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#### Academia is at risk, and Rush Limbaugh is here to steal your textbooks and replace them with AK-47’s and a bumper sticker that says you enjoy your 2nd Amendment rights. Anything and everything we know has been shaped by neoliberal imagination and higher education has been coopted by the military academic industrial complex which has taken a hold of our minds training us to be mindless robots to fight and die for America the hegemon wearing our red, white, and blues.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

"What happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony?" - James Young (1) At a time when both political parties, anti-public intellectual pundits and mainstream news sources view the purpose of higher education almost exclusively as a workstation for training a global workforce, generating capital for the financial elite, and as a significant threat to the power of the military, corporate and ultra-rich, it becomes more difficult to reclaim a history in which the culture of business is not the culture of higher education. This is certainly not meant to suggest that higher education once existed in an ideal past in which it only functioned as a public good and provided a public service in the interest of developing a democratic polity. Higher education has always been fraught with notable inequities and anti-democratic tendencies, but it also once functioned as a crucial reminder of both its own limitations and the potential role it might play in attacking social problems and deepening the promise of a democracy to come. As difficult as it may seem to believe, John Dewey's insistence that "democracy needs to be reborn in each generation, and education is its midwife" was once taken seriously by many academic leaders. (2) Today, it is fair to see that Dewey's once vaunted claim has been willfully ignored, forgotten or made an object of scorn. (3) Throughout the 20th century, there have been flashpoints in which the struggle to shape the university in the interest of a more substantive democracy was highly visible. Those of us who lived through the 1960s remember a different image of the university. Rather than attempt to train MBAs, define education through the lens of mathematical utility, indoctrinate young people into the culture of capitalism, decimate the power of faculty and turn students into mindless consumers, the university presented itself as a site of struggle. That is, it served, in part, as a crucial public sphere that held power accountable, produced a vast array of critical intellectuals, joined hands with the antiwar and civil rights movements and robustly challenged what Mario Savio once called "the machine" - an operating structure infused by the rising strength of the financial elite that posed a threat to the principles of critique, dissent, critical exchange and a never-ending struggle for inclusivity. The once vibrant spirit of resistance that refused to turn the university over to corporate and military interests is captured in Savio's moving and impassioned speech on December 2, 1964, on the steps of Sproul Hall at the University of California, Berkeley: There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears, upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working at all. (4) The 1960s may have been the high point of that period in US education in which the merging of politics, justice, civil rights and the search for truth made clear what it meant to consider higher education as a democratic public sphere. Not everyone was pleased or supported this explosion of dissent, resistance to the Vietnam War and struggle to make campuses across the United States more inclusive and emancipatory. Conservatives were deeply disturbed by the campus revolts and viewed them as a threat to their dream worlds of privatization, deregulation, militarization, capital accumulation and commodification. What soon emerged was an intense struggle for the soul of higher education. 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) 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) 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) Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. 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) 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) 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) 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)

#### The Role of the Ballot is to assume the role of an academic fighting neoliberalism to reclaim the academy and higher education. Objectivity is a lie placing an absolute truth where there is none to find except for the statement that neoliberalism is violent and uses normativity as a shield to hide their lies of oppression. Refuse that ethical criteria and embrace higher education’s true calling.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Our standard must be inclusive – Difference is fundamental and is willfully contained in order to preserve political regimes. Do you want to be this sort of politician, opposed to difference in their very breath, or do you want to be a poet, open to all creative powers of action.

Deleuze 68 (Difference and Repetition. Book by Gilles Deleuze. 1968. English Edition 1994 (Paul Patton) p. 51-53)

