## Cap K

#### The rights based approach fails to account for neoliberal institutions and serves to cause an institutional orientation to property.

**Noonan 17**, Jeff (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Windsor), and Josie Watson (clinical nursing Instructor at the University of Windsor). "Against Housing: Homes as a Human Life Requirement." Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research 28 (2017).

In February 2016, Canada was again criticized by the UN agency responsible for monitoring enforcement of The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966/1967) for its lack of progress in solving the problem. The report criticized Canada for the “absence of a national housing strategy; inadequate housing subsidy within the social assistance benefit; shortage of social housing units; increased evictions related to rental arrears; increased numbers of homeless and lack of homelessness prevention; shortage of emergency shelters; laws that penalize people for being homeless; lack of adequate housing for people with psycho-social and intellectual disabilities; and the poor housing conditions of Canada’s indigenous peoples” (Monsebraaten 2016). We of course concur with this criticism of decades of **government inattention to the growing problem of homelessness**, and do not disagree, in any dogmatic way, with the appeal to the right as a tactic of shaming governments into resuming their responsibilities for public investment in affordable housing. However, we want to argue that if access to housing is a right, it is a right because human beings have the sort of complex need for homes discussed in the previous section. If we accept that a) people have this complex need for homes and b) that it is systematically ignored by the normal operation of real estate markets and government policy, then c) it follows that homelessness **is a structural problem** of the normal operations of the socio-economic system, which prioritizes profitable investment over need satisfaction. Since, as we will now argue, **rights** are also a normal part of this same system, they **cannot, on their own, solve the problem** of the unmet complex need for homes. Thus, in order to understand the limits of a rights-based solution to the problem of homelessness**, we must understand the role rights have historically played in capitalism, and in order to understand the role they have played in capitalism,** we must think of capitalist society not only as a functional economic system, a mode of producing and distributing commodities, but also as a value-system which legitimates its way of producing and distributing commodities as good for those who live within it. Few if any societies have ever reproduced themselves solely on the basis of coercion, force, and overt political violence. Human societies, even the most oppressive, typically appeal to sets of norms that determine for a given socio-cultural system what is good and what is bad, and identify their social system with the unique conditions that allow that good to flourish (McMurtry 1998: 15). The threat of force against opponents is thus legitimated by appeal to the good that opponents threaten to ruin by their oppositional activity. If a majority can be convinced of the legitimacy of the value system, they will comply with its demands, making the need for overt violence unnecessary, and also creating citizens who will protect the integrity of the system against opponents, even in cases where, objectively speaking, the opponents make demands which are in the interests of the citizens. Liberal democratic capitalist societies are unique in the history of social organization for building in self-correcting mechanisms in the form of means of legitimate protest and social change. Rights have, since the eighteenth century, been essential to this self-correcting mechanism. The rights of citizens establish that which citizens may legitimately demand of their governments, and the formal procedures of democratic politics are the accepted means for pursuing these protests. In one sense, the legitimacy of protest and opposition represents a great historical victory over alien and oppressive political and social power. It comes, however, with built in limitations. Marx was the first to understand the systematic limitations of citizenship rights as the political means to achieve the social conditions for human freedom. In On the Jewish Question, he demonstrated that the condition of granting citizenship rights was their separation from the “private” economic sphere. In the political realm people are considered equal citizens, but this equal citizenship did not entail material equality in the sphere of production (Marx 1977: 153). On the contrary, in the sphere of production other laws prevail: the laws of self-interest, pursuit of individual advantage, and the distribution of income and advantage according to market forces (Marx 1986: 43). While the development of social **rights** **in the twentieth century** **ameliorated** **to** some extent (in the wealthiest capitalist countries) the gross deprivations of the Industrial Revolution and Victorian capitalism, they do not contest the dynamics of **the capitalist system as a whole,** its prioritization of private profit of comprehensive and universal need satisfaction, or legitimate **the mobilization of oppressed and exploited and alienated themselves to transform the structures that cause systematic need-deprivation in the first place** (Wood 2002: 130-1). As evidence, consider that explosion of inequality in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, which did not require the formal revocation of any citizenship **rights**, but used political tactics to **weaken the power of workers to resist and protect their interests by intensifying competition between them** for jobs and investment. Where market forces are allowed more or less free play, the prices for a given commodity can rise beyond the ability of a large number of people to pay for it, with the result that, in cases where the commodity is a life-requirement, **people are harmed because they are deprived of that which they need**. When this structure of deprivation obtains, the deprived have three general alternatives. On the one hand, people can be left to suffer the consequences of their deprivation, as the homeless typically are today. On the other hand, **governments can use public policy to meet the need**, as they define it and to the extent that they feel it is necessary to present themselves as champions of people’s rights and to maintain social stability. This alternative is clearly better than the first. Still, it is distinct from the third, which occurs where **the need-deprived mobilize themselves**, **define** the extent of **their needs** **and what they regard as adequate means of satisfying them**, and demand access to the resources that would be required to satisfy them. The various direct action struggles that **the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty has organized over the years to combat homelessness in Toronto** (especially the occupation of empty buildings) **is a** small but **significant example of** **the** sort of **movement** we have **in mind**. Let us now contrast the implications **of** rights and **needs-based approaches to the problem of homelessness.**

