#### I value Justice

#### Metaphysical violence is invevitable-All concepts, identities, and judgements are constructed in opposition to their negative. There can be no conception of good without bad, friendship without betrayal, promises without promise breaking. Justice should be focused on minimizing this ontological violence.

Hagglund 04 [Martin. "The necessity of discrimination: Disjoining Derrida and Levinas." diacritics 34.1 (2004): 40-71.]

“Derrida targets precisely this logic of opposition. As he argues in Of Grammatology, metaphysics has always regarded violence as derivative of a primary peace. **The possibility of violence can** thus **be accounted for only in terms of** a Fall, that is, in terms **of a fatal corruption of a pure origin**. By deconstructing this figure of thought, Derrida seeks to elucidate why violence is not merely an empirical accident that befalls something that precedes it. Rather, **violence** it **stems from an essential impropriety that does not allow anything to be sheltered from death** and forgetting. Consequently, Derrida takes issue with what he calls the “ethico-theoretical decision” of metaphysics, which postulates the simple to be before the complex, the pure before the impure, the sincere before the deceitful, and so on. All divergences from the positively valued term are thus explained away as symptoms of “alienation,” and the desirable is conceived as the return to what supposedly has been lost or corrupted. In contrast, Derrida argues that **what** **makes it possible for anything to be at the same time makes it impossible for anything to be in itself**. **The integrity of any** “positive” **term is necessarily compromised and threatened by its “other.”** **Such** constitutive **alterity answers to an essential corruptibility, which undercuts all ethico-theoretical decisions of how things ought to be in an ideal world.**11 A key term here is what Derrida calls “undecidability.” With this term he designates the necessary opening toward the coming of the future. **The coming of the future is strictly speaking “undecidable,” since it is a relentless displacement that unsettles any definitive assurance or given meaning**. One can never know what will have happened. Promises may always be turned into threats, friendships into enmities, fidelities into betrayals, and so on. There is no opposition between undecidability and the making of decisions. On the contrary, Derrida emphasizes that **one always acts in relation to what cannot be predicted, that one always is forced to make decisions even though the consequences of these decisions cannot be finally established.** **Any** kind of **decision** (ethical, or political decision, juridical, and so forth) **is** more or less **violent, but it is nevertheless necessary to make decisions.** Once again, I want to stress that violent differentiation by no means should be understood as a Fall, where violence supervenes upon a harmony that precedes it. On the contrary, **discrimination has to be regarded as a constitutive condition**. **Without divisional marks**—which is to say: without segregating borders—**there would be nothing at all.** In effect, every attempt to organize life in accordance with ethical or political prescriptions will have been marked by a fundamental duplicity. On the one hand, **it is necessary to draw boundaries**, to demarcate, **in order to form any community** whatsoever. On the other hand, **[but] it is precisely because of these** excluding borders **that every** kind of **community is characterized by** a more or less palpable **instability**. What cannot be included opens the threat as well as the chance that the prevalent order may be transformed or subverted. In Specters of Marx, Derrida pursues this argument in terms of an originary “spectrality.” A salient connotation concerns phantoms and specters as haunting reminders of the victims of historical violence, of those who have been excluded or extinguished from the formation of a society. The notion of spectrality is not, however, exhausted by these ghosts that question the good conscience of a state, a nation, or an ideology. Rather, Derridaʼs aim is to formulate a general “hauntology” (hantologie), in contrast to the traditional “ontology” that thinks being in terms of self-identical presence. What is important about the figure of the specter, then, is that it cannot be fully present: it has no being in itself but marks a relation to what is no longer or not yet. And since time— the disjointure between past and future—is a condition even for the slightest moment, Derrida argues that spectrality is at work in everything that happens. **An identity or community can never escape the machinery of exclusion**, can never fail to engender ghosts, **since it must demarcate itself against a past that cannot be encompassed and a future that cannot be anticipated**. Inversely, it will always be threatened by what it cannot integrate in itself—haunted by the negated, the neglected, and the unforeseeable. Thus, a rigorous deconstructive thinking maintains that we are always already in- scribed in an “economy of violence” where we are both excluding and being excluded. **No position can be autonomous or absolute but is necessarily bound to other positions that it violates and by which it is violated.** The struggle for justice can thus not be a struggle for peace, but only for what I will call “lesser violence.” Derrida himself only uses this term briefly in his essay “Violence and Metaphysics,” but I will seek to develop its significance. The starting point for my argument is that **all decisions made in the name of justice are made in view of what is judged to be the lesser violence**. If there is always an economy of violence, decisions of justice cannot be a matter of choosing what is nonviolent. **To justify something is rather to contend that it is less violent than something else.** This does not mean that decisions made in view of lesser violence are actually less violent than the violence they oppose. On the contrary, even the most horrendous acts are justified in view of what is judged to be the lesser violence. For example, justifications of genocide clearly appeal to an argument for lesser violence, since the extinction of the group in question is claimed to be less violent than the dangers it poses to another group. **The disquieting point, however, is that all decisions of justice are implicated in the logic of violence. The desire for lesser violence is never innocent, since it is a desire for violence in one form or another, and there can be no guarantee that it is in the service of perpetrating the better.”** (46-48)

#### And, Metaphysical violence is inescapable, the best we can hope for is some reduction. This means ideal theory fails-it attempts to ascribe a universal starting point to resolve that fundamental violence.

Hagglund 2 [Martin. "The necessity of discrimination: Disjoining Derrida and Levinas." diacritics 34.1 (2004): 40-71.]

“An possible objection here is that we must strive toward an ideal origin or end, an arkhe or telos that would prevail beyond the possibility of violence. **Even if every community is haunted by victims of discrimination** and forgetting, **we should try to reach a state of being that does not exclude anyone**, namely, a consummated presence that includes everyone. However, it is precisely with such an “ontological” thesis that Derridaʼs hauntological thinking takes issue. At several places in Specters of Marx he maintains that a completely present life—which would not be “out of joint,” not haunted by any ghosts—would be nothing but a complete death. Derridaʼs point is not simply that a peaceful state of existence is impossible to realize, as if it were a desirable, albeit unattainable end. Rather, he challenges the very idea that absolute peace is desirable. **In a state of being where all violent change is precluded, nothing can ever happen. Absolute peace is thus inseparable from absolute violence**, as Derrida argued already in “Violence and Metaphysics.” **Anything that would** finally **put an end to violence** (whether the end is a religious salvation, a universal justice, a harmonious intersubjectivity or some other ideal) **would end the possibility of life in general. The idea of absolute peace is the idea of eliminating the undecidable future that is the condition for anything to happen**. Thus, the idea of absolute peace is the idea of absolute violence.” (49)

#### Second, ethics requires answering the question of responsibility otherwise agents can always question why they are subject to the rule i.e “I know that a certain principle is moral, but why should I care about acting morally.” However, Absolute responsibility to the other fails, if I attempt to be hospitable to the other I inherently sacrifice my hospitality to the other other.