There is a crucial experiencex of difference and a corresponding experiment: every time we find ourselves confronted or bound by a limitation or an op- position, we should ask what such a situation presupposes. It presupposes a swarm of differences, a pluralism of free, wild or untamed differences; a properly differential and original space and time; all of which persist along- side the simplifications of limitation and opposition. A more profound real element must be defined in order for oppositions of forces or limitations of forms to be drawn, one which is determined as an abstract and potential multiplicity. Oppositions are roughly cut from a delicate milieu of overlap- ping perspectives, of communicating distances, divergences and disparities, of heterogeneous potentials and intensities. Nor is it primarily a question of dissolving tensions in the identical, but rather of distributing the disparities in a multiplicity. Limitations correspond to a simple first-order power - in a space with a single dimension and a single direction, where, as in Leib- niz's example of boats borne on a current, there may be collisions, but these collisions necessarily serve to limit and to equalise, but not to neu- tralise or to oppose. As for opposition, it represents in turn the second- order power, where it is as though things were spread out upon a flat surface, polarised in a single plane, and the synthesis itself took place only in a false depth - that is, in a fictitious third dimension added to the others which does no more than double the plane. In any case, what is missing is the original, intensive depth which is the matrix of the entire space and the first affirmation of difference: here, that which only afterwards appears as linear limitation and flat opposition lives and simmers in the form of free differences. Everywhere, couples and polarities presuppose bundles and networks, organised oppositions presuppose radiations in all directions. Stereoscopic images form no more than an even and flat opposition, but they depend upon something quite different: an arrangement of coexistent, tiered, mobile planes, a 'disparateness' within an original depth. Every-where, the depth of difference is primary. It is no use rediscovering depth as a third dimension unless it has already been installed at the beginning, enveloping the other two and enveloping itself as third. Space and time dis- play oppositions (and limitations) only on the surface, but they presuppose in their real depth far more voluminous, affirmed and distributed dif- ferences which cannot be reduced to the banality of the negative. It is as though we were in Lewis Carroll's mirror where everything is contrary and inverted on the surface, but 'different' in depth. We shall see that it is the same with every space: geometrical, physical, biophysical, social and lin- guistic (in this respect, how unlikely Trubetzkoy's declaration of principle appears: 'the idea of difference presupposes the idea of opposition ...'). There is a false profundity in conflict, but underneath conflict, the space of the play of differences. The negative is the image of difference, but a flat- tened and inverted image, like the candle in the eye of the ox - the eye of the dialectician dreaming of a futile combat? In this sense, too, Leibniz goes further or deeper than Hegel when he distributes the distinctive points and the differential elements of a multiplicity throughout the ground, and when he discovers a play in the creation of the world. It seems, therefore, as though the first dimension, that of the limit, despite all its imperfection, remains closest to the original depth. Leibniz's only error was to have linked difference to the negative of limitation, because he maintained the dominance of the old principle, because he linked the series to a principle of convergence, without seeing that divergence itself was an object of affirmation, or that the incompossibles belonged to the same world and were affirmed as the greatest crime and the greatest virtue of the one and only world, that of the eternal return. It is not difference which presupposes opposition but opposition which presupposes difference, and far from resolving difference by tracing it back to a foundation, opposition betrays and distorts it. Our claim is not only that difference in itself is not 'already' contradiction, but that it cannot be reduced or traced back to contradiction, since the latter is not more but less profound than difference. On what condition is difference traced or projected on to a flat space? Precisely when it has been forced Into a previously established identity, when it has been placed on the slope of the identical which makes it reflect or desire identity, and necessarily takes it where identity wants it to go - namely, into the negative.1S The imprint of the Hegelian dialectic on the beginnings of Phenomenology has often been noted: the here and the now are posited as empty identities, as abstract universalities which claim to draw difference along with them, when in fact difference does not by any means follow and remains attached in the depths of its own space, in the here-now of a differential reality always made up of singularities. It is said that there were thinkers who explained that movement was impossible, but that this did not prevent movement from occurring. With Hegel it is the other way round: he creates movement, even the movement of the infinite, but because he creates it with words and representations it is a false movement, and nothing follows. It is the same every time there is mediation or representation. The representant says: 'Everyone recognises that ...', but there is always an unrepresented singularity who does not recognise precisely because it is not everyone or the universal. 'Everyone' recognises the universal because it is itself the universal, but the profound sensitive conscience which is nevertheless presumed to bear the cost, the singular, does not recognise it. The misfortune in speaking is not speaking, but speaking for others or representing something. The sensitive conscience (that is, the particular, difference or ta alia) refuses. One can always mediate, pass over into the antithesis, combine the synthesis, but the thesis does not follow: it subsists in its immediacy, in its difference which itself constitutes the true movement. Difference is the true content of the thesis, the persistence of the thesis. The negative and negativity do not even capture the phenomenon of difference, only the phantom or the epiphenomenon. The whole of Phenomenology is an epiphenomenology. This is what the philosophy of difference refuses: omnis determinatio negatio. ... We refuse the general alternative proposed by infinite representation: the indeterminate, the indifferent, the undifferenciated or a difference already determined as negation, implying and enveloping the negative (by the same token, we also refuse the particular alternative: negative of limitation or negative of opposition). In its essence, difference is the object of affirmation or affirmation itself. In its essence, affirmation is itself difference. At this point, does the philosophy of difference not risk appearing as a new version of the beautiful soul? The beautiful soul is in effect the one who sees differences everywhere and appeals to them only as respectable, reconcilable or federative differences, while history continues to be made through bloody contradictions. The beautiful soul behaves like a justice of the peace thrown on to a field of battle, one who sees in the inexpiable struggles only simple 'differends' or perhaps misunderstandings. Conversely, however, it is not enough to harden oneself and invoke the well-known complementarities between affirmation and negation, life and death, creation and destruction (as if these were sufficient to ground a dialectic of negativity) in order to throw the taste for pure differences back at the beautiful soul, and to weld the fate of real differences to that of the negative and contradiction. For such complementarities as yet tell us nothing about the relation between one term and the other (does the determined affirmation result from an already negative and negating difference, or does the negative result from an already differential affirmation?). In very general terms, we claim that there are two ways to appeal to 'necessary destructions': that of the poet, who speaks in the name of a creative power, capable of overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes eternal return; and that of the politician, who is above all concerned to deny that which 'differs', so as to conserve or prolong an established historical order, or to establish a historical order which already calls forth in the world the forms of its representation. The two may coincide in particularly agitated moments, but they are never the same. No one passes less for a beautiful soul than Nietzsche. His soul is extremely beautiful, but not in the sense of the beautiful soul: no one is more endowed than he with a sense for cruelty or a taste for destruction. Moreover, throughout his work he never ceases to contrast two conceptions of the affirmation-negation relation.

#### This neoliberal hegemony results in mass violence and extinction – it threatens the entire planet.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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.

#### Liberalization of the higher education via a living wage is critical to develop advocates for equality and reject anti-intellectualism. Higher education has potential but now is key, critical intellectuals need to be involved.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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. 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 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) 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 contingent faculty are the throwaway academics and critical academics fighting against the neoliberal stronghold. Paying them a living wage creates the sufficient security for the job that gives them the confidence to liberalize the university and change the hegemonic structure of the US.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) Throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. 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) 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. The culture wars and the post-9/11 attacks on higher education under the reign of the new McCarthyism were followed by the hollowing out of the social state and the defunding of higher education. The more overt political attacks gave way to the economic wars waged against higher education, one current example being the attempt by billionaires such as the Koch brothers to turn higher education into nothing more than an ideological factory for neoliberal capitalism. In desperate need of money, more and more universities are selling off naming rights to their buildings, accepting gifts from hedge fund managers, and caving in to the demands of big donors to influence what is taught, what programs deserve to be sustained and what faculty should be rewarded. Moreover, as tuition skyrockets, poor people and people of color are being locked out of higher education so as to reinforce the two-tier system that Bloom and others once celebrated. At the same time as higher education is being defunded, corporatized and managed by an expanding class of administrators wedded to a neoliberal model of leadership, faculty has been downsized, creating an exploited and invisible class of underpaid, part-time workers. Many faculty members are now consigned to the service of Walmart workers, stripped of full-time positions, relegated to the status of "stoop laborers," (15) lacking power, security and a living wage, and largely devoid of any hope for a full-time position in the academy in the near future. According to the American Association of University Professors, at the present moment more than 50 percent of faculty are adjuncts barely able to pay their rents, conduct research and exercise any influence over the increasing corporatization and militarization of higher education. Many part-time faculty members make less than $21,000 annually, and as Colman McCarthy points out "slog like migrant workers from campus to campus." (16) A record number of adjuncts are now on food stamps and receive some form of public assistance. Given how little they are paid this should not come as a surprise, though that does not make it any less shameful. (17) These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism's culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education. And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the "hyper-educated poor" (18) joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. 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. 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 giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle.

#### This solves a laundry list of impacts.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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.

### Plan Text

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should require Universities to pay contingent faculty members a living wage.