#### That turns all their solvency- you cannot actually solve any of your impacts.

**Noonan 17**, Jeff (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Windsor), and Josie Watson (clinical nursing Instructor at the University of Windsor). "Against Housing: Homes as a Human Life Requirement." Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research 28 (2017).

The first point to note is that **the right (to housing**, in this case) is asserted as a counter-claim against the logic of production for profit, but it **does not contest the legitimacy of the value system** whose normal outcomes – society-wide deprivation – **it tries to correct**. Just as in the case of the constitutions of liberal-democratic states, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also recognizes the right to private property, without distinguishing personal property for use from universally required life-resources. Where the latter: land, water, minerals, productive apparatuses, and labour power are allowed to become private property, the products of their combination determined by considerations of profitability, and the acquisition of those products determined by ability to pay, there will always be crises of need deprivation, as the history of capitalism attests. The problem is that the appeal to the right to the need-satisfying good is met by a counter-appeal to the right to dispose of private property as the owner sees fit. The right of the home-deprived to public **housing is met by the counter-right of those with capital to dispose of it as they see fit in projects that return profit to themselves.** Where moral obligation is understood in the language of rights, duty extends only so far as other people’s rights over us. Where private property is a legal and accepted institution, individual rights to the goods that will satisfy their needs do not extend to other people’s personal property. If I am hungry and you have a sandwich, I have no right to half. **The structure of moral obligation becomes a problem when private property extends to the control of basic natural resources and vast pools of social wealth, such that one group’s holdings prevent other groups from satisfying their needs**. Those groups will have no legally actionable right against those who have (legitimately, within the rules of the game) acquired that property, and thus will not be able to satisfy their needs just by acting on their rights because their right does not override the opposed rights of private property. Right is met by right in this contradictory way because **the “rights-ground of social morality” has co-evolved with the capitalist mode of production** (Noonan 2006: xvi-xvii). A ground of social morality is the basis of legitimate claims on social wealth and natural resources. In capitalism, **rights** (legally actionable entitlements) **serve as the basis of legitimate claims on social resources**. However, these rights come in two forms: the right of exclusionary private property in life-resources represented by money, and the right of universal life-requirement satisfaction of those systemically deprived of needed goods. The problem, from a practical perspective, is that if there is to be public provision legitimated by appeal to people’s needs, there must be funds for public provision, which can only be acquired through taxation. **Those with surplus wealth will** resist paying higher taxes and **legitimate their resistance by appeal to their right to private property**. Moreover, if there are economic forces (such as those unleashed by globalization) that create pressure to reduce marginal tax rates on the rich, then funds for public investment can dry up, without there being any formal violation of anyone’s rights under the rights-ground of social morality, since it does not specify which of the two countervailing sets of rights are to win in any conflict, but rules out extra-legal struggle to resolve them.

