundred years ago, in the foreword to his classic book The Souls of Black Folks, W. E. B. DuBois declared that "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line." DuBois's diagnosis came seven years after the infamous Plessy v. Ferguson US Supreme Court decision codified "separate but equal" as the law of the land. Sadly, in the twenty-first century, the problem persists. Highway Robbery weighs in a half-century after the landmark US Supreme Court Brown v. Board of Education decision overturned Plessy and outlawed "separate but equal" in 1954. Unfortunately, decades of court rulings and civil rights laws have not eradicated the historic disparities between races or the discrimination that perpetuates them.' The United States remains a racially divided nation where extreme inequalities continue to persist in housing, schools, employment, income, environmental protection, and transportation. The struggle against transportation racism has always been about civil rights, social justice, equity, and fair treatment. For more than a century, African Americans and other people of color have struggled to end transportation racism. Harbingers of the modern civil rights movement, Rosa Parks and the Montgomery Bus Boycott of the 1950s challenged transportation racism. Later, the Freedom Riders of the 1960s defied "Jim Crow" on interstate transportation. Despite the heroic efforts of many and the monumental human rights gains over the past five decades, transportation remains a civil rights and quality oflife issue. Unfortunately, it appears that transportation-civil rights issues have dropped off the radar screens of many mainstream civil rights and social justice organizations at a time when racist political forces disguised as "conservatives" attempt to roll back and dismantle many hard-won civil rights gains. It is time to refocus attention on the role transportation plays in shaping human interaction, economic mobility, and sustainability. From New York City to Los Angeles, and a host of cities in between, people of color are banding together to challenge unfair, unjust, and illegal transportation policies and practices that relegate them to the back of the bus. From Rosa Parks and the brave souls who risked their lives in the Montgomery Bus Boycott to John Lewis and the Freedom Riders, individual and organizational frontal assaults on racist transportation policies and practices represent attempts to literally dismantle the infrastructure of oppression. Natural heirs of the civil rights legacy, the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union in the 1990s and hundreds of grassroots groups in the early years of the new millennium have taken to our nation's buses, trains, streets, and highways and joined the battle against transportation racism. Transportation racism hurts people of color communities by depriving their residents of valuable resources, investments, and mobility. This book represents a small but significant part of the transportation equity movement-a movement that is redefining transportation as an environmental, economic, civil, and human right. The need for transportation touches every aspect of our lives and daily routines. The course of one day could necessitate a range of activities: working, shopping, visiting friends, attending church, or going to the doctor. Furthermore, transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring equal access to education, employment, and other public services. Lest anyone dismiss transportation as a tangential expense, consider that except for housing, Americans spend more on transportation than any other household disbursement, including food, education, and health care. The average American household spends one fifth of its income-or about $6,000 a year-for each car that it owns and operates." It is not uncommon for many low-income, people of color households to spend up to one-third of their income on transportation. This book affirms that transportation is neither a marginal cost nor an irrelevant need, but a necessity.

#### Fourth, Effective public transportation policies are key to transportation equity

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Before examining the specific economic and social effects of transportation policies on minority and low-income communities, it is necessary to define transportation equity. While most transportation planners are concerned primarily with the efficiency and cost of transportation, including people’s mobility levels and the accessibility of transportation to the most people, those concerned about transportation equity seek fairness in mobility and accessibility levels across race, class, gender, and disability. The ultimate objective of transportation equity is to provide equal access to social and economic opportunity by providing equitable levels of access to all places. In the United States, concern about providing equal access to social and economic opportunity has mostly centered around an issue first identified by John Kain (1968) that is now commonly referred to as the “spatial mismatch hypothesis.” Spatial mismatch refers to the disconnect between the locations of housing and jobs suitable for lower-income people. In other words, those who most need entry-level jobs (primarily people of color) generally live in central cities while entry-level jobs are mostly in suburban locations that are not easily accessible from central cities. In England, however, policymakers and advocates often take a broader view of social inequity. The British effort to combat “social exclusion” is a more wide-ranging approach than the American battle against spatial mismatch.62 Efforts to eradicate social exclusion address communities that are isolated from or marginalized by general society. The English government defines social exclusion as “a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown.” Instead of directly addressing spatial equity questions through housing and land use policies that would improve housing affordability, discourage sprawling development, and improve enforcement of housing discrimination laws, U.S. policymakers have directed significant attention to overcoming the combined problem of residential segregation and limited employment accessibility for low-income persons by improving their transportation mobility. Federal policies fail to directly address the more fundamental issue of “access and participation” on a broad scale. In the United States, attempts to counter spatial inequity are usually limited to improving housing and employment access—represented in some respects by residential segregation—whereas social exclusion is a much broader concept. It encompasses concerns about 1) physical (personal) exclusion, 2) geographic exclusion, 3) exclusion from facilities, 4) economic exclusion, 5) temporal exclusion, 6) fear-based exclusion, and 7) space exclusion. Addressing social exclusion includes addressing problems such as lack of access to jobs, education, and training; low levels of access to public transportation at particular times of the day, which has an impact on persons without cars working late and early-morning shifts; and limited access to public and private spaces because of unsafe conditions and design.64 Transportation equity is a similarly broad concept. The importance of transportation policies and their inequitable effect on minority and low-income communities by limiting access to social and economic opportunities must be understood in this broader context.

### Observation Four – Impact Calculus

#### First, Great power war is obsolete – cooperation is more likely than competition

Deudney and Ikenberry 09 [Daniel, Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins, John, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, The Myth of the Autocratic Revival :Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb]

This bleak outlook is based on an exaggeration of recent developments and ignores powerful countervailing factors and forces. Indeed, contrary to what the revivalists describe, the most striking features of the contemporary international landscape are the intensification of economic globalization, thickening institutions, and shared problems of interdependence. The overall structure of the international system today is quite unlike that of the nineteenth century. Compared to older orders, the contemporary liberal-centered international order provides a set of constraints and opportunities -- of pushes and pulls -- that reduce the likelihood of severe conflict while creating strong imperatives for cooperative problem solving. Those invoking the nineteenth century as a model for the twenty-first also fail to acknowledge the extent to which war as a path to conflict resolution and great-power expansion has become largely obsolete. Most important, nuclear weapons have transformed great-power war from a routine feature of international politics into an exercise in national suicide. With all of the great powers possessing nuclear weapons and ample means to rapidly expand their deterrent forces, warfare among these states has truly become an option of last resort. The prospect of such great losses has instilled in the great powers a level of caution and restraint that effectively precludes major revisionist efforts. Furthermore, the diffusion of small arms and the near universality of nationalism have severely limited the ability of great powers to conquer and occupy territory inhabited by resisting populations (as Algeria, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and now Iraq have demonstrated). Unlike during the days of empire building in the nineteenth century, states today cannot translate great asymmetries of power into effective territorial control; at most, they can hope for loose hegemonic relationships that require them to give something in return. Also unlike in the nineteenth century, today the density of trade, investment, and production networks across international borders raises even more the costs of war. A Chinese invasion of Taiwan, to take one of the most plausible cases of a future interstate war, would pose for the Chinese communist regime daunting economic costs, both domestic and international. Taken together, these changes in the economy of violence mean that the international system is far more primed for peace than the autocratic revivalists acknowledge. The autocratic revival thesis neglects other key features of the international system as well. In the nineteenth century, rising states faced an international environment in which they could reasonably expect to translate their growing clout into geopolitical changes that would benefit themselves. But in the twenty-first century, the status quo is much more difficult to overturn. Simple comparisons between China and the United States with regard to aggregate economic size and capability do not reflect the fact that the United States does not stand alone but rather is the head of a coalition of liberal capitalist states in Europe and East Asia whose aggregate assets far exceed those of China or even of a coalition of autocratic states. Moreover, potentially revisionist autocratic states, most notably China and Russia, are already substantial players and stakeholders in an ensemble of global institutions that make up the status quo, not least the UN Security Council (in which they have permanent seats and veto power). Many other global institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, are configured in such a way that rising states can increase their voice only by buying into the institutions. The pathway to modernity for rising states is not outside and against the status quo but rather inside and through the flexible and accommodating institutions of the liberal international order .The fact that these autocracies are capitalist has profound implications for the nature of their international interests that point toward integration and accommodation in the future. The domestic viability of these regimes hinges on their ability to sustain high economic growth rates, which in turn is crucially dependent on international trade and investment; today's autocracies may be illiberal, but they remain fundamentally dependent on a liberal international capitalist system. It is not surprising that China made major domestic changes in order to join the WTO or that Russia is seeking to do so now. The dependence of autocratic capitalist states on foreign trade and investment means that they have a fundamental interest in maintaining an open, rule-based economic system. (Although these autocratic states do pursue bilateral trade and investment deals, particularly in energy and raw materials, this does not obviate their more basic dependence on and commitment to the WTO order.) In the case of China, because of its extensive dependence on industrial exports, the WTO may act as a vital bulwark against protectionist tendencies in importing states. Given their position in this system, which so serves their interests, the autocratic states are unlikely to become champions of an alternative global or regional economic order, let alone spoilers intent on seriously damaging the existing one. The prospects for revisionist behavior on the part of the capitalist autocracies are further reduced by the large and growing social networks across international borders. Not only have these states joined the world economy, but their people – particularly upwardly mobile and educated elites -- have increasingly joined the world community. In large and growing numbers, citizens of autocratic capitalist states are participating in a sprawling array of transnational educational, business, and a vocational networks. As individuals are socialized into the values and orientations of these networks, stark "us versus them" cleavages become more difficult to generate and sustain. As the Harvard political scientist Alastair Iain Johnston has argued, China's ruling elite has also been socialized, as its foreign policy establishment has internalized the norms and practices of the international diplomatic community. China, far from cultivating causes for territorial dispute with its neighbors, has instead sought to resolve numerous historically inherited border conflicts, acting like a satisfied status quo state. These social and diplomatic processes and developments suggest that there are strong tendencies toward normalization operating here. Finally, there is an emerging set of global problems stemming from industrialism and economic globalization that will create common interests across states regardless of regime type. Autocratic China is as dependent on imported oil as are democratic Europe, India, Japan, and the United States, suggesting an alignment of interests against petroleum-exporting autocracies, such as Iran and Russia. These states share a common interest in price stability and supply security that could form the basis for a revitalization of the International Energy Agency, the consumer association created during the oil turmoil of the 1970s. The emergence of global warming and climate change as significant problems also suggests possibilities for alignments and cooperative ventures cutting across the autocratic-democratic divide. Like the United States, China is not only a major contributor to greenhouse gas accumulation but also likely to be a major victim of climate-induced desertification and coastal flooding. Its rapid industrialization and consequent pollution means that China, like other developed countries, will increasingly need to import technologies and innovative solutions for environmental management. Resource scarcity and environmental deterioration pose global threats that no state will be able to solve alone, thus placing a further premium on political integration and cooperative institution building. Analogies between the nineteenth century and the twenty-first are based on a severe mischaracterization of the actual conditions of the new era. The declining utility of war, the thickening of international transactions and institutions, and emerging resource and environmental interdependencies together undercut scenarios of international conflict and instability based on autocratic-democratic rivalry and autocratic revisionism. In fact, the conditions of the twenty-first century point to the renewed value of international integration and cooperation.

#### Second, No extinction—humanity resilient

Bruce Tonn, Futures Studies Department, Corvinus University of Budapest, 2005, “Human Extinction Scenarios,” [www.budapestfutures.org/](http://www.budapestfutures.org/) downloads/abstracts/Bruce% 20Tonn%20-%20Abstract.pdf)

The human species faces numerous threats to its existence. These include global climate change, collisions with near-earth objects, nuclear war, and pandemics. While these threats are indeed serious, taken separately they fail to describe exactly how humans could become extinct. For example, nuclear war by itself would most likely fail to kill everyone on the planet, as strikes would probably be concentrated in the northern hemisphere and the Middle East, leaving populations in South America, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand some hope of survival. It is highly unlikely that any uncontrollable nanotechnology could ever be produced but even it if were, it is likely that humans could develop effective, if costly, countermeasures, such as producing the technologies in space or destroying sites of runaway nanotechnologies with nuclear weapons. Viruses could indeed kill many people but effective quarantine of ‘healthy’ people could be accomplished to save large numbers of people. Humans appear to be resilient to extinction with respect to single events.

#### Third, good decision-making requires you to reject their fixation on worst-case scenarios

Rescher ‘83

[Nicholas, Risk Analysis BadassRisk: A Philosophical Introduction to the Theory of Risk Evaluation and Management, Pg 50]

The "worst possible case fixation" is one of the most damaging modes of unrealism in deliberations about risk in real-life situa- tions. Preoccupation about what might happen "if worst comes to worst" is counterproductive whenever we proceed without recognizing that, often as not, these worst possible outcomes are wildly improbable (and sometimes do not deserve to be viewed as real possibilities at all). The crux in risk deliberations is not the issue of loss "if worst comes to worst'' but the potential ac- ceptability of this prospect within the wider framework of the risk situation, where we may well be prepared "to take our chances," considering the possible advantages that beckon along this route. The worst threat is certainly something to be borne in mind and taken into account, but it is emphatically not a satisfactory index of the overall seriousness or gravity of a situation of hazard.

#### Fourth, STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE OUTWEIGHS AND LIES AT THE ROOT CAUSE OF ALL OTHER FORMS OF VIOLENCE

Gilligan 96 – [James, Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical and Director of the Center for the Study of Violence “Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and Its Causes,” p191-196]cn

The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide-or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R . (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect. the equivalent of an ongoing, unending~ in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence-structural or behavioral-is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.

#### Fifth, We have an obligation to assist the helpless Other, even in the face of extinction

Jovanovic and Wood 04, Communications/Rhetoric Professors @ Denver University and University of North Carolina respectively

(Spoma and Roy, “Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics,” Philosophy and Rhetoric Vol 37 no 4, 2004, 317-334)

On September 11, 2001, terrorism touched down in the United States. While millions of us were immobilized and left speechless by what we witnessed live on television, thousands of others in the World Trade Center towers, at the Pentagon, and on three airplanes had no such luxury. They were confronted with a reality few could have ever imagined. One man inside World Trade Center One demonstrates that ethics is a lived response of the type Levinas describes. He was not alone, however. Without advance preparation or rules of conduct to follow, the men and women trapped by evil deeds remind us that ethics is a response to the call of the other. Harry Ramos, forty-six, had just returned to work at his office on the eighty-seventh floor after a week’s absence. Within minutes, the building was shaking violently; he braced himself in a doorway for stability. As light fixtures plummeted to the floor and smoke filled the office, Harry had no idea that a jetliner had just crashed into his building, floors above him. However, he knew enough to know that the survival of his office staff was at stake. Harry, the head trader for a small investment bank, the May Davis Group, was in the throes of pandemonium. Yet, he had to act. With the company.s chief financial officer, Harry marshaled the twelve employees in the office to the stairwell to begin the descent down eighty-seven floors, one step at a time. Harry stationed himself at the end of the line, making sure no one was left behind. .Nine floors down, the stairwell ended. Emerging into a hallway to look for the next flight of stairs, the group saw wires dangling from the cracked ceilings. Sparks popped. Small fires burned everywhere. Office workers were milling in confusion. The smoke was thickening . (Walsh 2001, 1). The scene was not promising. As the group continued down, Harry convinced the stragglers to keep moving. Along the way, Harry also stopped to help strangers make their way into the stairwell. At the fifty-third floor, Harry found Victor who, because of his large size or perhaps his profound fear, found it difficult to move. Together with another May Davis employee, they made it to the thirty-ninth floor by way of stairs and a short elevator ride. At one point, Harry let go of Victor, to walk ahead and survey the situation. Victor cried out in fear. "Harry, please help," he begged. "Don't worry, we’re not leaving you," Mr. Ramos said. (Walsh 2001, 1). Stopping to rest, the building sadistically shook again, and so the trio picked themselves up and walked down further, to the thirty-sixth floor. There, an exhausted Victor proclaimed his energy was spent, that his legs could not carry his frame another step. A firefighter rushing by yelled at Harry to leave Victor behind and run. But Harry did not move, assuring the large stranger, "Victor, don’t worry. I'm with you." Moments later, on television sets tuned in to the scene from all over the world, we saw the avalanche of cement and glass crush to the ground as the World Trade Center towers came tumbling down. As the buildings collapsed, so did thousands of lives. What the ordinary men and women like Harry Ramos left behind was not only a memory of good deeds, but also a glimpse into ethics and communication that compels us to answer the call of the other. Harry Ramos demonstrates for us the detectable evidence of the saying in everyday discourse. In Harry's response, we begin to recognize something compelling that makes possible the saying, what Levinas refers to as .the trace.. The trace signifies presence in absence, like how we feel someone's company even after they have left the room or when the amputee continues to experience the ache of a phantom limb. And, there is the trace of God who has "walked the earth" though is no longer directly visible. For Levinas, the trace is the vestige of the infinite. The Levinasian trace is nonphenomenological, signifying without manifesting anything (Peperzak 1997). As such, it resists our attempts to analyze it or identify it conclusively. Yet we continue to search for it in the saying, in the human face, and in responsibility. This quest, says Levinas, is a worthy one, indicative of an ethical life. The trace itself challenges logic and rationality; the trace resists comprehension as it .disturbs the order of the world. (1996b, 62). The difficulty of talking about the trace arises from its "enigmatic, equivocal" features that elude our attempts to name it. Levinas explains, "The infinite then cannot be tracked down like game by a hunter. The trace left by the infinite is not the residue of a presence; its very glow is ambiguous. (1998, 12). The trace, then, is not a sign or a concrete feature but a paradoxical function of sociality (Bergo 1999). The trace is palpable yet not tangible, within our reach yet out of our grasp. David Michael Levin describes Levinas's phenomenology as *tracework,* an obsession-sustained meditation on an admittedly hopeless search for the traces .of primordial responsiveness. . The project is hopeless, butnot futile; Levin offers, .since the effort, the attempt itself, carries enormous moral merit. (1998, 349). These are powerful ideas.an ethical subject whose ethics are lodged in a place otherwise than being; an ethic that can be conceived as the condition for dialogue in the saying to another; and the possibility of that saying, overwritten in ontology by the said, coming through still as a trace in discourse .like an unheard question. (Bergo 1999, 155). "Harry, please help me," is surely the call of conscience from one terrified and helpless man to a stranger who befriended him. "Don't worry, we're not leaving you," is just as surely the “here I am.” But the repeat at the end, "Don't worry, I'm with you," turns the "here I am" into a deeply exposed and singular commitment. It is no longer "we" but "I" who will be with the man who is not going anywhere in the heart of an inferno.

## Inherency

### Inherency – Minorities Rely on Intercity Public Transportation

#### Minorities in major cities disproportionately rely on public transportation now

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Some general demographic facts provide a basis for understanding how transportation, race, poverty, and geography intersect. Although America’s population is 69 percent white, 12 percent African American, 12.5 percent Latino, and 3.6 percent Asian American, the composition of major cities and urban areas is quite different. Almost half of the 100 largest cities have predominantly minority populations, while whites live mostly in the suburbs. Disparities in poverty levels remain between whites and minorities. Whites have a poverty rate of only 5 percent, compared with 22 percent for African Americans, 20 percent for Latinos, and 10 percent for Asian Americans. Nationally, public transportation users are disproportionately minorities with low to moderate incomes. Overall, public transit users are 45 percent white, 31 percent African American, and 18 percent Latino/Hispanic. In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos together comprise 54 percent of public transportation users (62% of bus riders, 35% of subway riders, and 29% of commuter rail riders.) Twenty-eight percent of public transportation users have incomes of $15,000 or less, and 55 percent have incomes between $15,000 and $50,000. Only 17 percent have incomes above $50,000. Just 7 percent of white households do not own a car, compared with 24 percent of African-American households, 17 percent of Latino households, and 13 percent of Asian-American households.

### Inherency – Unequal Transportation Funding Now

#### Unequal transportation funding disproportionately affects low income households and people who rely on public transportation—states disproportionately fund highway projects at the expense of public transportation

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Transportation costs are particularly burdensome for low-income households, which devote greater proportions of their incomes to transportation-related expenses than do higher-income households. In 1998, those in the lowest income quintile, making $11,943 or less, spent 36 percent of their household budget on transportation, compared with those in the highest income quintile, making $60,535 or more, who spent only 14 percent. Transportation expenditures continue to rise, reducing the amount low-income households have to spend on housing, food, health care, insurance, education, and other needs. The costs of car ownership can make it difficult to afford to purchase a home, and cars quickly depreciate compared with real property. Between 1992 and 2000, households with incomes of less than $20,000 saw the amount of their income spent on transportation increase by 36.5 percent or more (households with incomes between $5,000 and $9,999 spent 57 percent more on transportation than they did in 1992). In comparison, households with incomes of $70,000 and above only spent 16.8 percent more on transportation expenses than they did in 1992. There are significant inequities between bus service, which tends to serve more low-income riders, and rail service, which tends to serve higher-income riders. These inequities pale in comparison to the differences between governmental financial and political support for highway systems and for public transit systems. Many transportation planners and policymakers, concerned primarily with the needs of suburban commuters, have focused on constructing highways and commuter rail lines that do little to serve the needs of minority and low-income communities that depend on public transportation. Examination of state transportation spending priorities reveal another inequity. A body of research suggests that states are spending more resources on transportation needs in nonmetropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas. More research examining geographically coded data on spending between cities and other areas would provide a better understanding of how transportation spending patterns impact minority and low-income communities.

#### Unequal funding diverted to highways now—causes spatial segregation

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Transportation policies that favor highway development over public transit have several indirect negative effects. For one, such policies encourage housing development increasingly farther away from central cities, which has played an important role in fostering residential segregation and income inequalities. Also, the practice of locating major highways in minority and low-income communities has reduced housing in those areas. Other transportation investments, such as extending a rail line into a community, have made it more difficult for minorities and low-income individuals living there to afford housing because of ensuing property value increases. Individuals displaced by rising property values commonly have few alternative housing options and may end up living farther away from their jobs and social networks—a problem that is compounded by limited transportation options. Transportation policies favoring highways over transit have also helped to create “spatial mismatch”—the disconnect that occurs when new entry-level and low-skill jobs are located on the fringes of urban areas that are inaccessible to central-city residents who need those jobs. Public transportation systems operate most efficiently in densely developed urban areas and do a poor job of serving people who need to reach destinations far from the core downtown area. Transportation policies can also have indirect negative effects in the areas of health and education: Highway construction in minority and low-income communities can impair health through increased pollution, and access to education may be limited by cutbacks in school bus service with no affordable public transit as an alternative. Many transportation planners and policymakers have failed to recognize the link between transportation and land use policies and the impact of transportation policy on access to social and economic opportunities. Also, they have not recognized the need to take a regional approach in trying to address the inequitable effects of transportation policy.

#### Emphasis on highway construction over public transit funding disproportionately affects minorities and low-income riders

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

The emphasis on highway and road construction in federal and state policy shifts resources away from public transportation options for low-income families. According to survey results released by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) in November 2002, more than 50 percent of the transit agencies that responded to the survey had implemented, or were planning to implement, fare increases (almost 90 percent of the large systems), and 34 percent said they were cutting back on transit service.74 These fare increases and service cuts are being driven primarily by municipal, county, state, and transit agency budget crises brought on by the nation’s economic slump.75 Those who are dependent on public transportation often have difficulty meeting fare increases. Although more research is needed in this area, it is likely that because people of color are disproportionately poor and have higher rates of using public transportation, fare increases create a greater economic burden on minorities. An APTA report in 1992 found that nationwide, on average, users of public transportation are 45 percent white, 31 percent African American, and 18 percent Latino/Hispanic (see Figure 4) even though their general populations are approximately 69 percent, 12 percent, and 12.5 percent, respectively.76 Public transportation users also tend to have lower incomes. Nationally, approximately 38 percent of transit users have incomes of $20,000 or less, while 41 percent have incomes between $20,000 and $75,000. Only 21.5 percent have incomes above $75,000.77 APTA research and other sources suggest that fare increases can have very negative consequences for transit agencies.78 As fares go up, ridership tends to fall. These trends also tend to be more pronounced in smaller population centers. By increasing fares, public transit agencies run the risk of losing ridership, particularly riders with other transportation options. Those that remain—riders who lack other options—bear the burden of higher fares and service cutbacks that may result from ridership decline, which may severely impact their economic livelihoods and ability to access basic services.79 Little research examines the impact of fare reductions on transit agencies and ridership. One expert found that reducing fares can dramatically increase ridership.80 More research in this area would provide a clearer understanding of the effect of fare increases on minority and low-income populations.

#### These highway projects create displacement and destruction of minority housing within major cities

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Displacement and gentrification because of transportation projects are two examples of the negative impacts that have been inflicted on low-income neighborhoods of color. Residential location and housing are directly related to the need for equitable and efficient transportation systems, especially for persons with limited mobility. When housing is taken away for freeway projects in minority and low-income communities or becomes unaffordable, the displaced individuals have fewer options for seeking alternative housing and may end up living farther away from their jobs and social networks. This will be especially burdensome if their transportation options are limited. An individual’s residential location is crucial and encompasses not only issues of affordability, but also access to public schools, police and fire protection, and public transportation.115 Displacement Transportation policies and practices of locating freeway projects in minority neighborhoods have, in a number of cases, impeded the ability of minorities to access housing. Although there are no empirical data on the number of communities or people affected or the extent of the impact, historical and current examples of disproportionate impacts of transportation projects on minority neighborhoods exist and are discussed in this section. Freeway placements and expansions in urban areas typically occur where land prices are depressed—which frequently corresponds with the residential neighborhoods of low-income and minority households. Such neighborhoods generally have low levels of political power resulting from institutional discrimination over time. In some respects, freeway locations in cities are the philosophical progeny of “Negro removal” or “urban renewal” programs that were thought to cure “urban blight” by tearing down minorities’ homes.116 Some freeway construction projects have destroyed thousands of residential units occupied by minority and low-income households. In some cases, community objections to proposed projects have prevented widespread displacement and other inequitable effects. For example, in 1972, individuals and organizations concerned about people who would be displaced by the proposed I-105 “Century Freeway” construction in Los Angeles brought a lawsuit against state and federal government officials seeking injunctive relief. In 1982, the U.S. District Court approved a final consent decree requiring the state and federal defendants to provide 3,700 units of decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing to residents who were displaced by the freeway.117 Another example is the proposed extension to the Long Beach Freeway (710) in California. In 1994, the original proposal to extend the freeway provided more measures to lessen the impact of the proposed freeway in the predominantly white communities of South Pasadena and Pasadena and fewer measures in El Sereno, an almost completely Latino neighborhood in east Los Angeles.118 The original plan was to place mostly below-grade freeways in Pasadena and South Pasadena, but not in El Sereno. Also, it would have built five tunnel sections in Pasadena and South Pasadena to “mitigate the perception of a divided neighborhood” and only one tunnel in El Sereno (including a tunnel near the South Pasadena High School, but not one near the Sierra Vista Elementary School in El Sereno). Community members objected to the extension as proposed and, through a lawsuit, were able to make the project more equitable. In addition to destroying thriving neighborhoods, some freeway construction has posed physical hazards to the minorities and low-income individuals living near them. In Miami–Dade County, Florida, community residents remember well the detrimental impact that the construction of Interstate 95 had on vibrant African-American communities and business districts in the 1950s and 1960s. The decision to widen I-95 in the 1990s exacerbated the negative impact of the highway on local residents. Not only had the community never recovered from the original highway construction—the neighborhood’s property values had declined significantly over the past couple of decades as blight crept into the community—but the highway is within feet of residents’ houses. The only barrier protecting homes from the noise, vibration, and danger of potential accidents was a wire fence. On several occasions, local residents reported cars, tires, and other debris flying into their yards from the freeway, and many residents were afraid to be in the rear of their houses for fear of their lives.119 Local residents, who were predominantly minority and low to middle income, argued that the placement of the freeway and the proposed expansion was a clear case of discrimination and environmental injustice. Their accusations were further supported by the observation that other stretches of I-95 in Miami–Dade County in areas that were typically affluent and less likely to be predominantly minority had well-built and sturdy sound mitigation walls protecting property from the highway. In response to the residents’ concerns and allegations of discrimination, Florida officials quickly pulled together the financial resources to build a mitigation wall.120 Another current example of how transportation decisions can have a negative impact on a minority community is the controversy over a proposed major road that threatens to destroy a sacred American Indian site just outside of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Community leaders there are struggling to protect the Petroglyphs, a place for prayer and culture for the many Native American tribes (primarily Pueblo Indian tribes) in that region of the country. Despite its designation as a national park in 1998, developers and local politicians have repeatedly attempted to build roads through the park to facilitate access to new suburban growth farther out into the areas around Albuquerque. Through political and community organizing and legal advocacy, the Sacred Alliances for Grassroots Equality Council has succeeded in slowing efforts to develop portions of the Petroglyph National Park. Whether they will be able to prevent completely road construction through the Petroglyphs remains in question because powerful interests continue to advocate for road construction.121 Although proposed road projects would not destroy the community in which the Native Americans reside, they would be just as harmful because they would destroy a sacred site that is an integral part of their sense of community.

#### The Federal Government provides 80% of funding for highways—there isn’t nearly enough for transportation in the Squo despite funding.