## Neolib 1AC – Draft 2

### 1AC

#### Academia is at risk, and Rush Limbaugh is here to steal your textbooks and replace them with AK-47’s and a bumper sticker that says you enjoy your 2nd Amendment rights. Anything and everything we know has been shaped by neoliberal imagination and higher education has been coopted by the military academic industrial complex which has taken a hold of our minds training us to be mindless robots to fight and die for America the hegemon wearing our red, white, and blues.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

"What happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony?" - James Young (1) At a time when both political parties, anti-public intellectual pundits and mainstream news sources view the purpose of higher education almost exclusively as a workstation for training a global workforce, generating capital for the financial elite, and as a significant threat to the power of the military, corporate and ultra-rich, it becomes more difficult to reclaim a history in which the culture of business is not the culture of higher education. This is certainly not meant to suggest that higher education once existed in an ideal past in which it only functioned as a public good and provided a public service in the interest of developing a democratic polity. Higher education has always been fraught with notable inequities and anti-democratic tendencies, but it also once functioned as a crucial reminder of both its own limitations and the potential role it might play in attacking social problems and deepening the promise of a democracy to come. As difficult as it may seem to believe, John Dewey's insistence that "democracy needs to be reborn in each generation, and education is its midwife" was once taken seriously by many academic leaders. (2) Today, it is fair to see that Dewey's once vaunted claim has been willfully ignored, forgotten or made an object of scorn. (3) Throughout the 20th century, there have been flashpoints in which the struggle to shape the university in the interest of a more substantive democracy was highly visible. Those of us who lived through the 1960s remember a different image of the university. Rather than attempt to train MBAs, define education through the lens of mathematical utility, indoctrinate young people into the culture of capitalism, decimate the power of faculty and turn students into mindless consumers, the university presented itself as a site of struggle. That is, it served, in part, as a crucial public sphere that held power accountable, produced a vast array of critical intellectuals, joined hands with the antiwar and civil rights movements and robustly challenged what Mario Savio once called "the machine" - an operating structure infused by the rising strength of the financial elite that posed a threat to the principles of critique, dissent, critical exchange and a never-ending struggle for inclusivity. The once vibrant spirit of resistance that refused to turn the university over to corporate and military interests is captured in Savio's moving and impassioned speech on December 2, 1964, on the steps of Sproul Hall at the University of California, Berkeley: There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears, upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working at all. (4) The 1960s may have been the high point of that period in US education in which the merging of politics, justice, civil rights and the search for truth made clear what it meant to consider higher education as a democratic public sphere. Not everyone was pleased or supported this explosion of dissent, resistance to the Vietnam War and struggle to make campuses across the United States more inclusive and emancipatory. Conservatives were deeply disturbed by the campus revolts and viewed them as a threat to their dream worlds of privatization, deregulation, militarization, capital accumulation and commodification. What soon emerged was an intense struggle for the soul of higher education. 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) 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) 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) Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. 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) 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) 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) 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)

#### The Role of the Ballot is to assume the role of an academic fighting neoliberalism to reclaim the academy and higher education. Objectivity is a lie placing an absolute truth where there is none to find except for the fact that neoliberalism is violent and uses normativity as a shield to hide their lies of oppression. Refuse that ethical criteria and embrace higher education’s true calling.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Engagement with the resolution must be inclusive – Difference is fundamental and is willfully contained in order to preserve political regimes. Do you want to be this sort of politician, opposed to difference in their very breath, or do you want to be a poet, open to all creative powers of action.

Deleuze 68 (Difference and Repetition. Book by Gilles Deleuze. 1968. English Edition 1994 (Paul Patton) p. 51-53)

There is a crucial experiencex of difference and a corresponding experiment: every time we find ourselves confronted or bound by a limitation or an op- position, we should ask what such a situation presupposes. It presupposes a swarm of differences, a pluralism of free, wild or untamed differences; a properly differential and original space and time; all of which persist along- side the simplifications of limitation and opposition. A more profound real element must be defined in order for oppositions of forces or limitations of forms to be drawn, one which is determined as an abstract and potential multiplicity. Oppositions are roughly cut from a delicate milieu of overlap- ping perspectives, of communicating distances, divergences and disparities, of heterogeneous potentials and intensities. Nor is it primarily a question of dissolving tensions in the identical, but rather of distributing the disparities in a multiplicity. Limitations correspond to a simple first-order power - in a space with a single dimension and a single direction, where, as in Leib- niz's example of boats borne on a current, there may be collisions, but these collisions necessarily serve to limit and to equalise, but not to neu- tralise or to oppose. As for opposition, it represents in turn the second- order power, where it is as though things were spread out upon a flat surface, polarised in a single plane, and the synthesis itself took place only in a false depth - that is, in a fictitious third dimension added to the others which does no more than double the plane. In any case, what is missing is the original, intensive depth which is the matrix of the entire space and the first affirmation of difference: here, that which only afterwards appears as linear limitation and flat opposition lives and simmers in the form of free differences. Everywhere, couples and polarities presuppose bundles and networks, organised oppositions presuppose radiations in all directions. Stereoscopic images form no more than an even and flat opposition, but they depend upon something quite different: an arrangement of coexistent, tiered, mobile planes, a 'disparateness' within an original depth. Every-where, the depth of difference is primary. It is no use rediscovering depth as a third dimension unless it has already been installed at the beginning, enveloping the other two and enveloping itself as third. Space and time dis- play oppositions (and limitations) only on the surface, but they presuppose in their real depth far more voluminous, affirmed and distributed dif- ferences which cannot be reduced to the banality of the negative. It is as though we were in Lewis Carroll's mirror where everything is contrary and inverted on the surface, but 'different' in depth. We shall see that it is the same with every space: geometrical, physical, biophysical, social and lin- guistic (in this respect, how unlikely Trubetzkoy's declaration of principle appears: 'the idea of difference presupposes the idea of opposition ...'). There is a false profundity in conflict, but underneath conflict, the space of the play of differences. The negative is the image of difference, but a flat- tened and inverted image, like the candle in the eye of the ox - the eye of the dialectician dreaming of a futile combat? In this sense, too, Leibniz goes further or deeper than Hegel when he distributes the distinctive points and the differential elements of a multiplicity throughout the ground, and when he discovers a play in the creation of the world. It seems, therefore, as though the first dimension, that of the limit, despite all its imperfection, remains closest to the original depth. Leibniz's only error was to have linked difference to the negative of limitation, because he maintained the dominance of the old principle, because he linked the series to a principle of convergence, without seeing that divergence itself was an object of affirmation, or that the incompossibles belonged to the same world and were affirmed as the greatest crime and the greatest virtue of the one and only world, that of the eternal return. It is not difference which presupposes opposition but opposition which presupposes difference, and far from resolving difference by tracing it back to a foundation, opposition betrays and distorts it. Our claim is not only that difference in itself is not 'already' contradiction, but that it cannot be reduced or traced back to contradiction, since the latter is not more but less profound than difference. On what condition is difference traced or projected on to a flat space? Precisely when it has been forced Into a previously established identity, when it has been placed on the slope of the identical which makes it reflect or desire identity, and necessarily takes it where identity wants it to go - namely, into the negative.1S The imprint of the Hegelian dialectic on the beginnings of Phenomenology has often been noted: the here and the now are posited as empty identities, as abstract universalities which claim to draw difference along with them, when in fact difference does not by any means follow and remains attached in the depths of its own space, in the here-now of a differential reality always made up of singularities. It is said that there were thinkers who explained that movement was impossible, but that this did not prevent movement from occurring. With Hegel it is the other way round: he creates movement, even the movement of the infinite, but because he creates it with words and representations it is a false movement, and nothing follows. It is the same every time there is mediation or representation. The representant says: 'Everyone recognises that ...', but there is always an unrepresented singularity who does not recognise precisely because it is not everyone or the universal. 'Everyone' recognises the universal because it is itself the universal, but the profound sensitive conscience which is nevertheless presumed to bear the cost, the singular, does not recognise it. The misfortune in speaking is not speaking, but speaking for others or representing something. The sensitive conscience (that is, the particular, difference or ta alia) refuses. One can always mediate, pass over into the antithesis, combine the synthesis, but the thesis does not follow: it subsists in its immediacy, in its difference which itself constitutes the true movement. Difference is the true content of the thesis, the persistence of the thesis. The negative and negativity do not even capture the phenomenon of difference, only the phantom or the epiphenomenon. The whole of Phenomenology is an epiphenomenology. This is what the philosophy of difference refuses: omnis determinatio negatio. ... We refuse the general alternative proposed by infinite representation: the indeterminate, the indifferent, the undifferenciated or a difference already determined as negation, implying and enveloping the negative (by the same token, we also refuse the particular alternative: negative of limitation or negative of opposition). In its essence, difference is the object of affirmation or affirmation itself. In its essence, affirmation is itself difference. At this point, does the philosophy of difference not risk appearing as a new version of the beautiful soul? The beautiful soul is in effect the one who sees differences everywhere and appeals to them only as respectable, reconcilable or federative differences, while history continues to be made through bloody contradictions. The beautiful soul behaves like a justice of the peace thrown on to a field of battle, one who sees in the inexpiable struggles only simple 'differends' or perhaps misunderstandings. Conversely, however, it is not enough to harden oneself and invoke the well-known complementarities between affirmation and negation, life and death, creation and destruction (as if these were sufficient to ground a dialectic of negativity) in order to throw the taste for pure differences back at the beautiful soul, and to weld the fate of real differences to that of the negative and contradiction. For such complementarities as yet tell us nothing about the relation between one term and the other (does the determined affirmation result from an already negative and negating difference, or does the negative result from an already differential affirmation?). In very general terms, we claim that there are two ways to appeal to 'necessary destructions': that of the poet, who speaks in the name of a creative power, capable of overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes eternal return; and that of the politician, who is above all concerned to deny that which 'differs', so as to conserve or prolong an established historical order, or to establish a historical order which already calls forth in the world the forms of its representation. The two may coincide in particularly agitated moments, but they are never the same. No one passes less for a beautiful soul than Nietzsche. His soul is extremely beautiful, but not in the sense of the beautiful soul: no one is more endowed than he with a sense for cruelty or a taste for destruction. Moreover, throughout his work he never ceases to contrast two conceptions of the affirmation-negation relation.