Hagglund 3 [Martin. "The necessity of discrimination: Disjoining Derrida and Levinas." diacritics 34.1 (2004): 40-71.]

“For the same reason, Derridaʼs notion of “infinite responsibility” should not be conflated with Levinasʼs. For Derrida, the infinitude of responsibility answers to the fact that **responsibility always takes place in relation to a negative infinity of others. The negative infinity of responsibility is both spatial** (innumerable finite others that exceed my horizon) **and temporal** (innumerable times past and to come that exceed my horizon). Far from confirming Levinasʼs sense of responsibility, the negative infinity of others is fatal for his notion of an originary encounter that would give ethics the status of “first philosophy” and be the guiding principle for a metaphysical “goodness.” **Even if it were possible to sacrifice yourself completely to another, to devote all your forces to the one who is encountered face-to-face, it would mean that you had disregarded or denied all the others who demanded your attention or needed your help**. For there are always more than two, as Richard Beardsworth has aptly put it 137. **Whenever I turn toward another I turn away from yet another, and thus exercise discrimination**. As Der- rida points out in The Gift of Death, “**I cannot respond to the call, the demand, the obligation, or even the love of another without sacrificing the other other, the other others**” 68. Consequently, Derrida emphasizes that the concept of responsibility lends itself a priori to “scandal and aporia” 68. **There are potentially an endless number of others to consider, and one cannot take any responsibility without excluding some others in favor of certain others. What makes it possible to be responsible is thus at the same time what makes it impossible for any responsibility to be fully responsible.** Responsibility, then, is always more or less discriminating, and infinite responsibility is but another name for the necessity of discrimination.” (56)

#### And, ethical relationships are mediated through radical alterity. The other and the self are intertwined in an undecidable relationship that always already carries the possibility of annihilation, yet this very condition is necessary to have any relationship whatsoever.

Hagglund 4 [Martin. "The necessity of discrimination: Disjoining Derrida and Levinas." diacritics 34.1 (2004): 40-71.]

 “Thus, Derrida articulates a double argument concerning the relation between self and other. On the one hand, Derrida emphasizes that **the subject cannot go outside of itself. The openness to the other is mediated through oneʼs own experience and thus necessarily limited**. **On the other hand, the subject can never be in itself, but is always exposed to an alterity that exceeds it.**Alterity does not stem from the Good beyond being, but from the spacing of time that breaches the integrity of self and other from their first inception. The spacing of time entails that alterity is undecidable. **The other can be anything whatsoever or anyone whosoever. The relation to the other is thus the nonethical opening of ethics. This opening is violent because it entails that everything is exposed to what may corrupt and extinguish it**. Hence, Derrida emphasizes that the other as other is the other as mortal. It is this originary finitude that raises the demand of responsibility in the first place. **If the other could not be violated or annihilated** (and inversely, if the other could not violate or annihilate me) **there would be no reason to take responsibility or pursue reflections on ethical problems**. As Derrida writes in Politics of Friendship, **the violent opening of ethics is already revealed in the decree “thou shalt not kill.”** For Derrida, **this in- junction** does not testify to a primary peace but **indicates that violence is an imminent threat** (otherwise there would be no need for a prohibition). **Assaults and violations are always possible since relations can be forged only between finite beings, where the one is exposed to being murdered by the other and inversely**. Even the most affectionate love or intimate friendship is therefore haunted by the sentence “I can kill you, you can kill me,” as Derrida puts it in Politics of Friendship 122/143.” (Pg. 52)

#### Attempts at a reduction of metaphysical violence and an ethic of democratic responsibility towards the other requires refusal to foreclose possible futures. We never know who or what the other is and can therefore never know what they will require. However, democracy itself is inherently contradictory and requires that same metaphysical violence. This necessitates a conception of democracy as always to-come in which we create forms of struggle that result in material changes to include the other.

Matthews 13 [, Daniel (Daniel Matthews is a PhD candidate at the Birkbeck Law School, University of London where he teaches Contract Law), "The Democracy To Come: Notes on the Thought of Jacques Derrida." Critical Legal Thinking. N.p., 16 Apr. 2013. Web. 12 Dec. 2016.]