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

The federal government has continued to devote significant resources to transportation. For example, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)167 authorized $217 billion 168 "for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit pro-grams, and for other purposes,"'69 including a $41 billion allocation for mass transit,170 which was declared a victory for environmentalists and supporters of public transportation.171 Nonetheless, no form of transportation has received as much support from the federal government as highways.'72 Currently, the federal government pays 80% of the costs for the vast majority of all transportation projects, with states and localities covering the rest."17 In absolute terms, the overwhelming majority of funding is used for highway construction and repair.174

### Inherency – Rail Transit Fails Now

#### Rail transit ignores the urban core

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

Rail transit is not an appropriate investment for many communities. Nonetheless, new rail investments are being planned, designed, or constructed in nearly all of the fifty largest metropolitan areas in the US. These projects may initiate rail service in a community or extend existing systems, including new lines to downtown and regional employment centers, airports, intermodal facilities, and other destinations. While environmental justice is usually absent from these discussions, questions regarding what the infrastructure investment is intended to accomplish and which decisions will most effectively advance these goals can help guide the community interest. Transportation justice should therefore also advocate for rail alignments that serve communities of color to ensure better access to major employers and destinations such as universities and community colleges. TaD can also help leverage neighborhood amenities such as grocery stores, child care and job-training facilities, banks, affordable housing, and home ownership opportunities-many of which are underrepresented in low-income and minority neighborhoods. When introduced throughout a regional transit network, such transportation and land use policies can also help reduce poverty, especially among working families who spend between 20 and 40 percent of their income on transportation.

## Advantage – Transportation Racism

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Apartheid Internal

#### Transportation infrastructure issues are shaped by racism—public transportation remains mired in Apartheid style policies that perpetuate exclusion

EJRC, 2004

[Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “Suburban Sprawl and transporation racism.” The Black Commentator, 9-23-2004, Issue 106, Online, [http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106\_transportation\_racism.html#](http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html)] /WFI-MB

In the United States, all communities do not receive the same benefits from transportation advancements and investments. "Suburban sprawl is in part driven by race and class dynamics. Transportation spending has always been about opportunity, fairness, and equity," according to Clark Atlanta University professor Robert D. Bullard. The modern civil rights movement has its roots in transportation. For more than a century, African Americans and other people of color have struggled to dismantle transportation apartheid policies that use tax dollars to promote economic isolation and social exclusion. The decision to build highways, expressways, and beltways has far-reaching effects on land use, energy policy, and the environment. Similarly, the decisions by county commissioners to limit and even exclude public transit to job-rich suburban economic activity centers have serious mobility implications for central city residents. Writing in the Foreword to Dr. Bullard’s and Angel O. Torres’s book, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Highways to Equity, Congressman John Lewis (D-GA) states, "Our struggle is not over. Today those physical signs are gone, but the legacy of "Jim Crow" transportation is still with us. Even in a city like Atlanta, Georgia, a vibrant city with a modern rail and public transit system, thousands of people have been left out and left behind because of discrimination. Like most other major cities, Atlanta’s urban center is worlds apart from its suburbs."

#### Transportation racism exists now—funding for transit systems unequal—causing apartheid

Bernstein and Solomon, 2011

[Andrea and Nancy, American Radio Works contributors/producers, “Back of the Bus: Mass transit, race, and inequality.” 2-18-2011, Originally broadcast date, online, <http://transportationnation.org/backofthebus/>] /Wyo-MB

“Transportation in Atlanta has always been mired in race and racism,” says Robert Bullard, director of the Environmental Justice Center at Clark Atlanta University. When Atlanta began building its commuter rail system in the 1970s, white communities like Clayton County wanted no part of it. “Public Transit was equated with black people and poor people and crime and poverty. And when the Metropolitan Atlanta Transportation Authority was created MARTA, it was a running joke that MARTA” – he spells it out – M-A-R-T-A – “stood for moving Africans rapidly through Atlanta.” “It’s transportation apartheid,” he says. “One guy told me it takes him about 30 minutes to get here from where he lives, but if ladies are walking, it probably takes them longer,” McMillan said, as she walked from the bus to her car parked at the Home Depot. “Because I have walked, and it takes me about 40 minutes to walk from where I live to the bus stop.” More than half a century after Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama, prompting an 11-month boycott that led to integration of that city’s bus system, African Americans and Latinos are still struggling with an unequal transit system. It’s a struggle that stretches far back. In 1896, a case over segregated rail cars made it to the U.S. Supreme Court Case. It was that case – Plessy v. Ferguson – that legalized the infamous concept of “separate but equal.” It would take more than half a century for the legal precept to be overturned in the 1954 case, Brown v. Board of Education. But while the civil rights movement was playing out at schools, colleges, lunch counters and voting booths, a seemingly unrelated move by the federal government would change the way blacks and whites lived together for the next half century. In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower signed legislation that funded the interstate highway system. It was a seemingly unconnected event, but one that had enormous ramifications. “At the same time we were doing Brown v. Board of Education and trying to integrate the school system,” says Angela Glover Blackwell, the head of PolicyLink, “we were investing billions of dollars in a highway system that segregated the nation by allowing people to be able to run away from urban areas that were integrated to suburban areas that were all white.” One of the communities that was destroyed was the Rondo neighborhood in St. Paul, Minnesota. Before the highway tore through that neighborhood, Rondo Avenue was a bustling commercial thoroughfare, chock-a-block with barber shops, churches, and shoe stores. But in 1956, crews began leveling houses on Rondo Avenue to make way for Interstate 94. Nathanial Khaliq was 13 years old then. “There were cop cars everywhere,” he recalls, “And when I walked into the house, these guys had axes and sledgehammers. They were knocking holes in the walls, breaking the windows, tearing up the plumbing – you know, just to make sure he didn’t try to move back in there. I was crying because it looked like something bad was happening.” Ora Lee Patterson also grew up in Rondo. “To own your own home after you couldn’t vote, you weren’t considered as a human being – and then to see what happened with the freeway, and when they came through and gave them nickels and dimes for their property? They never gave those people what their houses were worth. Never.” It was, Patterson and Khaliq’s families were assured, just good urban planning. But Marvin Anderson, a retired attorney and law librarian, spent years searching for evidence the government purposely selected the site of the freeway for all the wrong reasons. In 1993, he unearthed a letter to the editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The writer, a city engineer, Claude Thompson, admitted the government chose the route for I-94 because it was in the city’s low-income black neighborhood. Following the mass exodus of the middle class to American suburbs, cities experienced a gradual deterioration of schools and increasing poverty. Even today, transportation funding continues to help the suburbs at the expense of cities. Eighty percent of all transportation dollars are spent on roads. The remaining 20 percent is spent on mass transit.

#### Suburbanization and gentrification have marginalized the urban poor, often subjected to the separation of neighborhoods due to zoning. They cannot respond due to a lack of political clout creating de facto apartheid between rich white suburbanites and poor minority city dwellers, only transportation can solve.

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

This massive migration to the suburbs did not occur evenly among all groups, however; it was primarily a white phenomenon.32 The migration to the suburbs by whites throughout the twentieth century left a vacuum in the central city to be filled by low-income, primarily minority migrants 33 who relocated to cities during a large, prolonged wave of rural-to-urban migration that began prior to World War I and continued intermittently throughout much of the twentieth century.34 Because high-income families dominated-and continue to dominate-the suburban demographic composition, minorities by and large did not participate in suburban migration until the 1970s and, even then, continued to be underrepresented in the suburban population.35 This history, in addition to current social preferences and prejudices that favor housing homogeneity-such as discriminatory lending practices36-has led many American cities to be segregated by race and income.37 One result of this urban-to-suburban shift is that residents of the central city, disproportionately minorities and low-income earners, have little convenient access to good jobs, essential services such as medical care, and shopping, much of which has followed higher income residents to the suburbs.38 Because zoning laws separate residential from commercial districts, the businesses that remain may be out of walking distance, especially for the elderly.39 Exacerbating this situation is the scarcity of transportation options near low-income areas in many central cities.40 This lack of transportation not only limits access to local services and shop-ping, but also isolates low-income communities from more prosperous areas in other parts of the city and beyond. Furthermore, while the highways necessary to connect suburbs and exurbs41 to the central city occasionally pass through affluent areas, they are more likely to pass through poor minority areas,42 destroying and dividing neighborhoods43 and making travel by foot unsafe in the process.44 Thus, for many poor residents with an automobile, meaning that **cars have become an unaffordable necessity.**45 During the 1980s and 1990s, various pressures, including increased housing costs and a decreased quality of life, led suburbanites to seek new housing options.46 One response was the birth of exurbs, adding even greater complexity to the transportation problem by diverting funding to the provision of highways over an even greater area.47 Another was gentrification, or the purchase and renovation of low-cost homes in the central city, generally by young, higher-income professionals.48 Although gentrification brought with it increased economic development, it also put severe economic pressure on those with low incomes by increasing housing values and, thus, the cost of home rental and purchase, as well as property taxes.49 In many cases, dilapidated suburbs became the only affordable housing option, pushing low-income and minority residents away from the recovering central city to suburbs with the same dearth of services that had been previously lacking in the central city, but with even fewer transportation options. Other negative effects of the predominant transportation regime in most American cities span class, race, and age. These include increased commuting times50 and transportation costs,51 environmental degrada-tion,52 and impeded economic development.53 Nonetheless, the greatest effects of American landscape development and the resulting transportation regime burden the urban poor.54 Through the processes of industrialization, urbanization, suburbanization, segregation, gentrification, and the growth of car dependence, the United States has evolved from a collection of small, self-sufficient, and closely knit urban and rural communities to an interdependent urban society in which mobility is essential, but access to transportation, especially for the urban poor, is limited. That the socioeconomic effects of suburbanization and car dependence on the urban poor have not been legally addressed may be a symptom of the fact that the effects of these processes have become apparent only within the last half-century.55 Furthermore, the groups most directly disadvantaged by this process historically **suffer from a lack of political power**,56 **leaving them with a reduced ability to press for legislative change.**

#### Transportation decisions shape the way the US looks and moves, so it is no accident that transportation apartheid has come about.

Bullard 04

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

Transportation equity is consistent with the goals of the larger environmental justice and civil rights movements. We emphasize issues of justice, fairness, and equity. We define transportation equity as a basic right, a right worth fighting for. Transportation systems do not spring up out of thin air. They are planned-and, in many cases, planned poorly when it comes to people of color. Conscious decisions determine the location of freeways, bus stops, fueling stations, and train stations. Decisions to build highways, expressways, and beltways have far-reaching effects on land use, energy policies, and the environment. Decisions by county commissioners to bar the extension of public transit to job- rich economic activity centers in suburban counties and instead spend their transportation dollars on repairing and expanding the nation's roads have serious mobility implications for central city residents. Together, all these transportation decisions shape United States metropolitan areas, growth patterns, physical mobility, and economic opportunities.' These same transportation policies have also aided, and in some cases subsidized, racial, economic, and environmental inequities as evidenced by the segregated housing and spatial layout of our central cities and suburbs. It is not by chance that millions of Americans have been socially isolated and relegated to economically depressed and deteriorating central cities and that transportation apartheid has been created.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Discrimination Internal

#### Despite decades of efforts to eradicate discrimination in the US, the problem is still here, and now it is time to solve it.

Bullard 04

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

More than one hundred years ago, in the foreword to his classic book The Souls of Black Folks, W. E. B. DuBois declared that "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line." DuBois's diagnosis came seven years after the infamous Plessy v. Ferguson US Supreme Court decision codified "separate but equal" as the law of the land. Sadly, in the twenty-first century, the problem persists. Highway Robbery weighs in a half-century after the landmark US Supreme Court Brown v. Board of Education decision overturned Plessy and outlawed "separate but equal" in 1954. Unfortunately, decades of court rulings and civil rights laws have not eradicated the historic disparities between races or the discrimination that perpetuates them.' The United States remains a racially divided nation where extreme inequalities continue to persist in housing, schools, employment, income, environmental protection, and transportation. The struggle against transportation racism has always been about civil rights, social justice, equity, and fair treatment. For more than a century, African Americans and other people of color have struggled to end transportation racism. Harbingers of the modern civil rights movement, Rosa Parks and the Montgomery Bus Boycott of the 1950s challenged transportation racism. Later, the Freedom Riders of the 1960s defied "Jim Crow" on interstate transportation. Despite the heroic efforts of many and the monumental human rights gains over the past five decades, transportation remains a civil rights and quality oflife issue. Unfortunately, it appears that transportation-civil rights issues have dropped off the radar screens of many mainstream civil rights and social justice organizations at a time when racist political forces disguised as "conservatives" attempt to roll back and dismantle many hard-won civil rights gains. It is time to refocus attention on the role transportation plays in shaping human interaction, economic mobility, and sustainability. From New York City to Los Angeles, and a host of cities in between, people of color are banding together to challenge unfair, unjust, and illegal transportation policies and practices that relegate them to the back of the bus. From Rosa Parks and the brave souls who risked their lives in the Montgomery Bus Boycott to John Lewis and the Freedom Riders, individual and organizational frontal assaults on racist transportation policies and practices represent attempts to literally dismantle the infrastructure of oppression. Natural heirs of the civil rights legacy, the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union in the 1990s and hundreds of grassroots groups in the early years of the new millennium have taken to our nation's buses, trains, streets, and highways and joined the battle against transportation racism. Transportation racism hurts people of color communities by depriving their residents of valuable resources, investments, and mobility. This book represents a small but significant part of the transportation equity movement-a movement that is redefining transportation as an environmental, economic, civil, and human right. The need for transportation touches every aspect of our lives and daily routines. The course of one day could necessitate a range of activities: working, shopping, visiting friends, attending church, or going to the doctor. Furthermore, transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring equal access to education, employment, and other public services. Lest anyone dismiss transportation as a tangential expense, consider that except for housing, Americans spend more on transportation than any other household disbursement, including food, education, and health care. The average American household spends one fifth of its income-or about $6,000 a year-for each car that it owns and operates." It is not uncommon for many low-income, people of color households to spend up to one-third of their income on transportation. This book affirms that transportation is neither a marginal cost nor an irrelevant need, but a necessity.

#### The benefits of transportation infrastructure development are most often felt by the well-off neighbourhoods, while the more negative effects are felt mostly by the low income neighbourhoods.

Bullard 04

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

The disparity of fruits borne by various transportation development projects is a grim story of a stolen harvest with disproportionate burdens and costs paid for in diminished health and life opportunities by poor people and people of color. Many federally subsidized transportation construction and infrastructure projects cut wide paths through low-income and people of color neighborhoods. They physically isolate residents from their institutions and businesses, disrupt once-stable communities, displace thriving businesses, contribute to urban sprawl, subsidize infrastructure decline, create traffic gridlock, and subject residents to elevated risks from accidents, spills, and explosions from vehicles carrying hazardous chemicals and other dangerous materials. Adding insult to injury, cutbacks in mass transit subsidies have the potential to further isolate the poor in inner-city neighborhoods from areas experiencing job growth-compromising what little they already have. So while some communities receive transportation benefits, others pay the costs. Some communities get roads, while others are stuck with the externalities such as exhaust fumes from other people's cars. Public transit and roads are not created equal. Generally, public transit in the US is often equated with the poor and the less successful. On the other hand, roads are associated with private automobiles, affluence, and success. In reality, both transit and roads are subsidized and form the heart of our public transportation infrastructure. The lion's share of transportation dollars is spent on roads, while urban transit systems are often left in disrepair or are strapped for funds. Public transit has received roughly $50 billion since the creation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration over thirty years ago, while roadway projects have received over $205 billion since 1956.6 Opaque transportation policy obscures the truth: transportation dollars are aiding and abetting the flight of people, jobs, and development to the suburban fringe.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Exclusion Internal

#### Urban transportation causes social exclusion due to the inability to receive employment or services because of either ineffective transport or financial inability. Only transportation to create livable cities can solve.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara, “Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

Urban transportation is socially unjust when the lack of benefits or unfair distribution leads to the *social exclusion* of individuals or groups in society. Social exclusion refers to the “situation where certain members of society are, or become, separated from much that comprises the normal ‘round’ of living and working in society” (Johnston, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0055), p. 751). Generally, this may involve exclusion from participation in democratic governance, decision-making, or production processes that otherwise lead to empowerment of disadvantaged groups (Foladori, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0035)). Patterns and processes of social polarization, segregation, and inequality (Maloutas, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0074)) may also reflect forces of social exclusion. Transportation systems can cause persons or groups to become socially excluded as a result of spatial, temporal, financial, or personal obstacles, such as cost-prohibitive transportation, fear for personal safety, restrictive transit schedules, or unserviced locations (Solomon, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0101)). Pickup and Guiliano ([2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0082)) identify three key factors where unsustainable urban transportation exacerbates the conditions of social exclusion. For one, poor access to services, places of employment, education, shopping, or amenities/recreation is a plausible indicator of social exclusion. Continual isolation resulting from persistent transportation-based barriers to opportunities ultimately fosters a lack of hope for the future among isolated individuals and groups. Also, concentrated social segregation (Stren and Polèse, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0084); Burton, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0015)) and polarized and fragmented communities emerge within metropolitan landscapes as a result of transportation-based social exclusion. For many, creating livable cities that enable construction of livelihoods requires social cohesion (Arend,[2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0001)), social diversity (Yiftachel and Hedgcock, [1993](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0117); Stren and Polèse, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0084)), and social integration (Burton, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0015)). Currently, a consistent definition of social exclusion and the linkages to urban transportation remains elusive (Solomon, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0101); Pickup and Giuliano, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0082)). Further, measurable benchmarks have yet to be developed (Solomon,[2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0101)). But the literature illustrates the significance urban transportation can play in the exclusion of individuals from society's benefits.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Gentrification Internal

#### Transportation inequality causes gentrification—destroying cultural diversity in communities

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Another housing-related impact of transportation policies is gentrification. Gentrification is commonly characterized as a transformation of neighborhood conditions that encompass physical, economic, and demographic dimensions and can be defined as “the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the essential character and flavor of that neighborhood.”122 It occurs for a number of reasons, including increased desirability of an area due to a transportation investment such as extension of a commuter rail line, new or improved train service or station, or addition of a highway ramp or exit. Most commonly, gentrification has been portrayed in terms of residential location patterns, such as “back to the city” flows of middle-income households from the urban fringe or suburbs or elsewhere within a metropolitan area. Gentrification, however, manifests itself through reinvestment and rehabilitation of previously degraded neighborhoods, improving the physical condition and appearance of both residential and commercial properties. Due to the perception that increased property values, increased safety, and improved neighborhood amenities signal neighborhood revival, middleincome households upgrade housing conditions for their personal consumption. While owneroccupied single-family residences replace renter occupancy, businesses that target the demographic group of middle-income homeowners transform older, traditional commercial locations through reinvestment and rehabilitation of structures. Thus, the gentrification process entails physical property improvements, a demographic change to higher income levels, more “yuppie” (young, urban professionals) households, and property value increases. Some neighborhood gentrifications absorb vacant properties, while others involve replacement (or displacement) of households no longer able to afford housing due to housing cost (price/rent) appreciation. While some consider property value increases resulting from gentrification to be positive, such changes have also been criticized for worsening the well-being of low-income persons, especially in neighborhoods of color. Some have argued that increases in property values are capitalized in rent increases, which then push households that are less able to pay to other neighborhoods or to undesirable housing arrangements.123 In particular, some argue that certain antisprawl land use policies that direct housing development away from the urban fringe reduce housing affordability and limit housing choice, especially for low-income households. Others have argued, in addition to causing displacement, that gentrification is undesirable because it leads to homogenous neighborhoods that are not socioeconomically or culturally diverse.124 However, there is insufficient data to draw specific conclusions about the net social and economic impacts of transportation investments on gentrification and displacement.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Humans Rights Internal

#### Transportation is a de facto right and less-fortunate minorities deserve it. Mass-transit in the inner-cities is necessary to dissolve these massive disparities

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer] \*Note: De facto- A socially attributed thing, in this context, rights. (e.g. Transportation as a right, or English as the De Facto national language) and De Jure- a court attributed right or thing. (e.g. Freedom and speech and religion)

The right to travel and freedom of movement act together to prohibit unjustified and burdensome restrictions on travel and mobility locally, across state borders, and internationally. Nowhere has it been suggested that these rights carry with them a concomitant right to transportation. However, the existence of such a right to transportation is not as outrageous as it may seem at first glance. Despite indications by the Supreme Court that a right to transportation is improbable, several constitutional sources and constitutionally based doctrines could plausibly give rise to a remedial right to transportation, or at least lend support to the existence of such a right: the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the right to travel, and freedom of movement. This Note argues that a de facto right to transportation exists and is supported by, though not based on, the right to travel and freedom of movement. Federal and state governments have devoted massive amounts of funding to transportation projects, creating a de facto right to transportation. This devotion to the development of transportation networks is likely to continue given transportation's importance to economic development. This de facto right to transportation must apply equally to all citizens through the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. However, this right currently does not exist equally for all classes-the urban poor, a large proportion of whom are minorities, are disproportionately excluded from its benefits. Transportation funding has been used primarily for the development of highways and roads, to the benefit of car owners. This focus on highway development has also disrupted other forms of urban mobility. This Note argues for greater funding of urban mass transportation systems as a means of alleviating this disparity.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Quality of Life Internal

#### Transportation allows an increased quality of life for disadvantaged inner-city residents.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara, “Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

The effect of transportation on the quality of life (QoL) of an individual or a group is another aspect from which research literature considers the social sustainability of urban transportation. Quality of life is “a multi-dimensional construct, and may be defined as the extent to which important values and needs of people are fulfilled” (Steg and Gifford, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0104), p. 62). Used as a public policy goal for reducing inequities, QoL indicators help examine the conditions for seeking happiness and fulfilling need and has been recognized as more conducive than adhering to strict economic goals (Helburn, [1982](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0048)). In transportation research, such indicators help to measure the extent to which an urban transportation system contributes to diminished quality of life. Although this area conceptually overlaps with social equity and social exclusion, it focuses more upon the individual experiences of daily life, acknowledging that people are perhaps ultimately less concerned about issues of social justice (as in the collective economic, social, and physical conditions of people in a community) than about their own quality of life (Khisty, [1996](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0059)).

#### Current transportation infrastructure is 3 times more likely to kill people from asthma and cancer

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

Our auto-dependent transportation system is also a major contributor to the United States's unhealthy air quality. Despite progress made since the 1970 Clean Air Act, nearly half of all Americans (133 million) breathe unhealthy air. Medical research has demonstrated that air pollution exacerbates and may even cause the onset of asthma. Researchers have also linked air pollution to heart disease, lung cancer, birth defects, brain damage, and even premature mortality." African Americans and Latinos are disproportionately exposed to harmful air pollutants partly as a result of the Interstate Era when urban freeways were often routed through communities of color in cities across the country. A recent study in the Los Angeles region found that the cancer risk along highway corridors with significant big truck traffic was 1,700 per million residents, the highest in region, and much higher than the regional average of 1,200 to 1,400 per million residents." While 33 percent of whites have been found to live in metropolitan areas failing to meet national air quality standards for two or more pollutants, 50 percent of African Americans and 60 percent of Latinos lived in these areas. Even greater differences were found for areas that violate air quality standards for three and four pollutants." The higher rate of exposure to air pollution is also resulting in disproportionately high rates of cancer and asthma among people of color. A new study by the American Cancer Society found that, compared to white men, African American men are 20 percent more likely to have cancer and 40 percent more likely to die from cancer." Asthma is almost twice as common among African Americans as whites, even when controlling for income levels. African American children are three times as likely to be hospitalized for treatment of asthma as white children. Asthma attacks send more than four times as many African Americans (22.9 visits per 1,000 people) to the emergency room as whites (4.9 visits per 1,000 people)." Even more troubling is the disparity in asthma-related deaths among African Americans and whites. Though African Americans make up 12 percent of the US population, they account for 23.7 percent of all deaths due to asthma. In 1998, the age-adjusted mortality rate for asthma was more than three times as high for African Americans (3.7 deaths per 100,000 people) as for whites (1.1 deaths per 100,000 people)."

### Transportation Racism Advantage – LA Proves

#### The most noticeable distinction of low-income LA MTA bus riders is their racial compostion.

**Mann 96**

[Eric, director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles, Planning Committee of the Bus Riders Union, “A New Vision for Urban Transportation”, 1996, <http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf> //wyo-MU]

**What could possibly motivate a public transportation agency to destroy the public transportation system and the lives of a half million people who use it? What level of contempt for 94 percent of its passengers,** whom the MTA patronizingly claims are its “customers,” **could warrant the unbearable conditions of people waiting on corners in droves for hours, for nothing more than a standing room only ride to a $5 per hour job? At the level of economics, the most important characteristic of bus riders of all races is their poverty**, or “profound poverty” as the MTA callously observes. **The concept of a low-income working class suffering discrimination is critical for understanding MTA policy. But it is the racial composition and categorization of these low-income bus riders that ex- plains the cruel and unusual punishment that our system has historically meted out for them.** In this historical context, the call to “Fight Transit Racism” is the key to mobilizing a broad social movement for a first class public transportation system in Los Angeles.

#### In LA MTA policy there is a clear prejudice against the urban poor. These are mostly African American, Latino, and Asian low-paid workers.

**Mann 96**

[Eric, director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles, Planning Committee of the Bus Riders Union, “A New Vision for Urban Transportation”, 1996, <http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf> //wyo-MU]

Too often in the popular discourse there is a false theoretical separation, in which “working class” is used to refer to white workers while “racial” and “ethnic” is used to refer to African American, Latino, and Asian communities, presented as totally undifferentiated in terms of their own class structure. But, it is **as a discrete group** that **low-income people of color, the primary constituents that make up the class of bus riders, have been the victims of a number of brutal economic forces.** First, **the higher-paid unionized jobs that African Americans and Latinos fought their way into during the 1960s are for the most part gone**— casualties as the U.S. made its brutal transition back to a low-wage nation and job exporter. **The lower-wage working class jobs that have stayed in the U.S**., with minimal job security, **are filled by women and, increasingly, immigrants of color. Because of the disappearance of the unionized, high-wage jobs, “cyclical unemployment” has been replaced by structural unemployment, particularly in the black community. There is now a justified reluctance among many black men, in particular, to accept jobs that are clearly exploitative and of extremely low wage rates. Also, there is clear prejudice among employers against African Americans because of their history of militant and principled leadership in social justice movements.** Second, **the former role of the social welfare state to buttress low-wage workers from the worst ravages of a market economy is** now **under frontal attack** from President Clinton and the Democrats, who agree that low-income women and men of color must be forcibly weaned from a “culture of dependence.” **The massive resources of government are** now more than ever **turned to support large corporations in the world market and to pacify a** voracious and **racist white middle-class electorate,** who simultaneously rail against “welfare” while supplementing their income through government-financed homeowners tax credits, FEMA earthquake relief payments, tax write-offs for home “business” expenses, and suburban rail systems with lap top computer terminals and childcare centers. As a result, **the low-wage working class must desperately struggle to beg, borrow, or steal enough funds to buy food, housing, clothing, education, transportation, and medical care in the market.** Third, the briefly fashionable view held during the 1960’s that society had some obligation to provide decent-paying jobs or adequate income for all its members has been replaced by the ideology of “an end to welfare as we know it” and the racialization, feminization, and criminalization of poverty. Laws such as “Three strikes and you’re out” and the re-legalization of the death penalty in many states are clearly aimed at incarcerating and killing African American and Latino youth, who are also overwhelmingly poor and working class. Thus, **it is the African American, Latino, and Asian poor people who cannot afford existing MTA fares. It is the explosive relationship of identity between an increasingly minority (and female) low-wage workforce and an increasingly stratified U.S. class structure that goes to the heart of our civil rights challenge.**

#### The LA transit system is broken down between the bus system and the train system, and the distinctions between who can afford to ride what are alarmingly racially oriented.

**Mann 96**

[Eric, director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles, Planning Committee of the Bus Riders Union, “A New Vision for Urban Transportation”, 1996, <http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf> //wyo-MU]

**Every day 350,000 passengers use the MTA bus system, taking 1.3 million daily rides, while 26,000 passengers use the MTA’s rail system, taking only 96,000 daily rides. The bus riders are 81 percent Latino, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American, and the rail riders are about 50 percent white.** But, **on the most overcrowded inner-city buses the passengers are virtually 100 percent people of color,** and **on the most luxurious trains the passengers are almost 70 percent white.** It is **the apartheid-like nature of this transit system** that **is unusually disturbing,** in which **a small and declining white minority benefits so greatly from racist government policy, while an enormous and growing group of people of color suffer such abuse and discrimination.**

This card is talking about the LA MTA.

#### Racism in the L.A. public transit system is very real but hard to fight because the form it takes provides companies with defense against accusations of discrimination.