#### We control uniqueness – the status quo oppresses contingent faculty which destroys the possibility for the de-corporatization of the academy and radical imagination.

Mahoney 14 (Kevin, Ph.D. from USC in Education, “Ripping Back the Veil of Exploitation in Higher Ed,” September 29, 2014, http://www.ragingchickenpress.org/2014/09/29/burnitdown-ripping-back-the-veil-of-exploitation-in-higher-ed-2/)//ghs-VA

The dirty secret of higher education in the United States is that the entire system depends upon the systematic exploitation of the majority – the super majority – of those who teach in its classrooms. As much as the right wing wants to point to the problem of “tenured radicals” warping the minds of good, wholesome American boys and girls, the fact remains that “tenured radicals” represent a micro-minority within the smallest portion of the nation’s faculty. Thanks to recent campaigns to raise the minimum wage, some splashy articles in Salon, the shameful death of an adjunct faculty member at Dusquesne University, and the unrelenting advocacy of organizations like the COCAL (Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor) and the New Faculty Majority the exploitation of part-time and adjunct faculty is back in the news. But, as anyone who is works as a contingent faculty member or who fights to stop this exploitation can attest, we’ve been here before and if anything, conditions have only gotten worse since the 2010 Tea Party victories and the brutal austerity measures carried out in states across the country. If you have felt a growing, visceral rage at deepening labor exploitation in higher education over the past few years, then you might not be surprised by the explosive Twitter conversation this past weekend using the #BurnItDown hashtag. People Tweeting with the #BurnItDown hashtag were ripping off the bandages and scabs that have covered over the conditions of adjuncts for way too long. And this time, if the tone and outrage turn into political action, contingent faculty will not be tamed with lip service equity from their institutions or half-promises to be “treated with respect” from their more privileged, tenured colleagues. If rage turns to political action, this time it’s for keeps. If you have no idea what is going on with #BurnItDown or you still think that Twitter is only a space for people to post pictures of their cats, here’s a little window into the #BurnItDown Twitter feed: Despite the fact that some higher education unions and academic associations were eventually forced to recognize and respond to the rapid growth of contingent labor in American colleges and universities, their responses have often felt a little too tepid and a little too late. When faculty at the nations most prestigious institutions are forced to apply for food stamps or sell plasma to make ends meet, another study of the problem of contingent labor feels like another punt – especially if you are the one having to sell your plasma. Some unions have started to organize adjuncts more aggressively than ever before and there have been several important victories over the past few years. However, instead of taking on the hard work of building a movement to turn back the assault on higher education, academics – especially tenure and tenure track academics – often cling to crumbs of cultural privilege or circle the wagons to preserve their ever shrinking intellectual outposts. Add to that the reluctance adjuncts have had for speaking out against their conditions for fear of losing their jobs and you’ve got a recipe for disaster. But #BurnItDown may indicate that conditions have gotten so bad and have been so bad for so long that adjuncts have reached a point of no return – that there is nothing left to lose. It’s either stand up and fight back or further sink into poverty and watch higher education become a mockery of everything that got them into the profession to begin with. And as tenured and tenure-track faculty have proven to be unreliable allies even as their own jobs have come under assault, #BurnItDown participants and countless adjuncts across the country seem ready to leave their colleagues in the dust and exercise their power. What power, you ask? The only power that has ever mattered in political movements: numbers. The fact is that contingent faculty make up 75% or more of the higher education workforce. That’s why the New Faculty Majority is called “The New Faculty Majority.” Even if I were to be cynical and assume only 5% of tenured and tenure track faculty would ally themselves with contingent faculty, the slogan “The University Works Because We Do,” is not simply a slogan. It’s a fact. And like workers of all stripes have learned over the course of history, the power to retake and remake higher education rests in the refusal to be complicit and the refusal to submit to dehumanizing working conditions. The halls of a university building may not be same as an assembly line in an auto plant, but both come to a screeching halt when workers sit down and occupy their workplaces. It’s not brain surgery, but it is hard. The question is what is harder? Living under current conditions or taking the risk to stand up and fight back. In his book, Get Up, Stand Up: Uniting Populists, Energizing the Defeated, and Battling the Corporate Elite, Bruce Levine argues that while there are real challenges in collective organizing, they are not as hard to overcome as some believe. But it’s important to understand, according to Levine, that the answer to exploitative, oppressive conditions is not to find out more facts, or read more studies about how bad things are. Rather, Levine argues that in every instance – from the Populists Movement to the Flint Sit Down Strikes to the Civil Rights Movement – the answer lies in everyday acts of resisting illegitimate authority. And, yes, that is risky but there is no short cut around it. As Levine put it in an interview he did on the Rick Smith Show, the good thing is that …you realize don’t have to wait for election day, you don’t have to wait for every four years to vote for the lesser of two evils. There’s things we could be doing every day to get back our courage, get back our balls, and a lot of that is from the integrity you get from resisting illegitimate authority and the solidarity you get from supporting other people who are resisting illegitimate authority in their life. As anyone who has ever done political organizing knows on some level, standing up and fighting back feels good. That fear you might feel in anticipation of an action begins to fade as you fight back with others. Yes, it might be risky, but fighting back with others, telling our stories out loud with others, begins to lessen that fear and reluctance. #BurnItDown may very well be one of those moments people look back upon and say that was the day they decided: “enough is enough.”