In order to elaborate on this deceptively simple phrase I want to assess democracy in relation to “autoimmunity” a key principle in Derrida’s later work. Autoimmunity both stands-in for and re-orientates a number of Derrida’s earlier “quasi-concepts:” aporia, double bind, the supplement, différance, antinomy and so on. In Rogues, **Derrida makes a sustained case for thinking of democracy as being governed by an autoimmune logic**. Biologically, **autoimmunity** describes a kind of bodily self-destruction whereby the body’s immune system produces antibodies or lymphocytes that work against substances naturally present in the body. Whilst clearly inspired by the biological inference, Derrida uses the term to **describe a gesture of self-defence or self-preservation of some thing that in fact leads to that thing’s destruction.** So, to suggest that democracy is autoimmune is to claim that it is threatened internally by its very own logic. This internal compromise or flaw to democracy is crucial to Derrida’s thinking of the democracy to come. I want to highlight two ways in which Derrida accounts for this self-inflicted dehiscence within democracy. The **first** issue involves the relation between democracy and sovereignty. Derrida suggests that **in order for democracy**, **understood** quite literally **as the rule** (cratos) **of the people** (demos), **to have any discernable effect in ruling it must rely on some form of sovereignty. Sovereignty and democracy are inseparable but contradictory partners.** The efficacy of democracy relies on sovereignty: **without sovereignty, the demos would be usurped by some other power and an effective rule of the demos would never be achieved.** In striving to protect itself and guarantee its dominance through a co-option of sovereignty, democracy suffers from an autoimmune self-destruction. **In an attempt to immunise and protect itself from destruction, democracy destroys itself by closing off, unifying and essentialising the multiplicity that enables the formation of democracy in the first place. The plurality of the demos must be contained and restrained in a sovereign community**: “the people” or “a nation”. **In this move there are inevitable exclusions and elisions that morph a heterogeneous collectivity into a homogonous unit. These omissions always return to haunt the supposed sovereignty of any political community, destroying the community’s immunity from difference and otherness.** Democracy and sovereignty are bound in a destructive clasp that means democracy as such (that is, a democracy without sovereignty) remains an impossibility. The **second** issue turns on the canonical problem of the relationship between equality and freedom. Again, **equality and freedom are two necessary but contradictory claims that unite in democracy**. **Equality hopes to guarantee that each actor within a community has equal value**, most clearly this is seen in the ascription of one equal vote to each individual in a community. **Freedom**, on the other hand, **is a question of** each individual’s singularity, **the freedom to exceed a determination of the same that equality tries to establish.** But, Derrida suggests, **freedom is impossible without a concept of equality — the suggestion being that freedom must always take place in relation to limits imposed by others and we must, in theory at least, all be equally free. Democratic freedom only makes sense, then, if everyone within the demos is equally free. So, equality becomes an integral part of freedom and because such equality is inscribed within freedom, equality is no longer merely a question of number and calculation but itself becomes incalculable. The two concepts are intrinsically bound but in an autoimmune relation. Equality confines every singularity to a measurable unit that is infinitely substitutable. Freedom, on the other hand, exceeds this calculation and enables each singularity to be heterogeneous to others, it is a guarantee of the singularity of each individual, enabling every other to treated as (wholly) other**. For democracy, these two competing factors are mutually dependent — liberty must take place in the context of liberty for all — so this represents an internal corruption within the very structure of democracy. **Democracy**, on this reading, **is always at war with itself**, never capable of resolving its inner tensions and contradictions. To put it in terms that echo Derrida’s earliest concerns with metaphysics of presence, we could say that **democracy is never present but is always deferred.** In its claim to presence (“this is democracy here-and-now”) democracy evokes the sovereignty that calls forth its destruction. **Democracy is,** then, **never fully present in the** (sovereign) **claim that democracy has arrived or been achieved. It is in this sense that democracy is always “to come”.** Significantly, **the “to come” here is not the positing of some horizon of possibility for democracy, as if it were just an Idea** (in a Platonic or regulative, Kantian, sense) **that we must move towards. Rather the “to come” expresses the dislocation that structures the very possibility of democracy from within**. The futural inference of the “to come” (à venir) is, however, significant. Derrida distinguishes between “the future” — thought of as a future-present, predictable and programmable — and the à venir which names an unforeseeable coming of the event, a rupture or disturbance that is unpredictable and open, without telos or knowable destination. **The “to come”** in Derrida’s formulation, then, **points to a transformative and disruptive potential at the heart of democracy, it points to a promise of change in the here and now.**

#### Thus the standard is consistency with democracy-to-come.

#### Contention One: A struggle for democracy-to-come requires free speech.

#### Free speech is key to a categorical openness towards the future, any restriction of speech is an attempt to foreclose a possible future which result in metaphysical violence.

Fritsch 02 [Matthias. "Derrida's democracy to come." Constellations 9.4 (2002): 574-597.]

If my demonstration that Derrida affirms a stronger link is correct, however, it should be clear that **the unavoidable practice of inheriting** from **an open future has** some **close affinities with** what is **inherited** in this case, namely, **democracy**. This seems to single out democracy as more attuned to the work of inheritance by way of repetition from the future. It seems undeniable that **Derrida’s reformulation of democracy does not affirm just any form of political organization,** and not even just any strains and interpretations of the democratic heritage. For example, Derrida’s **democracy to come appears much less defined by popular sovereignty, equality, and majority rule** – although Derrida recognizes their importance18 – **than by free speech, openness to criticism and otherness, and hospitality to singularity**. This shows, then, that **Derrida’s** concept of **democracy selectively inherits and reformulates those features** that show a structural homology between the normative and the quasi-transcendental levels, and **that are cut to fit the deconstructive understanding of identity-formation, of time and space,** and so on. **In this** way, **Derrida is led not only to the unavoidable affirmation of** historicity and **futural openness** – an affirmation which he says is affirmation itself19 – **but to affirm a** certain type of **democracy involving the commitment to free speech, to hearing the other out, to being open to challenges regarding the interpretation of essential concepts**, to criticize and perfect institutions with a view toward singularity and otherness, etc., in short, to what Derrida routinely affirms as his gloss on the emancipatory project of the Enlightenment.20 And these more specific, undoubtedly normative affirmations seem neither to be analytically contained in concepts of ‘democracy’ – so that a commitment to democracy necessarily implies a commitment to them – nor do they, in any obvious way, follow from the promise of repetition. It should come as no surprise, then, that Derrida is quite willing to use the normative language of ‘ought’ and ‘duty’ in his discussion of messianic and democratic experience. **The normative commitments that are involved in Derrida’s** reconceptualization of **democracy** in terms of infinite perfectibility, free speech, and the non-groundedness of the symbolic space of democratic identity-formation, **are** epitomized by what he calls **a “categorical imperative” of the event or of experience.**21 Derrida says: **The happening of the event is what cannot and should not be prevented: it is another name for the future itself.** **Not that it is good** – good in itself – **that everything or anything should happen; nor that we should give up trying to prevent certain things from coming to pass** (in that case there would be no choice, no responsibility, no ethics or politics). **But you do not try to oppose events unless you think they shut off the future, or carry a threat of death**….22 Notice how Derrida moves from the structural impossibility of closure (‘cannot be prevented’) to the normative claim that such closure ought not be prevented. In the face of this move, and given the structural homology of the ontological (better: quasi-transcendental) and the normative, political level, we must wonder how we are to understand their relation. Derrida at times seems to suggest a rather strong relationship, as in the above passage (which suggests that what cannot be avoided must not be avoided). Even if we do not expect any unquestionable foundations for values, or any rational necessity to lead from a quasi-transcendental account to moral and political affirmations, it seems fair to ask why a normative call to openness to the event, and everything that implies for democratic practice, should be linked to, or even follow from, the ineluctable exposure of any identity and meaning to a structurally open-ended repetition from the future.

#### Free speech is key to resolve democracy’s autoimmune logic.

Fritsch 2 [Matthias. "Derrida's democracy to come." Constellations 9.4 (2002): 574-597.]