#### Policy such as the aff that use the state to target homelessness prop us neoliberalism.

Craig Willse 10 (assistant professor of cultural studies at George Mason University). "Neo-liberal biopolitics and the invention of chronic homelessness." Economy and Society 39.2 (2010): 155-184.

**Those populations targeted as ‘chronically homeless’** would **appear**, then, **to fit within programmes of state racism** twice over: **both as populations considered social and economic drains and also as populations marked as racially inferior.** But, rather than directly killed or abandoned, we have what appears to be the opposite, as those designated chronically homeless are moved into housing programmes understood to protect and secure their health and wellbeing. How can this be? Is it the end of state racism? The earlier discussion suggests another understanding of chronic homelessness initiatives, and points to some of the historical limitations of Foucault’s analysis. Foucault’s description of biopower and state racism describes the emergence of the modern state form and its organization as the social welfare state. In such a formation, **the modern nation-state seeks to line up a national population with a national economy; the Keynesian welfare state did exactly this.** **In the** contemporary **neo-liberal context, social programmes become industries that serve the economy directly, not necessarily through investing in a labouring population, but through the production of service and knowledge industries**. In such a situation, illness and unproductivity may not need to be reduced or eliminated, as they would be in the social welfare state. Rather, **illness and waste, and populations organized as such, become fertile sites for economic investment, as they multiply opportunities for developing and extending governance mechanisms, making economic life possible.** The reproduction of housing insecurity and deprivation attests to the continuation of social abandonment through withdrawal and disinvestment. However, the invention of chronic homelessness suggests something in addition, as those nearest to death and most subject to the subordinating and dehumanizing effects of institutional racism become the privileged targets of federal policy and funding (at least for the time being). But, rather than a reversal of abandonment, the invention of chronic homelessness indicates how abandonment takes place within an economy and in service to the economy. **If chronic homelessness programmes enable rather than challenge neo-liberal housing insecurity and deprivation at structural levels, it is not so clear that these programmes are ‘life-saving’, even if they do prolong** or save some **individual lives.** Rather, the invention of chronic homelessness reminds us that the deaths of biopower are not instantaneous or complete, and that, in being slow to die and continuing to bear costs, populations marked by and for death demand of neo-liberal apparatuses a biopolitical investment. Thus, we might want to amend Foucault’s view of illness and death as the negation and loss of power, allowing us to question his assertion that ‘death is power’s limit, the moment that escapes it’ (Foucault, 1990 [1976], p. 138). The invention of chronic homelessness emerges in a context of neo-liberal economic restructuring of relationships between life, health, illness and death that moves past Foucault’s formulation of a zero-sum game in which those marked as ill or unproductive would be treated only as negation or loss. State racism in the neo-liberal context is a process of calculation and distribution, in addition to deprivation. Technical programmes such as chronic homelessness initiatives, and the economic investment they entail, should not be mistaken for political and social rescue of abandoned populations. These programmes emerge to manage costs and to transform illness and death into productive parts of post-industrial economies. **Neo-liberal forms of state racism facilitate the continued reproduction of housing insecurity and deprivation as forms of racial subordination, even while organizing those ‘losses’ into productive economic enterprises.**

#### Cities are sponges of capital—they absorb surplus value to further push off the inevitable crisis that is capitalism.

Kafui Attoh 11 (Macalester College and his PhD in Geography from Syracuse University, MA in urban studies). "What kind of right is the right to the city?." Progress in human geography 35.5 (2011): 669-685. RC

David Harvey (2008) situates the concept of the right to the city within a broader and more sweeping analysis of urbanization. **The rise and transformation of cities**, Harvey argues, **must be seen as central to the reproduction of capitalist society.**23 **Cities**, he argues, **play an active role ‘in absorbing surpluses’** (Harvey, 2008: 25; see also Harvey, 1982) **and staving off crises of overproduction and/or under consumption. Cities are crucial in satisfying capitalism’s perpetual ‘need to find profitable terrains for ... surplus production and absorption’** (Harvey, 2008: 24). If cities are indeed sites in which surpluses are absorbed, distributed, and produced, then, for Harvey, to have a right to the city has a very particular meaning.24

#### Capitalism needs to expend surplus to be survive. Capitalism seeks to maximize profit, inevitably creating surplus value. Spending that surplus is used to justify further exploitation in name of creating more surplus, ad infinitum.

