It’s more expensive than driving- means people will just choose to drive

O’Toole, 10 American public policy analyst, Cato Institute Senior Fellow (Randal, “Public Transit Proves Costly to Taxpayers and the Environment”, The Tennessee Center for Policy Research, 6/3/10, <http://www.beacontn.org/2010/06/public-transit-proves-costly-to-taxpayers-and-the-environment/>)

NASHVILLE **–** The Tennessee Center for Policy Research today released a policy report in conjunction with transportation expert Randal O’Toole. The report, titled Tackling Public Transit in Tennessee, affirms that Tennessee’s public transit system has provided little in the way of cost or environmental efficiency. Seventeen years of expense data from the Federal Transit Administration show that not only are automobiles a more cost-effective transportation option, but they also release far fewer greenhouse gases into the environment. “Public transit is often portrayed as a low-cost, energy-efficient alternative to auto driving. In reality, transit is much more costly than driving and requires huge subsidies to attract any riders at all,” said O’Toole in the report. The average transit cost per passenger mile is $1.21, while driving costs just $0.23. Similarly, the average transit subsidy per passenger mile is $1.04, where driving is subsidized merely $0.01 per passenger mile. O’Toole explained, “Tennessee transit riders pay an average of less than 70 cents every time they board a bus, while taxpayers pay an average of more than $4 to support that trip.”The current transportation system also has few benefits for the environment. Transit options release approximately 0.4 more pounds of CO2 into the environment than the average car. The insufficient amount of filled seats in transport vehicles such as buses, the Memphis trolley and the Music City Star contribute to each one’s failures to be energy-efficient. By ending highway subsidies, Congress would eliminate the excuse to subsidize inefficient rail transit. Contracting out and privatizing the transit industry would save tax dollars as well as encourage private operators to invest in the most efficient forms of transportation. Also, providing vouchers to the small percentage of Tennesseans who do not have access or the ability to drive would present a significantly smaller burden on taxpayers than the current system. “In the end,” O’Toole said, “only free market reforms will save Tennessee taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars while truly improving transit services for most people.”

**\*\*\*Gentrification DA\*\*\***

1NC Gentrification DA

**New transit leads to gentrification – likely users of transit are priced out of the neighborhood while new residents are more likely to use their cars anyway.**

Pollack, Bluestone, and Billingham 10, Stephanie Pollack, Barry Bluestone, and Chase Billingham, Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, October 2010, “Maintaining Diversity in America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” p. 34 (ED)

New transit brings with it rising rents and home values, particularly when light rail is located in previously lower-income neighborhoods dominated by rental housing. While neighborhood incomes also increase, the income of individual households will not necessarily change. As landlords raise rents, households that choose to remain and take advantage of the new transit may suffer from higher housing cost burdens. A new transit station may also set in motion a cycle of unintended consequences that reduces neighborhood residency by those groups most likely to use transit in favor of groups more likely to drive. In some newly transit-served neighborhoods, rising rents and home values attract not only higher-income residents but also car-owning residents. Use of public transit for commuting in this problematic subset of newly transit-served neighborhoods actually rose slower (or, in some cases, declined faster) than in the metropolitan area as a whole. Whether by displacement or replacement, or a combination of the two, in some transit-rich neighborhoods the pattern of change is working against the goal of attracting transit-oriented neighbors: the most likely potential transit riders are being crowded out by car owners less likely to be regular users of transit. This cycle raises concerns both about equity, because core transit riders are predominantly people of color and/or low income, and about the success of new transit investments in attracting desired levels of ridership. But, as illustrated below and detailed in the next chapter, policy tools can be deployed to produce more equitable patterns of neighborhood change.

Gentrification destroys the communities of socially excluded groups.

Powell and Spencer 03, John A. Powell, National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union founder of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Gregory H. Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Ohio State University’s Moritz College of Law and Marguerite L. Spencer, A.M.R.S., J.D., Senior Researcher at the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Adjunct Lecturer in Theology at the University of St. Thomas, 2003, *Howard Law Journal* 46.3, “Giving Them the Old ‘One-Two’: Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color,” p. 435-436, HeinOnline (ED)

Byrne focuses on two negative outcomes of gentrification: displacement (which we take up later) and the changing essence of a neighborhood, both of which he discounts.10 But there are many other negative consequences associated with gentrification including changes in power structures, institutions, voting power and losses of local businesses, social networks and services.11 It is much too easy, however, to appropriate these changes by claiming that “no neighborhood remains frozen in some ethnic or class essence”12 or that “great moments of neighborhood vitality may occur at unpredictable points during a transition” as Byrne does.13 Rather, as University of Chicago Policy Analysis John J. Betancur argues in a study of West Town Chicago, **gentrification is really a struggle between community and accumulation for which we must assume responsibility**:14 [T]here is an aspect of gentrification that mainstream definitions ignore. Descriptions of gentrification as a market process allocating land to its best and most profitable use, or a process of a replacing a lower for a higher income group, do not address the highly destructive processes of class, race, ethnicity, and alienation involved in gentrification . . . . [T]he right to community is a function of a group’s economic and political power . . . [T]he hidden hand is not so hidden in the process of gentrification and that in fact, it has a face—a set of forces manipulating factors such as class and race to determine a market outcome . . . The most traumatic aspect of this analysis is perhaps the destruction of the elaborate and complex community fabric that is crucial for low-income, immigrant, and minority communities—without any compensation.15

**Mass Transit Links**

An investment in mass transit will contribute to a greater gentrification as it causes people to move from the suburbs to the cities inevitably rising house prices

Martin 10, (Gerg St. Martin, Writer for Coalition on Sustainable Transportation, New Transit May Cause Unintended Gentrification, http://www.costaustin.org/jskaggs/?p=1333 DM)