**With** this mention of **the institutionally guaranteed right to free speech**, we have moved on to the second, distinctively futural feature of democracy. Derrida points out that **if one criticizes democracy** – for example, for its traditional exclusion of the ‘sister’ from its fraternal order, for its distinction between the natural-born member and the outsider, for its law of filiation – **one does so in the name of democracy, in the name of a democracy to come**.10 **Even if one criticizes democracy itself, one is authorized to do so** (and thus already encompassed) **by democracy. For democracy, by granting the right to free speech**, free assembly, and a free press, is the form of political organization that **calls for its own critique and that admits the fundamental revisability, and openness to challenge, of its own self-understanding**. **With this** admission, **democracy opens up a space between its actual condition and its future space** – which may or may not be a regulative ideal11 – **and situates itself between the present** present **and the future** present, between presence and the messianic, absolute future. It is this space, **this utopic space between the present and the future**, that la démocratie à venir delineates, by **open[s]**ing **up a space in which the definition of the ideal, and of the meaning of such fundamental terms as freedom and equality, remains open-ended.** This democratic and atopical (non-present) space may also be viewed as a polemical space. The promise of repetition, and **the open-endedness of the future to come, keeps the values and institutional structures open to different interpretations of what democracy means, thus allowing multiple voices to clash and negotiate with one another. The thinking of the** messianic or absolute **future** could thus support the space or field in which this polemos, this clash, is to take place. It might **serve as a reminder that the other, and the other others, be heard, both from within oneself and from the outside.** **The ‘to come’ would put a question mark behind everything put forward under the heading of ‘democracy’** – for instance, **by referring to allegedly ‘natural’ and hence unquestionable rights. Further, it might help to prevent** the ossification of interpreted values and **the closing of possibilities: the supreme democratic virtue would be to question oneself before questioning others**. (The messianic future is opposed to liberal good conscience.) But the messianic future, on Derrida’s view, would also keep democratic structures, such as equality and the always universal law, open to an appeal from singularity, interrupting the universal-juridical framework to let the justice of singularity come forth. **In this way, democracy would be enabled to face and thus negotiate its inescapable aporias, first and foremost hospitality and openness to the singular other and the equality of all.** (We will return to the question of aporia in a moment.) For purposes of clarification, this deconstructive space of discourse may be compared to Habermas’s understanding of the requirements of democratic discourse. On Derrida’s view, the polemical space of **democratic decision-making is opposed to a notion of deliberative democracy that specifies normative procedural criteria in advance.** **In the name of intelligibility and common sense**, Derrida fears, **a homogenous medium, a universal model of language, may be superimposed on the radically open forms of democratic discussion and questioning.** Thus, the polemical open-endedness of discussion may be construed as a deconstructive rejoinder to a discourse-ethical account of democratic deliberation: it would be a democratic discourse governed by openness, infinity, and the possibility of unsurpassable dissension that requires compromise rather than by normative rules given as universal and geared toward transparency and consensus.12 In addition, Derrida claims – perhaps a bit hastily – that **discursive norms program decisions, neutralize the event as the arrival of singularity, paralyze much-needed inventiveness, and thereby rule out responsibility as the relation to the otherness of the other.**13

#### Contention Two: Free speech is key to forms of critical engagement necessary to create a more inclusive democracy.

#### **Higher education is increasingly being invaded by militaristic capitalism that attempts to squash dissent and destroy criticism.**

Giroux 15 [Henry. "Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory." Truthout. N.p., 03 Mar. 2015. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.]

While the post-9/11 attacks have taken an even more dangerous turn, **higher education is still a site of intense struggle, but** it is fair to say **the right wing is winning**. **The success of the financial elite** in waging this war **can be measured not only by the rise in the stranglehold of neoliberal policies over higher education, the increasing corporatization of the university, the evisceration of full-time, tenured jobs for faculty, the dumbing down of the curriculum, the view of students as customers, and the growing influence of the military-industrial-academic complex in the service of the financial elite, but also in the erasing of public memory.** **Memory** is no longer insurgent; that is, it **has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage**. On the contrary, **it is either being cleansed or erased by the new apologists for the status quo who urge people to love the United States, which means giv[e]ing up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle.** The current call to cleanse history in the name of a false patriotism that celebrates a new illiteracy as a way of loving the United States is a discourse of anti-memory, a willful attempt at forgetting the past in the manufactured fog of historical amnesia. **This is particularly true when it comes to erasing the work of a number of critical intellectuals who have written about higher education as the practice of freedom**, **including** John Dewey, George S. Counts, **W.E.B. Du Bois**, the Social Reconstructionists, **and others, all of whom viewed higher education as integral to the development of both engaged critical citizens and the university as a democratic public sphere**. [(19)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a19) **Under** the reign of **neoliberalism**, with few exceptions, **higher education appears to be increasingly decoupling itself from its historical legacy as a crucial public sphere, responsible for both educating students for the workplace and providing them with the modes of critical discourse, interpretation, judgment, imagination, and experiences that deepen and expand democracy.** **As universities adopt the ideology of the transnational corporation and become subordinated to the needs of capital, the war industries and the Pentagon, they are less concerned about how they might educate students about the ideology and civic practices of democratic governance and the necessity of using knowledge to address the challenges of public life.** [(20)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a20) Instead, as part of the post-9/11 military-industrial-academic complex, **higher education increasingly conjoins military interests and market values, identities and social relations while the role of the university as a public good, a site of critical dialogue and a place that calls students to think, question, learn how to take risks, and act with compassion and conviction is dismissed as impractical or subversive**. [(21)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a21) **The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States,** extending from Thomas Jefferson to John Dewey to Maxine Greene, **who [which] held that freedom flourishes in the worldly space of the public realm only through the work of educated, critical citizens.** **Within this democratic tradition, education** was not confused with training; instead, its **critical function was propelled by the need to provide students with the knowledge and skills that enable a "politically interested and mobilized citizenry, one that has certain solidarities, is capable of acting on its own behalf, and anticipates a future of ever greater social equality across lines of race, gender, and class."** [(22)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a22) Other prominent educators and theorists such as Hannah Arendt, James B. Conant and Cornelius Castoriadis have long believed and rightly argued that we should not allow education to be modeled after the business world. Dewey, in particular, warned about the growing influence of the "corporate mentality" and the threat that the business model posed to public spaces, higher education and democracy. He argued: The business mind, having its own conversation and language, its own interests, its own intimate groupings in which men of this mind, in their collective capacity, determine the tone of society at large as well as the government of industrial society.... We now have, although without formal or legal status, a mental and moral corporateness for which history affords no parallel. [(23)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a23) Dewey and the other public intellectuals mentioned above shared a common vision and project of rethinking what role education might play in providing students with the habits of mind and ways of acting that would enable them to "identify and probe the most serious threats and dangers that democracy faces in a global world dominated by instrumental and technological thinking." [(24)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a24) Conant, a former president of Harvard University, argued that **higher education should create a class of "American radicals," who could fight for equality, favor public education, elevate human needs over property rights and challenge "groups which have attained too much power."** [(25)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a25) Conant's views seem so radical today that it is hard to imagine him being hired as a university president at Harvard or any other institution of higher learning. All of these intellectuals offered a notion of the university as a bastion of democratic learning and values that provide a crucial referent in exploring the more specific question regarding what form will be taken by the relationship between corporations and higher education in the 21st century. **It now seems naive to assume that corporations, left to their own devices, would view higher education as more than merely a training center for future business employees, a franchise for generating profits or a space in which corporate culture and education merge in order to produce literate consumers.**