**Mann 96**

[Eric, director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles, Planning Committee of the Bus Riders Union, “A New Vision for Urban Transportation”, 1996, <http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf> //wyo-MU]

**In** cases such as **Brown v. Board of Education, where a literal Jim Crow system was being challenged, it was hard for all but hard-core racists to justify such gross forms of racial segregation.** However, **in Los Angeles today, while the impacts of racism are just as pronounced, the form it takes is somewhat different**, especially after some of the victories of the civil rights movement. For example, **the Metrolink is the most “white” line, with a white ridership as high as 70 percent, serving some of the last overwhelmingly white suburbs in the region.** But **the entire demographic form of Los Angeles is now shaped by people of color, and there are virtually no majority white areas that can be reached without going through areas dominated by people of color.** Moreover, **the Bradley administration and the powerful African American and Latino voting coalitions in Los Angeles have made a substantial improvement in the conditions** of a rather large strata **of middle class people of color**, whose activities have included breaking into areas of previously lily-white suburban housing. It is **based on the above facts** that **the MTA argues in court that it cannot be practicing racial discrimination because many of the train lines carry more than 50 percent minority ridership, and “travel through” districts with an even higher percentage of people of color.** However, **these explanations fail to take into account that L.A. County is now 60 percent Latino, African American, Asian, and Native American and only 40 percent white.** So, another way of understanding the bus/rail racial numbers is that **on some of the most suburban trains, white people are represented by almost twice their percentage in the county. On the trains going through overwhelmingly minority communities, the white percentage is still almost the same as their population in the county.** By contrast, **on the buses, white ridership is only 19 percent (compared to their 40 percent of the county total), while black ridership is 22 percent (compared to their 11 percent of the county total), and Latino ridership is 47 percent (compared to 34 percent in the county).** Moreover, **the figure of 81 percent people of color on the bus system hides the fact that on the inner-city buses** such as the Vermont 204 line—the most overcrowded bus line in the U.S. carrying 20,000 riders a day with a load factor of over 1.45—**the passengers are almost entirely people of color. These** stark **statistics indicate that the trains are far more heavily white and the buses are far more heavily comprised of people of color, creating a strong racial character to each mode of transportation. These numbers say a lot, but sentiments sometimes give the story an added texture: the MTA itself has had a long-standing inside joke** (until we publicized it) **calling its bus system, “a third class bus system for Third World People.”**

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Livelihood Internal

#### Transportation ensures livelihoods of inner-city residents.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara,

“Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

By shifting the scale of sustainability research to the locality, social sustainability concerns of *meeting human needs* and *satisfying aspirations for a better life* can more appropriately be addressed and researched within context. Looking specifically at the locality, the objective of sustainability becomes the establishment and maintenance of *livelihoods*(CUPR, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0023)). Sustainable livelihoods, “processes of social and ecological reproduction situated within diverse spatial contexts” (CUPR, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0023), p. 7), enable individuals, households, and neighborhoods to construct a living that meets basic human needs. Within this localized level, sometimes the barriers to sustaining livelihoods are transportation-based. Transportation infrastructures of urban regions are essential for individuals to construct a livelihood in the city, providing mobility and access to places of opportunity across the geographic landscape. Socially sustainable transportation systems are adequate, efficient, effective, and crucial to alleviating poverty by providing access to markets, employment, education, and basic services (UN, [1992](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0106); World Bank, [1996](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0116)) and “sustain the progress of the society towards prosperity, freedom, and justice for all…” (Low and Gleeson, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0072), p. 12). It must further be considered that local manifestations of sustainability may be location specific (CUPR, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0023)) and context dependent (Maloutas, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0074)), suggesting that the *meaning* of and barriers to sustainable livelihoods is not uniform for all cities but is contingent upon the local conditions.

#### The livelihood of human beings is key to sustaining human rights

**Darooka 8** [Priiti, Human Dignity and Human Rights Caucus Human Rights and Gender Equity Livelihood Development and Displacement Concept January 2009, Livelihood, Development and Displacement Concept Note, <http://hdhrc.over-blog.com/>, spencer]

The right to livelihood is identified as a key right to the realization of all other rights. Livelihoods for people are a means to live a life with dignity. However, the critical issue of livelihoods is not adequately addressed by the current the human rights framework. International human rights instruments recognize the right to adequate standard of living, including right to food and housing, the right to work, the right to social security and the right to health. The protection and promotion of these rights protect people’s livelihood.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Marginalization Internal

#### The 14th Amendment guarantees protection of injustices against anyone’s pursuit. Transportation is, and empirically has, evolved to prioritize and legitimize white flight and the relocation of business which disenfranchises minorities.

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

Given the likelihood that provision of transportation will continue to be a duty of government, the real issue is whether the transportation provided unfairly benefits some groups and not others. The Fourteenth Amendment declares that states shall not "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."182 This phrase has been interpreted to require that "equal protection and security should be given to all under like circumstances in the enjoyment of their personal and civil rights" and that "no impediment should be interposed to the pursuits of anyone except as applied to the same pursuits by others under like circumstances."183 Although the Fourteenth Amendment was intended to eliminate racial discrimination,184 it has also been interpreted to prohibit, to a lesser degree, intentional disparate treatment on account of economic status.185 The modern American transportation system, because of its preference for transportation projects that primarily enable auto mobility, benefits whites and wealthier individuals to the exclusion of minorities and those with low incomes.186 This disparate benefit was acknowledged in academic transportation literature as far back as the 1920s.187 While this situation has obviously improved, race is linked to wealth,188 and wealth is clearly linked to the ability to purchase a car. Although American cities bore signs of segregation prior to the advent of the automobile, the proliferation of highways into urban areas beginning in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to further segregation.189 The dominance of the automobile enabled suburbanization, white flight, and the subsequent movement of businesses and services from the central city.190 By enabling suburbanization, segregation, and urban decay, the preference for highways and roads over rail and mass transportation systems disproportionately benefited whites over minorities. Thus, if it exists at all, the de facto right to transportation exists to varying degrees based on race. Unfortunately, this inequality does not necessarily give rise to a cause of action under the Equal Protection Clause for several reasons.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Poverty Internal

#### Rich white people can afford cars, while inadequate transportation plagues the inner-city and develops urban ghettos due to a lack of transportation to employment, causing a cycle of geographical poverty that condemns the poor to endless marginalization.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara, “Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

This growing dependence upon automobiles creates geographies of social inequities and polarization in metropolitan areas along socioeconomic lines. Racial minorities and the poor are disproportionately reliant upon inefficient public transportation systems that provide limited spatial and temporal service (Fielding, [1995](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0034); Pucher and Renne, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0090); Pucher, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0089)). In many sprawling cities in the United States, the large employment markets in the metropolitan periphery remain inaccessible via public transportation, leaving large populations of central-city residents without employment. These transportation-based barriers to employment led to the formation of urban ghettos or inner cities (Harvey, [1973](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0046)), resulted in social isolation (Wilson, [1987](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0115)) and concentrations of poverty among African Americans (powell, [2002](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0087)) in metropolitan urban core areas.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Racism Internal

#### Unequal transportation policies are ignored by policymakers now and are contributing to spatial segregation and inequality

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Transportation plays a vital role in our society. In fact, the Supreme Court recognized that the right to travel is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.1 Given the important role of transportation, it would be expected that policymakers would battle over transportation policy. Too often, however, those battles are fought over what specific projects will be funded and in which states or congressional districts, and scant attention is paid to the larger social and economic effects of transportation policies. The civil rights movement provides some evidence of the social importance of transportation to people of color. In 1955, the arrest of Rosa Parks for refusing to give her seat on a bus to a white rider sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Freedom Riders faced violent attacks to assert the rights of African Americans to ride on integrated buses traveling interstate. Many past and current transportation policies have limited the life chances of minorities by preventing access to places and opportunities. The expiration in 2003 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) provides an opportunity to address some of the inequitable effects that transportation policies have on minority and low-income communities. Americans have become increasingly mobile and more reliant on automobiles to meet their travel needs due largely to transportation policies adopted after World War II that emphasized highway development over public transportation. According to Census 2000 data, less than five percent of trips to work in urban areas were made by public transit, but this varies significantly by race and location.2 Minorities, however, are less likely to own cars than whites and are more often dependent on public transportation. The “transit-dependent” must often rely on public transportation not only to travel to work, but also to get to school, obtain medical care, attend religious services, and shop for basic necessities such as groceries. The transit-dependent commonly have low incomes and thus, in addition to facing more difficulties getting around, they face economic inequities as a result of transportation policies oriented toward travel by car. Surface transportation policies at the local, regional, state, and national levels have a direct impact on urban land use and development patterns. The types of transportation facilities and services in which public funds are invested provide varying levels of access to meet basic social and economic needs. The way communities develop land dictates the need for certain types of transportation, and on the other hand, the transportation options in which communities invest influence patterns of urban development. While many lament the trend toward “suburban sprawl” as unaesthetic or damaging to the environment, those who support social equity should also be concerned about this trend. Substantial investment in highway development and other transportation programs that encourage private automobile use has encouraged and supported low-density developments that extend increasingly farther and farther from the central city and to residential and commercial areas that are increasingly spread out—edgeless cities.3 In addition to being costly to state and local governments,4 transportation policies that encourage these growth patterns play a substantial role in producing some indirect, negative social and economic effects, including perpetuating residential segregation and exacerbating the inability of minorities to access entrylevel employment, which is increasingly found in suburban areas.5

#### Transportation policies contribute to racism and inequality in the squo—hurts minority users

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

This report reviews existing data and research regarding the economic and social effects of transportation policies. While the data suggest that these policies have inequitable effects on minority and low-income communities, more research is necessary to further understand the effects of transportation policies on minorities, particularly those living in the suburbs. We first provide historical background and demographic context for the remainder of the report. Next, we examine existing data about the costs of transportation and how these costs combined with current transportation policy priorities have inequitable effects on low-income minorities. We then identify indirect inequitable economic and social effects of surface transportation policies on minorities and examine existing research in this area. These indirect effects include inequitable access to employment and housing, and education and health disparities. The report then delves into the issue of unequal access to opportunities for construction jobs and contracts created by federal transportation programs. We next focus on the role of language barriers in access to transportation and participation in the transportation planning process, and examine the issue of minority participation in transportation planning processes. Following discussion of enforcement of civil rights and environmental laws, we close with policy recommendations and conclusions. Efforts to improve the fairness of transportation policies must first recognize the complexities and wide impact of those policies on civil rights, mobility, land use, and the environment. These efforts must also include setting easily enforceable standards to measure whether the benefits and burdens of transportation policies are distributed equitably to minority and low-income communities.6 Transportation researchers and scholars are increasingly recognizing the importance of social equity, largely due to the successful efforts of grassroots organizations to draw attention to the unfairness of transportation policies. An executive committee member of The National Academies’ Transportation Research Board predicted in 1999 that “[e]quity will be one of the major themes in transportation policy for the coming decade,” and called for more analysis and discussion of the distribution of costs and benefits of transportation projects to minority communities.7 The environmental justice movement has addressed some of the inequitable effects of transportation polices on racial minorities and brought attention to the issue of transportation equity. Environmental justice efforts, however, have primarily drawn attention to governmental policies that negatively and inequitably affect the natural environment in areas with concentrated minority populations (and consequently negative health effects).8 Historically, transportation equity has been largely ignored by the vast majority of transportation planners and researchers. Transportation policy inequities should be addressed both through environmental justice efforts and through traditional transportation analyses about access and mobility. We hope that this report, by further defining the issues, will compel policymakers, researchers, and administrators who work on transportation policies to recognize the critical need to support transportation equity as part of their work.

#### Although material evidence of racism and inequity has been widely eradicated, ‘invisible markers’ and immaterial vestiges remain.

Bullard 04

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

In my fifty-five years as a black male, having grown up in the small town of Elba, Alabama, in the 1950s and 1960s, I can recall the double standards forced onto African Americans by Jim Crow laws. In the South, blacks and whites lived close to one another-though in separate neighborhoods. I remember walking on paved streets in the white neighborhoods that suddenly became dirt or gravel roads in the black community. Many of the roads in the black community did not have street signs, sidewalks, or streetlights. Blacks paid taxes just like whites, but black residents received few benefits. In the 1960s, I remember the faded "Colored" and "White Only" signs in the bus stations in Troy, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Huntsville, as I made my three-hundred-mile journey from South Alabama to North Alabama to attend college at the predominately black A & M University. By the time I graduated in 1968, the signs were taken down. However, some blacks still would not enter the formerly "White Only" waiting rooms. In reality, "invisible" markers lingered, masking black denial and white privilege. While most of the overt cases of transportation racism may have faded into history, the last vestiges of racial discrimination in transportation planning have not been totally eradicated. When I travel back to Montgomery and Birmingham, across the South, and to other regions of the country, it is clear that remnants of transportation racism linger. People of color still do not have equal access to transportation benefits, but receive more than their fair share of transportation externalities with "dirty" diesel buses, bus barns, refueling stations, railroad tracks, and highways disrupting and dividing their communities. Since writing *Just Transportation: Dismantling Race and Class Barriers to Mobility* in 1997, not much has changed. Transportation equity issues continue to be major concerns among low-income and people of color groups around the country. Discrimination still places an extra "tax" on poor people and people of color who need safe, affordable, and accessible public transportation. Many root causes of this nation's transportation injustices have not evaporated in the past six years. Many of this nation's transportation-related disparities accumulated over a century. Even with sufficient resources and the coordinated commitment of the public in partnership with the corporations and the government, it will likely take years to dismantle the deeply ingrained legacy of transportation racism.

#### Transportation barriers contribute to racism in the inner-cities. Minorities often cannot receive adequate employment nor can they leave their city, as shown after hurricane Katrina New Orleans due to lack of transportation

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara,

“Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

However, the extent to which the research literature explores the *social* dimensions of sustainable transportation in the U.S. urban context is less explicit. This is particularly significant considering the many ways transportation-based barriers contribute to social injustices and socio-spatial inequities in U.S. urban areas, especially along lines of race and class. For example, inequitable access to employment exists in U.S. cities as low-skilled, low-wage, and minority workers are often more likely to experience problems of inadequate transportation to overcome the spatial separations between their residential location and places of work opportunities, resulting in higher levels of unemployment, more costly commutes, or compromised wages (Holzer, [1991](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0051); Ihlanfeldt and Sjoquist, [1998](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0053); Preston and McLafferty, [1999](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0088)). These problems of accessibility may become exacerbated for lower-wage workers who commute by automobile, as the rising cost of fuel poses greater financial hardships (Ball, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0006); Foss, [2006](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0036)), and individuals who are unable to absorb rising commuting costs must renegotiate issues of mobility and access to employment. Furthermore, the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 brought to light the mobility issues of inner-city poor populations (Canellos, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0018); Hess, [2006](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0049); Litman, [2006](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0070)), highlighting the greater threat to vulnerability among the nation's urban car-less minority poor in the event of emergency evacuations (Lui et al., [2006](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0073); Renne, [2006](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0094)). Just as transportation creates critical concern for environmental protection, the existent social disparities in transportation necessitate concerted attention.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Residential Segregation Internal

#### Unequal transportation policies are contributing to residential segregation in the squo

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

The previous section examined the direct effects of transportation policies on low-income minorities’ finances and their ability simply to get around. This section examines the indirect effects of transportation policies. One of the central indirect effects is the reinforcement of residential segregation. The form that we currently think of as “the city” is a product of both land use and transportation investment decisions. Highway investments in combination with federal housing and lending policies leading to post–World War II suburbanization played a significant role in “white flight” from central cities to suburbs, which had a profound impact in defining urban form and racial segregation patterns.96 Highway investment encourages the development of suburbs located increasingly farther away from central cities and has played an important role in fostering residential segregation patterns and income inequalities.97 Inequitable or inefficient land use patterns such as those resulting in residential segregation often are reinforced by policies, such as transportation investment decisions, that were established several decades ago. As many researchers have documented, residential segregation greatly influences minorities’ access to housing, education, and economic opportunities.98 More research, however, needs to be performed examining the relationship between transportation policies and residential segregation and how it should be addressed.

### Transportation Racism Advantage – Sprawl Internal

#### Sprawl must be prevented; only through inclusion of racist issues can the problem of racism be solved.

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

The smart growth movement is built on anti-sprawl rhetoric. But talking about smart growth is much easier than practicing smart growth. Since smart growth leaders have deep ties to the environmental justice and conservation movements, each have their own perspectives and agendas. Consequently, "sprawl" means different things to different people." In the most basic sense, sprawl is random, unplanned growth characterized by inadequate accessibility to essential land uses such as housing, jobs, and public services, including schools, parks, green space, and public transportation. Suburbia is an extension of established patterns of decentralization and low-density development." Sprawl-driven development has "literally sucked population, jobs, investment capital, and tax base from the urban core,'" Sprawl is fueled by the "iron triangle" of finance, land-use planning, and transportation service delivery. Typically, strip malls, low-density residential housing, and other isolated, scattered developments leapfrog over the landscape without any rhyme or reason, with urban-suburban sprawl consuming land faster than the population growth in many cities across the country. In order to access these new suburban developments, one must have access to an automobile-since public transit is usually inadequate or nonexistent-thus creating a car-dependent citizenry. Growth and sprawl are not synonymous. Nevertheless, suburban sprawl has been the dominant growth pattern for nearly all metropolitan regions in the United States for the past five decades." Historically, the decentralization of employment centers has had a major role in shaping metropolitan growth patterns and the location of people, housing, and jobs. Government policies fortified and tax dollars subsidized suburban sprawl through new roads and highways at the expense of public transit. 24 Tax subsidies made it possible for new suburban employment centers to become dominant outside of cities, and to pull middle-income workers and homeowners away from the urban core." From New York to Los Angeles and a host of cities and metropolitan regions in between, smart growth advocates are gradually moving their plans into action. Unfortunately, social equity issues are often marginalized or are left out altogether. Even in Atlanta, tagged "Sprawlanta," race and equity issues are largely skirted in the emerging smart growth partnerships." Not addressing transportation racism in Atlanta's sprawl problem is tantamount to the Braves playing without a baseball. Atlanta's African American community-which comprises 68 percent of the city's population and other people of color communities are invisible in the local smart growth initiative." Race and equity issues routinely get left out of national transportation and smart growth dialogue or are tagged on as an afterthought. Smart growth discussions take place as if America was a colorblind or race-neutral nation. **Not talking about the racism in regional planning will not make the problem go away**. Many of the smart growth proponents-who have the power and purse strings need to shed their biases and stereotypes of low-income people and people of color if the nation is to have a fair and equitable smart growth movement.

## Impact Calculus

### Impact Calc – Culture Impact

#### LOSS OF INDIGENOUS CULTURES THREATENS OUR EXTINCTION

Pam **Solo**, executive director, CULTURAL SURVIVAL QUARTERLY, Spring 19**92**, p. 1.

As the next millennium approaches, Cultural Survival hopes to take that lesson toward a second wave of political action that will help turn around relations between North and South, just as ordinary citizens helped reverse the tide of East-West relations. But while Western movements have focused on the weapons of war, the politics of the 1990s will center on a single interlocking agenda; human rights, the environment, and development. At its heart are some 600 million indigenous people. Their fate is a pathway and litmus test of our progress toward a peaceful and sustainable world order. From the periphery of political, economic and social power, they are moving to the center of world attention. Our survival depends on ensuring that no one, particularly the poorest of the poor is thrown out of the canoe or viewed as dispensable. This is a moral and a practical imperative. Readers of Cultural Survival Quarterly know this well. On the practical side, indigenous peoples live in the world’s last wild places, sheltering much of the world’s genetic heritage. By helping native peoples save themselves, we help them protect fragile environments on which we all ultimately depend. We need them for their part of the canoe to be cared for. But we also just need them to be-as human beings with a culture, a history and a hoped-for common future as a people. That is the moral imperative. It is past time to begin addressing this fundamental issue: human rights and the ability of human beings to discover ways to live together in plural societies. We want “At the Threshold” to help foster that process in communities throughout the United Sates. We invite your involvement, your ideas, and your time. What must be done? What is our role at the local level? How can we cause governments and business, schools and churches and community organizations to advance human rights, protect and conserve fragile resources, and address the conditions that condemn too many to choose between environmental degradation and endless poverty? The job will not be easy, nor will it be accomplished overnight, but this is the time to act Indian organizations are stronger and better organized than ever, indigenous peoples themselves are defining and leading movements for their rights. They are also looking to first-world activities as allies and partners in a new alliance. Cross cultural collaboration will join more familiar forms of political action, even if centuries of colonialism and ensuing powerlessness have left a legacy of distrust and poverty that complicates this alliance.

#### DESTRUCTION OF INDIGENOUS HISTORY AND CULTURE IS AS BAD AS GENOCIDE

Alice **Tallmadge**, journalist, “Tribes Unearth Their Past in Paper,” THE OREGONIAN, June 23, 20**01**, p. A1.

But they also are giving hope and strength to hundreds of Native Americans whose ancestors once had dominion over lands that stretched the length of the Oregon coast and to Southwest Washington and Northern California. "The worst tragedy to a cultural group is not merely the brutality and slaughter of the people," said Wasson, a member of the Coquille Tribe and a doctoral recipient from the University of Oregon. "Holocaust is terrible, but the immediate pain is for young people who are separated from their culture and traditions. They inherit the pain and anguish of their ancestors." "These documents mean more to us than interesting papers," said Jason Younker, a UO doctoral candidate and member of the Coquille Tribe. "They are actually proof that we were here." The Coquille Tribe was terminated in 1954, Younker said. "And until restoration in 1988, we were not Indians. Growing up a generation from that experience has a tremendous impact on your psyche. Now here we have overwhelming credibility to what we have already known: that we truly are the Coquille people.

### Impact Calc – Global Apartheid

#### And, global apartheid will result in extinction

Stulman accessed in 2010

(Michael, Associate Director of Policy and Communications for Africa Action, “Global Apartheid”, Africa Action: Activism for Africa Since 1953, <http://www.africaaction.org/global-apartheid.html>, accessed 8/12/2010)

The term "global apartheid" describes the current international system of minority rule that keeps Africa poor. Global apartheid is a system of inequality that dictates access to wealth, power and basic human rights based on race and place. The elites in the rich and powerful countries control the major global decision-making bodies - such as the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO) - and preserve this system, which works in their favor. They ensure that the privileged citizens of rich countries have more resources and access to human rights than people in poor countries.  Like apartheid in South Africa, global apartheid entrenches great disparities in wealth, living conditions, life expectancy and access to government institutions with effective power. It relies on the assumption that it is "natural" for different population groups to have different expectations of life.  Global patterns of poverty and HIV/AIDS, disproportionately concentrated among Black people, reveal the deadly impact of global apartheid. Africa's people are denied wealth, power, health and security. As a result, Africa is left with the largest share of poverty and suffering in the world. These patterns of inequality are nearly 500 years old - created through slavery, colonialism and corporate greed for Africa's wealth. Today, this inequality is increasing the global gap between rich and poor, along racial and geographical lines. The devastating spread of HIV/AIDS and other poverty-related diseases is the direct consequence of global apartheid. Africa is home to just over 10% of the world's population, but more than two-thirds of those living with HIV/AIDS globally. The glacial pace of the international response to AIDS reflects an entrenched double standard that was characteristic of the apartheid system. As Dr. Peter Piot of UNAIDS has remarked on the matter of AIDS in Africa and the western world's response, "If this had happened with white people, the reaction would have been different." Global apartheid is more than a metaphor. The concept captures fundamental characteristics of the current world order. It reveals them to be the result of historic injustices and current international policies that perpetuate global inequality. The fight against global apartheid is a matter of life and death for much of humankind and for the very concept of our common humanity.

### Impact Calc – Reject Worst Case Logic

#### THE LIKELIHOOD OF SYSTEMIC RACISM IS 100%--THIS DISAD CANNOT COMPETE WITH THAT—YOU MUST COMPLETELY DISREGARD THE DISADVANTAGE BY CALCULATING IT’S PROBABILITY DOWN TO ZERO

Rescher ‘83

[Nicholas, Risk Analysis BadassRisk: A Philosophical Introduction to the Theory of Risk Evaluation and Management, Pg 34-36]

On this issue there is a systemic di sagreement between pro- babilists working in mathematics or natural science and decision theorists who work on issues relating to human affairs. The former take the line that small numbers are small numbers and must be taken into account as such. The latter tend to take the view that small probabilities represent extremely remote prospects and can be written off. (Dc niinimis non curat 1ev, as the old precept has it: there is no need to bother with trifles.) When something is about as probable as it is that a thousand fair dice when tossed a thousand times will all come up sixes, then, so it is held, we can pretty well forget about it as worthy of concern. As a matter of practical policy we operate with probabilities on the principle that when xCa, then x 0. Where human dealings in real-life situations are concerned, sufficiently remote possibilities can - for all sensible purpose- be viewed as being of probability zero, and possibilities with which they are associated set aside. In "the real world'' people are prepared to treat certain pro- babilities as effectively zero, taking certain sufficiently improbable eventualities as no longer representing real possibilities. `~ In such cases our handling of the probabilities at issue is essentially a mat- ter of fiat, of deciding as a matter of policy that a certain level of sufficiently low probability can be taken as a cut-off point below which we are no longer dealing with ``real possibilities'' and with "genuine risks.'' In real-life deliberations, in the law (especially in the context of negligence) and indeed throughout the setting of our practical af- fairs, it is necessary to distinguish between real and unreal (or ``merely theoretical'') possibilities. Once the probability of an eventuation gets to be small enough, the event at issue may be seen as no longer a real possibility (theoretically possible though it may be). Such an event is 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: IP]eople refuse to worry about losses whose pro. bability is below some threshold. Probabilities below the threshold are treated as though they were zero.'3

#### NEXT, good decision-making requires you to reject their fixation on worst-case scenarios

Rescher ‘83

[Nicholas, Risk Analysis BadassRisk: A Philosophical Introduction to the Theory of Risk Evaluation and Management, Pg 50]

The "worst possible case fixation" is one of the most damaging modes of unrealism in deliberations about risk in real-life situa- tions. Preoccupation about what might happen "if worst comes to worst" is counterproductive whenever we proceed without recognizing that, often as not, these worst possible outcomes are wildly improbable (and sometimes do not deserve to be viewed as real possibilities at all). The crux in risk deliberations is not the issue of loss "if worst comes to worst'' but the potential ac- ceptability of this prospect within the wider framework of the risk situation, where we may well be prepared "to take our chances," considering the possible advantages that beckon along this route. The worst threat is certainly something to be borne in mind and taken into account, but it is emphatically not a satisfactory index of the overall seriousness or gravity of a situation of hazard.

### Impact Calc – Help Other First

#### We have an obligation to assist the helpless Other, even in the face of extinction

Jovanovic and Wood 04, Communications/Rhetoric Professors @ Denver University and University of North Carolina respectively

(Spoma and Roy, “Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics,” Philosophy and Rhetoric Vol 37 no 4, 2004, 317-334)

On September 11, 2001, terrorism touched down in the United States. While millions of us were immobilized and left speechless by what we witnessed live on television, thousands of others in the World Trade Center towers, at the Pentagon, and on three airplanes had no such luxury. They were confronted with a reality few could have ever imagined. One man inside World Trade Center One demonstrates that ethics is a lived response of the type Levinas describes. He was not alone, however. Without advance preparation or rules of conduct to follow, the men and women trapped by evil deeds remind us that ethics is a response to the call of the other. Harry Ramos, forty-six, had just returned to work at his office on the eighty-seventh floor after a week’s absence. Within minutes, the building was shaking violently; he braced himself in a doorway for stability. As light fixtures plummeted to the floor and smoke filled the office, Harry had no idea that a jetliner had just crashed into his building, floors above him. However, he knew enough to know that the survival of his office staff was at stake. Harry, the head trader for a small investment bank, the May Davis Group, was in the throes of pandemonium. Yet, he had to act. With the company.s chief financial officer, Harry marshaled the twelve employees in the office to the stairwell to begin the descent down eighty-seven floors, one step at a time. Harry stationed himself at the end of the line, making sure no one was left behind. .Nine floors down, the stairwell ended. Emerging into a hallway to look for the next flight of stairs, the group saw wires dangling from the cracked ceilings. Sparks popped. Small fires burned everywhere. Office workers were milling in confusion. The smoke was thickening . (Walsh 2001, 1). The scene was not promising. As the group continued down, Harry convinced the stragglers to keep moving. Along the way, Harry also stopped to help strangers make their way into the stairwell. At the fifty-third floor, Harry found Victor who, because of his large size or perhaps his profound fear, found it difficult to move. Together with another May Davis employee, they made it to the thirty-ninth floor by way of stairs and a short elevator ride. At one point, Harry let go of Victor, to walk ahead and survey the situation. Victor cried out in fear. "Harry, please help," he begged. "Don't worry, we’re not leaving you," Mr. Ramos said. (Walsh 2001, 1). Stopping to rest, the building sadistically shook again, and so the trio picked themselves up and walked down further, to the thirty-sixth floor. There, an exhausted Victor proclaimed his energy was spent, that his legs could not carry his frame another step. A firefighter rushing by yelled at Harry to leave Victor behind and run. But Harry did not move, assuring the large stranger, "Victor, don’t worry. I'm with you." Moments later, on television sets tuned in to the scene from all over the world, we saw the avalanche of cement and glass crush to the ground as the World Trade Center towers came tumbling down. As the buildings collapsed, so did thousands of lives. What the ordinary men and women like Harry Ramos left behind was not only a memory of good deeds, but also a glimpse into ethics and communication that compels us to answer the call of the other. Harry Ramos demonstrates for us the detectable evidence of the saying in everyday discourse. In Harry's response, we begin to recognize something compelling that makes possible the saying, what Levinas refers to as .the trace.. The trace signifies presence in absence, like how we feel someone's company even after they have left the room or when the amputee continues to experience the ache of a phantom limb. And, there is the trace of God who has "walked the earth" though is no longer directly visible. For Levinas, the trace is the vestige of the infinite. The Levinasian trace is nonphenomenological, signifying without manifesting anything (Peperzak 1997). As such, it resists our attempts to analyze it or identify it conclusively. Yet we continue to search for it in the saying, in the human face, and in responsibility. This quest, says Levinas, is a worthy one, indicative of an ethical life. The trace itself challenges logic and rationality; the trace resists comprehension as it .disturbs the order of the world. (1996b, 62). The difficulty of talking about the trace arises from its "enigmatic, equivocal" features that elude our attempts to name it. Levinas explains, "The infinite then cannot be tracked down like game by a hunter. The trace left by the infinite is not the residue of a presence; its very glow is ambiguous. (1998, 12). The trace, then, is not a sign or a concrete feature but a paradoxical function of sociality (Bergo 1999). The trace is palpable yet not tangible, within our reach yet out of our grasp. David Michael Levin describes Levinas's phenomenology as *tracework,* an obsession-sustained meditation on an admittedly hopeless search for the traces .of primordial responsiveness. . The project is hopeless, butnot futile; Levin offers, .since the effort, the attempt itself, carries enormous moral merit. (1998, 349). These are powerful ideas.an ethical subject whose ethics are lodged in a place otherwise than being; an ethic that can be conceived as the condition for dialogue in the saying to another; and the possibility of that saying, overwritten in ontology by the said, coming through still as a trace in discourse .like an unheard question. (Bergo 1999, 155). "Harry, please help me," is surely the call of conscience from one terrified and helpless man to a stranger who befriended him. "Don't worry, we're not leaving you," is just as surely the “here I am.” But the repeat at the end, "Don't worry, I'm with you," turns the "here I am" into a deeply exposed and singular commitment. It is no longer "we" but "I" who will be with the man who is not going anywhere in the heart of an inferno.