David Harvey 12 (Distinguished Professor of anthropology and geography at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He received his PhD in geography from the University of Cambridge in 1961). “Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution”. Verso Books, 2012. RC

To claim **the right to the city** in the sense I mean it here **is to claim** some kind of **shaping power over the processes of urbanization, over the ways in which our cities are made and remade, and to do so in a fundamental and radical way**. From their very inception, **cities have arisen through** the geographical and **social concentration of a surplus product. Urbanization has always been**, therefore, **a class phenomenon** of some sort, **since surpluses have been extracted from somewhere** and from somebody, **while control over the use of the surplus typically lies in the hands of a few** (such as a religious oligarchy, or a warrior poet with imperial ambitions). This general situation persists under capitalism, of course, but in this case there is a rather different dynamic at work. **Capitalism rests**, as Marx tells us, **upon the perpetual search for surplus value** (profit). But **to produce surplus value capitalists have to produce a surplus product.** This means that **capitalism is perpetually producing the surplus product that urbanization requires.** The reverse relation also holds. **Capitalism needs urbanization to absorb the surplus products it perpetually produces.** In this way an inner connection emerges between the development of capitalism and urbanization. Hardly surprisingly, therefore, **the logistical curves of growth of capitalist output over time are broadly paralleled by the logistical curves of urbanization of the world's population.**

#### The alternative is complete rejection of the capitalist system; mere reform is insufficient because it ensures the system will regenerate itself stronger from the pieces left.

Joel Kovel 07, Professor of Social Studies at Bard, The Enemy of Nature, 2007, p 142-3

The value-term that subsumes everything into the spell of capital sets going a kind of wheel of accumulation, from production to consumption and back, spinning ever more rapidly as the inertial mass of capital grows, and generating its force field **as a spinning magnet generates an electrical field. This phenomenon has important implications for the reformability of the system**. **Because capital** is so spectral, and **succeeds so well in** ideologically **mystifying its real nature, attention is constantly deflected from the actual source** of eco-destabilization **to the instruments** by which that source acts. The real problem, however, is the whole mass of globally accumulated capital, along with the speed of its circulation and the class structures sustaining this. That is what generates the force field, in proportion to its own scale; and it is this force field, acting across the numberless points of insertion that constitute the ecosphere, that creates ever larger agglomerations of capital, sets the ecological crisis going, and keeps it from being resolved. For one fact may be taken as certain — that to resolve the ecological crisis as a whole, as against **tidying up one corner** or another, **is** radically **incompatible with the existence of gigantic pools of capital**, the force field these induce, the criminal underworld with which they connect, and, by extension, the elites who comprise the transnational bourgeoisie. And by not resolving the crisis as a whole, we open ourselves to the spectre of another mythical creature, the many-headed hydra, that regenerated itself the more its individual tentacles were chopped away**.** To realize this is to recognize that there is no compromising with capital**, no schema of** reformism that will clean up its act by making it act more greenly or efficiently We shall explore the practical implications of this thesis in Part III, and here need simply to restate the conclusion in blunt terms: green capital, or non-polluting capital, is preferable to the immediately ecodestructive breed on its immediate terms. But this is the lesser point, and diminishes with its very success. For green capital (or ‘socially/ecologically responsible investing’) exists, by its very capital-nature, essentially to create more value, and this leaches away from the concretely green location to join the great pool, and follows its force field into zones of greater concentration, expanded profitability — and greater ecodestruction.

#### Also, the alternative solves better than the aff: as long as capitalism persists, exploitation is inevitable and piecemeal reforms such as the right to housing will be inevitably rolled back. The alt is a pre-requisite to actually solving for the harms the aff identifies.

