**International free market engagement perpetuates hegemonic hypermasculinity**

**Acker 4** – Professor of Sociology @ U of Oregon, Ph.D Sociology @ U of Oregon (Joan, “Gender, Capitalism, and Globalization”, 2004, Critical Sociology [SAGE Journals], Volume 30, Number 1, RSpec)

In today’s organizing for globalization, we can see the emergence of a hegemonic hypermasculinity that is aggressive, ruthless, competitive, and adversarial. Think of Rupert Murdoch (Reed 1996), Phil Knight (Strasser and Beklund 1993), or Bill Gates. Gates, who represents a younger generation than Murdoch and Knight, may seem to be more gently aggressive and more socially responsible than the other two examples, with his contributions to good causes around the globe. However, his actions made public in the anti-trust lawsuits against Microsoft seem to still exhibit the ruthlessness, competitiveness and adversarialness of hyper-masculinity. This masculinity is supported and reinforced by the ethos of the free market, competition, and a ‘win or die’ environment. This is the masculine image of those who organize and lead the drive to global control and the opening of markets to international competition. Masculinities embedded in collective practices are part of the context within which certain men make the organizational decisions that drive and shape what is called “globalization” and the “new economy.” We can speculate that how these men see themselves, what actions and choices they feel compelled to make and they think are legitimate, how they and the world around them define desirable masculinity, enter into that decision-making. Decisions made at the very top reaches of (masculine) corporate power have consequences that are experienced as inevitable economic forces or disembodied social trends. At the same time, they symbolize and enact varying hegemonic masculinities (Connell 1998)

Free trade and economic development policies ignore women’s role in their communities and are more exploitative than beneficial

Harcourt, professor of Rural Development, Environment and Population Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam 94 (Wendy, “The Globalisation of the Economy: An International Gender Perspective”, Focus on Gender 2:3, October 1994, JSTOR)//AS

This article argues that 'free trade', which guarantees the free movement of goods and capital, may have allowed for an acceleration of economic growth and economic interdependence among market economies in developed countries, but this has happened at the expense of an economic crisis in countries which have not benefited from such uneven growth. This has had a particularly acute impact on poor women, who are marginalised in the world economy. Although it is important to remember that different women's experiences are 'the outcome of different sets of interactions among patriarchal, class, racial, ethical, and spatial relations' (Pearson 1986, 93), gender is a critical determinant in the degree and manner in which economic and other forces affect different groups.lThe effects of deregulation are particularly acute in countries of the East and South. In general, while Central and Eastern European countries are struggling with the impact of a radical economic and political transition, the less-developed countries of the South are burdened by debt, depletion in resources caused by poverty, inequality and environmental problems, and 'aid fatigue' after 40 years of 'development' initiatives.The current trends which are restructuring industry and employment towards service sectors, casual, and part- Focus on Gender Vol 2, No. 3, October 1994 time and out work, might appear to be beneficial to women. But this article will argue that because traditional economics ignore the importance of women's work in the home, community, and informal sectors, economic development policies are rarely structured to encompass women's socio-economic reality and are more usually exploitative than beneficial.

**Hegemonic masculinity is invisibly rooted in the neoliberal economics of the plan**

**Elias 9** – Ph.D Politics and International Studies @ U of Warwick, M.A. International Political Economy @ U of Warwick, BA Politics and Modern History @ U of Manchester, Research Fellow @ Griffith U (Juanita, “Hegemonic Masculinity and Globalization: ‘Transnational Business Masculinities’ and Beyond”, 2009, <http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/33048/;jsessionid=AF004816F86BB4B663B21981AA0CD656?sequence=1>, RSpec)