A Northeastern report warns of the unintended consequences of first-time expansion of transit into some metropolitan neighborhoods. Extending public transportation to a metropolitan neighborhood for the first time can, in some cases, raise rents, bringing in a population of wealthier residents who would rather drive than take public transportation. That’s the conclusion of a report by the Kitty and Michael Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, which found that new public transit investments can sometimes lead to gentrification that prices out renters and low-income households—people considered core public-transportation users—working against the public goal of boosting transit ridership. The study, released today, urged planners and policymakers to consider the unintended consequences of neighborhood gentrification when expanding or improving public tr ansit, given the risk that transit investment can cause undesirable neighborhood change. “Transit planners frequently speak of the need for transit-oriented development to support ridership, but what transit stations need is transit-oriented neighbors who will regularly use the system,” said Stephanie Pollack, the report’s lead author and associate director of the Dukakis Center. “In the neighborhoods (around the country) where new light rail stations were built, almost every aspect of neighborhood change was magnified,” added Barry Bluestone, director of the Dukakis Center and the report’s coauthor. “Rents rose faster; owner-occupied units became more prevalent. Before transit was built, these neighborhoods had been dominated by low-income, renter households.” The report, “Maintaining Diversity In America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It includes new research analyzing socioeconomic changes in 42 neighborhoods in 12 metropolitan areas across the United States first served by rail transit between 1990 and 2000. The report’s findings, researchers said, also raise concerns about equity. Core transit riders are predominantly people of color and/or low-income who disproportionately live in transit-rich neighborhoods. Researchers calculated that transit-served metropolitan regions are currently home to over half of all African Americans, 60 percent of all Hispanics and 70 percent of all immigrants in the United States. The report’s recommendations include advising policymakers to get ahead of the issues using coordinated and community-responsive planning tools, and designing policies that attract core and potential transit users to these now transit-rich neighborhoods. To moderate increases in rents, future housing policies should include funding for land and property acquisition, preservation of existing affordable housing, and creation of new affordable housing, researchers said.

**Expanding public transit raises house prices and lowers ridership.**

Nusca 10, Andrew Nusca, 10-22-2010, SmartPlanet, “New public transit encourages gentrification, lowers ridership, study says,” http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/smart-takes/new-public-transit-encourages-gentrification-lowers-ridership-study-says/11832 (ED)

If you were to extend the reach of public transportation to an underserved neighborhood, you would expect ridership to increase and rents to drop, right? Wrong, according to a new study. A new report from the Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University says that the result may be the complete opposite — that is, attract a population of wealthier residents who prefer private cars to public buses and trains. The report, which can be found here (.pdf), found that new public transit investments can, in some cases, lead to gentrification. That means renters and low-income residents — you know, the folks you think would ride public transportation — get priced out of the neighborhood and, once again, away from easy access to the very system that’s thought to serve them the most. Studying 12 metropolitan areas in the United States in which one or more new commuter rail stations was opened in the course of a decade, the researchers examined changes in population growth, housing units, racial and ethnic composition, household income, housing costs, migration, public transit use and motor car ownership. Here’s what they found: For 64 percent of the neighborhoods around the new rail stations in the study (that’s 27 of 42 total), population grew more quickly than the rest of the metro area. 55 percent of those neighborhoods showed a “dramatic” increase in housing production. 62 percent of those neighborhoods showed a faster increase in owner-occupied units than the rest of the metro area. 50 percent of those neighborhoods showed an increase in the proportion of non-Hispanic white households relative to the rest of the metro area. (The other half showed no change or a decrease.) 62 percent of those neighborhoods showed an increase in median household income; 60 percent showed a boost in the proportion of households with incomes of more than $100,000. Perhaps most tellingly, 74 percent of the neighborhoods showed rents that increased faster than the rest of the metro area. A full 88 percent had a relative boost in median housing values, too. In 40 percent of the new transit neighborhoods, public transit use declined relative to the rest of the metro area. In 71 percent of the neighborhoods, ownership of a vehicle increased; in 57 percent, ownership of two or more cars increased.

**Neighborhoods with large numbers of renters are especially susceptible to gentrification – their plan disproportionately hurts the most vulnerable.**

Pollack, Bluestone, and Billingham 10, Stephanie Pollack, Barry Bluestone, and Chase Billingham, Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, October 2010, “Maintaining Diversity in America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” p. 33 (ED)

Our research also supports the conclusion that neighborhoods with a large number of renters are more susceptible to gentrification. Indeed, when we specifically looked at the neighborhoods where the new stations were light rail— neighborhoods which, in our study, were more likely to be dominated pre-transit by low-income, renter households than those in the heavy rail and commuter rail neighborhoods— almost every aspect of neighborhood change was magnified: rents rose faster and owner-occupied units became more prevalent, for example. In these TRNs, with their high population of low-income renters before the light rail station opened, in-migration by higher-income families appears to have disproportionately changed the demographic structure and substantially increased the risk and pace of gentrification.

**Bike Links**

**Bike lanes cause gentrification.**

Davis 11, Paul M. Davis, 8-30-11, Shareable, “Are Bike Lanes Expressways to Gentrification?”, http://www.shareable.net/blog/are-bike-lanes-an-expressway-to-gentrification (ED)

Improvements such as bike lanes increase the perceived “livability” of a neighborhood, serving as a sign to developers and housing speculators that a neighborhood is open for business. In this way, bike lanes play at least an indirect role in making neighborhoods too expensive for low income residents. In addition to discussing these issues, there must be serious consideration of alternative housing models that reduce the displacement of low-income communities. Commons-based housing models such as limited equity cooperative housing and community land trusts could serve as a corrective to real estate speculation and help preserve the character, culture and diversity of these communities. Gentrification is a significant problem in our nation’s cities, one that relatively affluent white people are complicit in, no matter their intentions. This is an ongoing conversation that we must make space for, and **not mistake bike-centric urban development to be a universally-beneficial effort lacking racial or class components.** Bernie Foster, publisher of Portland’s African American newspaper The Skanner, urged his readers to get involved in the discussion, writing “often the squeaky wheels are the ones that get the grease.” It’s a sentiment that will sound familiar to cycling advocates, who have struggled for decades to be included in infrastructure decisions. In this case, they’re the ones who must listen.