Richard Wolff 06 (Emeritus Professor of Economics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst). “Anti-Slavery and Anti-Capitalism”. 15 December 2006. http://www.rdwolff.com/content/anti-slavery-and-anti-capitalism

Thus, no surprise attaches to the fact, these days, that one widespread kind of social criticism concentrates on softening capitalism’s negative impacts on workers and the larger society. It seeks to raise workers’ wages and benefits and to make governments limit capitalists’ rapaciousness and the social costs of their competition. **In the US**, this is what “liberals” do: from the minimalist oppositions within the Democratic Party to the demands of social democrats and many “radicals” for major wage increases, major government interventions, and so on. **What always frustrates liberals** and radicals **is the difficulty of achieving** these **improved workers’ conditions and the insecurity and temporariness of whatever improvements they do achieve.** Today they bemoan yet another roll-back of improvements, namely those won under FDR’s New Deal, Kennedy’s New Frontier, and so on. **Marxism** is that other kind of opposition that **demands the abolition of capitalism as a system.** Since Marxists find capitalist exploitation to be as immoral and inhumane as slavery, they might logically seek a further amendment to the US Constitution that abolishes it as well. A Marxist program would seek to replace capitalist production by a non-wage system, one where the workers will not only produce surpluses but also be their own boards of directors. The “associated workers” would, as Marx suggested, appropriate their own surpluses and distribute them. The wage-payer versus wage-recipient division of people inside production would vanish. Every worker’s job description would entail not only his/her technical responsibilities to produce a specific output but also her/his responsibilities as part of the collective that appropriates and distributes the surplus. Monday to Thursday, each worker in each enterprise makes commodities, and every Friday, each worker functions as a member of that enterprise’s board of directors. The stakes here are less obtaining higher wages than abolishing the wage system.**The point of** such **a Marxist program is to overcome the** conflicts, wastes, and **inequalities** (economic, political, and cultural) **that flow from** the existence of **capitalist exploitation** whether or not wages are raised. The point is likewise to stress the incompatibility of any genuine democracy with the wage system and its usual social effects (and again whether wages are higher or lower). Of course, in the struggle between such a Marxist perspective and its various critics, the latter will depict the programmatic advocacy of an end to the wage system as impracticable, utopian, or deluded. Those persuaded by neoclassical economics will simply dismiss or ignore not only the Marxist criticism of the wage system but Marxism altogether. For them, the wage system is not only eternal and necessary, but also fair and “efficient.” For them, since there “is” no surplus, they need not read or learn Marxist theory and criticism, let alone debate it. So Marxist theory [is] and its proponents can and are largely excluded from public discourse in the media, the schools, and politics**.** For liberals suspicious of neoclassical economics – or “neoliberalism” as it is now more often called - the Marxian program sketched above would be seen as utopian fantasy at best. Yet, not the least irony of Bush’s America today is how his regime’s relentless removal or reduction of the past reforms (high wages, pensions, medical insurance, social security, state social programs, etc.) makes a liberal politics today seem painfully deluded to so many. The liberals seem hopelessly weak, unable to stop let alone reverse the Bush juggernaut. Worse still, **what [liberals]** they **advocate are precisely the reforms now being dismantled and thus revealed as having been** fundamentally **insecure all along.** The audience for capitalism’s critics and opponents is thus being primed to listen rather attentively to Marxist claims that an **abolition** of the wage system **offers not only a better society but also a far better basis for securing** those **improvements** in wages and working conditions **that mass action can achieve.** What is needed now are Marxists able and willing to articulate those claims to that audience, to persuade ever more of capitalism’s critics and opponents that abolition of exploitation and the wage system must be a component of their program for social change.