#### An openness towards new forms of learning is key to a critical pedagogy which opens up space for democracy to come.

Giroux 11 [Henry. "Occupy Colleges Now: Students as the New Public Intellectuals." Truthout. N.p., 21 Nov. 2011. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.]

**Finding** our way to **a [better]** more humane **future demands a new politics**, a new set of values, **and a renewed sense of** the fragile nature of **democracy**. In part, **this means educating a new generation of intellectuals who** not only **defend higher education as** a **democratic** public sphere, but also **[and] frame their own agency as intellectuals willing to connect their research, teaching, knowledge, and service with broader democratic concerns over equality, justice, and an alternative vision of what the university might be and what society could become**. Under the present circumstances, it is time to remind ourselves that **academe may be one of the few public spheres available that can provide the educational conditions for students, faculty, administrators, and community members to embrace pedagogy as a space of dialogue and unmitigated questioning, imagine different futures, become border-crossers, and embrace a language of critique and possibility that makes visible the urgency of a politics necessary to address important social issues and contribute to the quality of public life and the common good**. As people move or are pushed by authorities out of their makeshift tent cities in Zuccotti Park and other public spaces in cities across the United States, the harsh registers and interests of the punishing state become more visible. **The corporate state cannot fight any longer with ideas because their** visions, **ideologies** and survival of the fittest ethic **are bankrupt, fast losing any semblance of legitimacy. Students** all over the country **are changing the language of politics while reclaiming pedagogy as central to any viable notion of agency, resistance and collective struggle**. In short, they have become the new public intellectuals, using their bodies, social media, new digital technologies, and any other viable educational tool to raise new questions, point to new possibilities, and register their criticisms of the various antidemocratic elements of casino capitalism and the emerging punishing state. Increasingly, the Occupy Wall Street protesters are occupying colleges and universities, setting up tents, and using the power of ideas to engage other students, faculty, and anyone else who will listen to them. The call is going out from the University of California at Berkeley, Harvard University, Florida State University, Duke University, Rhode Island College, and over 120 other universities that the time has come to connect knowledge not just to power, but to the very meaning of what it means to be an engaged intellectual responsive to the possibilities of individual and collective resistance and change. **This poses a new challenge not only for** the brave **students** mobilizing these protests on college campuses, **but also** to **faculty who often relegate themselves to the secure and comfortable claim that scholarship should be disinterested, objective and removed from politics.** There is a great deal these students and young people can learn from this turn away from the so-called professionalism of disinterested knowledge and the disinterested intellectual by reading the works of Noam Chomsky, Edward Said, Jacques Derrida, Howard Zinn, Arundhati Roy, Elaine Scarry, Pierre Bourdieu and others who offer a treasure trove of theoretical and political insights about what it means to assume the role of a public intellectual as both a matter of social responsibility and political urgency. In response to the political indifference and moral coma that embraced many universities and scholars since the 1980s, the late Said argued for intellectuals to move beyond the narrow interests of professionalism and specialization as well as the cheap seductions of celebrity culture being offered to a new breed of publicity and anti-public intellectuals. Said wanted to defend the necessity - indeed, keep open the possibility - of the intellectual who does not consolidate power, but questions it, connects his or her work to the alleviation of human suffering, enters the public sphere in order to deflate the claims of triumphalism and recalls from exile those dangerous memories that are often repressed or ignored. Of course, such a position is at odds with those intellectuals who have retreated into arcane discourses that offer the cloistered protection of the professional recluse. Making few connections with audiences outside of the academy or to the myriad issues that bear down on everyday lives, many academics became increasingly irrelevant, while humanistic inquiry suffers the aftershocks of flagging public support. The Occupy Wall Street protesters have refused this notion of the deracinated, if not increasingly irrelevant, notion of academics and students as disinterested intellectuals. They are not alone. Refusing the rewards of apolitical professionalism or obscure specialization so rampant on university campuses, Roy has pointed out that **intellectuals need to ask themselves some very "uncomfortable questions about our values and traditions, our vision for the future, our responsibilities as citizens, the legitimacy of our 'democratic institutions,' the role of the state, the police, the army, the judiciary, and the intellectual community**."[[1]](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/5046%3Aoccupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals#1) Similarly, Scarry points to the difficulty of seeing an injury and injustice, the sense of futility of one's own small efforts, and the special difficulty of lifting complex ideas into the public sphere.[[2]](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/5046%3Aoccupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals#2) Derrida has raised important questions about the relationship between critique and the very nature of the university and the humanities, as when he writes: **The university** without condition does not, in fact, exist, as we know only too well. Nevertheless, in principle and in conformity with its declared vocation, its professed essence, it **should remain an ultimate place of critical resistance - and more than critical - to all the power of dogmatic and unjust appropriation**.[[3]](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/5046%3Aoccupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals#3) Chomsky and the late Zinn have spoken about and demonstrated for over 40 years what it means to think rigorously and act courageously in the face of human suffering and manufactured hardships. All of these theorists are concerned with what it means for **intellectuals both within and outside of higher education** to **embrace the university as a productive site of dialogue and contestation, to imagine it as a site that offers students the promise of a democracy to come, to help them understand that there is no genuine democracy without genuine opposing critical power and the social movements that can make it happen**. But there is more at stake here than arguing for a more engaged public role for academics and students, for demanding the urgent need to reconnect humanistic inquiry to important social issues, or for insisting on the necessity for academics to reclaim a notion of ethical advocacy and connective relationships. There is also the challenge of connecting the university with visions that have some hold on the present, defending education as more than an investment opportunity or job credential, students as more than customers, and faculty as more than technicians or a subaltern army of casualized labor. **At a time when higher education is increasingly being dominated by a reductive corporate logic and technocratic rationality unable to differentiate training from a critical education, we need a chorus of new voices** to emphasize that the humanities, in particular, **and the university**, in general, **should play a central role in keeping critical thought alive while fighting back all attempts to foreclose and pre-empt the further unraveling of human possibilities, prodding human society to go on questioning itself and prevent that questioning from ever stalling or being declared finished.