#### We have a moral obligation to help others even if that leads to extinction.

Watson 77, (Richard, Professor of Philosophy at Washington University, World Hunger and Moral Obligation, p. 118-119)

These arguments are morally spurious. That food sufficient for well-nourished survival is the equal right of every human individual or nation is a specification of the higher principle that everyone has equal right to the necessities of life. The moral stress of the principle of equity is primarily on equal sharing, and only secondarily on what is being shared. The higher moral principle is of human *equity per se*. Consequently, the moral action is to distribute all food equally, whatever the consequences. This is the hard line apparently drawn by such moralists as Immanuel Kant and Noam Chomsky—but then, morality is hard. The conclusion may be unreasonable (impractical and irrational in conventional terms), but it is obviously moral. Nor should anyone purport surprise; it has always been understood that the claims of morality—if taken seriously—supersede those of conflicting reason. One may even have to sacrifice one’s life or one’s nation to be moral in situations where practical behavior would preserve it. For example, if a prisoner of war undergoing torture is to be a (perhaps dead) patriot even when reason tells him that collaboration will hurt no one, he remains silent. Similarly, if one is to be moral, one distributes available food in equal shares (even if everyone then dies). That an action is necessary to save one’s life is no excuse for behaving unpatriotically or immorally if one wishes to be a patriot or moral. No principle of morality absolves one of behaving immorally simply to save one’s life or nation. There is a strict analogy here between adhering to moral principles for the sake of being moral, and adhering to Christian principles for the sake of being Christian. The moral world contains pits and lions, but one looks always to the highest light. The ultimate test always harks to the highest principle—recant or die—and it is pathetic to profess morality if one quits when the going gets rough. I have put aside many questions of detail—such as the mechanical problems of distributing food—because detail does not alter the stark conclusion. If every human life is equal in value, then the equal distribution of the necessities of life is an extremely high, if not the highest, moral duty. It is at least high enough to override the excuse that by doing it one would lose one’s life. But many people cannot accept the view that one must distribute equally even in f the nation collapses or all people die. If everyone dies, then there will be no realm of morality. Practically speaking, sheer survival comes first. One can adhere to the principle of equity only if one exists. So it is rational to suppose that the principle of survival is morally higher than the principle of equity. And though one might not be able to argue for unequal distribution of food to save a nation—for nations can come and go—one might well argue that unequal distribution is necessary for the survival of the human species. That is, some large group—say one-third of present world population—should be at least well-nourished for human survival. However, from an individual standpoint, the human species—like the nation—is of no moral relevance. From a naturalistic standpoint, survival does come first; from a moralistic standpoint—as indicated above—survival may have to be sacrificed. In the milieu of morality, it is immaterial whether or not the human species survives as a result of individual behavior.

#### Rejection of ethics for political concerns perpetuates tyranny – the only concern should be our ethical commitment to the Other

Jovanovic and Wood 04, – \*Communications/Rhetoric Professors @ Denver University and University of North Carolina respectively, (Spoma and Roy, “Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics,” Philosophy and Rhetoric Vol 37 no 4, 2004, 317-334, dml)

Levinas describes sociality of the kind we are discussing as a "moral summons" (1969, 196). We are called by the other to speak not to establish common ground but instead to recognize the infinite alterity of the other who resists our attempts to thematize him or her. Thus, we cannot know in advance what we will say, only that we will speak. Levinas claims that speech proceeds from radical alterity or absolute difference (the other), beseeching us to oblige with responsibility, with communication. Speaking is contact (Horowitz 2000). The relationship with the other is thus in the absence of foundations, thriving on the metaphysical desire to reach for the other, .accomplished as service and as hospitality. (Levinas 1969, 300). So it is that we are destined to communicate in the presence of another, a directive arising from an ethical imperative. But we have choices and we are not always ethical. Levinas knows this and fears that our rejection of ethics, of our relationship to the other, will perpetuate the very worst that humankind has to offer. *Totality and Infinity* begins with this warning: "The state of war suspends morality; it divests the eternal institutions and obligations of their eternity and rescinds ad interim the unconditional imperatives. In advance its shadow falls over the actions of men. (Levinas 1969, 21). Levinas experienced the dark shadow in the Nazi camps of World War II. His life project points to how we are commanded to responsibility in the face of living, against the more commonly accepted premise that to save ourselves we must murder the other. That we are haunted by misgivings or guilt or profound questions as we anticipate or reflect on an act of violence points out that our redemption is to be found in this responsibility (Bailie 2001).

### Impact Calc – Intervening Actors

#### NEXT, voting aff is a moral act—the blood of their improbable DAs will not be on your hands, but you know that acting in the face of certain abuses is necessary to sustain the absolutist principles that solve the DA

GEWIRTH ‘82

[Alan, Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Application, , pg 224-230//delo-uwyo]

5. Let us now consider the right mentioned above: a mother's right not to be tortured to death by her own son. Assume (although these specifica- tiojis arc here quite dispensable) that she is innocent of any crime and has no knowledge of any. What justifiable exception could there be to such a right? I shall construct an example which, though fanciful, has sufficient analogues in past and present thought and action t0 make it relevant to the status of rights in the real world.6 Suppose a clandestine group of political extremists have obtained an arsenal of nuclear weapons; to prove that they have the weapons and know how to use them, they have kidnapped a leading scientist, shown him the weapons, and then released him to make a public corroborative statement. The terrorists have now announced that they will use the weapons against a designated large distant city unless a certain prominent resident of the city, a young politically active lawyer named Abrams, tortures his mother to death, this torturing to lie earned out publicly in a certain way at a specified place and time in that city.Since the gang members have already murdered several other prominent residents of the city, their threat is quite credible.Their declared motive is to advance their cause by showing how powerful they are and by unmasking the moralistic pretensions of their political opponents. Ought Abrams to torture his mother to death in order to prevent the threatened nuclear catastrophe? Might he not merely pretend to torture his intlter, so that die could then be safely hidden while the hunt for the gang nienihers continued? Entirely apart from the fact that the gang could easily pierce. this deception, the main objection to the very raising of such questions is the moral one that they seem to hold open the possibility of acquiescing and participatnig in an unspeakably evil project. To inflict such extreme harm on one's mother would be an ultimate act of betrayal; in performing or even contemplating the performance of such an action the son would lose all self-respect and would regard his life as no longer worth living.7 A mother's right not to be tortured to death by her own son is beyond any compromise. It is absolute. This absoluteness may be analysed in several different interrelated deminsions, all stemming from the supreme principle of morality. The principle requires respect for the rights of all persons to the necessary conditions of human action, and this includes respect for the persons themselves as having the rational capacity to reflect on their purposes and to control their behavior in the light of such reflection. The principle hence prohibits using any person merely as a means to the well-being of other persons. For a son to torture his mother to death even to protect the lives of others would be an extreme violation of this principle and hence of these rights, as would any attempt by others to force such an action. For this reason, the concept. appropriate to it is not merely `wrong' but such others as `despicable', `die honourable', `base', `monstrous'. In the scale of moral modalities, such con- cepts function as the contrary extremes of concepts like the supererogatorv. What is supererogatory is not merely good or right but goes beyond these in various ways; it includes saintly and heroic actions whose moral merit surpasses what is strictly required of agents. In parallel fashion, what is base, dishonourable, or despicable is not entirely bad or wrong but goes be- yond these in moral demerit since it subverts even the minimal worth or dignity both of its agent and of its recipient and hence the basic presupposi- tions of morality itself. Just as the supererogatory is superlatively good, so the despicable is superlatively evil arid diabolic, and its moral wrongness is so rotten that a morally decent person will not even consider doing it. This is but another way of saying that the rights it would violate must remain absolute. 6. There is, however, another side to this story.What of the thousands of innocent persons in the distant city Whose lives ale imperilled by the threatened nuclear explosion? Don't they too have rights to life which, because of their numbers, are far superior to the mother's right? May they not contend that while it is all very well for Abrams to preserve his moral purity by not killing his mother, he has no right to purchase this at the ex- pense of their Iives, thereby treating them as mere means to his ends and violating their our' rights? Thus it may lie argued that the morally correct description of the alternative confronting Abrains is not simply that it is one of not violating or violating an innocent person's right to life, but rather not violating one innocent person's right to life and thereby violating the right to life of thousands of other innocent persons through being partly responsible for their deaths, or violating one innocent person's right to life and thereby protecting or fulfilling the right to life of thousands of other innocent persons. We have here a tragic conflict of rights and an illustration of the heavy price exacted by moral absolutism. The aggregative consequen- tialist who holds that that action ought always to be performed which maximizes utility or minimizes disutility would maintain that in such a situation the lives of the thousand must be preferred. An initial answer may be that terrorists who make such demands and Issue such threats cannot be trusted to keep their word not to drop the Bombs if the mother is tortured to death; and even if they now do keep their word, acceding in this ease would only lead to further escalated demands and threats. It may also be argued that it is irrational to perpetrate a sure evil in order to forestall what is so far only a possible or threatened evil. Philippa Foot has sagely commented on cases of this sort that if it is the is duty to kill his mother in order to save the lives of the many other innocent residents of the city, then "anyone who wants us to do something will think wrong has only to threaten that otherwise he himself will do some- thing we think worse".8 Much depends, however, on the nature of the wrong" and the `worse''. If someone threatens to commit suicide or to kill innocent hostages if we do not break our promise to do some relatively unimportant action, breaking the promise would be the obviously right course, by the criterion of degrees of necessity for action. The special diffiulty of tire present ease stems from the fact that the conflicting rights are tiC the same supreme degree of importance. It may be contended, however, that this whole answer, focusing on the Problem outcome of obeying the terrorists' demands, is a consequentialist argument and, as such, is not available to the absolutist who insists that Abrams must not torture his mother to death whatever the consequences.° This contention imputes to the absolutist a kind of indifference or even callousness to the sufferings of others that is not warranted by a correct understanding of his position. He can be concerned about consequences so long as he does not regard them as possibly superseding or diminishing the right and duty he regards as absolute. It is a matter of priorities. So long as the mother's right not to be tortured to death by her son is unqualifiedly respected, the absolutist can seek ways to mitigate the threatened disastrous consequences and possibly to avert them altogether. A parallel ease is found in the theory of legal punishment: the retributivist. while asserting that punish- ment must be meted out only to the persons who deserve it because of the crimes they have committed, may also uphold punishment for its deterrent effect so long as the latter, consequentialist consideration is subordinated to and lilmited by the conditions of the former, antecedentalist consideration.1° Thus the absolutist can accommodate at least part of the consequentialist's substantive concerns within the limits of his own principle. Is any other answer available to the absolutist, one that reflects the core of his position? Various lines of argument may be used to show that in refusing to torture his mother to death Abrams is not violating the rights of the multitudes of other residents who may die as a result, because he is not morally responsible for their deaths. Thus the absolutist can maintain that even if these others die they still have an absolute right to life because. the infringement of their right is not justified by the argument he upholds At least three different distinctions may be adduced for this purpose. In the unqualified form in which they have hitherto been presented, however they are not successful in establishing the envisaged conclusion. One distinction is between direct and oblique intention. When Abram refrains from torturing his mother to death, he does not directly intend the many ensuing deaths of the other inhabitants either as end or as means. These are only the foreseen but unintended side-effects of his action or, in this case, inaction. Hence, he is not morally responsible for those deaths. Apart from other difficulties with the doctrine of double effect, this distinction as so far stated does not serve to exculpate Abrams. Consider some parallels. Industrialists who pollute the environment with poisonous chemicals and manufacturers who use carcinogenic food additives do not directly intend the resulting deaths; that are only the unintended but foreseen side-effects of what they do directly intend, namely, to provide profitable demand-fulfilling commodities. The entrepreneurs in question may even maintain that the enormous economic contributions they make to the gross national product outweigh in importance the relatively fl'w deaths that regrettably occur. Still, since they have good reason to believe that deaths wifi occur from causes under their control, the fact that they do not directly intend the deaths does not remove their causal and moral responsibility for them. Isn't this also true of Abrams's relation to the deaths of the city's residents? A second distinction drawn by some absolutist is between killing and letting die. This distinction is often merged with others with which it is not entirely identical, such as the distinctions between commission and omission, between harming and not helping, between strict duties and generosity or supererogation. For the present discussion, however, the subtle differences between these may be overlooked. The contention, then, is that in refraining from killing his mother, Abrams does not kill the many innocent persons who will die as a result; he only lets them die. But one does not have the same strict moral duty to help persons or to prevent their dying as one has not to kill them; one is responsible only for what one does, not for what one merely allows to happen. Hence, Abrams is not moraily responsible for the deaths he fails to prevent by letting the many innocent persons die, so that he does not violate their rights to life.

#### AND, THE PRINCIPLE OF INTERVENING ACTION LET’S YOU DISMISS THE DA…IT IS THE ACTORS OF THEIR IMPACTs THAT MUST TOTE THE WEIGHT OF THE BLOOD THAT THEY SPILL

GEWIRTH ‘82

[Alan, Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Application, , pg 229-0//delo-uwyo]

An example of this principle may help to show its connection with the absoluitist thesis. Martin Luther King Jr. was repeatedly told that because he led demonstrations in support of civil rights, he was morally responsible for the disorders, riots, and deaths that ensued ai,cl that were shaking the American Republic to its foundations.'2 By the principle of the intervening action, however, it was King's opponents who were responsible because their intervention operated as the sufficient conditions of the riots and injuries. King might also have replied that the Republic would not be worth saving if the price that had to be paid was the violation of the civil rights of black Americans. As for the rights of the other Americans to peace and order, the reply would be that these rights cannot justifiably be secured at the price of the rights of blacks. It follows from the principle of the intervening action that it is not the son but rather the terrorists who are morally as well as causally responsible for the many deaths that do or may ensue on his refusal to torture his mother to death. The important point is not that he lets these persons die rather than kills them, or that he does not harm them but only fails to help them, or that he intends their deaths only obliquely but not directly. The point is rather that it is only through the intervening lethal actions of the terrorists that his refusal eventuates in the many deaths. Since the moral responsibility is not the son's, it does not affect his moral duty not to torture his mother to death, so that her correlative right remains absolute. This point also serves to answer some related questions about the rights of the many in relation to the mother's right. Since the son's refusal to torture his mother to death is justified, it may seem that the many deaths to which that refusal will lead are also justified, so that the rights to life of these many innocent persons are not absolute. But since they are innocent, why aren't their rights to life as absolute as the mother's? If, on the other hand, their deaths are unjustified, as seems obvious, then isn't the son's refusal to torture his mother to death also unjustified, since it leads to those deaths? But from this it would follow that the mother's right not to be tortured to death by her son is not absolute, for if the son's not infringing her right is unjustified, then his infringing it would presumably be justified. The solution to this difficulty is that it is a fallacy to infer, from the two premises (1) the son's refusal to kill his mother is justified and (2) many innocent persons die as a result of that refusal, to the conclusion (3) their deaths are justified. For, by the principle of the intervening action, the son's refusal is not causally or morally responsible for the deaths: rather, it is the terrorists who are responsible. Hence. the justification referred to in (1) does not carry through to (2). Since the terrorists' action in ordering the killings is unjustified, the resulting deaths are unjustified. Hence, the rights to life of the many innocent victims remain absolute even if they are killed as a result of the son's justified refusal, and it is not he who violates their rights. He may be said to intend the many deaths obliquely, in that they are a foreseen but unwanted side-effect of his refusal. But he is not responsible for that side-effect because of the terrorists' intervening action. It would be unjustified to violate the mother's right to life in order to protect the rights to life of the many other residents of the city. For rights cannot be justifiably protected by violating another right which, according to the criterion of degrees of necessity for action, is at least equally important. Hence, the many other residents do not have a right that the mother's right to life he violated for their sakes. To be sure, the mother also does not have a right that their equally important rights be violated in order to protect hers. But here too it must be emphasized that in protecting his mother's right the son does not violate the rights of the others; for by the principle of the intervening action, it is not he who is causally or morally responsible for their deaths. Hence too he is not treating them as mere means to his or his mother's ends.

### Impact Calc – No Extinction

#### Nuke war doesn’t cause extinction

Nyquist, 99 [J.R., WorldNetDaily contributing editor and author of ‘Origins of the Fourth World War,’ May 20, Antipas, “Is Nuclear War Survivable?” <http://www.antipas.org/news/world/nuclear_war.html>]  
As I write about Russia’s nuclear war preparations, I get some interesting mail in response. Some correspondents imagine I am totally ignorant. They point out that nuclear war would cause “nuclear winter,” and everyone would die. Since nobody wants to die, nobody would ever start a nuclear war (and nobody would ever seriously prepare for one). Other correspondents suggest I am ignorant of the world-destroying effects of nuclear radiation. I patiently reply to these correspondents that nuclear war would not be the end of the world. I then point to studies showing that “nuclear winter” has no scientific basis, that fallout from a nuclear war would not kill all life on earth. Surprisingly, few of my correspondents are convinced. They prefer apocalyptic myths created by pop scientists, movie producers and journalists. If Dr. Carl Sagan once said “nuclear winter” would follow a nuclear war, then it must be true. If radiation wipes out mankind in a movie, then that’s what we can expect in real life. But Carl Sagan was wrong about nuclear winter. And the movie “On the Beach” misled American filmgoers about the effects of fallout. It is time, once and for all, to lay these myths to rest. Nuclear war would not bring about the end of the world, though it would be horribly destructive. The truth is, many prominent physicists have condemned the nuclear winter hypothesis. Nobel laureate Freeman Dyson once said of nuclear winter research, “It is an absolutely atrocious piece of science, but I quite despair of setting the public record straight.” Professor Michael McElroy, a Harvard physics professor, also criticized the nuclear winter hypothesis. McElroy said that nuclear winter researchers “stacked the deck” in their study, which was titled “Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions” (Science, December 1983). Nuclear winter is the theory that the mass use of nuclear weapons would create enough smoke and dust to blot out the sun, causing a catastrophic drop in global temperatures. According to Carl Sagan, in this situation the earth would freeze. No crops could be grown. Humanity would die of cold and starvation. In truth, natural disasters have frequently produced smoke and dust far greater than those expected from a nuclear war. In 1883 Krakatoa exploded with a blast equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs, a detonation greater than the combined nuclear arsenals of planet earth. The Krakatoa explosion had negligible weather effects. Even more disastrous, going back many thousands of years, a meteor struck Quebec with the force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs, creating a crater 63 kilometers in diameter. But the world did not freeze. Life on earth was not extinguished. Consider the views of Professor George Rathjens of MIT, a known antinuclear activist, who said, “Nuclear winter is the worst example of misrepresentation of science to the public in my memory.” Also consider Professor Russell Seitz, at Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs, who says that the nuclear winter hypothesis has been discredited. Two researchers, Starley Thompson and Stephen Schneider, debunked the nuclear winter hypothesis in the summer 1986 issue of Foreign Affairs. Thompson and Schneider stated: “the global apocalyptic conclusions of the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly low level of probability.” OK, so nuclear winter isn’t going to happen. What about nuclear fallout? Wouldn’t the radiation from a nuclear war contaminate the whole earth, killing everyone? The short answer is: absolutely not. Nuclear fallout is a problem, but we should not exaggerate its effects. As it happens, there are two types of fallout produced by nuclear detonations. These are: 1) delayed fallout; and 2) short-term fallout. According to researcher Peter V. Pry, “Delayed fallout will not, contrary to popular belief, gradually kill billions of people everywhere in the world.” Of course, delayed fallout would increase the number of people dying of lymphatic cancer, leukemia, and cancer of the thyroid. “However,” says Pry, “these deaths would probably be far fewer than deaths now resulting from … smoking, or from automobile accidents.” The real hazard in a nuclear war is the short-term fallout. This is a type of fallout created when a nuclear weapon is detonated at ground level. This type of fallout could kill millions of people, depending on the targeting strategy of the attacking country. But short-term fallout rapidly subsides to safe levels in 13 to 18 days. It is not permanent. People who live outside of the affected areas will be fine. Those in affected areas can survive if they have access to underground shelters. In some areas, staying indoors may even suffice. Contrary to popular misconception, there were no documented deaths from short-term or delayed fallout at either Hiroshima or Nagasaki. These blasts were low airbursts, which produced minimal fallout effects. Today’s thermonuclear weapons are even “cleaner.” If used in airburst mode, these weapons would produce few (if any) fallout casualties

#### No extinction—humanity resilient

Bruce Tonn, Futures Studies Department, Corvinus University of Budapest, 2005, “Human Extinction Scenarios,” [www.budapestfutures.org/](http://www.budapestfutures.org/) downloads/abstracts/Bruce% 20Tonn%20-%20Abstract.pdf)

The human species faces numerous threats to its existence. These include global climate change, collisions with near-earth objects, nuclear war, and pandemics. While these threats are indeed serious, taken separately they fail to describe exactly how humans could become extinct. For example, nuclear war by itself would most likely fail to kill everyone on the planet, as strikes would probably be concentrated in the northern hemisphere and the Middle East, leaving populations in South America, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand some hope of survival. It is highly unlikely that any uncontrollable nanotechnology could ever be produced but even it if were, it is likely that humans could develop effective, if costly, countermeasures, such as producing the technologies in space or destroying sites of runaway nanotechnologies with nuclear weapons. Viruses could indeed kill many people but effective quarantine of ‘healthy’ people could be accomplished to save large numbers of people. Humans appear to be resilient to extinction with respect to single events.

### Impact Calc – No Power Wars

#### Great power war is obsolete – cooperation is more likely than competition

Deudney and Ikenberry 09 [Daniel, Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins, John, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, The Myth of the Autocratic Revival :Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb]

This bleak outlook is based on an exaggeration of recent developments and ignores powerful countervailing factors and forces. Indeed, contrary to what the revivalists describe, the most striking features of the contemporary international landscape are the intensification of economic globalization, thickening institutions, and shared problems of interdependence. The overall structure of the international system today is quite unlike that of the nineteenth century. Compared to older orders, the contemporary liberal-centered international order provides a set of constraints and opportunities -- of pushes and pulls -- that reduce the likelihood of severe conflict while creating strong imperatives for cooperative problem solving. Those invoking the nineteenth century as a model for the twenty-first also fail to acknowledge the extent to which war as a path to conflict resolution and great-power expansion has become largely obsolete. Most important, nuclear weapons have transformed great-power war from a routine feature of international politics into an exercise in national suicide. With all of the great powers possessing nuclear weapons and ample means to rapidly expand their deterrent forces, warfare among these states has truly become an option of last resort. The prospect of such great losses has instilled in the great powers a level of caution and restraint that effectively precludes major revisionist efforts. Furthermore, the diffusion of small arms and the near universality of nationalism have severely limited the ability of great powers to conquer and occupy territory inhabited by resisting populations (as Algeria, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and now Iraq have demonstrated). Unlike during the days of empire building in the nineteenth century, states today cannot translate great asymmetries of power into effective territorial control; at most, they can hope for loose hegemonic relationships that require them to give something in return. Also unlike in the nineteenth century, today the density of trade, investment, and production networks across international borders raises even more the costs of war. A Chinese invasion of Taiwan, to take one of the most plausible cases of a future interstate war, would pose for the Chinese communist regime daunting economic costs, both domestic and international. Taken together, these changes in the economy of violence mean that the international system is far more primed for peace than the autocratic revivalists acknowledge. The autocratic revival thesis neglects other key features of the international system as well. In the nineteenth century, rising states faced an international environment in which they could reasonably expect to translate their growing clout into geopolitical changes that would benefit themselves. But in the twenty-first century, the status quo is much more difficult to overturn. Simple comparisons between China and the United States with regard to aggregate economic size and capability do not reflect the fact that the United States does not stand alone but rather is the head of a coalition of liberal capitalist states in Europe and East Asia whose aggregate assets far exceed those of China or even of a coalition of autocratic states. Moreover, potentially revisionist autocratic states, most notably China and Russia, are already substantial players and stakeholders in an ensemble of global institutions that make up the status quo, not least the UN Security Council (in which they have permanent seats and veto power). Many other global institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, are configured in such a way that rising states can increase their voice only by buying into the institutions. The pathway to modernity for rising states is not outside and against the status quo but rather inside and through the flexible and accommodating institutions of the liberal international order .The fact that these autocracies are capitalist has profound implications for the nature of their international interests that point toward integration and accommodation in the future. The domestic viability of these regimes hinges on their ability to sustain high economic growth rates, which in turn is crucially dependent on international trade and investment; today's autocracies may be illiberal, but they remain fundamentally dependent on a liberal international capitalist system. It is not surprising that China made major domestic changes in order to join the WTO or that Russia is seeking to do so now. The dependence of autocratic capitalist states on foreign trade and investment means that they have a fundamental interest in maintaining an open, rule-based economic system. (Although these autocratic states do pursue bilateral trade and investment deals, particularly in energy and raw materials, this does not obviate their more basic dependence on and commitment to the WTO order.) In the case of China, because of its extensive dependence on industrial exports, the WTO may act as a vital bulwark against protectionist tendencies in importing states. Given their position in this system, which so serves their interests, the autocratic states are unlikely to become champions of an alternative global or regional economic order, let alone spoilers intent on seriously damaging the existing one. The prospects for revisionist behavior on the part of the capitalist autocracies are further reduced by the large and growing social networks across international borders. Not only have these states joined the world economy, but their people – particularly upwardly mobile and educated elites -- have increasingly joined the world community. In large and growing numbers, citizens of autocratic capitalist states are participating in a sprawling array of transnational educational, business, and a vocational networks. As individuals are socialized into the values and orientations of these networks, stark "us versus them" cleavages become more difficult to generate and sustain. As the Harvard political scientist Alastair Iain Johnston has argued, China's ruling elite has also been socialized, as its foreign policy establishment has internalized the norms and practices of the international diplomatic community. China, far from cultivating causes for territorial dispute with its neighbors, has instead sought to resolve numerous historically inherited border conflicts, acting like a satisfied status quo state. These social and diplomatic processes and developments suggest that there are strong tendencies toward normalization operating here. Finally, there is an emerging set of global problems stemming from industrialism and economic globalization that will create common interests across states regardless of regime type. Autocratic China is as dependent on imported oil as are democratic Europe, India, Japan, and the United States, suggesting an alignment of interests against petroleum-exporting autocracies, such as Iran and Russia. These states share a common interest in price stability and supply security that could form the basis for a revitalization of the International Energy Agency, the consumer association created during the oil turmoil of the 1970s. The emergence of global warming and climate change as significant problems also suggests possibilities for alignments and cooperative ventures cutting across the autocratic-democratic divide. Like the United States, China is not only a major contributor to greenhouse gas accumulation but also likely to be a major victim of climate-induced desertification and coastal flooding. Its rapid industrialization and consequent pollution means that China, like other developed countries, will increasingly need to import technologies and innovative solutions for environmental management. Resource scarcity and environmental deterioration pose global threats that no state will be able to solve alone, thus placing a further premium on political integration and cooperative institution building. Analogies between the nineteenth century and the twenty-first are based on a severe mischaracterization of the actual conditions of the new era. The declining utility of war, the thickening of international transactions and institutions, and emerging resource and environmental interdependencies together undercut scenarios of international conflict and instability based on autocratic-democratic rivalry and autocratic revisionism. In fact, the conditions of the twenty-first century point to the renewed value of international integration and cooperation.

#### No great power wars – shared interests

Gelb 10 - President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations. He was a senior official in the U.S. Defense Department from 1967 to 1969 and in the State Department from 1977 to 1979 (Leslie, Foreign Affairs, “GDP Now Matters More Than Force: A U.S. Foreign Policy for the Age of Economic Power,” November/December, proquest)

Also reducing the likelihood of conflict today is that there is no arena in which the vital interests of great powers seriously clash. Indeed, the most worrisome security threats today--rogue states with nuclear weapons and terrorists with weapons of mass destruction--actually tend to unite the great powers more than divide them. In the past, and specifically during the first era of globalization, major powers would war over practically nothing. Back then, they fought over the Balkans, a region devoid of resources and geographic importance, a strategic zero. Today, they are unlikely to shoulder their arms over almost anything, even the highly strategic Middle East. All have much more to lose than to gain from turmoil in that region. To be sure, great powers such as China and Russia will tussle with one another for advantages, but they will stop well short of direct confrontation.