#### Affirming treats the symptom by just brushing over the real issue—they don’t solve anything.

James H. Carr 98 (Senior Vice President for Policy, Research, and Evaluation at the Fannie Mae Foundation), (1998) Comment on Chester Hartman's “The case for a right to housing”: The right to “poverty with a roof"—a response to hartman, Housing Policy Debate, 9:2, 247-257,

**The reasons the housing** affordability **crisis persists**, however, **are much deeper than** obstacles created by **those who oppose specific programs** or shifting political priorities. **Access to** decent and affordable **housing is an outcome of** a number of resource **allocation processes, of which the housing market is perhaps the most superficial**. The approach that would ensure the greatest and most cost effective allocation of decent, affordable housing is one that is free of discriminatory barriers to broader societal opportunities that ultimately shape access to the housing market. Included are such areas as education, transportation, and employment. Unless all households have equal opportunities to receive an education that prepares them for the labor market, **people with similar aptitudes for a given occupation will have different abilities with which to compete for specific jobs. Because public education** in the United States **is funded** primarily **through local property taxes**, and affluent households and employers have migrated in large numbers out of central cities and into the suburbs, central-**city school[s] districts are often underfunded.** At the same time, many of these districts have schools with deteriorating infrastructure and students with systemic social problems resulting from concentrated poverty. Understandably, central-city school districts face a particularly challenging task in providing quality education. **Due** in large part **to the economic restructuring of U.S. cities, quality jobs** requiring moderate education and skill levels **have largely migrated to the suburbs.** Meanwhile, **minority populations have concentrated in central cities due partly to past and present discrimination in the housing market.** This ‘‘spatial mismatch,’’ further complicated by the low priority U.S. metropolitan areas have given to public transit systems and the high costs of automobile ownership in central cities relative to other areas in the United States, results in many residents lacking access to quality jobs.

#### The role of the ballot is to reject neoliberal and capitalist modes of production.

#### Capitalism causes inevitable crises, inequality, and dehumanization.

#### McClaren 13

Peter McClaren. Professor of Education, UCLA. “Critical Pedagogy Against Capitalist Schooling.” <http://www.globaleducationmagazine.com/critical-pedagogy-againstcapitalist-schooling-socialist-alternative-interview-peter-mclaren/>. Accessed 4/26/14.

While well-meaningprogressive educators might be willing to criticize the manner in which humans are turned into dead objects that Marxists refer to as fetishized commodities, they are often loathe to consider the fact that within capitalist society, all value originates in the sphere of production and that one of the primary roles of schools is to serve as agents or functionaries of capital. Furthermore, they fail to understand thateducation is more reproductive of an exploitative social order than a constitutive challenge to it precisely because it rests on the foundations of capitalist exchange value. Reading Marx and Freire may not alchemize us into revolutionaries capable of transcending capitalism but ignoring what they had to say about transforming education in the context of class struggle would be a huge loss to our efforts. Much of my work has tried to demonstrate that many liberal progressive educational reforms are embedded in a larger retrograde, opportunistic and banalizing politics that situates itself a culture of liberal compassion and a polyglot cosmopolitanism that does more to impede educational transformation than advance it. Revolutionary critical pedagogy is a mode of social knowing that inquires into what is not said, into the silences and the suppressed or the missing, in order to un-conceal operations of economic and political power underlying the concrete details and representations of our lives. It reveals how the abstract logic of the exploitation of the division of labor informs all the practices of culture and society. Materialist critiquedisrupts that which represents itself as natural and thus as inevitable and explains how it is materially produced. Critique, in other words, enables us to explainhow social differences—gender, race, sexuality, and class—have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation—namely within the international division of labor in global capitalism, sothatwe can fight to change them. Thus, apedagogy of critique is about the production of transformative knowledges. It is not about liberty as the freedom of desire, because this liberty, this freedom of desire, is acquired at the expense of the poverty of others. A pedagogy of critique does not situate itself in the space of the self, or in the space of desire, or in the space of liberation, but in the site of collectivity, need and emancipation To sum up, teachers need to supportsustainablealternatives to neoliberal capitalism with its emphasis on economic growth; protect nature’s resources for future generations; protect ecosystems and help support biodiversity; support a community based economics, and a grassroots democracy that includes participatory and direct forms, embody anti-racist, anti-ableist, anti-sexist, and anti-homophobic pedagogies that respect diversity and work from a post-patriarchal perspective.

#### Neoliberal ideology’s emphasis on the unfettered, self-interested subject is the reason other forms of exclusion and oppression exist.