** Corporations and the warfare state should not dictate the needs of public and higher education, or, for that matter, any other democratic public sphere. As the Occupy student protesters have pointed out over the last few months, **one of the great dangers facing the 21st century is not the risk of illusory hopes, but those undemocratic forces that promote and protect state terrorism, massive inequality, render some populations utterly disposable, imagine the future only in terms of immediate financial gains, and promote forms of self-serving historical reinvention in which power is measured by the degree to which it evades any sense of actual truth and moral responsibility. Students**, like their youthful counterparts in the 1960s, **are once again arguing that higher education, even in its imperfect state, still holds the promise**, if not the reality, **of being able to offer them the complex knowledge and interdisciplinary related skills that enable existing and future generations to break the continuity of common sense, come to terms with their own power as critical agents, be critical of the authority that speaks to them**, translate private considerations into public issues, **and assume the responsibility of not only being governed but learning how to govern.** Inhabiting the role of public intellectuals, students can take on the difficult but urgent task of reclaiming the ideal and the practice of what it means to reclaim higher education in general and the humanities, more specifically, as a site of possibility that embraces the idea of democracy not merely as a mode of governance but, most importantly- as journalist Bill Moyers points out - as a means of dignifying people so they can become fully free to claim their moral and political agency. Students are starting to recognize that it is crucial to struggle for the university as a democratic public sphere and the need to use that sphere to educate a generation of new students, faculty and others about the history of race, racism, politics, identity, power, the state and the struggle for justice. They are increasingly willing to argue in theoretically insightful and profound ways about what it means to defend the university as a site that opens up and sustains public connections through which people's fragmented, uncertain, incomplete narratives of agency are valued, preserved, and made available for exchange while being related analytically to wider contexts of politics and power. They are moving to reclaim, once again, the humanities as a sphere that is crucial for grounding ethics, justice and morality across existing disciplinary terrains, while raising both a sense of urgency and a set of relevant questions about what kind of education would be suited to the 21st-century university and its global arrangements as part of a larger project of addressing the most urgent issues that face the social and political world. The punishing state can use violence with impunity to eject young people from parks and other public sites, but it is far more difficult to eject them from sites that are designed for their intellectual growth and well-being, make a claim to educate them, and register society's investment and commitment to their future. Students can be forced out of parks and other public spaces, but it is much more difficult to force them out of those sites designed to educate them - places that are identified with young people and register the larger society's obligation to their future and well-being. The police violence that has taken place at the University of California campuses at Berkeley and Davis does more than border on pure thuggery; it also reveals a display of force that is as unnecessary as it is brutal, and it is impossible to justify. These young people are being beaten on their campuses for simply displaying the courage to protest a system that has robbed them of both a quality education and a viable future. But there is more. It is also crucial not to allow casino capitalism to transform higher education into another extension of the corporate and warfare state. **If higher education loses its civic purpose** and becomes simply an adjunct of corporate and military power, **there will be practically no spaces left for dissent, dialogue, civic courage, and a spirit of thoughtfulness and critical engagement**. This is all the more reason to occupy colleges and use them as a launching pad to both educate and to expand the very meaning of the public sphere. **Knowledge is about more than the truth; it is also a weapon of change.** The language of a radical politics needs more than hope and outrage; it needs institutional spaces to produce ideas, values, and social relations capable of fighting off those ideological and material forces of casino capitalism that are intent in sabotaging any viable notion of human interaction, community, solidarity, friendship, and justice. Space is not the ultimate prize here.[[4]](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/5046%3Aoccupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals#4) Politics and ideology are the essence of what this movement should be about. But space becomes invaluable when it its democratic functions and uses are restored. In an age when the media have become a means of mass distraction and entertainment, the university offers a site of informed engagement, a place where theory and action inform each other, and a space that refuses to divorce intellectual activities from matters of politics, social responsibility and social justice. **As students and faculty increasingly use the space of the university as a megaphone for a new kind of critical education and politics, it will hopefully reclaim the democratic function of higher education and demonstrate what it means for students, faculty, and others to assume the role of public intellectuals dedicated to creat[e]ing a formative culture that can provide citizens and others with the knowledge and skills necessary for a radical democracy.** Rather than reducing learning to a measurable quantity in the service of a narrow instrumental rationality, learning can take on a new role, becoming central to developing and expanding the capacity for critical modes of agency, new forms of solidarity, and an education in the service of the public good, an expanded imagination, democratic values, and social change. The student intellectual as a public figure merges rigor with civic courage, meaning with the struggle for eliminating injustice wherever it occurs and hope with a realistic notion of social change. Hopefully, the Occupy Wall Street movements will expand their appropriation of public space to the university. And if so, let's hope that higher education will be viewed as a crucial public good and democratic public sphere. Under such circumstances, the university might be transformed into a new and broad-based community of learning and resistance. This is a huge possibility, but one worth struggling for. Unlike the youth movements of the past, such a movement will not crystallize around specific movements, but will create, hopefully, a community of the broadest possible resistance and political clout. In this way, the Occupy movement will connect to the larger world through a conversation and politics that links the particular with broader notions of freedom and justice. And against the pedagogical machine and political forces of casino capitalism, this expanding movement will fight hopefully with renewed energy. It will be determined in its mission to expand the capacities to think otherwise, and courageous in its attempts to take risks. It will be brave in its willingness to change the nature of the questions asked, fight to hold power accountable, and struggle to provide the formative culture for students and others to fight for those economic, political, social, and cultural conditions that are essential both to their future and to democracy itself.

#### That requires an engagement with an insurgent public memory in which students are taught to criticize and question dominant power structures.

Giroux 15 [Henry. "Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory." Truthout. N.p., 03 Mar. 2015. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.]