#### This neoliberal hegemony results in mass violence and extinction – it threatens the entire planet.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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.

#### Liberalization of the higher education via a living wage is critical to develop advocates for equality and reject anti-intellectualism. Higher education has potential but now is key, critical intellectuals need to be involved.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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. 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 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) 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 contingent faculty are the throwaway academics and critical academics fighting against the neoliberal stronghold. Paying them a living wage creates the sufficient security for the job that gives them the confidence to liberalize the university and change the hegemonic structure of the US.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) Throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. 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) 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. The culture wars and the post-9/11 attacks on higher education under the reign of the new McCarthyism were followed by the hollowing out of the social state and the defunding of higher education. The more overt political attacks gave way to the economic wars waged against higher education, one current example being the attempt by billionaires such as the Koch brothers to turn higher education into nothing more than an ideological factory for neoliberal capitalism. In desperate need of money, more and more universities are selling off naming rights to their buildings, accepting gifts from hedge fund managers, and caving in to the demands of big donors to influence what is taught, what programs deserve to be sustained and what faculty should be rewarded. Moreover, as tuition skyrockets, poor people and people of color are being locked out of higher education so as to reinforce the two-tier system that Bloom and others once celebrated. At the same time as higher education is being defunded, corporatized and managed by an expanding class of administrators wedded to a neoliberal model of leadership, faculty has been downsized, creating an exploited and invisible class of underpaid, part-time workers. Many faculty members are now consigned to the service of Walmart workers, stripped of full-time positions, relegated to the status of "stoop laborers," (15) lacking power, security and a living wage, and largely devoid of any hope for a full-time position in the academy in the near future. According to the American Association of University Professors, at the present moment more than 50 percent of faculty are adjuncts barely able to pay their rents, conduct research and exercise any influence over the increasing corporatization and militarization of higher education. Many part-time faculty members make less than $21,000 annually, and as Colman McCarthy points out "slog like migrant workers from campus to campus." (16) A record number of adjuncts are now on food stamps and receive some form of public assistance. Given how little they are paid this should not come as a surprise, though that does not make it any less shameful. (17) These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism's culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education. And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the "hyper-educated poor" (18) joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. 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. 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 giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle.

#### This solves a laundry list of impacts.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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.

### Plan Text

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should require Universities to pay contingent faculty members a living wage.

## Neolib 1AC – Draft 3

### RoB/Inherency

#### Academia is at risk, and Rush Limbaugh is here to steal your textbooks and replace them with AK-47’s and a bumper sticker that says you enjoy your 2nd Amendment rights. Anything and everything we know has been shaped by neoliberal imagination and higher education has been coopted by the military academic industrial complex which has taken a hold of our minds training us to be mindless robots to fight and die for America the hegemon wearing our red, white, and blues.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

"What happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony?" - James Young (1) At a time when both political parties, anti-public intellectual pundits and mainstream news sources view the purpose of higher education almost exclusively as a workstation for training a global workforce, generating capital for the financial elite, and as a significant threat to the power of the military, corporate and ultra-rich, it becomes more difficult to reclaim a history in which the culture of business is not the culture of higher education. This is certainly not meant to suggest that higher education once existed in an ideal past in which it only functioned as a public good and provided a public service in the interest of developing a democratic polity. Higher education has always been fraught with notable inequities and anti-democratic tendencies, but it also once functioned as a crucial reminder of both its own limitations and the potential role it might play in attacking social problems and deepening the promise of a democracy to come. As difficult as it may seem to believe, John Dewey's insistence that "democracy needs to be reborn in each generation, and education is its midwife" was once taken seriously by many academic leaders. (2) Today, it is fair to see that Dewey's once vaunted claim has been willfully ignored, forgotten or made an object of scorn. (3) Throughout the 20th century, there have been flashpoints in which the struggle to shape the university in the interest of a more substantive democracy was highly visible. Those of us who lived through the 1960s remember a different image of the university. Rather than attempt to train MBAs, define education through the lens of mathematical utility, indoctrinate young people into the culture of capitalism, decimate the power of faculty and turn students into mindless consumers, the university presented itself as a site of struggle. That is, it served, in part, as a crucial public sphere that held power accountable, produced a vast array of critical intellectuals, joined hands with the antiwar and civil rights movements and robustly challenged what Mario Savio once called "the machine" - an operating structure infused by the rising strength of the financial elite that posed a threat to the principles of critique, dissent, critical exchange and a never-ending struggle for inclusivity. The once vibrant spirit of resistance that refused to turn the university over to corporate and military interests is captured in Savio's moving and impassioned speech on December 2, 1964, on the steps of Sproul Hall at the University of California, Berkeley: There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears, upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working at all. (4) The 1960s may have been the high point of that period in US education in which the merging of politics, justice, civil rights and the search for truth made clear what it meant to consider higher education as a democratic public sphere. Not everyone was pleased or supported this explosion of dissent, resistance to the Vietnam War and struggle to make campuses across the United States more inclusive and emancipatory. Conservatives were deeply disturbed by the campus revolts and viewed them as a threat to their dream worlds of privatization, deregulation, militarization, capital accumulation and commodification. What soon emerged was an intense struggle for the soul of higher education. 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) 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) 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) Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. 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) 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) 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) 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)