#### Major war is obsolete – multiple factors prevent global conflict

Mandelbaum 99 [Michael, American Foreign Policy Professor in the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins, February 25, Council on Foreign Relations Great Debate Series, “Is Major War Obsolete?”<http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/>]  
My argument says, tacitly, that while this point of view, which was widely believed 100 years ago, was not true then, there are reasons to think that it is true now. What is that argument? It is that major war is obsolete. By major war, I mean war waged by the most powerful members of the international system, using all of their resources over a protracted period of time with revolutionary geopolitical consequences. There have been four such wars in the modern period: the wars of the French Revolution, World War I, World War II, and the Cold War. Few though they have been, their consequences have been monumental. They are, by far, the most influential events in modern history. Modern history which can, in fact, be seen as a series of aftershocks to these four earthquakes. So if I am right, then what has been the motor of political history for the last two centuries that has been turned off? This war, I argue, this kind of war, is obsolete; less than impossible, but more than unlikely. What do I mean by obsolete? If I may quote from the article on which this presentation is based, a copy of which you received when coming in, “ Major war is obsolete in a way that styles of dress are obsolete. It is something that is out of fashion and, while it could be revived, there is no present demand for it. Major war is obsolete in the way that slavery, dueling, or foot-binding are obsolete. It is a social practice that was once considered normal, useful, even desirable, but that now seems odious. It is obsolete in the way that the central planning of economic activity is obsolete. It is a practice once regarded as a plausible, indeed a superior, way of achieving a socially desirable goal, but that changing conditions have made ineffective at best, counterproductive at worst.” Why is this so? Most simply, the costs have risen and the benefits of major war have shriveled. The costs of fighting such a war are extremely high because of the advent in the middle of this century of nuclear weapons, but they would have been high even had mankind never split the atom. As for the benefits, these now seem, at least from the point of view of the major powers, modest to non-existent. The traditional motives for warfare are in retreat, if not extinct. War is no longer regarded by anyone, probably not even Saddam Hussein after his unhappy experience, as a paying proposition. And as for the ideas on behalf of which major wars have been waged in the past, these are in steep decline. Here the collapse of communism was an important milestone, for that ideology was inherently bellicose. This is not to say that the world has reached the end of ideology; quite the contrary. But the ideology that is now in the ascendant, our own, liberalism, tends to be pacific. Moreover, I would argue that three post-Cold War developments have made major war even less likely than it was after 1945. One of these is the rise of democracy, for democracies, I believe, tend to be peaceful. Now carried to its most extreme conclusion, this eventuates in an argument made by some prominent political scientists that democracies never go to war with one another. I wouldn’t go that far. I don’t believe that this is a law of history, like a law of nature, because I believe there are no such laws of history. But I do believe there is something in it. I believe there is a peaceful tendency inherent in democracy. Now it’s true that one important cause of war has not changed with the end of the Cold War. That is the structure of the international system, which is anarchic. And realists, to whom Fareed has referred and of whom John Mearsheimer and our guest Ken Waltz are perhaps the two most leading exponents in this country and the world at the moment, argue that that structure determines international activity, for it leads sovereign states to have to prepare to defend themselves, and those preparations sooner or later issue in war. I argue, however, that a post-Cold War innovation counteracts the effects of anarchy. This is what I have called in my 1996 book, The Dawn of Peace in Europe, common security. By common security I mean a regime of negotiated arms limits that reduce the insecurity that anarchy inevitably produces by transparency-every state can know what weapons every other state has and what it is doing with them-and through the principle of defense dominance, the reconfiguration through negotiations of military forces to make them more suitable for defense and less for attack. Some caveats are, indeed, in order where common security is concerned. It’s not universal. It exists only in Europe. And there it is certainly not irreversible. And I should add that what I have called common security is not a cause, but a consequence, of the major forces that have made war less likely. States enter into common security arrangements when they have already, for other reasons, decided that they do not wish to go to war. Well, the third feature of the post-Cold War international system that seems to me to lend itself to warlessness is the novel distinction between the periphery and the core, between the powerful states and the less powerful ones. This was previously a cause of conflict and now is far less important. To quote from the article again, “ While for much of recorded history local conflicts were absorbed into great-power conflicts, in the wake of the Cold War, with the industrial democracies debellicised and Russia and China preoccupied with internal affairs, there is no great-power conflict into which the many local conflicts that have erupted can be absorbed. The great chess game of international politics is finished, or at least suspended. A pawn is now just a pawn, not a sentry standing guard against an attack on a king.” Now having made the case for the obsolescence of modern war, I must note that there are two major question marks hanging over it: Russia and China. These are great powers capable of initiating and waging major wars, and in these two countries, the forces of warlessness that I have identified are far less powerful and pervasive than they are in the industrial West and in Japan. These are countries, in political terms, in transition, and the political forms and political culture they eventually will have is unclear. Moreover, each harbors within its politics a potential cause of war that goes with the grain of the post-Cold War period-with it, not against it-a cause of war that enjoys a certain legitimacy even now; namely, irredentism. War to reclaim lost or stolen territory has not been rendered obsolete in the way that the more traditional causes have. China believes that Taiwan properly belongs to it. Russia could come to believe this about Ukraine, which means that the Taiwan Strait and the Russian-Ukrainian border are the most dangerous spots on the planet, the places where World War III could begin. In conclusion, let me say what I’m not arguing. I’m not saying that we’ve reached the end of all conflict, violence or war; indeed, the peace I’ve identified at the core of the international system has made conflict on the periphery more likely. Nor am I suggesting that we have reached the end of modern, as distinct from major, war; modern war involving mechanized weapons, formal battles, and professional troops. Nor am I offering a single-factor explanation. It’s not simply nuclear weapons or just democracy or only a growing aversion to war. It’s not a single thing; it’s everything: values, ideas, institutions, and historical experience. Nor, I should say, do I believe that peace is automatic. Peace does not keep itself. But what I think we may be able to secure is more than the peace of the Cold War based on deterrence. The political scientist Carl Deutcsh once defined a security community as something where warlessness becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Well, he was referring to the North Atlantic community, which was bound tightly together because of the Cold War. But to the extent that my argument is right, all of Eurasia and the Asia-Pacific region will become, slowly, haltingly but increasingly, like that.

### Impact Calc – Prefer Direct Consequences

#### If the consequence is not a direct result of the plan but an alternative policy than vote aff

Bernie Gert, Prof of Philosophy at Dartmouth, 2004 (Common Morality: Deciding What to Do, pg. 69-70)  
8. Are there any alternative actions or policies that would be morally preferable? This feature is often simply included as part of features and which are concerned with the harms and benefits that are caused, avoided, and prevented. But it is not merely the consequences of alternative policies that are morally relevant. An alternative action or policy may be morally preferable to the action being considered because it does not violate a moral rule. Paternalistic deception, which might be justified if there were no non paternalistic alternatives, is not justified if there is a preferable alternative, such as taking time to persuade citizens or patients rather than deceiving them. Explicit awareness of this feature may lead people to try to find out if there are any alternative actions that either would not involve a violation of a moral rule or would involve causing much less harm. The inadequacy of most of the discussions of legalizing physician assisted suicide is an example of the failure to consider this morally relevant feature. It is admitted by proponents of legalizing physician assisted suicide that doing so has some risks, such as increasing pressure on terminally ill patients to die sooner and various other kinds of abuse. However, they claim that these risks are significantly outweighed by the benefits of legalizing physician-assisted suicide, such as the elimination of months or years of terrible pain and suffering. If there were no alternative method of eliminating these months or years of terrible pain and suffering, then they would have a strong argument. However, patients are already allowed to refuse food and fluids as well as any medical treatment, so legalizing physician-assisted suicide is not necessary to prevent significant pain and suffering. If patients are educated about this alternative, which, contrary to popular opinion, usually causes no pain, and can always be made completely painless, they can arrange to die as quickly or more quickly than with physician-assisted suicide. The presence of this alternative changes the force of the argument.

### Impact Calc – Probability Over Magnitude

#### People have a cognitive bias against high probability-low magnitude impacts. You should undervalue their DAs – the longer the chain of events the less likely the scenario

Yudkowsky 06 [Eliezer, 8/31/2006. Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence Palo Alto, CA. “Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks, Forthcoming in Global Catastrophic Risks, eds. Nick Bostrom and Milan Cirkovic,singinst.org/upload/cognitive-biases.pdf.

4. The Conjunction Fallacy Linda is 31 years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice, and also participated in anti-nuclear demonstrations. Rank the following statements from most probable to least probable: 1. Linda is a teacher in an elementary school. 2. Linda works in a bookstore and takes Yoga classes. 3. Linda is active in the feminist movement. 4. Linda is a psychiatric social worker. 5. Linda is a member of the League of Women Voters. 6. Linda is a bank teller. 7. Linda is an insurance salesperson. 8. Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement. 89% of 88 undergraduate subjects ranked (8) as more probable than (6) (Tversky and Kahneman 1982). Since the given description of Linda was chosen to be similar to a feminist and dissimilar to a bank teller, (8) is more representative of Linda’s description. However, ranking (8) as more probable than (6) violates the conjunction rule of probability theory which states that p(A & B) \_ p(A). Imagine a sample of 1,000 women; surely more women in this sample are bank tellers than are feminist bank tellers. Could the conjunction fallacy rest on subjects interpreting the experimental instructions in an unanticipated way? Perhaps subjects think that by “probable” is meant the probability of Linda’s description given statements (6) and (8), rather than the probability of (6) and (8) given Linda’s description. Or perhaps subjects interpret (6) to mean “Linda is a bank teller and is not active in the feminist movement.” Although many creative alternative hypotheses have been invented to explain away the conjunction fallacy, the conjunction fallacy has survived all experimental tests meant to disprove it; see e.g. Sides et al. (2002) for a summary. For example, the following experiment excludes both of the alternative hypotheses proposed above: Consider a regular six-sided die with four green faces and two red faces. The die will be rolled 20 times and the sequence of greens (G) and reds (R) will be recorded. You are asked to select one sequence from a set of three and you will win $25 if the sequence you chose appears on successive rolls of the die. Please check the sequence of greens and reds on which you prefer to bet. 1. RGRRR 2. GRGRRR 3. GRRRRR 125 undergraduates at UBC and Stanford University played this gamble with real payoffs. 65% of subjects chose sequence (2) (Tversky and Kahneman 1983). Sequence (2) is most representative of the die, since the die is mostly green and sequence (2) contains the greatest proportion of green faces. However, sequence (1) dominates sequence (2) because (1) is strictly included in (2), to get (2) you must roll (1) preceded by a green face. In the above task, the exact probabilities for each event could in principle have been calculated by the students. However, rather than go to the effort of a numerical calculation, it would seem that (at least 65% of) the students made an intuitive guess, based on which sequence seemed most “representative” of the die. Calling this “the representativeness heuristic” does not imply that students deliberately decided that they would estimate probability by estimating similarity. Rather, the representativeness heuristic is what produces the intuitive sense that sequence (2) “seems more likely” than sequence (1). In other words the “representativeness heuristic” is a built-in feature of the brain for producing rapid probability judgments rather than a consciously adopted procedure. We are not aware of substituting judgment of representativeness for judgment of probability. The conjunction fallacy similarly applies to futurological forecasts. Two independent sets of professional analysts at the Second International Congress on Forecasting were asked to rate, respectively, the probability of “A complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983” or “A Russian invasion of Poland, and a complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983.” The second set of analysts responded with significantly higher probabilities (Tversky and Kahneman 1983). In Johnson et al. (1993), MBA students at Wharton were scheduled to travel to Bangkok as part of their degree program. Several groups of students were asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance. One group of subjects was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance covering the flight from Thailand to the US. A second group of subjects was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance covering the round-trip flight. A third group was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance that covered the complete trip to Thailand. These three groups responded with average willingness to pay of $17.19, $13.90, and $7.44 respectively. According to probability theory, adding additional detail onto a story must render the story less probable. It is less probable that Linda is a feminist bank teller than that she is a bank teller, since all feminist bank tellers are necessarily bank tellers. Yet human psychology seems to follow the rule that adding an additional detail can make the story more plausible. People might pay more for international diplomacy intended to prevent nanotechnological warfare by China, than for an engineering project to defend against nanotechnological attack from any source. The second threat scenario is less vivid and alarming, but the defense is more useful because it is more vague. More valuable still would be strategies which make humanity harder to extinguish without being specific to nanotechnologic threats—such as colonizing space, or see Yudkowsky (2008) on AI. Security expert Bruce Schneier observed (both before and after the 2005 hurricane in New Orleans) that the U.S. government was guarding specific domestic targets against “movie-plot scenarios” of terrorism, at the cost of taking away resources from emergency-response capabilities that could respond to any disaster (Schneier 2005). Overly detailed reassurances can also create false perceptions of safety: “X is not an existential risk and you don’t need to worry about it, because A, B, C, D, and E”; where the failure of any one of propositions A, B, C, D, or E potentially extinguishes the human species. “We don’t need to worry about nanotechnologic war, because a UN commission will initially develop the technology and prevent its proliferation until such time as an active shield is developed, capable of defending against all accidental and malicious outbreaks that contemporary nanotechnology is capable of producing, and this condition will persist indefinitely.” Vivid, specific scenarios can inflate our probability estimates of security, as well as misdirecting defensive investments into needlessly narrow or implausibly detailed risk scenarios. More generally, people tend to overestimate conjunctive probabilities and underestimate disjunctive probabilities (Tversky and Kahneman 1974). That is, people tend to overestimate the probability that, e.g., seven events of 90% probability will all occur. Conversely, people tend to underestimate the probability that at least one of seven events of 10% probability will occur. Someone judging whether to, e.g., incorporate a new startup, must evaluate the probability that many individual events will all go right (there will be sufficient funding, competent employees, customers will want the product) while also considering the likelihood that at least one critical failure will occur (the bank refuses a loan, the biggest project fails, the lead scientist dies). This may help explain why only 44% of entrepreneurial ventures2 survive after 4 years (Knaup 2005). Dawes (1988, 133) observes: “In their summations lawyers avoid arguing from disjunctions (‘either this or that or the other could have occurred, all of which would lead to the same conclusion’) in favor of conjunctions. Rationally, of course, disjunctions are much more probable than are conjunctions.” The scenario of humanity going extinct in the next century is a disjunctive event. It could happen as a result of any of the existential risks we already know about—or some other cause which none of us foresaw. Yet for a futurist, disjunctions make for an awkward and unpoetic-sounding prophecy.

### Impact Calc – Racism Causes Dehumanization

#### Racism perpetuates dehumanization

Wilder and Memmi, 1996

[Gary and Albert, WEB Dubois institute, racial theorists, “Irreconcilable differences.” Transition, 71, 1996, pp. 158-177, Accessed online vis JSTOR] /Wyo-MB

Perhaps Memmi's most precocious and valuable insights emerge from his belief that racism traps its victims in "an impos- sible condition ... a condition which can have no solution in its actual structure." We can read Memmi's work as an inven- tory of possible responses to colonization, racism, and anti-Semitism. He believes that racialized subjects are inevitably im- pelled by contradictory gestures of self- rejection and self-affirmation, and that it is as impossible to secure recognition as different but equal as it is to gain full ac- cess to "universal" humanity: "No matter which way I turned I always found my- self an accomplice of the established or- der." He has profound empathy for op- pressed peoples' attempts to survive with dignity, and he allows us to see the desire to disappear into the mainstream and the wish to retreat into ghettoized enclaves as natural reactions to the racial dilemma.

#### DEHUMANIZATION DESTROYS THE VALUE TO LIFE AND OUTWEIGHS ALL CALCULABLE IMPACTS

Berube 97 – [David M., Professor of Communication Studies at University of South Carolina., “NANOTECHNOLOGICAL PROLONGEVITY: The Down Side,” <http://www.cas.sc.edu/engl/faculty/berube/prolong.htm>]

This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matson's treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn[s]: "its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record -- and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.... Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's next of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon.

### Impact Calc – Reject Racism

#### Must reject every instance of racism

Joseph Barndt, Co-Director, Crossroads, DISMANTLING RACISM, 1991, p. 155-156

The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust: the effects of uncontrolled power privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison, will inevitably destroy us. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger point of self-destruction seems to be drawing even more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonialism, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction, may be reaching a point of no return. A small and predominately white minority of the global population derives its power and privilege from the suffering of the vast majority of peoples of color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.

#### Racism is the root cause of violence

Foucault '76 [Michel, Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-1976, p. 254-257 Trans. David Macey]

What in fact is racism? It is primarily a way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power's control: the break between what must live and what must die. But racism does make the relationship of war-"If you want to live, the other must die" - function in a way that is completely new and that is quite compatible with the exercise of biopower. On the one hand, racism makes it possible to establish a relationship between my life and the death of the other that is not a military or warlike relationship of confrontation, but a biological-type relationship: "The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more Ias species rather than individual-can live, the stronger I will be, the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate." There is a direct connection between the two. In a normalizing society, race or racism is the precondition that makes killing acceptable. When you have a normalizing society, you have a power which is, at least superficially, in the first instance, or in the first line a biopower, and racism is the indispensable precondition that allows someone to be killed, that allows others to be killed. And we can also understand why racism should have developed in modern societies that function in the biopower mode; we can understand why racism broke out at a number of .privileged moments, and why they were precisely the moments when the right to take life was imperative. Racism first develops with colonization, or in other words, with colonizing genocide. If you are functioning in the biopower mode, how can you justify the need to kill people, to kill populations, and to kill civilizations? By using the themes of evolutionism, by appealing to a racism. War. How can one not only wage war on one's adversaries but also expose one's own citizens to war, and let them be killed by the million (and this is precisely what has been going on since the nineteenth century, or since the second half of the nineteenth century), except by activating the theme of racism

#### That’s a moral side constraint—reject racism in every instance.

Albert Memmi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris, 1999 (Racism, Published by the University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0816631654, p. 163-165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet, for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark [end page 163] history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which man is not himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates, in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologue to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one's moral conduct only emerges from a choice; one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other, and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is "the truly capital sin."22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity's spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in [end page 164] banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. "Recall," says the Bible, "that you were once a stranger in Egypt," which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming one again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal--indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice, a just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

### Impact Calc – Survival Logic Bad

#### NEXT, toleration of evil in the name of survival destroys the value to life

CALLAHAN ‘73

[Daniel J. Callahan, The Tyranny of Survival: And other pathologies of civilized life. Pg 91-93//delo-uwyo]

That individuals, tribes, communities and nations have committed so much will, energy and intelligence to survival has meant that they have survived, and their descendants are present to tell the tale. Nothing is so powerful a motive force, for self or society, as the threat of annihilation, nothing so energizing as the necessity to live. Without life, all else is in vain. Leaving aside the question of whether we need more enlightened attitudes toward suicide in our society, which we may. it is still not for nothing that suicide has been looked upon with abhorrence, whether from a religious or a psycho- logical perspective. It seems to violate the most fundamental of human drives, and has always required a special explana- tion or justification. The value of survival could not be so readily abused were it not for its evocative power.2 But abused it has been. In the name of survival, all manner of social and political evils have been committed against the rights of individuals, including the right to life. The purported threat of Communist domina- tion has for over two decades fueled the drive of militarists for ever-larger defense budgets, no matter what the cost to other social needs. During World War II, native Japanese-Ameri- cans were herded, without due process of law, into detention camps. This policy was later upheld by the Supreme Court in Korematsu v. United States (1944) in the general context that a threat to national security can justify acts otherwise bla- tantly unjustifiable. The survival of the Aryan race was one of the official legitimations of Nazism. Under the banner of survival, the government of South Africa imposes a ruthless apartheid, heedless of the most elementary human rights. The Vietnamese war has seen one of the greatest of the many absurdities tolerated in the name of survival: the destruction of villages in order to save them. But it is not only in a political setting that survival has been evoked as a final and unarguable value. The main rationale B. F. Skinner offers in Beyond Freedom and Dignity for the controlled and conditioned society is the need for survival.3 For Jacques Monod, in Chance and Necessity, sur- vival requires that we overthrow almost every known religious, ethical and political system.4 In genetics, the survival of the gene pool has been put forward as sufficient grounds for a forceful prohibition of bearers of offensive genetic traits from marrying and bearing children. Some have even suggested that we do the cause of survival no good by our misguided medical efforts to find means by which those suffering from such com- mon genetically based diseases as diabetes can live a normal life, and thus procreate even more diabetics. In the field of population and environment, one can do no better than to cite Paul Ehrlich, whose works have shown a high dedication to survival, and in its holy name a willingness to contemplate governmentally enforced abortions and a denial of food to starving populations of nations which have not enacted popu- lation-control policies. For all these reasons, it is possible to counterpoise over against the need for survival a "tyranny of survival." There seems to be no imaginable evil which some group is not willing to inflict on another for the sake of survival, no rights. liberties or dignities which it is not ready to suppress. It is easy, of course, to recognize the danger when survival is falsely and manipulatively invoked. Dictators never talk about their aggressions, but only about the need to defend the fatherland, to save it from destruction at the hands of its enemies. But my point goes deeper than that. It is directed even at a legitimate concern for survival, when that concern is allowed to reach an intensity which would ignore, suppress or destroy other funda- mental human rights and values. The potential tyranny of survival as a value is that it is capable, if not treated sanely, of wiping out all other values. Survival can become an obsession and a disease, provoking a destructive singlemindedness that will stop at nothing. We come here to the fundamental moral dilemma. If, both biologically and psychologically, the need for survival is basic to man, and if survival is the precondition for any and all human achievements, and if no other rights make much sense without the premise of a right to life-then how will it be possible to honor and act upon the need for survival without, in the process, destroying everything in human beings which makes them worthy of survival? To put it more strongly, if the price of survival is human degradation, then there is no moral reason why an effort should be made to ensure that survival. It would be the Pyrrhic victory to end all Pyrrhic victories. Yet it would be the defeat of all defeats if, because human beings could not properly manage their need to survive, they suc- ceeded in not doing so. Either way, then, would represent a failure, and one can take one's pick about which failure would be worse, that of survival at the cost of everything decent in man or outright extinction.

### Impact Calc – Structural Violence OW

#### STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE OUTWEIGHS AND LIES AT THE ROOT CAUSE OF ALL OTHER FORMS OF VIOLENCE

Gilligan 96 – [James, Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical and Director of the Center for the Study of Violence “Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and Its Causes,” p191-196]cn

The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide-or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R . (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect. the equivalent of an ongoing, unending~ in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence-structural or behavioral-is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.

#### Focus on structural issues is the only way to truly achieve peace—conventional risk assessment fails

Nathan, CCR director, 1—Executive director, Centre for Conflict Resolution. Served on the Cameron Commission of Inquiry into Arms Trade, established by President Mandela. (Laurie, The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: The structural cause of violence in Africa, August 2001,<http://webworld.unesco.org/water/wwap/pccp/cd/pdf/educational_tools/course_modules/reference_documents/conflict/thefourhorsemen.pdf>)  
*1.* It is necessary to focus more on the structural causes of violence than on violence *per se.* This assertion runs directly counter to the conventional approach to “early warning” and “crisis prevention”. In the realm of international politics, early warning is primarily concerned with the initiation and escalation of intra- and inter-state hostilities. Former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992, 15-16) declared that the aim of early warning is to “assess whether a threat to peace exists and to analyse what action might be taken by the United Nations to alleviate it”. According to International Alert (1996), the goal is to predict trends toward an intensification of violence in order to protect vulnerable sectors of society against gross human rights violations, terror and genocide. The early warning/action model proposed by John Davies and Ted Gurr (1998, 4-5) regards the structural causes of violence as “background conditions” or “tensions”. These form the basis for “long-term risk assessment” of a “potential crisis” and point to opportunities for pre-crisis development aid, peacebuilding or peacemaking initiatives. “Dynamic early warning” is intended to identify “accelerator events” that exacerbate the tensions and indicate the possibility that a “full-blown crisis” or “conflagration” will occur “within the coming months or weeks”. Accelerator events can include arms acquisitions, incidents of aggressive posturing or low intensity violence, a crop failure, a major currency devaluation, and new repressive or discriminatory policies. The early warning model’s emphasis on large-scale violence reflects a misdiagnosis of the problem. It implies that the outbreak of hostilities is the worst-case scenario when, as illustrated by the Banyamulenge uprising and many other rebellions against authoritarian rule, resort to violence may be an act of desperation in response to a perceived worst-case scenario. On humanitarian grounds alone, Zaire fell into the category of “worst case scenario” prior to the 1996 rebellion: state hospitals and health facilities were virtually non-existent; preventable and curable diseases accounted for at least 50% of all deaths; child and maternal mortality rates were among the highest in the world; and inflation reached 24 000% in 1994 (Shearer, 1999). Paradoxically, the international community’s preoccupation with hostilities and its lesser concern with structural violence might contribute to oppressed communities becoming increasingly militant. An emphasis on the proximate causes of violence similarly reflects a misreading of the core problem. Many countries may experience the events described as “accelerators” but they are not equally susceptible to being engulfed by violence as a result. It is scarcely conceivable that, say, Canada, Belgium or New Zealand would be plunged into civil war following a crop failure, a currency devaluation, or even the introduction of discriminatory policies. Accelerators lead to hostilities in certain states but not others precisely because they heighten the structural tensions that exist in the former. Whereas accelerator events may or may not provoke violence depending on the circumstances, these structural tensions give rise to a societal propensity to violence. By focusing on the proximate causes of hostilities and relegating structural issues to the status of “background conditions”, the dynamic early warning model is oriented towards crisis reaction rather than crisis prevention. The more severe the structural problems in a given country, the greater the number of potential accelerators, the greater the risk of violence posed by such events, and the more difficult the task of determining which events constitute early warning of an incipient civil war. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, it could have been said with certainty that Zaire was a country in crisis and that some kind of explosion or implosion would occur in the future. Yet who could have predicted that the process that culminated in the fall of Mobutu would begin in October 1996 and be initiated by the Banyamulenge under the leadership of Laurent Kabila in response to a decision taken by a provincial governor? Mass violence does not occur as an independent event. It is an outcome of historically dysfunctional political relationships and structural factors that undermine human security. It cannot be prevented or terminated unless these matters are addressed to the satisfaction of local actors. This cannot be done within a time-frame of weeks or months, as suggested by Davies and Gurr (1998, 4). As argued further below, early warning and action are much too late if they are triggered by the proximate causes of violence. By this stage, the situation may have deteriorated and enmity may have mounted to the point that the momentum towards protracted warfare is irreversible.

## Solvency

### Solvency – Critical Mobility

#### Only critical mobility thinking can transgress the sedentary and nomad theories and give identity to those without it.

**Jensen 2009**

[Ole, Professor of Urban Theory in the Department of Architecture and Media Technology at Aalborg University, Denmark, Board member of the Center for Mobility and Urban Studies, on the Taskforce of the Cosmobilities Network, affiliated to the Pan-American Mobilites Network, and has strong links to Centre for Mobilities Research, “Flows of Meaning, Cultures of Movements – Urban Mobility as Meaningful Everyday Life Practice ” Volume 4, Issue 1 of Mobilities, pages 139-158, February 4th, 2009, Taylor & Francis Online, spencer]

However, none of the poles within the sedentary‐nomad polarisation can claim to understand the contemporary mobility phenomenon. Instead of moral condemnation or uncritical enthusiasm of contemporary mobile practices we need to ‘think mobilities’ critically. We may be inspired by the sedentary and nomad theories, but in order to capture the mobility practices of contemporary urbanism we need to go beyond these dualities. In the words of Casey; ‘as between nomadic and sedentary space, we cannot simply choose; it is a matter of “not better, just different”’ (Casey,[1997](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref13), p. 308). But what is crucial here is that ‘all discussions of mobility necessarily tend to have moral overtones of one sort or another’ (Morley, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref52), p. 228). Critical mobility thinking means addressing mobility without a moral pre‐judgement as a third position moving beyond the sedentary and nomad metaphysics. This attempt to reflect mobilities beyond the sedentary/nomad dichotomy correlates with the insights of relational geographical theory (Massey, [1994](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref48), p. 154). This is for example the case when the ‘trajectory’ and the ‘route’ comes to the foreground in Massey's conceptualisation of the way spatio‐temporal practices constitutes places in a complex web of flows: ‘You are, on that train, travelling not across space‐as‐surface … you are travelling across trajectories’ (Massey, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref49), pp. 118–119, emphasis in original). An example of transgressing nomad/sedentary thinking is found in an empirical survey of 200 residents in Manchester where Savage *et al.* ([2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref67)) coin the notion ‘elective belonging’ to show how a relational understanding of place implies that identities are constituted via mobile practices. Accordingly, there is no fixed and nested sense of place but rather geographies of material, emotional and imaginary sorts created through networks of connectivity that transcend place as an enclave. What is not denied, however, is the importance of settlement, place and fixation. The study points to the conclusion that people do ‘put down roots’. But simultaneously ‘identities are developed through the networked geography of places’ (Savage *et al.*, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17450100802658002#ref67), p. 207). Thus this empirical study is a window into the difficult but necessary work it takes to unlock the dichotomous notion of fixity or flow, nomad or sedentary thinking.