Higher education is not going to save the United States from becoming more authoritarian, but its destruction as a democratic public sphere is a crucial signpost as to how far we have tipped over into the nightmare of authoritarianism. **The shutting down of the higher education system as a democratic public sphere is not a definitive marker of defeat**. On the contrary, **it suggests the need for a new understanding of politics, one in which the university has a crucial role to play in the struggle to defend radical democracy as the new commons, and education as central to a politics that takes it seriously**. The winds are changing and this struggle is coming once again into view. We see it in Europe with the rise of radical political parties in Spain and Greece that connect the struggle over economic power with the struggle to create new modes of agency, culture, education and ideology, all of which now infuse the linking of politics to larger social movements. In this struggle, **there is a need to reclaim an insurgent public memory and the lost or suppressed narratives of older progressive battles in order to both learn from them and to build upon their insights**. This is necessary in order for educators and others **to rethink the meaning of politics, reclaim the radical imagination, launch a comprehensive education program that speaks to the concrete issues bearing down on peoples' lives, and develop new political formations capable of merging the various struggles together under the wide banner of a post-capitalist democracy "that serves people over corporations."** [(36)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a36) As Tariq Ali has mentioned in a different context, the history of the struggles and suppression of the US working class, Communist Party and other progressive struggles has been erased: "This is a history that is not emphasized. This wretched neoliberalism has downgraded the teaching of history. It is the one subject they really hate." **If education does not become the center of politics, democracy as an ideal and site of struggle will fail to inspire and energize a new generation of young people**. And a new wave of domestic terrorism will descend on the United States, already visible in the rise of the police and surveillance state. **At stake here is the need to take seriously** Pierre Bourdieu's insistence that too many progressives have underestimated **that "the most important forms of domination are not only economic but also intellectual and pedagogical, and lie on the side of belief and persuasion**." [(37)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a37) It is well worth remembering that politics undermines its pedagogical functions and democratic goals when it underestimates "the symbolic and pedagogical dimensions of struggle" and fails to forge the "appropriate weapons to fight on this front." [(38)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a38) **Such a failure generally produces not only the tactics of vanguardism, but also promotes strategies that underestimate the challenge of getting people to think differently and to invest something of themselves in an insurgent politics in which they can recognize their sense of agency and hope. Not only is there a need to challenge, disrupt and interrogate the market imaginaries, visions and vocabularies that undermine the great ideals that a range of social movements have fought for in the past, but also there is the need to combine the educative function of changing hearts and minds with sustained efforts to build robust, large-scale organizations and what Nancy Fraser calls "large-scale public powers."** [(39)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a39) The Occupy movement taught us that "emancipatory ideas not be confined to separate enclaved arenas where only those who already believe in them are exposed to arguments for them." [(40)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a40) Occupy created a large umbrella under the call to eliminate inequality in a wide range of areas extending from the economic realm to a variety of spheres that included all manner of exclusions based on race, sexual orientation and the destruction of the environment. At the same time, Occupy failed to create a strong presence because it lacked the capacity for large-scale coordination and long-term organizations. That is, it failed to develop and sustain a public space in which a broad-based movement could be mobilized in the interest of creating sustainable counter publics. Tariq Ali captures this failure perfectly in his comment: I was sympathetic to the Occupy movement, but not to the business of not having any demands.... They should have had a charter demanding a free health service, an end to the pharmaceuticals and insurance companies' control of the health service, a free education at every level for all Americans. **The notion**, promoted by anarchists such as John Holloway, **that you can change the world without taking power is useless**. I have a lot of respect for the anarchists that mobilize and fight for immigrant rights. But I am critical of those who theorize a politics that is not political. You have to have a political program. [(41)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a41) Surely, even a modest list of demands that would challenge market fundamentalism such as a call to break up big banks, a tax on trading, free education for all, free health care, reducing the military budget to create a jobs program, investing in crucial infrastructures, expanding public transportation, a high tax rate on big corporations and the salaries of the ultra-rich job destroyers such as the CEOs who run banks, hedge funds and other rogue financial institutions, would be a productive beginning to question and challenge the most basic assumptions of a normalized capitalism. **The resistance to oppressive power structures demands a politics, public pedagogy and political formation that embraces struggle as part of developing a political program on a national and international scale that can inspire, energize and produce a collective show of sustained solidarity**. **The current historical moment calls for a politics that is transnational in its scope, global in its sense of responsibility and capable of creating new democratic public spheres in which it becomes possible to show private troubles can be connected to larger social issues, and public connections and modes of solidarity can be sustained beyond the private sphere. Only then will the promise and possibility of creating a radical global commons in the service of a radical democracy come into view.** [(42)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a42) History is open, and the times are rife with unrest accompanied by new levels of state terrorism, all of which call for new ways to subvert the theater of cruelty and class consolidation that has the globe in the stranglehold of a death wish. Neoliberalism in its many punitive forms has exhausted its credibility and now threatens the entirety of human life and the planet itself. Hope is in the air but it won't succeed in creating the promise of a new democratic future unless it first recognizes and grapples with the depth of the US nightmare. It is time for new visions, a new collective radical imagination, new tactics, new political formations and sustained, organized, international struggles. It is time to march into a future that will not mimic the dark authoritarianism haunting the present.

### Extra Cards

#### Free speech good

Giroux 15 [Henry. "Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory." Truthout. N.p., 03 Mar. 2015. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.]

US higher education is increasingly more divided into those institutions educating the elite to rule the world in the 21st century and second-tier and third-tier institutions that largely train students for low-paid positions in the capitalist world economy. **It is increasingly apparent that the university in the United States has become a social institution that not only fails to address inequality in society, but also contributes to a growing division between social classes**. At the same time, **it has become a class and racial sorting machine constructing impenetrable financial and policy boundaries that serve as workstations to produce updated forms of economic and racial Darwinism**. Moreover, as tuition exceeds the budgets of most Americans, quality education at public and private universities becomes primarily a privilege reserved for the children of the rich and powerful. While researchers attempt to reform a "broken" federal student financial aid system, there is "growing evidence ... that the United States is slipping (to 10th now among industrialized countries) in the proportion of young adults who attain some postsecondary education." [(26)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a26) **Higher education has a responsibility not only to be available and accessible to all youth, but also to educate young people to make authority politically and morally accountable and to expand both academic freedom and the possibility and promise of the university as a bastion of democratic inquiry, values and politics, even as these are necessarily refashioned at the beginning of the new millennium**. Questions regarding whether the university should serve public rather than private interests no longer carry the weight of forceful criticism as they did when raised by Thorstein Veblen, Robert Lynd and C. Wright Mills in the first part of the 20th century. Yet, such questions are still crucial in addressing the reality of higher education and what it might mean to imagine the university's full participation in public life as the protector and promoter of democratic values among the next generation. **This is especially true at a time when the meaning and purpose of higher education is under assault by a phalanx of right-wing forces attempting to slander, even vilify, liberal and left-oriented professors, cut already meager federal funding for higher education, and place control of what is taught and said in classrooms under legislative oversight**. [(27)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a27) **While the US university faces a growing number of problems that range from the increasing loss of federal and state funding to the incursion of corporate power, a galloping commercialization and the growing influence of the national security state, it is also currently being targeted by conservative politicians that have hijacked political power and waged a focused campaign against the principles of academic freedom, sacrificing the quality of education made available to youth in the name of patriotic correctness and dismantling the university as a site of critical pedagogical practice, autonomous scholarship, independent thought and uncorrupted inquiry.**