#### The Role of the Ballot is to assume the role of an academic fighting neoliberalism to reclaim the academy and higher education. Objectivity is a lie placing an absolute truth where there is none to find except for the fact that neoliberalism is violent and uses normativity as a shield to hide their lies of oppression. Refuse that ethical criteria and embrace higher education’s true calling.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Engagement with the resolution must be inclusive – Difference is fundamental and is willfully contained in order to preserve political regimes. Do you want to be this sort of politician, opposed to difference in their very breath, or do you want to be a poet, open to all creative powers of action.

Deleuze 68 (Difference and Repetition. Book by Gilles Deleuze. 1968. English Edition 1994 (Paul Patton) p. 51-53)

There is a crucial experiencex of difference and a corresponding experiment: every time we find ourselves confronted or bound by a limitation or an op- position, we should ask what such a situation presupposes. It presupposes a swarm of differences, a pluralism of free, wild or untamed differences; a properly differential and original space and time; all of which persist along- side the simplifications of limitation and opposition. A more profound real element must be defined in order for oppositions of forces or limitations of forms to be drawn, one which is determined as an abstract and potential multiplicity. Oppositions are roughly cut from a delicate milieu of overlap- ping perspectives, of communicating distances, divergences and disparities, of heterogeneous potentials and intensities. Nor is it primarily a question of dissolving tensions in the identical, but rather of distributing the disparities in a multiplicity. Limitations correspond to a simple first-order power - in a space with a single dimension and a single direction, where, as in Leib- niz's example of boats borne on a current, there may be collisions, but these collisions necessarily serve to limit and to equalise, but not to neu- tralise or to oppose. As for opposition, it represents in turn the second- order power, where it is as though things were spread out upon a flat surface, polarised in a single plane, and the synthesis itself took place only in a false depth - that is, in a fictitious third dimension added to the others which does no more than double the plane. In any case, what is missing is the original, intensive depth which is the matrix of the entire space and the first affirmation of difference: here, that which only afterwards appears as linear limitation and flat opposition lives and simmers in the form of free differences. Everywhere, couples and polarities presuppose bundles and networks, organised oppositions presuppose radiations in all directions. Stereoscopic images form no more than an even and flat opposition, but they depend upon something quite different: an arrangement of coexistent, tiered, mobile planes, a 'disparateness' within an original depth. Every-where, the depth of difference is primary. It is no use rediscovering depth as a third dimension unless it has already been installed at the beginning, enveloping the other two and enveloping itself as third. Space and time dis- play oppositions (and limitations) only on the surface, but they presuppose in their real depth far more voluminous, affirmed and distributed dif- ferences which cannot be reduced to the banality of the negative. It is as though we were in Lewis Carroll's mirror where everything is contrary and inverted on the surface, but 'different' in depth. We shall see that it is the same with every space: geometrical, physical, biophysical, social and lin- guistic (in this respect, how unlikely Trubetzkoy's declaration of principle appears: 'the idea of difference presupposes the idea of opposition ...'). There is a false profundity in conflict, but underneath conflict, the space of the play of differences. The negative is the image of difference, but a flat- tened and inverted image, like the candle in the eye of the ox - the eye of the dialectician dreaming of a futile combat? In this sense, too, Leibniz goes further or deeper than Hegel when he distributes the distinctive points and the differential elements of a multiplicity throughout the ground, and when he discovers a play in the creation of the world. It seems, therefore, as though the first dimension, that of the limit, despite all its imperfection, remains closest to the original depth. Leibniz's only error was to have linked difference to the negative of limitation, because he maintained the dominance of the old principle, because he linked the series to a principle of convergence, without seeing that divergence itself was an object of affirmation, or that the incompossibles belonged to the same world and were affirmed as the greatest crime and the greatest virtue of the one and only world, that of the eternal return. It is not difference which presupposes opposition but opposition which presupposes difference, and far from resolving difference by tracing it back to a foundation, opposition betrays and distorts it. Our claim is not only that difference in itself is not 'already' contradiction, but that it cannot be reduced or traced back to contradiction, since the latter is not more but less profound than difference. On what condition is difference traced or projected on to a flat space? Precisely when it has been forced Into a previously established identity, when it has been placed on the slope of the identical which makes it reflect or desire identity, and necessarily takes it where identity wants it to go - namely, into the negative.1S The imprint of the Hegelian dialectic on the beginnings of Phenomenology has often been noted: the here and the now are posited as empty identities, as abstract universalities which claim to draw difference along with them, when in fact difference does not by any means follow and remains attached in the depths of its own space, in the here-now of a differential reality always made up of singularities. It is said that there were thinkers who explained that movement was impossible, but that this did not prevent movement from occurring. With Hegel it is the other way round: he creates movement, even the movement of the infinite, but because he creates it with words and representations it is a false movement, and nothing follows. It is the same every time there is mediation or representation. The representant says: 'Everyone recognises that ...', but there is always an unrepresented singularity who does not recognise precisely because it is not everyone or the universal. 'Everyone' recognises the universal because it is itself the universal, but the profound sensitive conscience which is nevertheless presumed to bear the cost, the singular, does not recognise it. The misfortune in speaking is not speaking, but speaking for others or representing something. The sensitive conscience (that is, the particular, difference or ta alia) refuses. One can always mediate, pass over into the antithesis, combine the synthesis, but the thesis does not follow: it subsists in its immediacy, in its difference which itself constitutes the true movement. Difference is the true content of the thesis, the persistence of the thesis. The negative and negativity do not even capture the phenomenon of difference, only the phantom or the epiphenomenon. The whole of Phenomenology is an epiphenomenology. This is what the philosophy of difference refuses: omnis determinatio negatio. ... We refuse the general alternative proposed by infinite representation: the indeterminate, the indifferent, the undifferenciated or a difference already determined as negation, implying and enveloping the negative (by the same token, we also refuse the particular alternative: negative of limitation or negative of opposition). In its essence, difference is the object of affirmation or affirmation itself. In its essence, affirmation is itself difference. At this point, does the philosophy of difference not risk appearing as a new version of the beautiful soul? The beautiful soul is in effect the one who sees differences everywhere and appeals to them only as respectable, reconcilable or federative differences, while history continues to be made through bloody contradictions. The beautiful soul behaves like a justice of the peace thrown on to a field of battle, one who sees in the inexpiable struggles only simple 'differends' or perhaps misunderstandings. Conversely, however, it is not enough to harden oneself and invoke the well-known complementarities between affirmation and negation, life and death, creation and destruction (as if these were sufficient to ground a dialectic of negativity) in order to throw the taste for pure differences back at the beautiful soul, and to weld the fate of real differences to that of the negative and contradiction. For such complementarities as yet tell us nothing about the relation between one term and the other (does the determined affirmation result from an already negative and negating difference, or does the negative result from an already differential affirmation?). In very general terms, we claim that there are two ways to appeal to 'necessary destructions': that of the poet, who speaks in the name of a creative power, capable of overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes eternal return; and that of the politician, who is above all concerned to deny that which 'differs', so as to conserve or prolong an established historical order, or to establish a historical order which already calls forth in the world the forms of its representation. The two may coincide in particularly agitated moments, but they are never the same. No one passes less for a beautiful soul than Nietzsche. His soul is extremely beautiful, but not in the sense of the beautiful soul: no one is more endowed than he with a sense for cruelty or a taste for destruction. Moreover, throughout his work he never ceases to contrast two conceptions of the affirmation-negation relation.