The emphasis on hegemonic masculinity brings important gendered issues to the forefront of contemporary discussions of globalization. Perhaps most significantly, these writings draw attention to how gender identities are thoroughly implicated in processes associated with neoliberal globalization. Globalization and global politics are not gender-free but are rooted in the privileging of certain forms of masculinity within what Connell terms a ‘world gender order’ (Connell, 2005a, pp.xxii). Thus whilst ‘most studies of globalization have little or nothing to say about gender’ (Connell, 2005a, pp. xxi), Masculinity Studies scholars make visible the gendered character, for example, of the rhetorically gender-neutral neoliberal market agenda in global politics, diplomacy, international institutions and economic policy-making. Such writings therefore clearly complement the emphasis in Feminist International Relations (IR) on the ways in which both the theory and practice of global politics are thoroughly masculinized (Tickner, 1991; Whitworth, 1997).Making masculinity visible within the politics and processes associated with contemporary globalization matters because it forces those of us who wish to develop a more critical understanding of globalization to understand how gender frames the world in which we live. However, making masculinity visible is inevitably a difficult task. As Kimmel (1997) argues, masculinity has assumed the banality of the unstated norm; not requiring comment, let alone explanation. Indeed, its invisibility be speaks its privilege.

**Every trade deal the United States has entered into has been self-serving and bad for women. Here’s two examples:**

1. **NAFTA**   
   **Citizens Trade Campaign 2002**

Trade Agreements Based on NAFTA Model Have Proven Harmful to Women, Proposed New Rules Threaten Further Damage International trade, a dominant force in the global economy in which women live and work, inevitably will affect women. Nine years of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) model of trade liberalization has proven harmful to women in all three NAFTA signatory countries. Now, new agreements such as the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), several bilateral agreements, and negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) stand poised to expand trade rules into new areas. By not addressing the impact on women’s lives and livelihoods, these new agreements could have significant negative ramifications for women throughout the world. After nine years, the data shows clearly that the NAFTA model of trade liberalization has a disproportional, negative impact on women in all three countries. For U.S. women, trade related job loss has a disproportionate and severe impact due to the fact that women’s employment is concentrated in areas often affected by trade, such as textile and apparel industries. In fact, according to a 1999 survey, 66 percent of all recipients of NAFTA-Trade Adjustment Assistance were women. (General Accounting Office, “Trade Adjustment Assistance: Trends, Outcomes, and Management Issues in Dislocated Worker Programs” GAO-01-59, October 2000). In addition, when U.S. companies shut down or move abroad, it is unlikely that women will be re-employed in good-paying union jobs comparable to those in manufacturing. Though women may find non-union jobs in retail trade and services, for example, textile jobs pay 64 percent more than retail sector jobs: $451.00 in weekly wages for non-supervisory workers, compared to $274.83 for retail. (BLS, October 2000). Jobs in the service sector are often less secure and offer fewer benefits. For women in Mexico, the effects of NAFTA liberalization have been particularly severe. As has been documented, the majority of small farmers worldwide are women. Many small farmers in Mexico have been forced off their land as NAFTA has put small farmers in fierce competition with big agribusiness firms and driven down commodity prices. In this situation, Mexican women must migrate with their families to cities to find work. Such work for women in Mexico is often concentrated in the Export Processing Zones (EPZs), or Maquiladoras, where women earn wages which are often not enough to sustain their families and pay for a higher cost of living in the cities. In addition, NAFTA has locked in a model of unenforceable labor and human rights in the EPZs, wherein women face such threats as on the job discrimination, sexual harassment, and violence. Women workers in many factories in Mexico have reported rampant physical abuse and sexual harassment. In addition, mandatory pregnancy testing as a condition for employment is often standard practice (Spieldoch, White 2003).