#### Sachikonye 10

Tawanda Sachakonye (Rhodes University). “A Foucauldian Critique of Neo-liberalism.” January 2010. <http://eprints.ru.ac.za/1812/3/Sachikonye-MA-TR10-48.pdf>

In terms of individual citizens neo-liberal government promotes the notion of the responsible citizen. Thus, the ideal individual in neo-liberal society practises personal responsibility by making informed rational decisions. Neo-liberal democracy therefore ―aspires to construct prudent subjects whose moral quality is based on the fact that they rationally assess the costs and benefits of a certain act as opposed to other alternative acts‖ (Lemke, 2001: 201). Neo-liberal governments together with corporations create conditions in which the responsible rational individual can become a successful entrepreneur or consumer. The success or failure of the individual depends on his or her skill and work ethic. Hence, life for an individual in neo-liberal society becomes one of personal responsibility to a greater extent. Giroux 53 argues that under neo-liberalism the state no longer assumes responsibility for social needs and rather focuses on initiating various deregulations and privatizations‘, whilst relinquishing all social responsibility to the market and private philanthropy‘ (2004). The neo-liberal state has no real obligation towards its citizens except to provide the necessary conditions for entrepreneurship and consumerism. As a result, a kind of Darwinist ‘survival of the fittest’ ethic becomes apparent; Giroux argues that: ―[s]ocial Darwinism has been resurrected from the ashes of the 19th century sweatshops and can now be seen in full bloom in most reality TV programs and in the unfettered self-interests that now drives popular culture. As narcissism is replaced by unadulterated materialism, public concerns collapse into utterly private considerations and where public space does exist it is mainly used as a confessional for private woes, a cut throat game of winner take all, or an advertisement for consumerism‖ (2004) 54 . This is a sentiment that is echoed by Bourdieu 55 , who states that this form of moral Darwinism establishes what he terms the ‘cult of the winner’ and ultimately institutes a survival of the fittest mentality that is underpinned by cynicism and self interest (1998). The neo-liberal state utilises knowledge like market research as a technique of power. This is similar to how the government in the 17 th century viewed statistics as the science of the state‘ and a component of the technology of government (Smart, 2002: 129). The neoliberal government can now use market research to indirectly control its citizens as well as gather information about their personal lives. Market research with its use of modern technology and accurate data supersedes census studies and statistics. Dufour writes: ―[v]ast numbers of market researchers are therefore always taking the pulse of consumers and surveying their sexual and emotional lives, so as to anticipate their needs and to give their desires possible names and credible destinations‖ (2008: 58). The collecting of such information and the use of it to control citizens fits the Foucauldian critique. The field of marketing is a highly efficient technology of neo-liberal governance; it becomes a mechanism through which neo-liberal government can regulate a consumer society and provide specific products to cater for the varied needs of different individuals. Dufour notes: ―[t]here is no such thing as a small profit. A profit can be made from babies who want‘ their favourite shampoo, senior citizens who want‘ to occupy their spare time and invest their savings, poor adolescents who want‘ cheap brand names and rich adolescents who want‘ their own cars. They must all be satisfied. I‘ is now central to every advert‖ (2008: 58). Neo-liberalism dominates society through subtle means. Thus, neo-liberalism does not seek to assert itself by placing disciplinary controls on life‘ (Dufour, 2008: 157). Neo-liberalism has permeated society by using subtle political technologies‘. These mechanisms of power transcend the old overt technologies‘: religion, the police and family, and are more flexible in that they are less reliant on coercion and are less costly, as noted by Dufour (2008: 157). The new political technologies of neo-liberal governance include: the internet, multimedia software, the fields of marketing and management, as well as telecommunications technology governance have yielded more control, management and surveillance than any traditional government could have hoped for. Neo-liberal governance has also managed to dehumanise human society by forcing the complexity of human difference into the narrow confines of entrepreneurialism, consumerism and the logic of self interest. Fine and Leopold write: ―[a]re we the manipulated mannequins of the advertising industry, the sovereignless victims of profit-hungry corporate capital, rational economic man and women trading off one commodity against another according to their relative prices and utilities?‖ (1993: 3). This is indeed a grim question to fathom but one which neo-liberal governance has made pertinent.