### Solvency – Public Transit Funding -

#### Transportation apartheid is perpetuated by unequal funding for metropolitan public transit systems

EJRC, 2004

[Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “Suburban Sprawl and transporation racism.” The Black Commentator, 9-23-2004, Issue 106, Online, [http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106\_transportation\_racism.html#](http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html)] /WFI-MB

Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not. Between fiscal year 1992 and 1999, states had more than $33.8 billion in federal funds available to spend on either highways or public transit, but spent only 12.5% of that sum on transit. Georgia and twenty-nine other states restrict the use of the gasoline tax revenue for funding highway programs only. Because Atlanta-area jobs have moved to suburbs, where public transit is minimal, they are virtually inaccessible to non-drivers. Thirty-nine percent of all black households in Atlanta do not have access to cars, and in 2000, only 34% of the region's jobs were within a one-hour public transit ride of low- income urban neighborhoods. The current federal funding scheme continues to be biased against metropolitan areas. Generally, states spend less than 20 percent of federal transportation funding on transit. Public transit has received roughly $50 billion since the creation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration over thirty years ago while roadway projects have received over $205 billion since 1956. From 1998-2003, TEA-21 transportation spending amounted to $217 billion. This was the "largest public works bill enacted in the nation’s history." Although local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure, they receive only about 10 percent of every dollar they generate. On average, Americans spend 19 cents out of every dollar earned on transportation expenses. Transportation costs ranged from 17.1 percent in the Northeast to 20.8 percent in the South – where some 54 percent of African Americans reside. Americans spend more on transportation than they do on food, education, and health care. The nation’s poorest families spend more than 40 percent of their take home pay on transportation. Only about five percent of all Americans use public transit to get to work. Only 7 percent of white households own no car, compared with 24 percent of African American households, 17 percent of Latino households, and 13 percent of Asian-American households. Urban transit is especially important to African Americans where over eighty-eight percent live in metropolitan areas and over fifty-three percent live inside central cities. African Americans are almost six times as likely as whites to use transit to get around. About sixty percent of African Americans live in ten metropolitan areas. In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos comprise over fifty-four percent of transit users (sixty-two percent of bus riders, thirty-five percent of subway riders, and twenty-nine percent of commuter rail riders). Inadequate public transit services in many of the nation’s metropolitan regions, which have high proportions of "captive" transit dependents, has exacerbated social, economic, and racial isolation and aided in institutionalizing transportation apartheid. Today, no other group is more physically isolated from jobs than African Americans. Suburbs are increasing their share of office space, while central cities see their share declining. In 2000, the "spatial mismatch" between jobs and residence meant that more than 50 percent of the nation’s blacks would have to relocate to achieve an even distribution of blacks relative to jobs; the comparable figures for whites are 20 to 24 percentage points lower. The suburban share of the metropolitan office space is 69.5 percent in Detroit, 65.8 percent in Atlanta, 57.7 percent in Washington, DC, 57.4 percent in Miami, and 55.2 percent in Philadelphia. Getting to these suburban jobs without a car is next to impossible. It is no accident that Detroit leads in suburban "office sprawl." Detroit is also the most segregated big city in the United States and the only major metropolitan area without a regional transit system. Only about 2.4 percent of metropolitan Detroiters use transit to get to work. From New York to California, and a host of cities in between, people of color and poor people are challenging unfair, unjust, and illegal transportation policies and practices that relegate them to the back of the bus. Transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring access to education, health care, and other public services.

### Solvency – Equity Key

#### Equity is the best method of evaluation of distribution—it helps the most disadvantaged.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara,

“Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

Equity is one common general understanding for the social dimensions of sustainability within the literature. Equity refers to fairness of distribution, not equality. Everyone in society does not have equal need; thus, with equity, the distribution of resources is based upon need. Equity and social justice in the distribution of transportation benefits has been theorized through three key philosophical perspectives: egalitarianism, horizontal equity, and vertical equity (Khisty, [1996](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0059); Litman, [2005b](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0069)). *Egalitarianism*: All persons are created equal and should be treated as such. Thus, regardless of socioeconomic status (or geographic location), all of society should receive equal benefit of transportation service. In this approach, the net benefits of transportation should be distributed equally within society. *Horizontal equity*: There should be equal treatment for people in unequal positions. This “users-pay” perspective presupposes impartial treatment across society where individuals and groups receive and use what they pay for in transportation. *Vertical equity*: The distribution of benefits across socioeconomic classes should provide the greatest benefit (at the least cost) to the most disadvantaged. This is closely aligned with Rawls' ([1971](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0092)) theory of justice that favors equal distribution unless it is necessary to create an unequal distribution that ultimately favors the least advantaged in society; here priority of equity is placed above efficiency.

### Solvency – Federal Investment Key

#### Federal investment in public transportation infrastructure is key

Williams, 2011

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

Washington, DC- American Public Transportation Association (APTA) President William Millar today urged Congress to increase federal investment in public transportation and detailed ways for Congress to more efficiently target investments to improve and expand America’s public transit systems. In testimony before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure’s Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, Millar called on leaders in Congress to promote growth and innovation in public transit, especially by passing a well funded six year multimodal surface transportation bill. “New federal investment would produce much-needed progress toward bringing our nation’s public transportation infrastructure up to a state of good repair and building the capacity for millions of new riders,” Mr. Millar said in prepared testimony. He noted that the U.S. Department of Transportation has estimated that more than $78 billion is needed to bring existing transit infrastructure up to a state of good repair. Highlighting the dire situation facing public transportation, Millar told the Subcommittee about the results of new research which found that rising gas prices will directly lead to a massive increase in ridership on public transit systems around the country. “The volatility of the price at the pump is another wakeup call for our nation to address the increasing demand for public transportation services,” Millar said. Millar also discussed new options for public transit funding including public-private partnerships and other types of innovative financing, but cautioned that “new financing tools do not replace the need for expanded federal investment.”

#### Federal public transit funding is necessary to solve racial injustice and unequal access to opportunitity

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

The following are some recommendations that follow from the issues raised in the report and from what we know from existing research. Implementation of these recommendations would help address the racial injustices created by transportation policies across the country and advance the national—and constitutional—goal of equality. 1. Increase funding for public transportation, and develop new programs and support existing programs that improve minorities’ mobility. Public transportation is a public service that should be supported. Also, support programs focusing on the needs of lowincome and minority transit users to provide reliable connections to job sites and other necessary destinations. For example, the Job Access and Reverse Commute programs support a number of promising efforts to connect low-wage workers to jobs and services, but additional funding is needed to examine which of these efforts are most effective and most likely to be successfully replicated. Also, a handful of significant research identifies increased access to cars as having a positive impact on the ability of minorities to gain access to and retain employment, which suggests that pilot programs that help low-income minorities access cars when public transit is inadequate should be developed.

#### Congressional Action can solve—it just has to encourage smart growth and focus on the inner city.

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

Of course, the creation of a legal right is not the only way in which Congress can address inequalities in transportation. Various studies demonstrate the importance of transportation for economic development and escaping poverty.222 In light of the economic and social importance of transportation, Congress should devote resources to make equal access to transportation a reality. A successful congressional approach includes a focus on not only transportation networks, but also attention to overall development patterns. Encouraging smart growth223 by cur-tailing highway development, devoting resources to urban redevelopment, and accommodating alternative forms of transportation, including the promotion of walking, has been shown to be an effective means of limiting sprawl, improving the quality of the environment, and promoting social justice.224 These strategies, like the transportation problems they address, have effects that span racial, social, and economic boundaries but predominantly impact those most affected by the current highway dominated transportation regime: the urban poor.

### Solvency – Inclusion

#### Transportation policy k2 meaningful inclusion and access to jobs and economic opportunities for minority participants

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

During the civil rights movement of the 1960s, much of the discussion about transportation issues for minority and low-income persons revolved around land use patterns and the social and economic conditions of urban areas. Shortly following the civil unrest in Los Angeles in 1965, the California governor appointed a commission chaired by John McCone (McCone Commission) to examine the causes of the unrest. The McCone Commission identified “inadequate and costly” transportation as contributing to high rates of unemployment among the black urban population.11 In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (commonly known as the Kerner Commission) released its report on the causes and effects of riots in U.S. cities. Among its recommendations for enhanced employment opportunities for central-city residents was the creation of improved transportation links between ghetto neighborhoods and new job locations in the suburbs.12 In 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., described how city planning decisions result in transportation systems that underserve minority communities: “Urban transit systems in most American cities . . . have become a genuine civil rights issue—and a valid one—because the layout of rapid-transit systems determines the accessibility of jobs to the African-American community. If transportation systems in American cities could be laid out so as to provide an opportunity for poor people to get meaningful employment, then they could begin to move into the mainstream of American life.”

### Solvency – Policy Key

#### Need policies to address transportation inequality—key to solve negative effects on minority and low-income communities

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Transportation policies not only have inequitable effects on the ability of low-income individuals and minorities to access places, but also have serious indirect effects such as encouraging and reinforcing residential segregation; restricting access to employment and other economic opportunities, housing, and education; and causing health disparities. This report identifies these effects to illustrate the need for those who work on transportation issues to address seriously the inequitable effects of transportation policies. As this report—particularly the section on enforcement of civil rights and environmental laws—has underscored, a vital step is the development of measures or standards of whether the burdens and benefits of transportation polices and decisions are equitable to minority and lowincome communities. These communities have suffered many of the burdens of transportation policies, and it is unclear how many of the benefits they have gained. Once measures are established, individuals and government officials must be able to easily enforce such measures, including in the courts if necessary; otherwise, equity cannot be ensured. Another critical need identified in this report is for additional research and data collection on transportation equity issues. Existing research provides some strong indications of the links between transportation policies and inequitable effects on minorities and low-income individuals, but some significant gaps remain. Although TEA-21 allocated $3.3 billion over six years for surface transportation research and development to ensure that the United States will be a world leader in these areas, only a very small fraction of those funds are spent on research examining transportation’s effect on social equity.240 Policymakers, researchers, and advocates need to recognize the interaction between transportation, land use, and social equity and support programs that understand and address this interaction. There are many opportunities for policymakers to address some of the inequitable effects of transportation policies on minority and low-income communities. The upcoming reauthorization of TEA-21 is one such opportunity. Housing development policies are another. “Smart growth” initiatives are yet another, but smart growth initiatives have not always incorporated principles of equity. Policymakers should use these many opportunities to move us toward equity for all.

### Solvency – Poverty

#### Transportation in the Status quo just costs too much money—transport allows home ownership and causes financial security

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

With few alternatives to driving available to most Americans, families have no choice but to spend heavily on car ownership. US households are now spending nearly one-fifth of their family budgets on transportation.' The poorest families, those earning less than $14,000 per year after taxes, spend approximately 40 percent of their take-home pay on transportation expenditures. This compares to 22 percent for families earning between $27,177 and $44,461 annually, and 13 percent per year for families making more than $71,900 per year. 8 This trend coincides with the Interstate Era and the advent of the private automobile. In 1935, families expended just 10 percent of their budgets on transportation. By 1960, that figure had risen to 14percent. From 1972 through today, the portion of the family budget devoted to getting around increased to 20 percent." The vast majority (nearly 95 percent) of expenditures on transportation go toward owning and operating a private automobile. Even for the poorest families, almost 95 percent of the $3,178 spent on transportation annually goes to down-payments and monthly payments, insurance, gasoline, repairs, and other vehicle-related expenses. \0 Unfortunately, the investment in a private vehicle yields little financial return. A new $20,000 car will lose 25 percent of its value in just the first year, and almost 80 percent of its value over ten years. II And the almost obligatory expenditures on car ownership leave less of the family budget for other necessities like housing, food, health care, and education. An analysis of the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey by the Center for Neighborhood Technology estimated that excessive Just Transportation 167 auto expenditures by low-income families suppress home ownership by between 5 and 10 percent of what it would be if households could reduce transportation expenditures to average levels and invest these cost savings in home ownership instead. In places which offer more transportation choices, the burden of transportation expenditures is far lower. Families living in autodependent Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida spend almost 25 percent of their household budgets on transportation. In contrast, households living in cities with good transit service and walkable neighborhoods spend far less. Residents of San Francisco, Boston, Portland, and New York spend, respectively, 16.9 percent, 16.8 percent, 16.2 percent, and 15.l percent oftheir budgets on transportation expenses. Shifting government priorities to increase public investment in transit and manage growth to better accommodate more transportation choices can greatly reduce the household costs of transportation. A recent Bureau of Transportation Statistics study found that, for the 66 percent of the working poor who commuted by private vehicle, individuals spent fully 21 percent of their income to get to and from work. In contrast, the working poor who were able to take public transportation, bicycle, carpool, or walk to work spent far less, leaving more for housing, health care, food, and education." Adequate funding for transportation alternatives is more than just good transportation policy; it is good fiscal policy, helping families invest in real opportunities for financial security such as home ownership and education.

#### Air pollution is killing kids and current transportation infrastructure is isolating people of color from jobs and services

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

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." Inner-city children have the highest rates for asthma prevalence, hospitalization, and mortality." 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. African Americans are almost three times more likely than whites to die from asthma." Representatives from the grassroots environmental justice organizations and networks have begun to mobilize around clean air as a basic civil right. They are demanding clean air, transportation equity, and fair distribution of regional spending." Groups have called for new interagency approaches to foster greater public participation of impacted populations to create healthy and sustainable communities through wise transportation investments. They want an end to transportation racism that is siphoning off needed funds from communities of color, isolating them from jobs and economic activity centers, and making them sick from breathing other people's automobile pollution. These transportation equity advocates are demanding fair and smart growth.

#### Lack of transit in the status quo dooms inner-city residents to poverty because they can’t find and keep jobs—the states encourage this

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

Beyond the financial burden and disparate health impacts placed on communities of color and low-income communities, the auto-oriented transportation system also makes it more difficult to find and keep a good job. State and regional transportation priorities typically favor highway development over public transit, contributing to sprawling development at the expense of the urban core and leaving less funding available for transit. The lack of coordination between transportation, economic development, and housing decisions increases the costs of transit service delivery, making transit more difficult to finance. These costs are typically absorbed by local governments, despite shrinking tax bases, due to the restrictions more than thirty states have on state gas taxes, which can only be used on highway programs. Congestion relief and economic development goals drive most infrastructure investments. Research on induced travel, however, finds that new roadways attract almost equal levels of traffic growth due to building booms along new traffic corridors. A Maryland study on the relationship between highway investment and sprawl recently found that more than 90 percent of developed properties within five miles of a major interstate highway were built after the adjacent section of the highway was completed." As a result of this pattern, sprawl development has become the status quo in many parts of the country. The resulting "spatial mismatch" between jobs and housing concentrates high rates of poverty in the urban core and makes residential and economic development generated by new roads in outer suburbs virtually inaccessible by transit, foot, or bicycle. That lack of coordination between agencies compounds challenges facing transit-dependent communities. According to a recent survey, none of the fifty states consider public transportation availability when allocating state economic development subsidies. In fact, states encouraged the relocation of corporations from transit-accessible urban areas to auto dependent exurbs. 25 The combination of policies that favor highway building and auto-dependent, single-use development is especially detrimental because less funding is available for transit and transit becomes a more expensive service. Low-income and minority families are disproportionately affected by inadequate investment in transit since they are more likely to reside in urban communities and depend on transit to get around. Not only have the jobs left the urban core where they live, but environmental justice communities in some instances have no way to get to the jobs in the exurbs.

#### Transportation is imperative to members of the urban core having jobs

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

Sprawl-driven development diverts funds away from central cities. Improving low-income residents' mobility, particularly for those making the transition from welfare to work, may be the difference between employment and unemployment, and between self sufficiency and dependency. Public transportation improvements go hand in hand with expanding job opportunities. Innovative programs are needed to improve transportation efficiency; reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment; reduce the need for infrastructure investment; provide efficient access; examine development patterns; and involve the community in such efforts. The regional transportation planning process needs to include a thorough and comprehensive assessment of current and future travel needs. This assessment should incorporate transportation options such as transit, walking, and bicycling based on the location and demographics of forecasted population and employment trends. The assessment will also need to quantify the various infrastructure changes which may be needed: for example, miles of new roads, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes; public transit and vanpool service expansion; congestion pricing; and parking management.

#### The inner-city competes and loses for funding—transit is a prerequisite for social services and any economic activity.

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

ISTEA recognized that central cities and suburbs are not equal and often compete for scarce resources. One need not be a rocket scientist to predict the outcome of a competition between affluent suburbs and their less affluent central-city competitors. Megabucks are spent on freeways to move suburbanites around, while central-city residents fight for pennies to keep transit services running and fares affordable. These problems appear to be more severe in urban areas with large concentrations of poor people and people of color. Highways are the lifelines for suburban commuters-connecting them to home, work, shopping, recreation, and other activities. Millions of central-city residents have no options except public transit. Transit providers know this and are not inclined to pamper their low-income, people of color, urban transit-dependent riders as they do their white suburban "choice riders." These double standards persist in the face of budget shortfalls and service cuts. Recent cuts in mass transit subsidies and· fare hikes have restricted access to essential social services and economic activities. The money spent on building roads is more about mobility for the rich than equity for all. More roads on the urban edge translate into more cars and more land-use patterns that can only be served by highways. Sprawl-driven transportation also fuels political campaign contributions for those elected officials who promote sprawl as "good business."

### Solvency – Racism

#### Transportation in the status quo prioritizes rich car owners of the exurbs, leaving the taxes in the inner city insufficient to renovate transit, massive collaborative systemic changes are necessary to quell racist tendencies in the status quo

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

The transportation and urban development policies of the Interstate Era (1956-1991) erected major barriers to mobility for the more than 30 percent of Americans who cannot or do not drive automobiles. These policies tended to promote a "one-size-fits-all" approach to highways and transportation planning, which has separated jobs and workplaces from housing and services and turned the car into the link between them. This development pattern has made the car a basic necessity in most cities and communities across the country. This has happened in part from land-use practices, transportation policies that focused roadway investment in growing areas, and the huge attraction of highway access for development opportunities at the expense of access by transit. The resulting exodus of the population to suburban areas and beyond shifted tax bases to the exurbs, leaving a pattern of **urban disinvestment nearly uniform throughout** the United States. In this environment, the voices and concerns of the affected communities and their allies have largely been ignored. This spatial mismatch between jobs, services, and housing has created serious environmental justice challenges in today's cities. Foremost among these dilemmas-although not necessarily most prominent in the public eye-is the nationwide shortage of affordable transportation choices. Inadequate transit funding reinforces the lack of access to job opportunities in many low-income and people of color communities. "Transportation racism" was also perpetuated by transportation-related health burdens disproportionately affecting specific socioeconomic groups and the limited availability of federal transportation resources at the metropolitan level, where 80 percent of people of color reside. Increased investment in transit and related development can begin the tasks of knitting ill-affected communities back together, curbing environmental impacts, and addressing past environmental injustices. However, ensuring mobility and equal access to jobs for low-income and communities of color will require massive systemic changes. Effectively addressing the interrelated challenges facing African American, Latino, and other communities of color will require decision-makers to begin to take comprehensive approaches to transportation, housing, and economic development. It is equally important that government agencies and urban planners openly engage transportation justice concerns by enabling meaningful public involvement, collecting and reporting data on projects, requiring performance measures, and invoking alternative dispute resolution when needed. Although numerous states and metropolitan areas have efforts underway that begin to advance more comprehensive planning approaches, additional collaboration is needed between multiple agencies and stakeholders to maximize what would otherwise result in isolated strategies.

### Solvency – Sustainable Public Transportation

#### Status quo urban transportation is disproportionally harming households and is cutting off basic human needs. Only a Switch to socially sustainable urban transportation can solve

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara,

“Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

Considerations of equity in urban transportation literature frequently analyze disparities in accessibility to urban opportunities, disparities in cost-benefit distributions, or disparities in environmental justice related to transportation systems. Traditional concepts of accessibility refer to the opportunities and activities available in geographic space. Geographic context enables or constrains access to opportunities through the spatial arrangement of activities; the design, efficiency, and availability of the transportation infrastructure; and personal availability of transportation (Hanson, [1995](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0042); Hanson, [1998](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0043); Couclelis, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0022)). Socially sustainable urban transportation examines the equitable distribution of access to those opportunities that are fundamental to meeting human needs such as employment, social/public services, affordable housing, education, health care, recreational/open space, shopping (Bailly et al.,[2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0005); Burton, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0015); Stren and Polèse, 2003; Arend, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0001); Richardson, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0095)) and is especially concerned with the equitable distribution of opportunities for disadvantaged populations. For example, research has shown that in situations of city growth and urban sprawl, the levels of accessibility among the elderly and children tend to be compromised (Gilbert, [2002](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0038)). Research has also noted many distributional inequities of the costs and benefits of urban transportation (Hodge, [1995](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0050); Deka, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0025); Bae and Mayeres, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0004)). For example, Deka ([2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0025)) found that the percentage of household expenditures on transportation has increased most for low-income households. Further, many argue that the negative environmental consequences of urban transportation systems disproportionately affect minority and disadvantaged populations, whose neighborhoods experience higher levels of vehicle emission air pollution, traffic congestion, noise pollution, and loss of land to highway construction (Bullard and Johnson, [1997](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0013); Sanchez et al., [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0097); Bullard et al., [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0014); Schweitzer and Valenzuela, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0099)). The inherent tension within transportation planning between social equity and total system efficiency (Khisty, [1996](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0059); Deka, [2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0025); Bae and Mayeres, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0004)) illustrates a key challenge of implementing socially sustainable urban transportation.

### Solvency – K2 Sustainability

#### In order to ensure sustainability for future generations and equity within ours, social focus in urban transportation is key

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara,

“Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

However, universally agreed conceptualizations and definitions of sustainability and sustainable development remain elusive (Lele, [1991](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0066); Redclift, [1992](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0093); Wilbanks, [1994](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0113); Beatley, [1995](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0007)). To define sustainability, many research publications draw upon a single passage from the Brundtland Report, “…development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” (WCED, [1987](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0110), p. 8), suggesting intergenerational environmental equity. Yet as emphasis is commonly placed upon the environmental dimensions of sustainability, many argue the social dimension of sustainability in the Brundtland Report is overlooked (Yiftachel and Hedgcock, [1993](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0117); Pinfield, [1994](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0083); Polèse and Stren, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0084); Low and Gleeson, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0072); Foladori, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0035)). Some suggest social dimensions of sustainability are explicitly incorporated (Foladori, [2005](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0035)) within the Brundtland Report's vision of sustainability, if not at the heart of it (Pinfield, [1994](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0083)). Others argue sustainability is not limited to natural resource management for future generations, but also implies *intragenerational* socioeconomic equity (Bailly et al., [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0005); Stren and Polèse, [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0084); Maloutas, [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0074)). Without a doubt, the urgency of preserving the environment for future generations has been a primary driving force in sustainability. But in meeting environmentally sustainable objectives, the Brundtland Report outlined how sustainability should also seek to meet social objectives of *intragenerational* equity that “enhance both current and future potential to meet human needs and aspirations” for a better life (WCED, [1987](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0110), p. 46). Thus, it is argued here that the *social* is integral to the whole understanding of sustainability. With this in mind, research is needed to explore the parameters of social sustainability in the context of urban transportation.

#### Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation is critical to maintaining social equity and quality of life, while quelling social exclusion. Sustainability is the only way to do this.

**Boschmann and Kwan 2008** [E. Eric, Ph.D., Ohio State University and Asst. Geography Professor at University of Denver & Mei-Po, Professor of Geography at UC-Berkeley and Ph.D. University of California, Santa Barbara, “Toward Socially Sustainable Urban Transportation: Progress and Potentials,” International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, [Volume 2](http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujst20?open=2#vol_2), [Issue 3](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujst20/2/3), March 17th 2008, pages 138-157, spencer]

In many instances, however, the *social* dimensions of sustainable urban transportation are more implicit than explicit in the literature. For example, although Sanchez et al. ([2003](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0097)) do not use the terminology of *sustainability*, the research focus on the inequitable effects of surface transportation policies in the United States certainly implies dimensions of social sustainability. Similarly, Bullard and Johnson ([1997](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0013)) and Bullard et al. ([2004](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0014)) examine the race- and class-based transportation injustices in the United States but do not use a framework of *sustainability*. To further explore the status of the literature on this, we examined the literature to answer the following question: In what ways can urban transportation be socially *unsustainable*? That is, what barriers in allowing humans to meet their basic needs and aspire toward a better life are created or augmented by urban transportation systems? The literature suggests that SSUT is most appropriately examined at localized scales, the level at which activities of individual livelihoods occur. Further, social equity, social exclusion, and quality of life emerge as three integral and interconnected qualities illustrative of socially sustainable urban transportation in the context of U.S. cities. Although none of these are unambiguous in their definition,[1](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#FN0001)they provide a platform from which to conceptualize SSUT. A common thread among all three is the goal of *social justice*, understood as the distribution of society's benefits and burdens (Johnston et al., [2000](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0055)). Admittedly a contested term (Harvey, [1996](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15568310701517265#CIT0047)), social justice encompasses the entirety of issues embedded in socially sustainable urban transportation including the inequitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of transportation in U.S. cities, geographic patterns of social exclusion, and diminished quality of life among individuals. The remainder of this section more specifically outlines these literature contributions that imply the social dimensions of sustainable urban transportation.

### Solvency – Transportation Equity

#### Effective public transportation policies are key to transportation equity

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Before examining the specific economic and social effects of transportation policies on minority and low-income communities, it is necessary to define transportation equity. While most transportation planners are concerned primarily with the efficiency and cost of transportation, including people’s mobility levels and the accessibility of transportation to the most people, those concerned about transportation equity seek fairness in mobility and accessibility levels across race, class, gender, and disability. The ultimate objective of transportation equity is to provide equal access to social and economic opportunity by providing equitable levels of access to all places. In the United States, concern about providing equal access to social and economic opportunity has mostly centered around an issue first identified by John Kain (1968) that is now commonly referred to as the “spatial mismatch hypothesis.” Spatial mismatch refers to the disconnect between the locations of housing and jobs suitable for lower-income people. In other words, those who most need entry-level jobs (primarily people of color) generally live in central cities while entry-level jobs are mostly in suburban locations that are not easily accessible from central cities. In England, however, policymakers and advocates often take a broader view of social inequity. The British effort to combat “social exclusion” is a more wide-ranging approach than the American battle against spatial mismatch.62 Efforts to eradicate social exclusion address communities that are isolated from or marginalized by general society. The English government defines social exclusion as “a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown.” Instead of directly addressing spatial equity questions through housing and land use policies that would improve housing affordability, discourage sprawling development, and improve enforcement of housing discrimination laws, U.S. policymakers have directed significant attention to overcoming the combined problem of residential segregation and limited employment accessibility for low-income persons by improving their transportation mobility. Federal policies fail to directly address the more fundamental issue of “access and participation” on a broad scale. In the United States, attempts to counter spatial inequity are usually limited to improving housing and employment access—represented in some respects by residential segregation—whereas social exclusion is a much broader concept. It encompasses concerns about 1) physical (personal) exclusion, 2) geographic exclusion, 3) exclusion from facilities, 4) economic exclusion, 5) temporal exclusion, 6) fear-based exclusion, and 7) space exclusion. Addressing social exclusion includes addressing problems such as lack of access to jobs, education, and training; low levels of access to public transportation at particular times of the day, which has an impact on persons without cars working late and early-morning shifts; and limited access to public and private spaces because of unsafe conditions and design.64 Transportation equity is a similarly broad concept. The importance of transportation policies and their inequitable effect on minority and low-income communities by limiting access to social and economic opportunities must be understood in this broader context.

## 2AC – AT

### AT – Courts CP

#### Can’t prove racist intentions in a court

**Dombroski 2005** [Matthew A., J.D., James Kent Scholar, Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, Managing Editor, *Columbia Law Review,* Columbia Law Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), “Securing Access to Transportation for the Urban Poor,” pp. 503-536, Jstor, spencer]

Despite the racial implications of suburbanization and segregation,197 proving a discriminatory purpose in the development of transportation networks is a difficult if not impossible task, especially where the procedures employed and the asserted justifications seem legitimate.198 Thus, unless they can prove a discriminatory purpose, protected classes are unable to establish themselves as victims of a suspect classification. Where no discriminatory purpose is evident, government action is subject not to strict scrutiny, but to the less rigorous rational basis scrutiny, which can be easily overcome by a showing that the act is rationally related to a legitimate government purpose.

### AT – Business is in the City

#### Business is leaving cities

**Bullard et al 2004** [Robert D., PhD in Sociology, Dean of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University. Previously Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Glenn S. Johnson, PhD,  Associate Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University, and Angel O. Torres, M.C.P. (City Planning), Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, and adjunct professor of sociology at Clark Atlanta University, "Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” South End Press, Spencer]

Where highways are built and where public transport systems extend are not unrelated. Similarly, spatial mobility and social mobility are interrelated. New job growth and economic activity centers are concentrated on the fringe of the metropolitan areas and often beyond the reach of public transportation. Over 80 percent of the country's future growth (if current trends hold) is expected to occur in "edge cities" and other suburbs. 54 In an analysis of office space in thirteen of the nation's largest metropolitan commercial real estate markets, a 2000 Brookings Institution study found that central cities' share of office space dropped from 74 percent in 1979 to 58 percent in 1999.55 Nearly an equal share of office space is found in traditional downtowns (38 percent) and "edgeless" cities that often extend over hundreds of square miles. The latter are generally not mixed-use, pedestrian friendly, or accessible by transit. The Brookings study also found that Detroit had the highest percentage (69.5 percent) of office space outside the city. Atlanta was second, with almost two-thirds of its 132 million square feet of space outside the city. This is a dramatic shift from two decades ago, when over 43 percent of Atlanta's office space was in the city. Other metropolitan areas with office sprawl included Washington, DC (57.7 percent), Miami (57.4 percent), and Philadelphia (55.2 percent)." People of color comprise the majority population in all five of the most office-sprawled cities. The exodus of low-skilled jobs to the suburbs disproportionately affects central-city residents, particularly people of color, who often face a more limited choice of housing location and transportation in growing areas. Between 1990 and 1997, jobs on the fringe of metropolitan areas grew by 19 percent versus 4 percent job growth in core areas. While metropolitan regions expanded into the suburbs, many of America's central cities became forgotten places. 57 Americans who have the economic means continue to leave central cities. Higher income households are leading this flight. Although affluent households (persons making $60,000 and over) make up only 24 percent of households in the nation's larger cities, they account for over 40 percent of the 1.2 million outmigrants. A 2000 study by Harvard University’s Joint Center for Housing Studies reports that between 1990 and 1997, new construction in outlying counties in metropolitan areas grew by 15 percent, compared with only 5 percent housing growth in counties closer to central cities."