**Bike lanes contribute to the displacement of low-income communities.**

Davis 11, Paul M. Davis, 8-30-11, Shareable, “Are Bike Lanes Expressways to Gentrification?”, http://www.shareable.net/blog/are-bike-lanes-an-expressway-to-gentrification (ED)

This is only the latest salvo in a debate taking place in many of the nation’s cities over bike lanes and how they affect disadvantaged communities. In Washington DC, where a 31% increase in white residents in the past decade has been met by an 11% decline in the black population, debates over gentrification have reached a fever pitch. As a recent New York Times article notes, in some DC neighborhoods bike lanes are seen to indicate the impending displacement of low-income communities: **Some of these poorer residents saw revitalization as code for efforts to drive them out, and the building of dog parks and bike and streetcar lanes as efforts by affluent whites to re-arrange spending priorities to suit themselves**. This echoes sentiments voiced in a 2009 Portland Mercury article: "When initiatives for cycling come through, there are questions about who will benefit from bike lanes," says Paige Coleman, director of the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods. Coleman says conversations about biking being a "white thing" have come up often in recent years. "Some communities call the bike lanes the 'white stripes of gentrification,'" she adds. As a white male who uses a bike as my primary mode of transportation, my initial reaction to these reports was one of reflexive defensiveness. After all, the health and environmental benefits of cycling are well-documented and universally beneficial. But it’s worth reconsidering our assumptions. The pet causes of affluent whites have long received more attention than immediate issues affecting those in disadvantaged communities. And while making bicyclists safer on the road might seem to benefit everyone, such city infrastructure initiatives have complex political, race and class components.

**AT: No Displacement**

**False – our 1NC link indicates new mass transit empirically causes house prices to rise faster than incomes, displacing low-income residents.**

**And, even if they win this argument, public transit increases the housing costs for renters who stay – still turns case.**

Pollack, Bluestone, and Billingham 10, Stephanie Pollack, Barry Bluestone, and Chase Billingham, Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, October 2010, “Maintaining Diversity in America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” p. 33 (ED)

Displacement is not, however, the only problem associated with gentrification. Another negative consequence of gentrification involves not those neighborhood residents who leave but those who remain behind. We found larger increases in both rents and home values in the newly transit-served neighborhoods than in the corresponding metropolitan areas in roughly three-quarters of the TRNs studied. For existing homeowners in these TRNs, this was a boon. For existing renters, however, this likely caused many to pay a higher proportion of their income for shelter and could eventually force them to seek housing elsewhere. Our findings therefore raise the concern that new transit is associated with higher housing cost burdens for renters who remain in the neighborhood.

**Turns Case – Automobility**

**Expanding transit increases automobile usage – attracts wealthier families to the area that are less likely to use public transit.**

Pollack, Bluestone, and Billingham 10, Stephanie Pollack, Barry Bluestone, and Chase Billingham, Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, October 2010, “Maintaining Diversity in America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” p. 25-26 (ED)

Another troubling finding from the first round of analysis was that the placement of a new transit station did not consistently increase the number of neighborhood residents reporting that they used public transit for their commute. Indeed, in over half of the TRNs we studied, public transit use for commuting by neighborhood residents actually declined relative to the change in transit use in the metro area after the new station opened. This was perhaps not surprising since automobile ownership increased more than in the corresponding metro area in nearly three-quarters of these newly transit-served neighborhoods, with ownership of two or more autos increasing in nearly three in five. Another adverse consequence of the gentrification observed in newly transit-served neighborhoods is that the higher income households living in the TRN bring and use more vehicles and may therefore undermine efforts to shift commuting trips to the newly-built transit. Gentrification, as discussed in Chapter 2, can be a positive or destructive form of neighborhood change. This initial round of analysis found evidence of gentrification and of at least two negative consequences of such gentrification in TRNs: higher housing cost burdens for renters and an influx of automobileowning households less likely to use transit for commuting

Impacts

Gentrification is based on white privilege – denies communities of color accesses to resources.

Powell and Spencer 03, John A. Powell, National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union founder of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Gregory H. Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Ohio State University’s Moritz College of Law and Marguerite L. Spencer, A.M.R.S., J.D., Senior Researcher at the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Adjunct Lecturer in Theology at the University of St. Thomas, 2003, *Howard Law Journal* 46.3, “Giving Them the Old ‘One-Two’: Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color,” p. 439, HeinOnline (ED)

Any definition of gentrification, then, must take whiteness and white privilege into account. As George Lipsitz argues, [W]hite supremacy is usually less a matter of direct, referential, and snarling contempt than a system for protecting the privileges of whites by denying communities of color opportunities for asset accumulation and upward mobility. Whiteness is invested in, like property, but it is also a means of accumulating property and keeping it from others . . . the artificial construction of whiteness almost always comes to possess white people themselves unless they develop antiracist identities, unless they disinvest and divest themselves of the their investments in white supremacy.34 While we stop short of accusing those who support gentrification of racism, we do argue that being white contributes to and draws benefits from the privileges and entitlements associated with the “white face” of gentrification.35 Whites cannot give up white privilege by remaining the passive beneficiaries of this racial hierarchy. Instead, they can help to dismantle the racialized structures, rationalizations, and forms of power upon which gentrification rely.

Gentrification intensifies racism against low-income urban dwellers of color.

Powell and Spencer 03, John A. Powell, National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union founder of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Gregory H. Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Ohio State University’s Moritz College of Law and Marguerite L. Spencer, A.M.R.S., J.D., Senior Researcher at the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Adjunct Lecturer in Theology at the University of St. Thomas, 2003, *Howard Law Journal* 46.3, “Giving Them the Old ‘One-Two’: Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color,” p. 436-437, HeinOnline (ED)

Although studies of it often ignore ethnicity and race,16 gentrification has a very clear racial component. Commonly, higher-income white households replace lower-income minority ones,17 often in the very same neighborhoods that experienced “white flight” and urban renewal in the 50s and 60s.18 Where there *is* displacement then gentrification can be seen as a double insult—a “one-two” knock—out of urban dwellers of color. White middle class flight initially causes low-income minority neighborhoods to become isolated and undervalued. Then at some point in the future, and in part because the neighborhood values are depressed, whites move back in and force residents to leave, often to strange neighbors that are in distress. Even if minority residents remain, they fear their way of life will not be the same.19 In Atlanta’s Kirkwood, East Atlanta, Grant Park, Hunter Hills, Cascade, Collier Heights, Peyton Forest neighborhoods, for example, “the children and grandchildren of those whites who fled to the suburbs are drifting back into the city in small but significant clumps. It’s white flight in reverse.”20 And while nonwhites can also be the agents of gentrification, they too can be pushed out, as the black gentrifriers in Park Slope, Brooklyn are being replaced with whites.21

Gentrification causes the subjugation of low-income households.