#### Current norms breeds homeless academics – wages oppresses contingent faculty which destroys the possibility for the de-corporatization of the academy and radical imagination necessary to challenge neoliberalism. Scholarship cannot produced when faculty do not have the resources nor value to be taken seriously.

Mahoney 14 (Kevin, Ph.D. from USC in Education, “Ripping Back the Veil of Exploitation in Higher Ed,” September 29, 2014, http://www.ragingchickenpress.org/2014/09/29/burnitdown-ripping-back-the-veil-of-exploitation-in-higher-ed-2/)//ghs-VA

The dirty secret of higher education in the United States is that the entire system depends upon the systematic exploitation of the majority – the super majority – of those who teach in its classrooms. As much as the right wing wants to point to the problem of “tenured radicals” warping the minds of good, wholesome American boys and girls, the fact remains that “tenured radicals” represent a micro-minority within the smallest portion of the nation’s faculty. Thanks to recent campaigns to raise the minimum wage, some splashy articles in Salon, the shameful death of an adjunct faculty member at Dusquesne University, and the unrelenting advocacy of organizations like the COCAL (Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor) and the New Faculty Majority the exploitation of part-time and adjunct faculty is back in the news. But, as anyone who is works as a contingent faculty member or who fights to stop this exploitation can attest, we’ve been here before and if anything, conditions have only gotten worse since the 2010 Tea Party victories and the brutal austerity measures carried out in states across the country. If you have felt a growing, visceral rage at deepening labor exploitation in higher education over the past few years, then you might not be surprised by the explosive Twitter conversation this past weekend using the #BurnItDown hashtag. People Tweeting with the #BurnItDown hashtag were ripping off the bandages and scabs that have covered over the conditions of adjuncts for way too long. And this time, if the tone and outrage turn into political action, contingent faculty will not be tamed with lip service equity from their institutions or half-promises to be “treated with respect” from their more privileged, tenured colleagues. If rage turns to political action, this time it’s for keeps. If you have no idea what is going on with #BurnItDown or you still think that Twitter is only a space for people to post pictures of their cats, here’s a little window into the #BurnItDown Twitter feed: Despite the fact that some higher education unions and academic associations were eventually forced to recognize and respond to the rapid growth of contingent labor in American colleges and universities, their responses have often felt a little too tepid and a little too late. When faculty at the nations most prestigious institutions are forced to apply for food stamps or sell plasma to make ends meet, another study of the problem of contingent labor feels like another punt – especially if you are the one having to sell your plasma. Some unions have started to organize adjuncts more aggressively than ever before and there have been several important victories over the past few years. However, instead of taking on the hard work of building a movement to turn back the assault on higher education, academics – especially tenure and tenure track academics – often cling to crumbs of cultural privilege or circle the wagons to preserve their ever shrinking intellectual outposts. Add to that the reluctance adjuncts have had for speaking out against their conditions for fear of losing their jobs and you’ve got a recipe for disaster. But #BurnItDown may indicate that conditions have gotten so bad and have been so bad for so long that adjuncts have reached a point of no return – that there is nothing left to lose. It’s either stand up and fight back or further sink into poverty and watch higher education become a mockery of everything that got them into the profession to begin with. And as tenured and tenure-track faculty have proven to be unreliable allies even as their own jobs have come under assault, #BurnItDown participants and countless adjuncts across the country seem ready to leave their colleagues in the dust and exercise their power. What power, you ask? The only power that has ever mattered in political movements: numbers. The fact is that contingent faculty make up 75% or more of the higher education workforce. That’s why the New Faculty Majority is called “The New Faculty Majority.” Even if I were to be cynical and assume only 5% of tenured and tenure track faculty would ally themselves with contingent faculty, the slogan “The University Works Because We Do,” is not simply a slogan. It’s a fact. And like workers of all stripes have learned over the course of history, the power to retake and remake higher education rests in the refusal to be complicit and the refusal to submit to dehumanizing working conditions. The halls of a university building may not be same as an assembly line in an auto plant, but both come to a screeching halt when workers sit down and occupy their workplaces. It’s not brain surgery, but it is hard. The question is what is harder? Living under current conditions or taking the risk to stand up and fight back. In his book, Get Up, Stand Up: Uniting Populists, Energizing the Defeated, and Battling the Corporate Elite, Bruce Levine argues that while there are real challenges in collective organizing, they are not as hard to overcome as some believe. But it’s important to understand, according to Levine, that the answer to exploitative, oppressive conditions is not to find out more facts, or read more studies about how bad things are. Rather, Levine argues that in every instance – from the Populists Movement to the Flint Sit Down Strikes to the Civil Rights Movement – the answer lies in everyday acts of resisting illegitimate authority. And, yes, that is risky but there is no short cut around it. As Levine put it in an interview he did on the Rick Smith Show, the good thing is that …you realize don’t have to wait for election day, you don’t have to wait for every four years to vote for the lesser of two evils. There’s things we could be doing every day to get back our courage, get back our balls, and a lot of that is from the integrity you get from resisting illegitimate authority and the solidarity you get from supporting other people who are resisting illegitimate authority in their life. As anyone who has ever done political organizing knows on some level, standing up and fighting back feels good. That fear you might feel in anticipation of an action begins to fade as you fight back with others. Yes, it might be risky, but fighting back with others, telling our stories out loud with others, begins to lessen that fear and reluctance. #BurnItDown may very well be one of those moments people look back upon and say that was the day they decided: “enough is enough.”