### AT – No Riders

#### Transportation solves in highly dense areas—it’s more efficient with more people to ride

**Burton 2k** [Elizabeth, Professor of Architecture and Director of the Wellbeing In Sustainable Environments (WISE) research unit at Oxford Brookes University, “The Compact City: Just or Just Compact? A Preliminary Analysis,” *Urban Studies, Vol. 37, No. 11, 2000,*spencer]

It is generally accepted that public transport works better in compact cities owing to the tendency for a larger population to live within easy access of a stopping-point (Goodchild, 1994; ECOTEC, 1993). Newman and Kenworthy (1989a) have provided perhaps the most well-known evidence. Their work has suggested that higher-density cities are associated with a high use of public transport: public transport declines as density drops and falls away at around 20–30 people per hectare (Newman, 1992).

### AT – States CP

#### Appeals to states’ rights and federalism are linked to institutionally racist practices, undergirding segregation and slavery

Bracey 1 (Christopher A., Visiting Assistant Professor, Northwestern University School of Law, “Louis Brandeis and the Race Question,” Spring 2001, 52 Ala. L. Rev. 859)

One possible explanation relates to Brandeis' views on federalism, namely, that Brandeis' failure to disrupt state segregation regimes was rooted in a firm dislike for the Fourteenth Amendment. n318 Brandeis commented on numerous occasions that he found the Fourteenth Amendment to be far too intrusive on state authority. n319 Indeed, his dissenting opinion in New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann n320 clearly articulates his preference for state experimentation and autonomy. n321 Thus, one might argue that Brandeis' respect for state sovereignty and federalism precluded him, as a jurisprudential matter, from second-guessing the overall appropriateness of segregation. Or put differently, perhaps Brandeis felt that principles of federalism prohibited the use of national institutions to implement policy to protect African-Americans from the tyranny of the states. Strict adherence to principles of federalism, however, would not explain Brandeis' failure to intervene on behalf of African-Americans. [\*907] Indeed, just the opposite is true. A rigid concept of federalism would demand, in turn, strict application of the anti-discrimination principle contained in the Fourteenth Amendment, thereby necessitating intervention rather than precluding it. In any case, Brandeis was acutely aware that federalism provided opportunities for innovation as well as intervention when states seek to impose pernicious norms. Perhaps the clearest examples of this appear in his opinions in Whitney v. California n322 and Olmstead v. United States, n323 in which Brandeis came down strongly on the side of individual liberties. In those cases, Brandeis was not willing to sacrifice individual liberty--or at least certain liberties--on the altar of states' rights. n324 One could approve of federalism and find threats to individual liberty sufficient to warrant central intervention. Thus, it is not strict adherence to principles of federalism, but an unprincipled federalism that has explanatory power in this case. However, chalking up Brandeis' inaction to an unprincipled federalism is problematic for another reason. Unprincipled federalism was routinely invoked to perfect the marginalized status of African-Americans--first, as a barrier to prevent the federal government from interfering with the institution of slavery, and later as justification for state-sponsored racism. Indeed, during Brandeis' time, federalism served as a "vessel[] of racial subordination" n325 routinely invoked as a basis to oppose legal efforts to protect African-Americans against violence and political degradation. n326 Thus, to argue that Brandeis' inaction was attributable to unprincipled federalism is to suggest that Brandeis, like many southern Euro-Americans, attempted to cover his "naked racism with the fig leaf of states' rights." n327 Of course, there is nothing specific in Brandeis' past to warrant such a profound condemnation--nothing that would suggest that Brandeis harbored some deep-seated prejudice. An adherence to an unprincipled federalism may explain why others adopted a hands-off approach when it came to racial issues, but is not particularly persuasive in this instance. [\*908]

#### The counterplan fails to provide an adequate account of the history of spatial racism in the United States, they reinforce institutional racism by “leaving it up to the states” and solve none of our critical investigation of the Federal role in preserving and disrupting racial hierarchy

Bullard 7 (Robert D., the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, The Black Metropolis in the Twenty-First Century: Race, Power, and Politics of Place, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2007)

The history of space in relationship to civil rights and urbanized minorities, particularly blacks, however manifests itself quite differently and is important to our understanding of today's institutions and regional dynamics. .Unlike other racial groups who were denied access to space through formal exclusion, blacks and whites initially lived in close proximity to one another, primarily in the South, prior to and after emancipation. The status of black slaves in the United States, however, was less about racialized space and more about control through explicit and formal means. Yet the issue did not stray far from the concept of membership and opportunity associated with belonging and space. The Dred Scott case set clear parameters around who could access membership and opportunity. There, the Supreme Court concluded that because Scott, a runaway slave, was not a citizen, he could be excluded from being a member of the imagined society. Not only were blacks denied the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizenship granted under the Constitution, they were deemed "a subordinate inferior class of beings" subject to the authority of the dominant white race. This was, and is possibly, the most defining case in United States history. Segregation under Jim Crow, and after as embraced in Plessy v. Ferguson, is an extension of the same issue. It is important to note that in Dred Scott the Supreme Court asserted that only the federal government could confer citizenship, not the states. After the Civil War, the privilege and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment attempted to correct Dred Scott and confer citizenship on blacks. But the Supreme Court substantially undermined the citizenship implication of the privilege and immunities clause. In the Slaughterhouse Case, which was about the right to work as an incident of national citizenship, however, the Supreme Court rendered this clause virtually meaningless, as most of the privileges associated with citizenship were offered by the state.33 This reinforcement of states' rights has led some to call this one of the worst cases in U.S. history.36 Like many monumental events, the Civil War was about many things. One of those things enshrined in the Civil War amendments was a restructuring of federal and states powers. But significant shift to federal power was both delayed and undermined by the Supreme Court until the 1930s and the New Deal. Even then, the Court attempted to limit the federal government, and capitulated only when threatened with court packing. It was critical to have a strong federal government for the civil rights movement to succeed. It is not surprising that many of those who oppose civil rights also argued and continue to argue in favor of states' rights. But the new localism arrangement that grew up after the civil rights movement, as many scholars have demonstrated, is similar to the states' rights movement. One will notice that neither of these movements is explicitly about race. The arrangement of space has been one of the most important ways to distribute and retard opportunity along racial lines. Jim Crow emerged in the South as the dominant form of spatial apartheid segregating public accommodations and transportation, clearly demarcating the spaces occupied by whites and blacks, and reinforcing the highly visible and powerful racial hierarchy. In the Northeast and Midwest, where many blacks relocated, the use of space was intensified, segregating blacks by neighborhood and jurisdiction. Whites fled to the suburbs, while those left behind faced displacement through urban renewal and removal. These two migrations—blacks to and whites away from city centers—led to a dearth of opportunity on the one hand and opportunity-rich subsidized spatial enclaves on the other, respectively. These inequitable spatial arrangements, both in the South and the North, created further demands for inclusion and citizenship. As such, the civil rights movement was more about Dred Scott than about Plessy. It was about the claim of full membership and full opportunity associated with being a full partner in the imagined community. Despite the demise of Jim Crow, the movement came up short. Communities of color remain isolated from essential life opportunities in the impoverished city and inner-ring suburbs, while whites continue to sprawl into the opportunity-rich outer suburbs or return to the city to gentrify it. It is important to acknowledge the role the federal government has played and continues to play in distributing opportunities spatially. The departure of whites from the central city was no accident, nor was the isolation of people of color in central cities. As Kenneth Jackson and others have described, the government first opened up the suburbs to whites through the National Housing Act of 1934.37 This law created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, later called the Federal Housing Administration, which subsidized home mortgages for whites in the suburbs.

### AT – CRT K

#### The aff uses the law to advance a project commensurate with emancipation, your authors agree with our project

Roithmayr 99 (Daria, Asst Prof of Law @ U Illinois, Race Is…Race Isn’t, Pg. 5)

Critical race theory also provides the theoretical justification for taking seriously oppositional accounts of race-for example, counterstories that challenge the conventional take on integration as a universalizing move to equalize education for all races. Oppositional counterstories provide one way to make good on critical race theory's commitment to use law to transform and move social institutions toward racial empowerment and emancipation. For many outside the legal field, critical race theory has become synonymous with the idea of counter-story telling-challenging the stock story on merit or academic tracking or standardized testing by redescribing an experience or a social phenomenon from an outsider's: perspective. Mari Matsuda, one of the founding mothers of critical race theory, exhorts social decision-makers to "look to the bottom" to evaluate the impact of policy on the disenfranchised and disempowered.

#### De-Politicization of Law Fails-It creates a separation of law and politics, making oppression worse

Alfieri 98 (Anthony, Law Prof and Director @ U Miami Law, Spring, BOOK REVIEW: Black And WhiteCritical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge, La Raza Law Journal)

At bottom, the conflicts within CRT and the attacks upon it emanate from CRT's own growing antipathy toward the traditional civil rights discourse that animates liberal race reform. To Critical Race theorists, liberal faith in a court-driven, technocratic eradication of racial bias is misplaced. n33 Faith in the rationality of progressive law reform, they argue, rests on principles of neutrality, objectivity, and value-free reasoning. Obtaining a set of nonideological, regulative principles, however, requires a depoliticization of the legal process. Depoliticization, in turn, compels the separation of law and politics. When pushed outside the domain of liberal theory, CLS teaches, the conceptual separation of law and politics collapses in the raw, delegitimating competition for state power. n34 Because of this material inseparability, the depoliticization of law and the liberal state fails. In this way, the CRT politics of race represents a complex variant of the CLS politics of law: power-driven, instrumental, and value-laden.

#### CRT Deals With An Intersection Of Law And Race To Dismantle Racism- That Is The Aff

Pedrioli 2K5 (Carlo, Ph.D. candidate @ U Utah, BOOK REVIEW: UNDER A CRITICAL RACE THEORY LENS, African-American Law and Policy Report)

As noted above, this Book Review will employ Critical Race Theory to evaluate Patterson's critical narrative. Critical Race Theory is an appropriate intellectual tool for evaluating Patterson's conclusions because Critical Race Theory, like Patterson's book, deals with the intersection of law and race. 8 Specifically, Critical Race Theory addresses the law from the perspectives of racial outsiders, especially black individuals, 9 and considers how the law constructs race. 10 Critical Race Theory seeks to remind society "how deeply issues of racial ideology and power continue to matter in American life." 11

# Transportation Racism Negative

## Case Neg Cards

### Inherency – Funding Solved Now

#### Funding issues solved now—stimulus boosted public transit funding

Jacobson, 2009

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

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

### AT – Transportation Racism – Not Intentional

#### They have to prove it’s not a natural process and the lack of justice is intentional

**Burton 2k** [Elizabeth, Professor of Architecture and Director of the Wellbeing In Sustainable Environments (WISE) research unit at Oxford Brookes University, “The Compact City: Just or Just Compact? A Preliminary Analysis,” *Urban Studies, Vol. 37, No. 11, 2000,*spencer]

Ideas of justice can only be applied to the compact city if it is accepted that the phenomenon is open to the influence of human agency—that is, that it is not a purely ‘natural’ phenomenon. This is accepted on the basis that the compact city is a concept actively promoted in practice through policy, particularly land-use planning policy (for example, Eisenschitz, 1997). Cities can become more compact through development, via the mechanisms of the market and through the influence of interventions such as planning policy. Where land uses themselves are concerned (except in agriculture and forestry and major transport and energy projects), the current UK planning system has direct controls over certain kinds of change in the environment— through strategic and local plans and development control. Planning authorities have external effects on the environment by giving or refusing permissions to land uses which themselves have environmental impacts (Jacobs, 1993). Distributional justice may be viewed in terms of both the fairness of the outcome of distribution (the endresult) and the fairness of the actions and procedures that bring this about. The latter will not be dealt with within this research. Instead, the focus will be limited to an investigation of the fairness of the intended endresult of the compact city proposition.

### AT – Transportation Racism – Alt Causes

#### Alt causes to lack of equity—regressive sales taxes are one example

**Taylor 10** [Brian Taylor, PhD, Professor and Chair of Urban Planning Director, UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies, Rebecca Kalauskas, MA, Research Assistant UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies Hiroyuki Iseki, Assistant Professor of Planning and Urban Studies School of Urban Planning and Regional Studies University of New Orleans, “Addressing Equity Challenges to Implementing Road Pricing,” March 2010, <http://www.its.berkeley.edu/publications/UCB/2010/PRR/UCB-ITS-PRR-2010-6.pdf>, spencer]

Many transportation economists and policy analysts characterize along two dimensions. The first dimension is horizontal equity, which considers how similarly situated people (the elderly, bus riders, and so on) fare relative to one another. Horizontal equity is achieved, for example, when all members of the same income class pay equal taxes. The second dimension is vertical equity, which considers how differently situated people (poor vs. wealthy, drivers vs. non-drivers, etc.) fare relative to one another. Vertical equity is achieved, for example, when taxes are levied on households proportional to the ability to pay. Increasingly, the concepts of longitudinal or intergenerational equity have been incorporated into the equity analyses of transportation policies, particularly in regards to road pricing (Levinson 2001; Szeto and Lo 2005; Viegas 2001). While horizontal and vertical equity are central concepts in taxation and finance, questions of transportation equity run much deeper and are summarized in Table 1. How can we make sense of such a disparate set of competing theories, and how can they be applied, separately or in concert, to practical questions of road pricing? Arguments over transportation pricing and finance frequently directly or indirectly incorporate parts of the theories described in Table 1, but often in an internally contradictory, even illogical fashion. Voters, and the people they elect, frequently judge policies that distribute scarce resources based on instinct or feeling formed by limited or incomplete introductions to the many ideas of distributive justice. Indeed, public opinion research has consistently found that most people’s conception of justice is highly variable and complex; studies of both stated preferences and actual behavior show that people switch among characterizations of justice according to the situation (Frey, 2003;Tetlock, 2002; Rozin et al., 1999; Gladwell, 2002). Members of the public, and the officials whom they elect, will frequently argue that roadway tolls would be unfair because they disproportionately affect the poor, and yet those same officials campaign for and voters approve highly income-regressive sales and other non-transportation-use-based tax increases earmarked for transportation without raising similar equity concerns. This may be because tolls represent a significant change from the status quo, are highly visible, and at times can be quite high. In contrast, sales taxes, in contrast, are not so visible, as they are levied in small amounts over very large numbers of transactions. Or it may be simply that sales taxes are common, familiar, and therefore escape scrutiny, while things like congestion charges are less familiar, inviting skepticism (Derrick & Scott, 1998). But in either case such distinctions are not based on consistently applied principals of equity.

### AT – Transportation Racism – Inevitable

#### Racism inevitable—everyone is a racist

Wilder and Memmi, 1996

[Gary and Albert, WEB Dubois institute, racial theorists, “Irreconcilable differences.” Transition, 71, 1996, pp. 158-177, Accessed online vis JSTOR] /Wyo-MB

Memmi's structural analyses always at- tend to the subjective conditions of op- pression, as well as the objective: the guilt of the racist, the bad faith of the colo- nial leftist, the self-hatred of the op- pressed. (Two generations ago Memmi was theorizing colonial ambivalence in ways that have only recently been taken up in the academy.) But Memmi rejects any attempt to psychologize racism as a matter of individual prejudice. Insisting that "racial prejudice is a social fact," he calls on us "to abandon once and for all that sociology ofgood intentions, or psycho- pathology, which looks upon racism as a monstrous or incomprehensible aberra- tion ... or a sort of madness on the part of certain individuals." He excoriates the easy "indignation of sentimental anti- racism, which achieves as little as it costs." When Memmi writes that "everyone, or nearly everyone is an unconscious racist, or a semi-conscious one, or even a con- scious one," he is suggesting that racism precedes individuals, organizes their re- ality, structures their social relations.

### AT – Transportation Racism – Exclusion Inevitable

#### Attempting to banish exclusion is the root of all violence

Hatab, 02

(Lawrence J. Professor of Philosophy at Old Dominion University 2002 Prospects for a Democratic Agon Why We can still be Nietzscheans: The Journal of Nietzsche p.MUSE)

How can we begin to apply the notion of agonistics to politics in general and democracy in particular? First of all, contestation and competition can be seen as fundamental to self-development and as an intrinsically social phenomenon. Agonistics helps us articulate the social and political ramifications of Nietzsche's concept of will to power. As Nietzsche put it in an 1887 note, "will to power can manifest itself only against resistances; it seeks that which resists it" (*KSA* 12, p.424). Power, therefore, is not simply an individual possession or a goal of action; it is more a global, interactive conception. For Nietzsche, every advance in life is an overcoming of some obstacle or counterforce, so that conflict is a mutual co-constitution of contending forces. Opposition generates development. The human self is not formed in some internal sphere and then secondarily exposed to external relations and conflicts. The self is constituted in and through what it opposes and what opposes it; in other words, the self is formed through agonistic relations. Therefore, any annulment of one's Other would be an annulment of one's self in this sense. Competition can be understood as a shared activity for the sake of fostering high achievement and self-development, and therefore as an intrinsically social activity. 10 In the light of Nietzsche's appropriation of the two forms of Eris, it is necessary to distinguish between agonistic conflict and sheer violence. A radical agonistics rules out violence, because violence is actually an impulse to eliminate conflict by annihilating or incapacitating an opponent, bringing the agon to an end. 11 In a later work Nietzsche discusses the "spiritualization of hostility (*Feindschaft*)," wherein one must affirm both the presence and the power of one's opponents as implicated in one's own posture (*TI* "Morality as Antinature," 3). And in this passage Nietzsche specifically applies such a notion to the political realm. What this implies is that the category of the social need not be confined to something like peace or harmony. Agonistic relations, therefore, do not connote a deterioration of a social disposition and can thus be extended to political relations. How can democracy in general terms be understood as an agonistic activity? Allow me to quote from my previous work. Political judgments are not preordained or dictated; outcomes depend upon a contest of speeches where one view wins and other views lose in a tabulation of votes; since the results are binding and backed by the coercive power of the government, democratic elections and procedures establish temporary control and subordination—which, however, can always be altered or reversed because of the succession of periodic political contests. . . . Democratic elections allow for, and depend upon, peaceful exchanges and transitions of power. . . . [L]anguage is the weapon in democratic contests. The binding results, however, produce tangible effects of gain and loss that make political exchanges more than just talk or a game. . . . The urgency of such political contests is that losers must yield to, and live under, the policies of the winner; we notice, therefore, specific configurations of power, of domination and submission in democratic politics.

### AT – Transportation Racism – In Group/Out Group Inevitable

#### Group identification is inevitable – anthropology and evolutionary biology

R. Paul Shaw, U. British Columbia, and Yuwa Wong, U., International Studies Quarterly, March 1987, “Ethnic Mobilization and the Seeds of Warfare: An Evolutionary Perspective”, 31:1, 11-12 JSTOR.

No study of human evolution would be complete without tracking the impact of kinship on the conduct of human affairs. Anthropologists, for example, have shown that kinship dictates organizational structure of extended families to the extent that it prescribes who marries whom (incest avoidance), who cares for whom, who is entitled to inherit from whom, and who governs (males in patrilineal societies). Yet, most social scientists treat kinship and ethnicity as mere access; group members "happen" to be those who interact enough to transmit culture to one another (or who are similar or different in beliefs and practice, and hence are variably disposed to conflict). As Daly (1982) puts it, this is an extremely impoverished view of kinship. It ignores the evolutionary model of man which prescribes that the fundamental commonality of interest among kin is to maximize inclusive fitness. Inclusive fitness equals an individual's Darwinian fitness (egoistic) augmented by an allowance for the effect that the individual can have on the reproductive success of those who share identical genes by common descent. Inclusive fitness differs from traditional notions of "survival of the fittest" in two respects (Masters, 1983). First, natural selection favors the ability of individuals to transmit their genes to posterity (rather than their "fitness" in terms of health, power, beauty, or other physical traits). Second, an organism's inclusive fitness can be furthered by assisting others who are genetically related (nepotism). In other terms, the evolutionary model of man predicts that sexual organisms, such as humans, have evolved not only to be egoistic but to be fundamentally nepotistically altruistic (Flinn and Alexander, 1982). In doing so, it provides an ultimate raison d'etre for membership in ethnic groups. Let us now track emergent proximate causes which probably reinforced inclusive fitness benefits to group membership and promoted in-group amity/out-group enmity in the process. To avoid confusion, we employ the term "nucleus ethnicity" to refer to immediate relatives who share a high degree of genetic relatedness (grandfathers, sons, cousins, etc.). A nucleus group thus comprises one's offspring, one's siblings' offspring, one's parents and their siblings, and one's parents' offspring. It would number a few hundred individuals at most. A characteristic of nucleus ethnic groups is that they serve as organizational vehicles in which individuals can monitor, and if necessary protect, the fitness of related members which, subsequently, bears on their own inclusive fitness. The more cohesive the group, the more each member is in a position to effectively assess his/her inclusive fitness. In this respect, we posit that inclusive fitness would have predisposed genetically related individuals to band together in groups beyond, say, the extended family. A predisposition to participate in groups is only one side of the equation however. The other side concerns environmental stimuli needed to reinforce the utility of group membership over evolutionary time. What might these environmental forces have been? In early hominid evolution, it is likely that membership in an expanded group would have increased each individual's access to scarce resources and ability to manage others. Hunting in numbers, for example, would have enabled primitive man to overcome large game. Numbers would also have reduced susceptibility of individuals to attack by predators. To facilitate hunting and to prevent attack, groups would almost certainly have served as information centers concerning the nature and location of resources, as well as predators. The more these features of group membership enhanced inclusive fitness (the rate of reproduction, quality of offspring, survival), the more group members would have been deterred from splintering off. And bear in mind that early humans spent a very long time during which their social behavior was structured largely by both defense against large predators and competition with them. Turning to more recent periods of human evolution, Alexander (1971, 1979) proposes that the main function of kin-related groups—and thus their significance for their individual members—shifted from protection against predatory effects of nonhumans to protection against other human groups. 2 He hypothesizes that the necessary and sufficient forces to explain the maintenance of every kind and size of human group above the immediate family, extant today and throughout all but the earliest portions of human history were (i) war, or intergroup competition and aggression, and (ii) the maintenance of balances of power between such groups. This has been called the "balance of power hypothesis." Alexander's hypothesis divides early human history into three broad periods of sociality (1979: 223): (1) small, polygynous, probably multimale bands that stayed together for protection against large predators; (2) small, polygynous, multimale bands that stayed together both for protection against large predators (probably through aggressive defense), and in order to bring down large game; and (3) increasingly large polygynous, multimale bands that stayed together largely or entirely because of the threat of other, similar, nearby groups of humans. He submits that there is not an iota of evidence to support the idea that aggression and competition have not been central to human evolution. The point we wish to stress is that in the past one million years or so an increasing proportion of man's "hostile environment" has been other nucleus ethnic groups engaged in resource competition. While the unit of selection remains that of the gene and their individual carriers, intergroup conflict has rendered groups of ever-expanding size and internal structure effective forces of selection. According to this idea, expansion of nucleus ethnic groups through intermarriage, or their expansion via amalgamation with other nucleus ethnic groups, was motivated by the fact that other groups were doing so. Failure to maintain a balance of power (initially in terms of numbers only), would inevitably mean the domination of one group by a larger group and, consequently, unequal access to fitness enhancing resources. From this perspective, large scale agriculture and an increasingly elaborate division of labor follow as concomitant developments. The underlying momentum of such developments is "group selection" (to maintain the balance of power) which, in turn, is a consequence of "genetic selection." Baer and McEachron (1982) extend Alexander's hypothesis by proposing that the evolution of weapons had the effect of making unrelated individuals far more dangerous to one another, and that this, irr turn, reduced intergroup transfer of individuals, and made nucleus ethnic groups much more closed. Weapons would have altered the costs and benefits of aggressive behavior as they could be developed faster than physiological protection against them would evolve. They could also be thrown, thereby removing the need for the attacker to be in close proximity to the attacked. Thus weapons would have lowered the cost of attacking while increasing the costs of being attacked. In doing so, they probably increased xenophobia, fear, and antagonism toward strangers. This would work to reduce intergroup transfer of individuals—where fighting was necessary initiation—because (i) the costs of injury would be so much higher, and (ii) one group might have better, or unknown, weapons than others. Out-group enmity would be strongly reinforced in the process. The thrust of Baer and McEachron's hypothesis is that one of the first evolutionary steps taken as weapons developed was to severely restrict individuals from changing groups. From the residents' point of view, the admission of an extra-group conspecific would lead to now dangerous rank-order confrontations. The closing of groups would have resulted in two beneficial effects from the standpoint of inclusive fitness. First, because of the increased tendency of males to remain in their natal group, the genetic relatedness among the adult males, and in the group as a whole, would increase. This would have increased solidarity among group members and thus cohesion of the group per se. It would also work to reduce within group aggression, and thus genetic loss through injury or death from fighting. Second, the new high costs of overt aggression would act to change the character of the dominance system. Insofar as dominant individuals could not afford to be injured in rank-order fighting, there would be an increased selection for social skills in attaining and maintaining status, and decreased emphasis on overt aggression. These would combine to produce a more effective internal ordering of power relations to the extent that groups could be more quickly mobilized to meet the challenges from outsiders. In the process, intergroup conflict would select for greatly increased human capacity to recognize enemies versus relatives and friends (Alexander, 1971).

### AT – Structural Violence – No Escalation

#### Structural violence doesn’t escalate

Robert Hinde and Lea Pulkkinnen, Cambridge psychology professor and University of Jyväskylä psychology professor, 2000, DRAFT Background Paper for Working Group 1: HUMAN AGGRESSIVENESS AND WAR, 50th Pugwash Conference On Science and World Affairs: "Eliminating the Causes of War" Queens' College, Cambridge, http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG1draft1.htm

People are capable of perpetrating the most terrible acts of violence on their fellows. From before recorded history humans have killed humans, and violence is potentially present in every society. There is no escaping the fact that the capacity to develop a propensity for violence is part of human nature. But that does not mean that aggression is inevitable: temporary anger need not give rise to persistent hostility, and hostility need not give rise to acts of aggression. And people also have the capacity to care for the needs of others, and are capable of acts of great altruism and self-sacrifice. A subsidiary aim of this workshop is to identify the factors that make aggressive tendencies predominate over the cooperative and compassionate ones. Some degree of conflict of interest is often present in relationships between individuals, in the relations between groups of individuals within states, and in the relations between states: we are concerned with the factors that make such conflicts escalate into violence. The answer to that question depends critically on the context. While there may be some factors in common, the bases of individual aggressiveness are very different from those involved in mob violence, and they differ yet again from the factors influencing the bomb-aimer pressing the button in a large scale international war. In considering whether acts which harm others are a consequence of the aggressive motivation of individuals, it is essential to recognise the diversity of such acts, which include interactions between individuals, violence between groups, and wars of the WW2 type. We shall see that, with increasing social complexity, individual aggressiveness becomes progressively less important, but other aspects of human nature come to contribute to group phenomena. Although research on human violence has focussed too often on the importance of one factor or another, it is essential to remember that violence always has multiple causes, and the interactions between the causal factors remain largely unexplored.

### Turn – Reinforces Racism

#### Trying to solve civil rights reinforces current racism—empirics

**Jones 2** [Bernie D., PhD Candidate, History, University of Virginia, “Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium?” HARVARD BLACKLETTER LAW JOURNAL v. 18, Spring 2002, p. 24-25., spencer]

The quandary faced by civil rights activists lay in the fact that the formal barriers to African American progress--the de jure discrimination they suffered for generations--had been removed. Because the official [\*25] barriers had been torn away, it seemed as though the problems of entry had been long resolved; however, the effects of those ancient barriers remained significant. What appeared to be "an unambiguous commitment to antidiscrimination" 91 was in reality, a murky morass of competing interests, where the "conflicting interests actually reinforce existing social arrangements, moderated to the extent necessary to balance the civil rights challenge with the many interests still privileged over it."92 But since the formal barriers were gone, many thought enough had been done and did not see the need to do anything further. Among this group were those formalists who thought affirmative action was preferential treatment.

#### Social policies to solve racism fuel white supremacist groups through the use of racial politics

Morrison 94 [John, Prof @ University of Iowa, “Colorblindness, Individuality, And Merit: An Analysis Of The Rhetoric Against Affirmative Action”, 1994 <http://academic.udayton.edu/RACE/04NEEDS/affirm04.htm>, spencer]

A pervasive argument againstaffirmative actionis that itactually creates or exacerbates racial problems. A common version of this argument is the concern about racial politics. For example, consider Richmond v. J.A. Crosen Co. In that case Richmond, Virginia, with five of the nine city council seats held by African-Americans, enacted an affirmative action plan for city construction contacts. Justice Scalia charged that this "set-aside clearly and directly benefi[tted] the dominant political group, which happens also to be the dominant racial group." Another version of the same point is the claim that affirmative action programs injure "innocent whites," thereby encouraging the growth of white-supremacy groups.One final version argues thataffirmative action is susceptible to exploitation because these programs proportedly benefit only middle-class African- Americans who do not need the help as much as those in lower socio-economic classes.