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

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, middle- income households upgrade housing conditions for their personal consumption. While owner- occupied 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.

Gentrifiers exhibit racism towards low-income residents of color.

Powell and Spencer 03, John A. Powell, National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union founder of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Gregory H. Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Ohio State University’s Moritz College of Law and Marguerite L. Spencer, A.M.R.S., J.D., Senior Researcher at the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School and Adjunct Lecturer in Theology at the University of St. Thomas, 2003, *Howard Law Journal* 46.3, “Giving Them the Old ‘One-Two’: Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color,” p. 437-438, HeinOnline (ED)

Indeed, the racializing dynamics in gentrifying neighborhoods are quite complex. The first wave of gentrifriers in the 1970s who embraced tolerance and diversity22 for the most part no longer exist.23 Rather, uncolored gentrifiers now often shun low-income residents of color, and even exhibit open hostility and racism toward them.24 For example, in one local scholar calls “ethnic cleansing,” the city of Chicago and the University of Illinois have eradicated the nearby landmark black business district, Maxwell Street, of “a type of clientele the city and university do not want.”25 Similarly, in Oakland, where the eviction rate has risen 300% since 1998, 75% of those evicted are people of color.26 Whites also exhibit a sense of entitlement toward the areas they gentrify, pushing through an agenda that marginalizes current residents. In one neighborhood in D.C., white inmovers sued the historical black Baptist church for unencumbered use of a ball field adjacent to a local school that the church had traditionally been using for a parishioner parking. As a result, the church is now reluctantly planning to move the suburbs.27

\*\*\*Automobility Good\*\*\*

**Automobility Good – Autonomy**

**Automobility is essential to autonomy – key to value to life.**

Lomasky 97, Loren E. Lomasky, *Independent Review* 2.1, “Autonomy and Automobility,” Business Source Complete

The automobile, definitionally, promotes automobility. The complementarity of autonomy and automobility is only slightly less evident. In the latter part of the twentieth century, being a self-mover entails, to a significant extent, being a motorist. Because we have cars we can, more than any other people in history, choose where we will live and where we will work, and separate these two choices from each other. We can more easily avail ourselves of near and distant pleasures, at a schedule tailored to individual preference. In our choice of friends and associates, we are less constrained by accidents of geographical proximity. In our comings and goings, we depend less on the concurrence of others. We have more capacity to gain observational experience of an extended immediate environment. And for all of the preceding options, access is far more open and democratic than it was in preautomobile eras. Arguably, only the printing press (and perhaps within a few more years the microchip) rivals the automobile as an autonomy-enhancing contrivance of technology. No one who has been caught in rush-hour gridlock will maintain that commuting to and from work is an unalloyed joy. Competing with tens of thousands of other motorists for scarce expanses of asphalt reminds one of the Hobbesian war of all against all. For critics of the automobile this complaint is not a negligible point. But neither are its implications entirely clear-cut. Just as worthy of notice as the unpleasantness of stop-and-go commuting is how many people voluntarily subject themselves to it. Have they not realized how much time they are wasting in overly close proximity to their steering wheels? Such inadvertence is not plausible. Evidently, people who, individually and collectively, could have devised for themselves residential and occupational patterns not incorporating lengthy commutes chose to do otherwise. In their judgment, the costs of commuting are compensated by the benefits thereby derived. The more the critics emphasize the magnitude of the costs, the more these critics underscore, often unwittingly, the extent of the benefits. Commentators from the Greek philosophers to Adam Smith to Karl Marx have noted that **the nature of the work one does largely shapes the quality of life one enjoys.** For nearly all of us, to do work suited to oneself in a satisfactory environment is a great good, whereas to perform alienating labor under unfriendly and unhealthy conditions is a correspondingly great evil. Similarly, to reside in a comfortable and functional dwelling situated in a neighborhood one finds hospitable is also a considerable good. For most people throughout human history, neither occupation nor place of residence has afforded more than a negligible range of choice. One did the work one's father or mother did, or to which one had been apprenticed, or the kind of work available in that place. And one lived near the workplace. The increased affluence and openness of liberal capitalist society vastly expanded the range of choice. But the coming of the automobile essentially separated the choices. Previously one lived either near one's work or else on a commuter rail line. But the geography of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford tracks did not bind motorists. Depending on how much time they cared to invest in transit, they could live at a considerable distance from their workplaces, yet emancipated from the rigidities of mass transit. Cultured despisers of the idiocy of suburban existence can and do decry this circumstance, but millions of Americans (and, increasingly, the rest of the world) disagree. Even if one believes for aesthetic or other reasons that row upon row of bungalows or ersatz Tudor houses miles distant from the city or industrial area to which they are connected by roadways represent unattractive neighborhoods, one cannot deny that they are genuine objects of choice for those who live there. People, we might say, have a right to banality. To respect the autonomy of persons is to acknowledge that expanding their options for combining work and place of residence is as such a plus. Nineteenth-century socialist reformers decried the enhanced ability of industrial capitalism's factory system to exploit workers. Human labor, they charged, had become no more than an appendage of mill or machine. Although one could reasonably respond (as Friedrich Hayek [1954] famously did in Capitalism and the Historians) that workers who voluntarily abandoned their rural domiciles for the factory town did so only because they themselves regarded the move as a net improvement, one must nonetheless concede that their situation was not enviable. They may have enjoyed a higher standard of living than that available to them on the farm, but their work was grueling and their opportunities for self-directed choice minimal. Against the perceived oppression of industrial society, the reformers contrived various nostrums, one family of which, now mercifully defunct, oppressed millions of unfortunate souls throughout most of this century. No syndicalist scheme or string of workers' cooperatives remotely approaches the automobile as an emancipatory instrument. Insofar as it extended the feasible range of commuting between residence and labor, the coming of the motorcar augmented the bargaining power enjoyed by workers. A company town offers little scope for alternate employment opportunities. Changing jobs very likely requires changing place of residence, and exit costs of both pecuniary and nonpecuniary sorts may render that prohibitive. However, widespread automobile ownership dramatically extended the geographical radius of possible employment venues. Hence, the market for labor came more closely to approximate the economists' model of many sellers and many buyers. In theory, under a legal regime of free contract, workers always enjoyed the right to terminate their employment when they wished to do so, but in practice the exercise of this liberty often proved discouragingly costly. Automobility significantly lowered those costs. The country music song "Take This Job and Shove It" became something of an anthem for the disaffected at a time when car ownership had become almost universal. Musical aesthetics aside, those who value choice not only formalistically but as the existence of genuine live options must appreciate this alternative. **Detroit has done more for the liberation and dignity of labor than all the Socialist Internationals combined.** One can also observe liberation by viewing the employment-residence nexus from the other direction. The ability to choose where one will live makes a considerable difference in the exercise of self-determination. Life in the suburbs is not inherently better than life in the central city, but it is different. To the extent that one possesses a real opportunity to choose between them, one can give effect to significant values that shape the contours of a life. A city may offer ready access to arts and education, a succession of ethnically diverse neighborhoods, a feeling of drive and vitality, an ambience that "swings." But cities are often dirty, expensive, and dangerous. Exurban life may provide peaceful neighborliness, gardens and green spots, family-oriented activities that take place in the home or the mall. But exurbs are often antiseptic, provincial, and stultifying. To choose the one is to relinquish (some of) what the other affords. So which is the better alternative? People must answer for themselves based on their own conceptions of what matters most. To the extent that one has geographical mobility, the question is answered by an act of positive choice rather than through inertia or extraneous constraints such as the location of one's place of employment. Choice of residence serves as a major avenue for Americans to exercise their right to free association. Choosing a neighborhood is the macrolevel correlate to choosing one's friends. One thereby decides with whom one will live. And perhaps even more important, one decides with whom one will not live. In contemporary society, "leaving home" signifies a full coming of age and the concomitant entitlement to direct one's own projects as an adult. But then comes the necessity of finding and making a home in a neighborhood to which one has a fie at least in part because one has freely chosen to live there rather than somewhere else. This choice too signifies and gives effect to one's values. Some people prize a high degree of homogeneity of race or religion or age or economic class among those with whom they will most frequently associate. Others prefer a heterogeneous diversity of different ages, skin tones, and backgrounds from which casual acquaintances and intimate friendships will emerge. Considering whether one of these preferences deserves more admiration than the other carries us away from the theme of this essay, but even if one regrets that some people choose to segregate themselves from those who somehow differ--or conversely, that some defect from tightly knit ethnic communities--**an ethic that endorses autonomy must acknowledge that, the content of individual choices aside, it is good that people can make up their own minds and then act on their decision about where to live.**