#### FTAA

**Citizens Trade Campaign 2002**

The Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) is a trade agreement currently under negotiation that would expand the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to include 31 additional nations in the Western Hemisphere. This massive expansion is currently being negotiated without meaningful public or Congressional input. The FTAA would not only extend the failed policies of the NAFTA which have eroded living standards, undermined workers rights, devastated family farms, and empowered corporations to challenge domestic public interest laws, but could also include new provisions to severely restrict the ability of federal, state, and local governments throughout the hemisphere to regulate both public and private services, or to provide essential public services. The effort to bind the economies of the Western Hemisphere into a single free trade agreement began at the Summit of the Americas, in December of 1994 in Miami, Florida. It was at the Summit that heads of state and governments of 34 countries in the region- all nations in North, Central and South America and the Caribbean except Cuba- agreed to complete negotiations for a Free Trade Area of the Americas by 2005. Unfortunately, the public and most Members of Congress are only vaguely aware this agreement is being negotiated, and their input has not been taken into account. Corporate interests, however, are actively involved; under the trade advisory committee system, over 500 corporate representatives have security clearance and access to FTAA documents while only a handful of civil society representatives have been given clearance. The FTAA would accelerate the global “race to the bottom” initiated under NAFTA: with the FTAA, exploited workers in Mexico would be forced to ‘compete’ with even more desperate workers in Haiti, Bolivia or Guatemala, as multinational corporations move in and out of the region with ease. This “race to the bottom” would also be mirrored for small farmers throughout the hemisphere as the devastating effects of NAFTA on commodity prices and concentration are amplified.

### 2NC MAIN OVERVIEW

Trade deals create an economics of speed that guaruntees the worst impacts of capitalism for two reasons:

#### **Innovation- Goldman et al ‘6 ev says making innovation the driver of the economy creates volatile industries in which new product development takes precedence- this involves high-risk investment scenarios and creates an endless cycle of tek bubbles and forces companies to maximize short-term profits in order to meet investor demands- here’s more evidence**

#### **Competition- need to succeed against competing nations is the apex of the economics of speed- compresses time to ensure accelerated production**

O’Carroll 8

(Aileen, Fuzzy Holes and Intangible Time: Time in a knowledge industry, Time Society, 2008; 17; 179)

‘When time is money, speed becomes an absolute and unassailable imperative for business’ (Adam, 2003: 101). Adam locates the origins of current organizational rationality in the concept of ‘time economy’, which implies that the shorter the period of time between an investment and its return, the greater the profit. Competition adds another layer of time compression. The faster a product is produced, the cheaper it can be, so the competition can be undercut. Furthermore, if there is more time left to produce another product, all the better to compete with one’s rivals in industry. In opposition to this speeded-up time, is time in creative or caring industries, where work is not ‘amenable to translation into the clock-time units on one hand and time compression on the other’ (Adam, 2003: 102).

### 2NC Financial Collapse Overview

#### **Panic selling­- Goldman et al ‘6 says that- focus on innovation creates an economy driven by volatile industries where companies race to create new products before their competitors- causes all or nothing investment strategies and speculation that ensure panic selling and constant bubble creation**

#### **Turns 100% of the aff- makes innovation redundant rather than complementary because of winner-take-all tek races- impact is collapse of global innovation**

Hart and Ernst ‘7

(David, Associate Professor in the School of Public Policy at George Mason University, Dieter, Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, Governing the Global Knowledge Economy: Mind the Gap!, East-West Center, Economic Series, No. 93, January 2008, [www.eastwestcenter.org/fileadmin/stored/pdfs/ECONwp093\_2.pdf](http://www.eastwestcenter.org/fileadmin/stored/pdfs/ECONwp093_2.pdf))