### Solvency – Cant Solve Equity

#### Can’t solve social equity—empirics

**Burton 2k** [Elizabeth, Professor of Architecture and Director of the Wellbeing In Sustainable Environments (WISE) research unit at Oxford Brookes University, “The Compact City: Just or Just Compact? A Preliminary Analysis,” *Urban Studies, Vol. 37, No. 11, 2000,*spencer]

Social equity is often ascribed to the compact city with little or no verification. Empirical research has concentrated almost exclusively on the environmental impacts such as energy, transport emissions, loss of open land, natural habitats and resource depletion (Owens, 1986; Newman and Kenworthy, 1989b; ECOTEC, 1993), and this research in itself has proved to be highly contentious (see, for example, Breheny, 1992). The limited research which addresses social issues has tended to focus on overall social or quality of life issues rather than on the effects of urban compactness on the disadvantaged in particular, or on its differential effects across different social groups (Mowbray, 1991). Social impact analysis, cost– benefit analyses and balance sheet approaches generally aggregate costs and benefits rather than address the diversity of experience (Breheny, 1984; Morris *et al*., 1989). Although the equity effects of urban regeneration and innercity policies have been investigated, such policy evaluation has not included compact city policy evaluation. In summary, no empirical research has been undertaken to support the claims that high-density, mixed-use cities have a positive effect on the social equity element of sustainable development (Kenworthy, 1992). Furthermore, not only is there an absence of evidence to support the claim that compact cities promote social equity, there are also suggestions that such cities may in fact discourage equity (see, for example, Smyth, 1996). Therefore, the objective of the research reported here is to examine the validity of claims that the higher-density city promotes social equity.

## Impact Calc

### 1NC – AT – Impact Calculus

#### It is racist not to consider consequences – the only moral stance is to consider link turns and long-term effects.

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

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

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

Schell 1982

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

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

### 2NC – Impact Calc Extensions

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority – we should take action to prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

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

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

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

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

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

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

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

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

#### You’re responsible for the plan’s consequences – if we win our impact, moral rules should be suspended

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

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

#### Wars employ institutional racism to fuel foreign exploits

Cynthia Peters, No Date, Life After Capitalism Essays. U.S. Anti War Activism

This is a new element of war -- one that the anti-war movement needs to be more conscious of. And that is that the war isn't limited to the bombings, nor even the economic sanctions and the free trade agreements (which also kill and destroy), but it continues on with the waves of immigrants who come to our country out of desperation only to do our dirty work and expose themselves to yet new ways of being exploited by the empire beast of the north. Now they're in the belly of the beast, facing racist and sexist institutions that humiliate them and use them as pawns in our own domestic race and class wars. In Massachusetts, now, as well as many other communities in the United States, failing schools are being blamed on brown Spanish-speaking people from Latin America. It's easy for the government and the privileged to use Latin American immigrants as scapegoats because our society and our popular culture supports the idea that you can blame what is wrong on minority communities rather than on the powerful institutions that actually orchestrate what happens. Domestic racism makes it possible for states to get rid of bilingual education, and allow urban schools to deteriorate to the point where even the army finds they cannot recruit from communities of color because the kids in those communities have not been taught how to read and write. For those people of color who can't escape the ghetto via the military, there's always incarceration, where no education is required. Where you simply rot inside one of the main growth industries in the United States -- prisons -- the destination for a hugely disproportionate number of those people of color. We live in a world where the lucky immigrants in El Norte are the ones who are taking out the trash for those that sent down the helicopters and machine guns and financial planners tasked with systematically dismantling their homes, their native economies, their way of life. So you see, the U.S. anti-war movement has to have fighting domestic racism on its agenda as well. Racism at home not only destroys lives inside our borders, it props up a foreign policy that needs to be able to kill brown people with impunity. Part of the reason -- let's be frank -- that there isn't more grassroots pressure against the is war is because N. Americans are so thoroughly steeped in racism that we are trained to believe that brown people's lives are not worth as much. Even if, for some reason, U.S. institutions did not need racism to help protect power and privilege for the few, we would still need racism because it is integral to rationalizing our foreign policy. The same is true of sexism. As I was leaving Boston a few days ago, there was an article in the paper about the ongoing defunding of the UN Family Planning Agency and Bush's imposing of the Global Gag Rule on health clinics that receive U.S. funding. That means they're not allowed to talk about abortion as an option for pregnant women. Does Bush really care whether women in other countries have access to abortion? No. What he cares about is having mechanisms in place that allow for the control of populations. He cares about undermining democracy and building alliances with oppressive fundamentalist regimes that have their own reasons for limiting women's reproductive choices. To enhance social control, Bush has to daily construct and support patriarchal and social and cultural practices at home. Why? Partly because men don't want political participation of women domestically, and partly because they have to create the rationalizations for the alliances they are building with elites from other countries. By the way, I just want to texture what I am saying here by adding that the women served by these agencies are poor women. It's poor women who won't get the abortions. George Bush doesn't want his own daughters to have to resort to back-alley abortions. And they won't have to because they have money and they would be able to find other means. Racism and sexism and U.S. global wars came together rather poignantly recently. For months, in the States, the corporate media has been eagerly following the fate of Guatemalan Siamese twins who were born joined at the head. They were brought to the UCLA Mattel hospital for months of surgeries and treatments, and Mattel picked up the bill. For those of you who don't know, Mattel is the toy company that makes dolls for little girls. There are dolls that actually drool and pee, and give little girls early lessons in the joys of cleaning up baby's body fluids. There are Barbie dolls with impossibly huge and gravity-defying breasts that give girls early lessons in how inherently flawed they are. So while 200,000 peasants died in the 1980s in Guatemala at the hands a of U.S.-armed and trained military, many of these peasants brutally tortured and killed, and all of it very easily avoidable with a few minimum policy changes in the United States, you won't hear too much talk about that in my country. We don't know the first thing about Guatemalan peasants except that there are two lucky beneficiaries of the charitable Mattel.

#### War increases racism

Federal News Service, May 3, 1991, LN

As Talat has indicated, during the Second World War, when I was 10 years old, I was interned in a prison camp by the United States government for only one reason: my heritage. By accident of birth, I am an American of Japanese ancestry. But when the Japanese empire attacked Pearl Harbor, they attacked every American, including Americans of Japanese ancestry. But in times of war facts are too often waived in favor of hysteria and racism. That was a fact during World War II. It's a lesson of history that I believe our nation has learned. But it is a lesson that must be remembered and practiced to have true meaning. That's why I spoke out when the FBI began interviewing Americans of Arab ancestry during the Middle East crisis. Loyal Americans of Arab ancestry targeted solely on the basis of their ethnic heritage were being asked about their political views. They were being asked, "Are you a loyal American?" They were being asked for the names of, quote, "disloyal," unquote, Americans of Arab ancestry. In all, it was a specter of a new McCarthyism that was too obvious and dangerous to be ignored. If the FBI or any other government agency chooses to tear indiscriminately at the thread or at any thread of our tapestry, then every American must be concerned.

#### War causes racism

Christian Science Monitor (Boston, MA), March 18, 1991, LN

Unfortunately, in times of war it is common to demonize one's enemies and to slide into the kind of racism of which our treatment of Japanese Americans in World War II is one of the most shameful examples. It is no small irony that one of my Saudi graduate students receives hate calls because of his Arab family name, even though Saudi Arabs have risked their lives as our allies.

### War Turns Oppression

#### Nuclear war increases political oppression and turns the K

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

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

#### Nuclear war causes government crackdown—turns the alt

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

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

#### Nuclear war causes exploitation of marginalized groups

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

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

### War Turns Culture

#### Wars are really bad for culture

Protect Cultural Property In The Event Of Armed Conflict, Information Kit, 2005, http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file\_download.php/eb9001344657daef4b81e6339ac6fe8binfkiteb.pdf

Wars, confrontations and conflicts in general, between two or more opposed factions, have always represented a serious threat to the integrity of the cultural heritage located on their territories.Unfortunately, this threat most often materializes in the form of the destruction of significant amounts of cultural property (movable and immovable): monuments, religious sites, museums, libraries, archives, etc., thus depriving humanity of a shared and irreplaceable cultural heritage. Although the practice has existed since ancient times, the destruction of cultural property has proved even more devastating since the introduction of aerial bombing and long-distance weapons. World War I resulted in the destruction of a large amount of cultural property in Rheims, Leuven and Arras, among many other examples, but World War II was even more traumatic, due to the regular nature of bombings, export of cultural property from occupied territories and, naturally, the geographical scope and duration of the conflict. There still remains a considerable number of disputes concerning cultural objects displaced during World War II, despite several multilateral and bilateral agreements, ad hoc negotiations between the former belligerents, and restitution proceedings before the national courts, either completed or ongoing. Traditionally, the pillaging of cultural property proclaimed “spoils of war” has been deliberately carried out by the victor. Separate from this practice of “inter-state” plunder, there is “individual” pillaging made easy by the consequences of armed conflicts, especially if long-lasting and/or accompanied by a military occupation. These consequences include social and economic instability, poverty, weakening or even disappearance of the administrative authorities in charge of ••••➤ Protect cultural property in the event of armed conflict Protéger les biens culturels en cas de conflit armé Proteger los bienes culturales en caso de conflicto armado u maintaining public order, etc. (unless temporarily replaced by the occupying authorities). A new threat to cultural property emerged after World War II, as noninternational and/or ethnic conflicts increased. Not only do these conflicts fall outside the scope of rules applicable to traditional “inter-state” conflicts, but their goal is often clearly to destroy the adversary’s or the opposing “ethnic group’s” cultural heritage. In addition, this destruction is facilitated by the geographical proximity and mutual knowledge of the cultural sites and property, as well as culture of the adversary. This is exemplified by the destruction during the war in the former Yugoslavia, where cultural property that was not a military target was deliberately attacked by the opposing ethnic group, seeking to destroy the traces or symbols of the ethnic “enemy’s” culture. Particularly significant examples include the bombing of the old town of Dubrovnik in Croatia and the destruction of the Mostar Bridge in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These new challenges clearly show the need to improve protection of cultural property, particularly in the case of internal conflicts with an ethnic dimension. However, even this type of conflict should not be beyond the reach of the requirements for protection summarized in the eternal message – so often ignored in the reality of conflict – of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict: “… damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all [hu]mankind, since each people makes its contribution to the culture of the world.”

#### Wars empirically target and exploit cultural icons

James Nafziger is the Thomas B. Stoel Professor of Law and Director of International Programs, Willamette University College of Law PROTECTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN TIME OF WAR AND ITS AFTERMATH International Foundation for Art Research, No Date

In April 2003, as the dust appeared to be settling on the Battle of Baghdad in the cradle of civilization, the world witnessed the horror of what appeared to be extensive looting of museums, libraries and other institutions in Iraq. At first, the decimation of the world's finest collection of ancient Mesopotamian artifacts and a wealth of later material appeared to be of an unprecedented scale. Fortunately, the extent of the looting turned out to be considerably less than originally thought. Much of the lost material had been safely hidden away before the fighting began, and some looted items were soon recovered. Even so, the occurrence of substantial plunder in the face of inadequate military safeguards and apparently organized plunder urges anyone concerned about protecting cultural heritage to review the applicable regime in time of war and in its aftermath.1 The looting sparked controversy about the adequacy of international law to protect cultural property during and after military conflict, the extent of United States obligations, and compliance by the United States with those obligations. The media highlighted such technical legal issues as the extent to which United States obligations were limited by its status as a non-party to several pertinent treaties, particularly the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict,2 which has been ratified by over 100 states. These issues are properly considered in light of recent developments. The Cold War's end introduced halcyon prospects of a new world order. Once again, as happened every twenty years or so in the last century, the global community foresaw a world ruled by right rather than might.3 International law and institutions would protect persons and property around the world. This latest bubble of optimism soon burst in the heat of renewed warfare, ethnic cleansing, and collective terrorism. Iraq invaded Kuwait, removing some 20,000 artifacts and objets d'art, and, in the ensuing Gulf War, used cultural property to shield military objectives from attack. For many readers of this Journal, the destruction of Dubrovnik and the Mostar Bridge during the bloody implosion of Yugoslavia heightened skepticism about the capacity of the new world order to protect the cultural heritage.

#### Wars destroy cultures

Manfred Lachs, ‘The defences of culture’ Museum No 147 (Vol XXXVII, n° 3, 1985) From Antiquity to Kinetic Art, p. 167

While man’s yearning for peace has been his innermost desire from time immemorial, his march through history has, as we all know, been accompanied by frequent armed struggle. Looking back over a period ofrhirty-five centuries, less than three hundred years have been free from wars. The search for wealth, plunder and domination, but also the goal of freedom and independence, have motivated man’s resort to armed force. Little need be said of the destructive effect of wars on all continents or of the misery and death brought in their wake. They have become part of our lives, unfortunately, and are viewed as inescapable. Armies have become important parts of societies war itself is considered an art and is so described by historians. Obviously it has been the arch-enemy of culture and civilization, particularly when ravaging whole countries, destroying men and what human labour and spirit has tried to build for centuries.

#### War would destroy our cultural achievements – rebuilding would be impossible

Justice C. G. Weeramantry judge with the International Court of Justice (1991-2000).

International Law Summer, 2000

Likewise, the cultural treasures of the world would be destroyed. All that we have built up for thousands of years as a memento of human achievement in the past, all that will go overboard in one moment. What happens after the war, of course, we reduced whoever is unfortunate enough to survive would live in a stone age, and as Henry Kissinger once said, those who are sifting among the debris of the space age would not be thinking of how to rebuild the economy and how to rebuild the auto industry, but they would be trying to think how they may find nonradioactive berries on the trees around them or edible timber bark which they can eat. That will be the level to which the survivors will be reduced.

### War Turns Movements

#### Your movement will fail in a world dominated by our war impact

Editor David Gabbard, 2006, Knowledge and Power in the Global Economy: Politics and the Rhetoric of School Reform . Art Education John Jota Leaños – Arizona State University Anthony J. Villarreal – University of California, Santa Cruz

The silencing of dissent in the U.S. during times of war has an unfortunately long history. From the Sedition Act of 1798, Lincoln's suspending of Habeas Corpus, the internment of the Japanese during WWII, McCarthyism of the Cold War, and the active political harassment of the late 1960s CointelPro operations, to today’s War on Terror, “extraordinary rendition”, and the renewal of the Patriot Act, the U.S. government has with relative ease foregone democratic process in order to shield the multitudes from unpopular views, “security threats”, and/or ideas that problematize the terms of U.S. hegemony. Ideological censorship and surveillance have become an everyday practice in the United States, manifest not only in the heart of corporate media, but also in the lives of average citizens, in the work place, our neighborhoods, and increasingly, in our schools. Take the example of the Currituck County, North Carolina student, who was visited at school by the FBI after workers at the local Wal-Mart reported his homework assignment, a photograph of President Bush with a thumbtack stuck in his forehead. In another instance, the FBI questioned and confiscated the work of a student at Prosser High School, Washington, because of the art’s anti-war message. On still another occasion, the FBI investigated a student at Calvine High School in Sacramento, for writing the initials “PLO” in his notebook. These authoritarian reactions, coupled with the surveillance, harassment, and indictments of politically engaged professors and educators, have become all-too-common in the midst of the so-called “infinite war on terrorism”. Discourse that challenges “national interests” is considered blasphemous during times of war.

## Misc

### CP – Minority Cars

#### Minority cars counterplan

Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma, 2003

[Thomas, Rich and Jacinta, The Civil Rights Project at Harvard & Center for Community Change, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities.” Online, <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf>] /WFI-MB

Some argue that transportation policies and people’s preferences are so strongly in favor of traveling by automobiles that mobility benefits from public transportation are considered negligible.109 Some also argue that public transit is not a viable alternative to the personal automobile due to the geographic imbalance between housing and job locations.110 The fact that small investments are made in transit (relative to roads and highways) while metropolitan areas continue to sprawl leads to further auto-dependency that imposes a disproportionate burden on low-income persons.111 Many low-income and minority households lack access to an automobile and thus depend on public transit, which limits the location and types of employment that are available to them.112 Recent research suggests that increased automobile ownership rates may have beneficial impacts on low-income workers and their families.113 Autos not only improve job search activities, but also job retention, especially in cases where (or when) public transit service is unavailable.114 In addition, autos provide flexibility beyond work-related trips, so that individuals can meet other daily needs related to child care, education, shopping, health care, etc. The role of cars should be a consideration in transportation mobility strategies for low-income and minority people. The challenge, however, is to devise public policy that effectively increases auto access in cases in which other modes are infeasible.

### Transportation Infrastructure K

**Public Transit is a product of racist planning efforts; the affirmative is inevitably coopted by the institutional racism that forms the background for their policy**

**Bullard 04** [Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “The Anatomy of Transportation Racism”, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

**Some contend that "racism is an integral, permanent, and indestructible component of this society" Permanent or not, racism continues to be a central factor in explaining the social inequality, political exploitation, social isolation, and the poor health of people of color in the United States. Furthermore, contemporary race relations in America can no longer be viewed in the black-white paradigm.** Racism makes the daily life experiences of most African Americans, Latino Americans, Native Americans, and Asian and Pacific Islander Americans very different from that of most white Americans. **Modern racism must be understood as an everyday lived experience."** Not having **reliable public transportation can mean the difference between gainful employment and a life of poverty** in the ghettos and barrios. Since most do not have cars, **transportation is** even more **crucial for the vulnerable population that is moving from welfare to work. Training, skills, and jobs are meaningless if millions of Americans can't get to work.** Of course, it would be ideal if job centers were closer to the homes of inner-city residents, but few urban core neighborhoods have experienced an economic revitalization that can rival the current jobs found in the suburbs. **Transportation remains a major stumbling block for many to achieve self-sufficiency. It boils down to "no transportation, no job," and, more often than not, public transportation does not connect urban residents to jobs. Transportation policies did not emerge in a race- and class-neutral society. Transportation-planning outcomes often reflected the biases of their originators with the losers comprised largely of the poor, powerless, and people of color. Transportation is about more than just land use. Beyond mapping out the paths of freeways and highways, transportation policies determine the allocation of funds and benefits, the enforcement of environmental regulations, and the siting of facilities.** Transportation planning affects residential and commercial patterns, and infrastructure development. 25 **White racism shapes transportation and transportation-related decisions, which have consequently created a national transportation infrastructure that denies many black Americans and other people of color the benefits, freedoms, opportunities, and rewards offered to white Americans. In the end, racist transportation policies can determine where people of color live, work, and play."** **Transportation planning has duplicated the discrimination used by other racist government institutions and private entities to maintain white privilege.** The transportation options that are available to most Americans today were shaped largely by federal policies as well as individual and institutional discrimination. Transportation options are further restricted by both the geographic changes that have taken place in the nation's metropolitan regions and historical job discrimination dictating limited incomes." **Transportation decision- making is political. Building roads in the job-rich suburbs while at the same time blocking transit from entering these same suburbs are political decisions buttressed by race and class dynamics. In cities and metropolitan regions all across the country, inadequate or nonexistent suburban transit serves as invisible "Keep Out" signs directed against people of color and the poor.**

### Transportation Racism K – Ext.

**Racism still exists in the US and is very prevalent.**

**Bullard 04**

[Robert, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “The Anatomy of Transportation Racism”, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity, January 1, 2004 //wyo-MU]

**Although the US has made tremendous strides in civil rights, race still matters in America.**" In his classic book Invisible Man, Ralph Ellison illustrated that **white racism not only harms individuals, but it also renders black people and their communities invisible." By one definition, white racism is the "socially organized set of attitudes, ideas, and practices that deny African Americans and other people of color the dignity, opportunities, freedoms, and rewards that this nation offers white Americans'?" Racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for whites while shifting costs to people of color. Many racist acts and practices are institutionalized informally-and in some cases become standard public policy.** For decades, it was legal and common practice for transit agencies to operate separate and unequal systems for whites and blacks and for city, county, and state government officials to use tax dollars to provide transportation amenities for white communities while denying the same services to black communities. **American cities continue to be racially polarized. Residential apartheid is the dominant housing pattern for most African Americans**-still the most segregated ethnic group in the country. **Nowhere is this separate society contrast more apparent than in the nation's central cities and large metropolitan areas. Urban America typifies the costly legacy of slavery, Jim Crow, and institutionalized discrimination."** America's dirty secret, **institutionalized racism is part of our national heritage**." Racism is a potent tool for sorting people into their physical environment." St. Claire Drake and Horace R. Cayton, in their 1945 groundbreaking Black Metropolis, documented the role racism played in creating Chicago's South Side ghetto." In 1965, psychologist Kenneth Clark proclaimed that **racism created our nation's "dark ghettos**/'Pln 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the Kerner Commission, reported that "**white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto" and** that "**white institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it."**21The black ghetto is kept contained and isolated from the larger white society through well-defined institutional practices, private actions, and government policies." **Even when the laws change, some discriminatory practices remain.**

### 1NC – CRT K

#### FIRST, CANNOT SOLVE RACISM THROUGH LAWS... THE LEGAL SYSTEMSYSTEM IS INHERENTLY RACIST

Richard Delgado, Professor, Law, University of Colorado, review of “Recasting the American Race Problem: Rehtinking the American Race Problem,” by Roy L. Brooks, CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW, March 1992, npg.

Our system of antidiscrimination law is designed to detect and punish breaches of the principle of formal equal opportunity (pp. 51-66). For Brooks, as for most liberals, the problems that afflict this approach lie in its implementation. The tests by which courts evaluate claims of unequal treatment are too stringent (pp. 100-01), the burden of proof incorrectly placed (pp. 152-55), the remedies ill-considered (pp. 120-28), and the requirements of proof of intent and causation too strict (p. 155) to enable the law to function effectively. But an emerging counter view holds that the problems with the principle lie not merely with the means by which courts enforce it. Rather: (A) the principle itself is poorly suited to its task— racism and racial subordination are the norm in our society rather than the exception; and (B) members of our culture--including judges--construct key notions like race and racism so as to maintain relations between the races in roughly their current condition.

#### Second, NOTIONS OF FORMAL EQUALITY WITHOUT CHALLENGING THE SYSTEM ONLY JUSTIFY THE OPPRESSION OF AFRICAN AMERICANS--THEY FAIL BECAUSE IT IS “NATURAL”

T. Alexander **Aleinikoff**, Professor, Law, University of Michigan, “A Case for Race-Consciousness,” COLUMBIA LAW REVIEW v. 91, 19**91**, p. 1060+.

That the white-created image of African-Americans should remain largely unchallenged by black conceptions is troubling not only because the white version reflects stereotypes, myths, and half-truths, but also because of the role the white definition plays in explaining the historical treatment and current condition of blacks. Given strong incentives to absolve whites and blame blacks for existing social and economic inequalities, the white story about blacks has never been flattering. As Kimberle Crenshaw has powerfully argued, when the white image of blacks is combined with other American stories -- such as equality of opportunity -- it becomes "difficult for whites to see the Black situation as illegitimate or unnecessary." It works this way: Believing both that Blacks are inferior and that the economy impartially rewards the superior over the inferior, whites see that most Blacks are indeed worse off than whites are, which reinforces their sense that the market is operating "fairly and impartially"; those who should logically be on the bottom are on the bottom. This strengthening of whites' belief in the system in turn reinforces their beliefs that Blacks are indeed inferior. After all, equal opportunity is the rule, and the market is an impartial judge; if Blacks are on the bottom, it must reflect their relative inferiority. n57

#### Third, WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT USING THE LEGAL SYSTEM WILL NOT WORK AND LOOK FOR OTHER VENUES OF ACTIVISM

Bernie D. **Jones**, PhD Candidate, History, University fo Virginia, “Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium?” HARVARD BLACKLETTER LAW JOURNAL v. 18, Spring 20**02**, p. 72.

Rodrigo and the professor argued for new concepts in civil rights jurisprudence, based upon evidence--scholarly sources on civil rights law and sociological evidence that demonstrated the position of people of color in society. All of this supported Delgado's position on the shortcomings of the liberal faith in the law. Rodrigo pointed to newer directions for civil rights strategy. Thus, critical race theorists proposed that people of color should use what Rodrigo referred to as legal instrumentalism in civil rights strategy, similar to Bell's racial realism: "Under it, subordinated people would acknowledge that in many eras and in many courts, success is not really possible. At these times, it is better to look elsewhere for relief." 302 That could mean political activism, or protest, as in the early civil rights movement, when massive resistance made it impossible for activists to force compliance with the law. But Williams perceived that the key lay in considering how to counteract resistance to liberal activism in the American imagination.

### 2NC – CRT K – Alt Solves

#### FIFTH, IDENTIFICATION WITH THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE OPPRESSED AND INCLUSION OF ALTERNATIVE VIEWS KEY TO BREAKING DOWN THE EXISTING LEGAL ORDER

Derrick A. **Bell**, Visiting Professor, Law, New York University, “David C. Baum Memorial Lecture: Who’s Afraid of Critical Race Theory?” UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW, 19**95**, p. 901-902.

Critical race theorists strive for a specific, more egalitarian, state of affairs. We seek to empower and include traditionally excluded views and see all-inclusiveness as the ideal because of our belief in collective wisdom. For example, in a recent debate over "hate speech," both Chuck Lawrence and Mari Matsuda made the point [\*902] that being committed to "free speech" may seem like a neutral principle, but it is not. 28 Thus, proclaiming that "I am committed equally to allowing free speech for the KKK and 2LiveCrew" is a non-neutral value judgment, one that asserts that the freedom to say hateful things is more important than the freedom to be free from the victimization, stigma, and humiliation that hate speech entails. We emphasize our marginality and try to turn it toward advantageous perspective building and concrete advocacy on behalf of those oppressed by race and other interlocking factors of gender, economic class, and sexual orientation. When I say we are marginalized, it is not because we are victim-mongers seeking sympathy in return for a sacrifice of pride. Rather, we see such identification as one of the only hopes of transformative resistance strategy. However, we remain members of the whole set, as opposed to the large (and growing) number of blacks whose poverty and lack of opportunity have rendered them totally silent. We want to use our perspective as a means of outreach to those similarly situated but who are so caught up in the property perspectives of whiteness that they cannot recognize their subordination.

### 2NC – CRT K – Law Fails

#### RACISM REMAINS ALIVE AND WELL DESPITE LEGAL REFORMS--AFRICAN AMERICANS ARE SYSTEMICALLY DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

T. Alexander **Aleinikoff**, Professor, Law, University of Michigan, “A Case for Race-Consciousness,” COLUMBIA LAW REVIEW v. 91, 19**91**, p. 1060+.

We live in a world of racial inequality. In almost every important [\*1066] category, blacks as a group are worse off than whites. Compared to whites, blacks have higher rates of unemployment, lower family incomes, lower life expectancy, higher rates of infant mortality, higher rates of crime victimization, and higher rates of teenage pregnancies and single-parent households. Blacks are less likely to go to college, and those who matriculate are less likely to graduate. Blacks are underrepresented in the professions, in the academy, and in the national government. n30 Of course there has been progress. Comparing the situation of blacks half a century ago to their situation today shows a difference that is startling, and even encouraging, although the last decade evidences a slowing progress and some backsliding. But when the comparison is made between whites and blacks today, it is impossible to ignore the deep and widening difference that race makes. n31

#### CHANGING THE LAW DOES NOTHING TO HELP AFRICAN AMERICANS

Bernie D. **Jones**, PhD Candidate, History, University fo Virginia, “Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium?” HARVARD BLACKLETTER LAW JOURNAL v. 18, Spring 20**02**, p. 37

Although Bell was uncertain at this juncture, within ten years, he had found greater certainty. The law never solved anything--attempts to go beyond mere symbolism were fruitless. Racism always played a role in the fate of African Americans under the law; current efforts for redress remained a long battle, where activists saw that progress was not always uphill. It was interspersed with backward steps, stalemates and digression. By the 1980s, Bell feared for the future and thought legal institutions had been useless in the struggle. But in the early 1970s, he was cautious; he perceived that his students would eventually learn, through law practice and advocacy, just what the limits were. Bell was aware of the failures of the past and the struggles of the present; nonetheless, he perceived there was still some hope, as his young activists marched ahead and continued from where his generation ended.

#### LEGAL ACTION DOES NOT CHALLENGE DE FACTO RACISM--BROWN PROVES

Bernie D. **Jones**, PhD Candidate, History, University fo Virginia, “Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium?” HARVARD BLACKLETTER LAW JOURNAL v. 18, Spring 20**02**, p. 37-38.

Nonetheless, something was missing: the Supreme Court under Warren and Burger implemented form over substance. The Court "was far more ready to invalidate overtly discriminatory policies that ended indefensible restrictions on the rights of blacks than it was willing to tackle the more subtle rules that do not create blatant racial classifications but in their racist administration are as pernicious as the most flagrant Jim Crow signs." 133 Thus, the Court held that de jure segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional, but set forth an "all deliberate speed" requirement that did nothing but encourage stonewalling. By the 1970s, de facto segregation persisted, even though de jure segregation ended: "when policies under review were not so blatant as to embarrass whites as well as discriminate against blacks," ostensibly race-neutral rules gave advantages to whites over blacks. 134 Bell explained that the Supreme Court decided to overturn Plessy v. Ferguson and end official court-sanctioned segregation in Brown, because it was in a unique position to make a statement to the country and to the world about America's commitment to racial equality. Segregation was an embarrassment, not only to individual whites who believed racial inequality to be immoral, but to "those whites in policymaking positions able to see the economic and political advances at home and abroad that would follow abandonment of segregation." 135 The Court could make a moral statement to benefit blacks, but with little sacrifice to whites.

#### LAW CANNOT BE NETURAL, PRIVILEGES SUBJECT WHO ARE WHITE

Derrick A. **Bell**, Visiting Professor, Law, New York University, “David C. Baum Memorial Lecture: Who’s Afraid of Critical Race Theory?” UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW, 19**95**, p. 901.

Professor Charles Lawrence speaks for many critical race theory adherents when he disagrees with the notion that laws are or can be written from a neutral perspective. Lawrence asserts that such a neutral perspective does not, and cannot, exist -- that we all speak from a particular point of view, from what he calls a "positioned perspective." 27 The problem is that not all positioned perspectives are equally valued, equally heard, or equally included. From the perspective of critical race theory, some positions have historically been oppressed, distorted, ignored, silenced, destroyed, appropriated, commodified, and marginalized -- and all of this, not accidentally. Conversely, the law simultaneously and systematically privileges subjects who are white.