Critiques of automobility are based in ivory-tower hostility to autonomy.

Lomasky 97, Loren E. Lomasky, *Independent Review* 2.1, “Autonomy and Automobility,” Business Source Complete

First, the cited ills do not support a general indictment of the automobile and attempts to roll back its use. Rather, the indicated remedy is to adopt policies that reduce spillover costs. Legislators should aim taxes and regulatory controls at the vehicles that pollute excessively or present more than normal dangers to others; differential pricing for peak and off-peak access to highways lies well within the capabilities of currently available technology; and so on.[11] Well-aimed attentiveness to particular avoidable costs is commendable; wholesale denunciations of automobility are not. Second, the balance sheet of instrumental values and disvalues ignores the intrinsic goodness of automobility in promoting autonomy and complements of autonomy--such as free association and privacy. Even if purely instrumental calculations did not unambiguously display a positive balance in favor of automobility, its autonomy-enhancing aspects are so pronounced both qualitatively and quantitatively that any plausibly adequate normative evaluation of the status of automobile usage must give them primary attention. Could the automobile's critics have failed to observe that cars support autonomy? If these effects were slight and subtle, that supposition might be reasonable. But when compared with alternate means of transportation the automobile stands out as the vehicle of self-directedness par excellence. To overlook this fact would be like visiting the mammal area at the zoo and failing to notice that the elephants are larger than the zebras, camels, and warthogs. I am convinced that the automobile's most strident critics appreciate that automobility promotes autonomy--and that is precisely why they are so wary of it. Public policymakers have a professional predisposition to consider people as so many knights, rooks, and pawns to be moved around on the social chessboard in the service of one's grand strategy. Not all analysts succumb to this temptation, but many do. Their patron saint is the philosopher Plato, the utopian architect of the ideal Republic, who embraces propaganda campaigns ("Noble Lie"), eugenic breeding, radical property redistribution schemes and--most tellingly--rule exercised by people just like himself, the philosopher-kings. If one sincerely believes that one knows what is best, and if one benevolently desires to gift one's fellows with this treasure, their obdurate insistence on continuing to do things in their own preferred way can be maddening. "I'll give you what's good for you," the policy specialist vows, first in the soft tones of a promise and then, after experiencing rejection, in the clipped cadences of a threat. People who drive automobiles upset the patterns spun from the policy intellectual's brain. The precise urban design that he has concocted loses out to suburban sprawl; neat integration of work, residence, and shopping within compact, multipurpose developments gives way to bedroom communities here, industrial parks there, and malls everywhere in between. If people rode buses and trains whenever they could, less oil would be burned and fewer acres of countryside would be paved over. Perhaps the races and classes would mix more. Perhaps communities of an old-fashioned sort, where everyone knew his neighbor, would return. Perhaps the central city would come alive again in the evenings. Perhaps...but why go on? These lovely visions give way before the free choices of men and women who resist all blandishments to leave their cars in the garage. They wish to drive, and by doing so they powerfully express their autonomy, but their exercises of choice also have the effect of rendering the planners' conceptions moot. So the intellectuals sulk in their tents and grumpily call to mind utopias that might have been. Although this essay was stimulated in the first instance by a conviction that the critics of the automobile had, at best, offered distinctly one-sided appraisals, my aim here has been to develop the positive case for the value of automobility, not to respond point by point to the items in the brief against the automobile. (And, of course, I staunchly agree with some of these points.) Many of the argumentative missiles launched at the automobile become more fully intelligible if one understands them as motivated at least as much by a disinclination to tolerate individual autonomy as by any particular facet of automobile technology.