Although the deterrent effect of “free-riding” is the most obvious global governance challenge impinging on flows of codified knowledge, it is not the only one. Ironically, the absence of global governance can spark wasteful public spending in certain fields, even as it reduces investments in others. The basic dynamic is the same one that inspires “patent races.” In very hot high-technology fields, competing nations may perceive a “winner-take-all” situation, in which they expect value to be appropriated from knowledge only by the first to create it. The result is duplication of effort, imprudent “crash” programs, and even outright fraud, as in the South Korean stem cell case. The “winner-take-all” expectation may have some basis to it, since regional agglomerations of technological capability often do arise. Yet, the race to invest often extends far beyond its plausible regional or national winners. Political leaders in unlikely locales find such investments difficult to resist. They gain immediate public support through their association with high technology, while the political costs of wasted investments are deferred past the end of their terms of office or simply ignored. The damage may be compounded by indirect subsidies or by the extension of IPR or other forms of protection into these same fields. In an ungoverned global knowledge economy, then, the coordination and public goods problems are likely to yield a highly unbalanced portfolio of national (and regional and corporate) investments in science. Some fields will be orphaned due to an inability to cooperate, even though the global net benefit of investments in them would be positive. Others will be crowded with pretenders jostling for advantage, most of whom will be wasting their money.

#### **Diffused decisionmaking- fast capitalism makes boom/bust cycles too rapid and dismantles regulatory decisionmaking- all their sustainability ev assumes previous modes of globalization**

Hassan ‘5

(ARC Senior Research Fellow, Media and Communications @ Univ. of Melbourne)

(Robert, Timescapes of the Network Society, Fast Capitalism 1.1, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism-/1\_1/hassan.html)

The revolutions of neoliberalism and ICTs have certainly made capitalism flexible, and have disrupted the old time-grids of Fordism, but at a cost that will probably be unsustainable over the long term. In other words, capitalism, through its revolutionary momentum, in a systemic dialectic, is digging its own grave—again. Massey, in the quote above, writes of those "groups who are really in a sense in charge of time-space compression." As I said before, however, these words could have been written in the 1960s, long before the rise of the network society, and long before the power of those "groups" became problematic. On the effects of neoliberal globalization, Anthony Giddens (1997: 4-5) has written that: We are at the beginning of a fundamental shakeout of world society, which comes from numerous sources… It comes from the impact of technology on global markets and also from the disappearance of the Soviet Union. We are at the beginning of this process and we don't really know as yet where it is going to lead us… If you could say that the West controlled the earlier phases of globalisation, the current phase is one that nobody controls. (emphasis added) Certain individuals and groups benefit from this upset power-geometry. Some, of course, get to become extremely powerful. But no one is in control because the power geometry that rested upon the spatial and temporal grids of Fordist capitalism has been shattered by neoliberalism and the ICT revolution. Harvey's "rapidity of time" does indeed make it increasingly difficult to "react to events." Planning and consolidation of power count for less when "events" can hit like a tidal wave. Wild stock market fluctuations, the deregulation of industries, the diminution of regulatory government involvement in all aspects of the economy (let the market decide) has meant that individuals and groups leading a company one day can find themselves and their corporations in deep trouble the next (like the CEOs of Enron and WorldCom). The effect of the neoliberal globalization/ICT revolutions, then, does make capitalism more flexible, it does disrupt the temporal grids of Fordism—but it also disrupts the power-geometry that was formed upon these. A flexible and informationized capitalism is, then, over the medium- to long-term, a much weaker and intrinsically risk-prone capitalism.

#### **Financial Calculations- economics of speed reduces future unsustainability into present financial calculations- ignores risks of rampant speculation and ensures collapse- empirically proven**

Hope ‘10

(Auckland University of Technology) (Wayne, Time, Communication, and Financial Collapse, International Journal of Communication 4 (2010), 649–669)