#### Speech restrictions are historically conservative

Giroux 15 [Henry. "Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory." Truthout. N.p., 03 Mar. 2015. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.] Brackets in Original

For instance, **the Powell Memo** was released on August 23, 1971, and authored for the Chamber of Commerce by Lewis F. Powell Jr., who would later be appointed as a member of the US Supreme Court. [(5)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a5) Powell **identified the US college campus "as the single most dynamic source" for producing** and housing **intellectuals** "who are **unsympathetic to** the **[free] enterprise** system." [(6)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a6) He recognized that **one crucial strategy in changing the political composition** of higher education was to convince university administrators and boards of trustees that the most fundamental problem facing universities was the lack of conservative educators, or what he labeled the "imbalance of many faculties." [(7)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a7) The Powell Memo **was** designed to develop **a broad-based strategy**, not only **to counter dissent** but also to develop a material and ideological infrastructure with the capability to transform the US public consciousness through a conservative pedagogical commitment **to reproduce the knowledge, values, ideology and social relations of the corporate state**. Not only did the Powell Memo understand and take seriously the educative nature of politics, it also realized that if a crisis of economics was not matched by a crisis of ideas, it was easier to reproduce a society in which conformity could be bought off through the swindle of a neoliberal mantra that used the discourse of freedom, individuality, mobility and security to serve the interests of the rich and powerful. **The Powell Memo was** the most influential of **one of a number of ideological interventions in the 1970s that developed political roadmaps to crush dissent, eliminate tenure and transform the university into an adjunct of free-market fundamentalism**. But it certainly was not the first shot fired as part of a larger conservative struggle to shape US higher education. [(8)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a8) **Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. As early as the 1920s, conservatives were waging an ideological war against liberal education and the intellectuals who viewed higher education as a site of critical dialogue and a public sphere engaged in both the pursuit of truth and in developing a space where students learned to read both the word and world critically.** Conservatives were horrified by the growing popularity of critical views of education and modes of pedagogy that connected what students were taught to both their own development as critical agents and to the need to address important social problems. **During the McCarthy era,** criticism of the university and its dissenting intellectuals cast a dark cloud over the exercise of academic freedom, and **many academics were either fired or harassed out of their jobs because of their political activities outside the classroom or their alleged communist fervor or left-wing affiliations**. In 1953, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI) was founded by Frank Chodorov in order to assert right-wing influence and control over universities. ISI was but a precursor to the present era of politicized and paranoid academic assaults. In fact, William F. Buckley, who catapulted to fame among conservatives in the early 1950s with the publication of God and Man at Yale, in which he railed against secularism at Yale University and called for the firing of socialist professors, was named as the first president of ISI. The former president of ISI, T. Kenneth Cribb Jr., delivered the following speech to the Heritage Foundation in 1989, a speech that perfectly captures the elitist and ruling-class ideological spirit and project behind ISI's view of higher education: We must ... provide resources and guidance to an elite which can take up anew the task of enculturation. Through its journals, lectures, seminars, books and fellowships, this is what ISI has done successfully for 36 years. The coming of age of such elites has provided the current leadership of the conservative revival. But we should add a major new component to our strategy: **the conservative movement is now mature enough to sustain a counteroffensive on that last Leftist redoubt, the college campus**.... We are now strong enough to establish a contemporary presence for conservatism on campus, and contest the Left on its own turf. We plan to do this greatly by expanding the ISI field effort, its network of campus-based programming. [(9)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a9) ISI was an early effort on the part of conservatives to "'take back' the universities from scholars and academic programs regarded either as too hostile to free markets or too critical of the values and history of Western civilization." [(10)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a10) As part of an effort to influence future generations to adopt a conservative ideology and leadership roles in "battling the radicals and PC types on campus," the Institute was just one of many right-wing foundations and institutes to have emerged since the 1980s, in particular, to provide numerous scholarships, summer programs and fellowships. [(11)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a11) In the 1980s, the idea of higher education becoming a space in which a new multiethnic middle-class generation of students might be educated was viewed as a dire threat to many conservatives. The most famous advocate of this position was Allan Bloom. [(12)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a12) He responded to this alleged threat with a discourse that was as hysterical as it was racist. In his book, The Closing of the American Mind, Bloom was quite clear in his claim that admitting people of color to Ivy League schools was an insult to white elites whom he considered the only constituents qualified to manage and lead US society. The hidden structure of politics was quite visible in Bloom's work and revealed unapologetically his deeply held belief that the commanding institutions of the economy, culture and politics could only be led by mostly white, ruling-class males who were privileged and eager to do their best to maintain the class and racist structure that defined the United States at that particular historical moment. This was an era in which left academics and critical academic fields were under siege, particularly under the political and academic leadership of right-wing reactionaries such as Gov. Ronald Reagan, who began his career by attacking leftists such as Angela Davis at the University of California, Berkeley, and John Silber who as the president of Boston University prided himself on firing and denying tenure to numerous left educators, including myself. [(13)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a13) The culture wars of the 1980s and 1990s gave way to the new McCarthyism of the post-9/11 era, which took a dangerous turn that far exceeded the attacks marked by the culture wars. **In the aftermath of 9/11, the university was once again under attack by a number of right-wing organizations emboldened by a growing culture of fear and unflinching display of jingoistic patriotism. This was particularly exemplified by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, which issued a report shortly after the attacks accusing an allegedly unpatriotic academy of being the "weak link in America's response to the attack."** [**(14)**](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory#a14) **The legacy of a full-fledged new style McCarthyism was resuscitated as academics and others who looked critically at the imperialistic registers of US foreign policy were routinely dismissed from their jobs or made the object of public shaming. Some universities in Ohio, California and other states started requiring job applicants to sign statements confirming they did not belong to any terrorist groups. Academics who criticized the war in Iraq or questioned the Bush administration's use of torture often found their names on blacklists posted on the internet by right-wing groups such as Campus Watch and Target of Opportunity.**