Automobility Good – Privacy

Automobility is essential to privacy.

Lomasky 97, Loren E. Lomasky, *Independent Review* 2.1, “Autonomy and Automobility,” Business Source Complete

Privacy complements autonomy. Someone who is private has a life of his own. That is, he is not entirely defined and constrained by a public persona. The capacity to be self-determining requires some quantum of privacy, whereas being an adjunct to a greater whole or an organic part of an organism does not. Individuals are private only to the extent that some part of their personas belongs primarily to them and not to the world at large. Being inappropriately viewed during a moment of intimacy or vulnerability constitutes one of the most basic encroachments on privacy. In an extended sense, privacy incorporates limitations not only on perceptual access but also on the knowledge or control others may have over oneself. What constitutes an invasion of privacy is not fixed by our nature as human beings but is relative both to more or less arbitrary convention and to the far-from-arbitrary conditions that govern the possibility of forging an identity that is distinctively one's own. "A man's home is his castle" expresses one early manifestation of this impulse. The king is powerful and the king reigns, but in one little corner of the realm the commoner, not the king, enjoys (quasi) regal prerogatives. A right not to be subject to search and seizure without due process of law and a right not to be obliged to incriminate oneself are further manifestations. They express the conviction that personal dignity imposes limits on mandatory subjection to the scrutiny of others. Some ancient conceptions of privacy endorsed a radical withdrawal from one's fellows. We should view the hermit or anchorite not as essentially a misanthrope but rather as someone who by separating himself from other human beings thereby draws closer to his God. (For Christians, Jesus in the wilderness provides the paradigmatic instance; there are many others.) Monasticism constitutes a slightly less radical version: voluntary sequestration with a few like-minded others away from the main crossroads of urban life. From Qumran by the Dead Sea to David Koresh at Waco, sectarians have acted on the belief that they could achieve a greater inner and external freedom by isolating themselves from the majority culture. When that majority culture nonetheless forcibly impinges on them, results typically are tragic. Previously I have focused on the value to individuals of the capacity to approach and enjoy particular goods. The concern for privacy underscores the concomitant importance of the capacity to distance oneself from threats. If too many eyes are on me where I am, then I shall enhance my privacy by moving out of the spotlight of public scrutiny. For most of us the relevant degree of privacy rarely involves isolation from all others but usually does require the ability to exercise a significant degree of discretionary control over who will have access to one's body and mind. Adolescents who go out to "do nothing" thereby claim a measure of privacy vis-a-vis their parents; a fishing trip may have less to do with baiting fishhooks than with taking oneself off invasive social hooks. For twentieth-century American society, the automobile serves as the quintessential bastion of privacy. For many of us the Honda, not the home, is the castle. Ironically or not, those minutes between home and office on a freeway clogged past capacity with multitudes of other cars may be one's most private time of the day. (I do not mean to slight the benefits of the other great solitude-enhancing device of our culture, the bathroom.) Even those who love their spouse and children, delight in the company of friends, and work compatibly alongside colleagues may nonetheless relish a short time each day to be alone. Such interludes do not indicate an antisocial impulse. Intermediate periods of solitude can fuel bouts of gregariousness and sociality just as an astringent serves to clean the palate between sumptuous courses. Social planners are wont to gnash their teeth at the number of motorists who could arrange to commute by car pool but instead "inefficiently" take up roadway space with solitary-occupant cars. Diamond lanes and other inducements have only a limited effect on the average occupancy. This outcome may be viewed as a failure of policy, but it can also be seen as a reasonable and in some ways estimable response to the valid human desire for privacy. "It is not good for the man to be alone," says Scripture, but for those who live among a surfeit of others, it is sometimes very good indeed to be alone. The closing of the car door can provide a welcome shutting out of the rest of the world, allowing a recapture of the self by the self--as opposed to its usual embeddedness in an array of intersecting public spaces. Car pools are not necessarily a bad thing; in demonstrable respects, we might be better off if more people doubled and tripled up before taking to the roads. Privacy in virtually all its forms, including that afforded by the automobile has significant costs. (Think of the private room versus the hospital ward.) I shall not inquire here whether the costs of automotive privacy exceed the benefits; my point is simply that driving solo has genuine benefits that go beyond merely instrumental facility in getting from here to there. Any unbiased cost-benefit analysis must acknowledge that privacy has a positive value and proceed from there. Being alone is one aspect of privacy but not, I believe, the most central. More salient to privacy than the distancing of oneself from others is a (re)gaining of control over one's immediate environment. I may be surrounded by other people, but if I can determine to a significant degree what they shall be allowed to perceive of me and know about me and impose on me, then to that extent I have retained a private self. Surely one reason for people's fondness for their cars and for automobility in general is the control afforded over one's immediate environment. Drivers make choices by turning the wheel clockwise and counterclockwise, determining the external environment to which they will move themselves; by other manipulations they arrange the internal environment to their liking. Pushing one button turns on the radio. Pushing others changes the station, lowers the volume, turns off the radio and switches to the tape player. Individuals choose for themselves whether to listen to news reports, Beethoven, the Beatles, or nothing at all. Next to the switches for the stereo are those for climate control, windshield washing, blinking one's lights, and perhaps a cellular phone. (Because the last item supplies incoming as well as outgoing calls, an assessment of whether it extends or diminishes privacy is double edged.) The vehicle's make, model, style, color, and options are more permanent objects of one-time choice. Automobile reviewers write about "responsiveness." This has a limited meaning in the context of evaluating how a vehicle performs, but automobiles, unique among all forms of personal transportation, have a larger responsiveness. Individuals exercise control over the internal environment of their cars in a manner not possible with any alternate mode of getting around.

**Automobility Good – Knowledge**

Automobility enhances local knowledge –essential to individual value to life.