The reality of financial collapse was officially acknowledged on September 20, 2008, when the U.S. Treasury announced a plan to purchase up to $700 billion of worthless securities from troubled banks. The initial document was rejected by the House of Representatives and modified by the Senate before passing into law on October 3, 2008 (Wade 2008, p. 9). This was the first installment of the controversial Troubled Asset Relief Plan (TARP), whereby Federal regulators used taxpayers’ money to stabilize and reorganize the investment banking system. The spreading credit crisis forced a similar response from the ECB, the Bank of England, and major European governments. National and supra-national governmental institutions confronted a worldwide recessionary spiral. Financial collapse effectively reduced bank lending and credit lines to large-, medium-, and small-scale firms. Cuts in production, massive layoffs, and increased unemployment drove down consumer spending, which forced all kinds of businesses to close. Reduced credit flows and falling aggregate demand in large Western countries diminished export returns throughout East Asia. China, Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore sold less consumer durables, electronic goods, and software products to North American and European consumers (Gumbel & Schuman, 2009, pp. 15–18; Elliott, 2009, pp. 20–21). As world economic circumstances worsened, financialized capitalism and neo-liberalism became understood in epochal terms. Correspondingly, the 2007–2008 financial collapse and its global consequences invoked historical comparisons with the 1930s depression. Some academics and journalists have drawn from Karl Marx, Maynard Keynes, Hyman Minsky, and Charles Kindleberger to illustrate the inherent cyclicity of financial crises. Others have emphasized the unprecedented global connectivity of finance, production, and consumption. For this article, it is sufficient to conclude that the temporal contradictions and real-time myopia of financialized capitalism are matters of historical record. Within the 2000–2006 credit bubble, investors, politicians, regulators, and the financial media did not fully appreciate the growing uncertainty about what lay ahead. More specifically, evolving financial technologies of speculation, whereby the uncertain future was collapsed into present calculations, obscured the prospect that future happenings might be unpredictable and uncontrollable. When such happenings did, in fact, transpire, the previously unforeseen problem of systemic risk became obvious; financial stability was threatened on a global scale.

#### **The impact is global conflict- financial collapse ensures North-South inequalities are exacerbated and creates massive social upheaval- that can only be checked by nationalist imagery and ensures international conflict as the public externalizes blame onto foreign competitors- no checks on escalation because interdependence has collapsed and nationalism ensures irrational policy calculations**

### 2NC Environment Overview

#### Economics of speed leads to environmental collapse-

#### Environmental Blinders- Simons ’10 says when companies race products to the market they search for any imaginable advantage, creating incentives for unsustainable innovation- additionally, the need to create quick profit for investors disincentivizes disruptive technologies like renewables and encourages companies to develop within existing unsustainable technology formats- epistemically excludes environmental costs from our calculations

#### Waste Production- the need to produce quickly ensures environmental corner cutting- means unsustainable energy use and pollution creation

Land ‘6

(University of Strathclyde, Glasgow) (Ray, Networked Learning and the Politics of Speed: a Dromological Perspective, Networked Learning 2006)

Adam (1998:69) identifies the interrelated social and environmental hazards of speed, when it becomes tightly coupled to efficiency and competition, as being ‘a rise in energy use, second with the production of pollution, and third with reference to increased production of waste, all of which in turn, add to an overall escalation of environmental degradation.’ A further pressure on the environment arises, she argues, when, ‘due to the economic valorisation of speed, corners are being cut in relation to safety and sustainability.’ Virilio, similarly, sees globalisation not as economic but as primarily ecological. The pollution it causes is not just that of the physical environment as in the atmospheric greenhouse effect ‘but also to the pollution of distances and delays which make up the world of concrete experience’ (116). In his view ‘globalisation relates to the dromospheric greenhouse effect of confinement within the limit-acceleration of telecommunications’ (117).

#### Economics of speed ensures massive environmental collapse- two scenarios for extinction-

Resource wars- a toxic Earth decreases available pool of resources and creates time pressures that make violent resource acquisition the only option- puts nation’s backs to the wall and ensures all political calculations are zero-sum- biggest internal link magnitude for escalation

#### Carrying capacity- environmental destruction like forest-clear cutting, pollution production, pesticide use, and strip-mining destroys natural eco-system cycles and disrupts the biological timescapes- creates multiple trends for extinction like global warming and biodiversity loss that collapse the ability of the earth to sustain life- evaluate this impact first because its structural and its magnitude increases exponentially as positive feedback sequences increase