Lomasky 97, Loren E. Lomasky, *Independent Review* 2.1, “Autonomy and Automobility,” Business Source Complete .

Automobiles enhance mobility, and mobility enhances knowledge. Recall the discussion of the relationship between self-moving and perception in Aristotle's biological theory. As the area in which people can direct their self-aware movements increases, so too does the range of their knowledge-gathering capacities. The knowledge in question is, in the first instance, local knowledge. By traveling through, around, and within a place, one comes to know it in its particularity. This kind of knowledge has no very close substitute. I may have read a score of books about Paris, but if I have never visited the City of Lights, if I have never traversed its streets and bridges and marketplaces, then I could not truly claim, "I know Paris." One can no more reduce knowledge of a place to possessing many facts about that place than one can reduce knowing another person to having read a very detailed resume. Philosophers often distinguish between knowledge by description and knowledge by acquaintance. To acquire the latter, one often needs mobility. Of course automobiles are not the only form of transportation that serves to increase local knowledge, and for some types of local knowledge they may serve poorly. One such case is that described in the preceding paragraph: for acquiring up-close knowledge of a city like Paris, shoes serve better than tires. All forms of transportation--from walking to bicycling to trains, buses, ships, and airplanes--enhance knowledge. But with the possible exception of the motorcycle, another means of transportation assailed by no shortage of critics, none combines local maneuverability with extended range to the degree that the automobile does. The train can move me from one city to another at intermediate distance and afford me the opportunity of viewing the terrain in between. But it allows only a limited number of stops along the way, the speed may be slower or faster than one would wish for optimal information gathering, and the route will be exactly the same on the thousandth trip as on the first. Airplanes excel for speed, but everything between points of departure and destination is indistinct. Walking is a wonderful way to observe a neighborhood, but inadequate to take in even the opposite end of a village, let alone a state or country. For genuine exploration at long or intermediate range, the car dominates all alternatives. How much weight should one give this sort of knowledge? The question deserves an answer. Few of the automobile's critics have a word to say about the knowledge-enhancing aspects of automobility, either because they have never considered the automobile from the perspective of information gathering or because they implicitly suppose that what one learns while behind a steering wheel is trivial. But these critics do not represent the population at large. They are intellectuals and information processors of one stripe or another, most comfortable with information that can be synthesized in books or graphs or computerized databases. They tend to depreciate information that can't be measured, quantified, and represented symbolically. But the information to be gained from reading a history book or running a regression is not the only sort that individuals can use effectively in their pursuits. Knowledge need not be grand or profound to have value in itself and to complement choice. By driving north along the lake to see how the autumn leaves have turned and whether the Canadian geese are still milling or have flown, I may gain an inherently worthwhile experience. Driving through the various neighborhoods of a city reveals where the bakeries, hairdressers, and Thai restaurants are located; who is having a garage sale this week; and which parts of town are becoming distinctly seedier. Teenagers cruising the "main drag" are conducting an epistemological mission motivated by the hope of sniffing out the whereabouts of others of a desirable age and gender. And even the stereotypically boorish Bermuda-shorts-clad tourists with their vans, videocams, and surly children in tow may actually be uplifted by the sights of the Civil War battlefield or seaside to which they have driven. When the range within which one moves about becomes extended, so too does the range of one's potential knowledge. The automobile is the quintessential range extender, not only by lengthening the trips one can take but also by multiplying the number of available routes. Knowledge by acquaintance has been emphasized in the preceding discussion, but automobility also extends one's ability to acquire other kinds of knowledge. Cars go not only to malls and theme parks but to libraries, universities, and museums. Cars provide regular access to urban centers of learning to those who live many miles distant. The traditional derogatory image of the unlettered "country bumpkin" has been rendered increasingly obsolete by new technologies--telephone, television, computer and, not least, the automobile.

CAP Links **Mass transit links**

**Their integration and breaking down of the unique societies that have developed in poor areas destroys the possibility for effective resistance to the capitalist system**

**Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology Ljubljana University, 09**

(Slavoj, “Censorship Today: Violence, or Ecology as a New Opium for the Masses” <http://schwarzemilch.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/censorship-today.pdf>)

Last but not least, new forms of apartheid, new Walls and slums. On September 11th, 2001, the Twin Towers were hit; twelve years earlier, on November 9th, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. November 9th announced the "happy '90s," the Francis Fukuyama dream of the "end of history," the belief that liberal democracy had, in principle, won, that the search is over, that the advent of a global, liberal world community lurks just around the corner, that the obstacles to this ultra-Hollywood happy ending are merely empirical and contingent (local pockets of resistance where the leaders did not yet grasp that their time is over). In contrast to it, 9/11 is the main symbol of the forthcoming era in which new walls are emerging everywhere, between Israel and the West Bank, around the European Union, on the U.S.-Mexico border. So what if the new proletarian position is that of the inhabitants of slums in the new megalopolises? The explosive growth of slums in the last decades, especially in the Third World megalopolises from Mexico City and other Latin American capitals through Africa (Lagos, Chad) to India, China, Philippines and Indonesia, is perhaps the crucial geopolitical event of our times. It is effectively surprising how many features of slum dwellers fit the good old Marxist determination of the proletarian revolutionary subject: they are "free" in the double meaning of the word even more than the classic proletariat ("freed" from all substantial ties; dwelling in a free space, outside the police regulations of the state); they are a large collective, forcibly thrown together, "thrown" into a situation where they have to invent some mode of being-together, and simultaneously deprived of any support in traditional ways of life, in inherited religious or ethnic life-forms. While today's society is often characterized as the society of total control, slums are the territories within a state boundaries from which the state (partially, at least) withdrew its control, territories which function as white spots, blanks, in the official map of a state territory. Although they are de facto included into a state by the links of black economy, organized crime, religious groups, etc., the state control is nonetheless suspended there, they are domains outside the rule of law. In the map of Berlin from the times of the now defunct GDR, the are of West Berlin was left blank, a weird hole in the detailed structure of the big city; when Christa Wolf, the well-known East German half-dissident writer, took her small daughter to the East Berlin's high TV tower, from which one had a nice view over the prohibited West Berlin, the small girl shouted gladly: "Look, mother, it is not white over there, there are houses with people like here!" - as if discovering a prohibited slum Zone... This is why the "de-structured" masses, poor and deprived of everything, situated in a non-proletarized urban environment, constitute one of the principal horizons of the politics to come. If the principal task of the emancipatory politics of the XIXth century was to break the monopoly of the bourgeois liberals by way of politicizing the working class, and if the task of the XXth century was to politically awaken the immense rural population of Asia and Africa, the principal task of the XXIth century is to politicize - organize and discipline - the "de-structured masses" of slum-dwellers. Hugo Chavez's biggest achievement is the politicization (inclusion into the political life, social mobilization) of slum dwellers; in other countries, they mostly persist in apolitical inertia. It was this political mobilization of the slum dwellers which saved him against the US-sponsored coup: to the surprise of everyone, Chavez included, slum dwellers massively descended to the affluent city center, tipping the balance of power to his advantage

**The dissolution of communities through transportation equity is an excuse to break up ethnic communities and enforce capitalism- turns case**

**Zizek**, **Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology Ljubljana University, 93 (Slavoj, “Tarrying with the negative”, pgs 213-216)**

What truly disturbs liberals is therefore enjoyment organized in the form of self-sufficient ethnic communities. It is against this background that we should consider the ambiguous consequences of the politics of school busing in the U.S.A., for example. Its principal aim, of course, was to surmount racist barriers: children from black communities would widen their cultural horizons by partaking in the white way of life, children from white communities would experience the nullity of racial prejudices by way of contacts with blacks, etc. Yet, inextricably, another logic was entwined in this project, especially where school busing was externally imposed by the "enlightened" state bureaucracy: to destroy the enjoyment of the closed ethnic communities by abrogating their boundaries. For this reason, school busing-- insofar as it was experienced by the concerned communities as imposed from outside-- reinforced or to some extent even generated racism where previously there was a desire of an ethnic community to maintain the closure of its way of life, a desire which is not in itself "racist" (as liberals themselves admit through their fascination with exotic "modes of life" of others). [15](http://www.questia.com/5785793) What one should do here is to call into question the entire theoretical apparatus that sustains this liberal attitude, up to its Frankfurt-school-psychoanalytical *pièce de résistance*, the theory of the so-called "authoritarian personality": the "authoritarian personality" ultimately designates that form of subjectivity which "irrationally" insists on its specific way of life and, in the name of its self-enjoyment, resists liberal proofs of its supposed "true interests." The theory of the "authoritarian personality" is nothing but an expression of the ressentiment of the left-liberal intelligentsia apropos of the fact that the "non-enlightened" working classes were not prepared to accept its guidance: an expression of the intelligentsia's inability to offer a positive theory of this resistance. [16](http://www.questia.com/5785793)  The impasses of school busing also enable us to delineate the inherent limitation of the liberal political ethic as it was articulated in John Rawls's theory of distributive justice. [17](http://www.questia.com/5785793) That is to say, school busing fully meets the conditions of distributive justice (it stands the trial of what Rawls calls the "veil of ignorance"): it procures a more just distribution of social goods, it equalizes the chances for success of the individuals from different social strata, etc. Yet the paradox is that everyone, including those deemed to profit most by busing, somehow felt cheated and wronged-- why? The dimension infringed upon was precisely that of fantasy. The Rawlsian liberal-democratic idea of distributive justice ultimately relies on "rational" individuals who are able to abstract their particular position of enunciation, to look upon themselves from a neutral place of pure "metalanguage" and thus perceive their "true interests." Such individuals are the supposed subjects of the social contract which establishes the coordinates of justice. What is thereby a priori left out of consideration is the fantasy-space within which a community organizes its "way of life" (its mode of enjoyment): within this space, what "we" desire is inextricably linked to (what we perceive as) the other's desire, so that what "we" desire may turn out to be the very destruction of our object of desire (if, in this way, we deal a blow to the other's desire). In other words, human desire, insofar as it is always already mediated by fantasy, can never be grounded in (or translated back into) our "true interests": the ultimate assertion of our desire, sometimes the only way to assert its autonomy in the face of a "benevolent" other providing for our Good, is to act *against* our Good. [18](http://www.questia.com/5785793)  Every "enlightened" political action legitimized by the reference to "true interests" encounters sooner or later the resistance of a particular fantasy-space: in the guise of the logic of "envy," of the "theft of enjoyment." Even such a clear-cut issue like the Moral Majority pro-life movement is in this respect more ambiguous than it may seem: one aspect of it is *also* the reaction to the endeavor of the "enlightened" upper-middle-class ideology to penetrate the lower-class community life. And, on another level, was not the same attitude at work in the uneasiness of the wide circle of English leftist-liberal intellectuals apropos of the great miner's strike in 1988? One was quick to renounce the strike as "irrational," an "expression of an outdated working-class fundamentalism," etc.; while all this was undoubtedly true, the fact remains that this strike was also a desperate form of resistance from a certain traditional working-class way of life. As such, it was perhaps more "postmodern," on account of the very features perceived by its critics as "regressive," than the usual "enlightened" liberalleftist criticism of it. [19](http://www.questia.com/5785794)  The fear of "excessive" identification is therefore the fundamental feature of the late-capitalist ideology: the Enemy is the "fanatic" who "overidentifies" instead of maintaining a proper distance toward the dispersed plurality of subject-positions. In short: the elated " deconstructionist" logomachy focused on "essentialism" and "fixed identities" ultimately fights a straw-man. Far from containing any kind of subversive potentials, the dispersed, plural, constructed subject hailed by postmodern theory (the subject prone to particular, inconsistent modes of enjoyment, etc.) simply designates the form of subjectivity that corresponds to late capitalism. Perhaps the time has come to resuscitate the Marxian insight that Capital is the ultimate power of "deterritorialization" which undermines every fixed social identity, and to conceive of "late capitalism" as the epoch in which the traditional fixity of ideological positions (patriarchal authority, fixed sexual roles, etc.) becomes an obstacle to the unbridled commodification of everyday life.