#### Left unchecked this ideology ends in extinction and closes the curtains on the theaters of cruelty that threatens political formation.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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.

#### Neoliberalism’s imposition on workers has also created lifeless theory in isolation that reproduces violence.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Although there are still a number of academics such as Noam Chomsky, Angela Davis, John Rawlston Saul, Bill McKibben, Germaine Greer and Cornel West who function as public intellectuals, they are often shut out of the mainstream media or characterized as marginal, unintelligible, and sometimes as unpatriotic figures. At the same time, many academics find themselves laboring under horrendous working conditions that either don't allow them to write in a theoretically rigorous and accessible manner for the public because they do not have time - given the often intensive teaching demands of part-time academics and increasingly of full-time, non-tenured academics as well. Or they retreat into a kind of theoreticism in which theory becomes lifeless, detached from any larger project or the realm of worldly issues. In this instance, the notion of theory as a resource, if not theoretical rigor itself, are transformed into a badge of academic cleverness shorn of the possibility of advancing thought within the academy or reaching a larger audience outside of their academic disciplines. Consequently, such intellectuals often exist in hermetic academic bubbles cut off from both the larger public and the important issues that impact society. To no small degree, they have been complicit in the transformation of the university into an adjunct of corporate power. Such academics run the risk of not only becoming incapable of defending higher education as a vital public sphere, but also of having any say over the conditions of their own intellectual labor. Without their intervention as public intellectuals, the university defaults on its role as a democratic public sphere willing to produce an informed public, enact and sustain a culture of questioning, and enable a critical formative culture capable of producing citizens "who are critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question so that democracy again becomes society's movement."34

#### The prevention of true academic engagement with the university from contingent faculty reinforce the current academic industrial complex and perpetuates colonialism.

Tuck and Yang – ’14 – Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, SUNY New Paltz and Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies, UC San Diego (Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing Research, <https://faculty.newpaltz.edu/evetuck/files/2013/12/Tuck-and-Yang-R-Words_Refusing-Research.pdf>, p. 223, MM)

Research is a dirty word among many Native communities (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), and arguably, also among ghettoized (Kelley, 1997), Orientalized (Said, 1978), and other communities of overstudied Others. The ethical standards of the academic industrial complex are a recent development, and like so many post-civil rights reforms, do not always do enough to ensure that social science research is deeply ethical, meaningful, or useful for the individual or community being researched. Social science often works to collect stories of pain and humiliation in the lives of those being researched for commodification. However, these same stories of pain and humiliation are part of the collective wisdom that often informs the writings of researchers who attempt to position their intellectual work as decolonization. Indeed, to refute the crime, we may need to name it. How do we learn from and respect the wisdom and desires in the stories that we (over) hear, while refusing to portray/betray them to the spectacle of the settler colonial gaze? How do we develop an ethics for research that differentiates between power—which deserves a denuding, indeed petrifying scrutiny—and people? At the same time, as fraught as research is in its complicity with power, it is one of the last places for legitimated inquiry. It is at least still a space that proclaims to care about curiosity. In this essay, we theorize refusal not just as a "no," but as a type of investigation into "what you need to know and what I refuse to write in" (Simpson, 2007, p. 72). Therefore, we present a refusal to do research, or a refusal within research, as a way of thinking about humanizing researchers.

### Plan

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should require Universities to pay contingent faculty members a living wage.

### Solvency

#### Liberalization of the higher education via a living wage is critical to develop advocates for equality and reject anti-intellectualism. Higher education has potential but now is key, critical intellectuals need to be involved.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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. 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 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) 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:

#### Paying them a living wage creates the sufficient security for throwaway academics that gives them the confidence to liberalize the university and change the hegemonic structure of the US.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) Throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. 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) 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. The culture wars and the post-9/11 attacks on higher education under the reign of the new McCarthyism were followed by the hollowing out of the social state and the defunding of higher education. The more overt political attacks gave way to the economic wars waged against higher education, one current example being the attempt by billionaires such as the Koch brothers to turn higher education into nothing more than an ideological factory for neoliberal capitalism. In desperate need of money, more and more universities are selling off naming rights to their buildings, accepting gifts from hedge fund managers, and caving in to the demands of big donors to influence what is taught, what programs deserve to be sustained and what faculty should be rewarded. Moreover, as tuition skyrockets, poor people and people of color are being locked out of higher education so as to reinforce the two-tier system that Bloom and others once celebrated. At the same time as higher education is being defunded, corporatized and managed by an expanding class of administrators wedded to a neoliberal model of leadership, faculty has been downsized, creating an exploited and invisible class of underpaid, part-time workers. Many faculty members are now consigned to the service of Walmart workers, stripped of full-time positions, relegated to the status of "stoop laborers," (15) lacking power, security and a living wage, and largely devoid of any hope for a full-time position in the academy in the near future. According to the American Association of University Professors, at the present moment more than 50 percent of faculty are adjuncts barely able to pay their rents, conduct research and exercise any influence over the increasing corporatization and militarization of higher education. Many part-time faculty members make less than $21,000 annually, and as Colman McCarthy points out "slog like migrant workers from campus to campus." (16) A record number of adjuncts are now on food stamps and receive some form of public assistance. Given how little they are paid this should not come as a surprise, though that does not make it any less shameful. (17) These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism's culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education. And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the "hyper-educated poor" (18) joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. 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. 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 giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle.

#### Only a living wage can solve this education crisis that is necessary to recover a generation of lost research – it produces effective scholarship for change.

Segran 14 (Elizabeth, writer based in Cambridge, Massachusetts for the Atlantic, “The Adjunct Revolt: How Poor Professors Are Fighting Back,” APR 28, 2014, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/04/the-adjunct-professor-crisis/361336/)//ghs-VA

A spate of research about the contingent academic workforce indicates that Cerasoli’s circumstances are not exceptional. This month, a report by the American Association of University Professors showed that adjuncts now constitute 76.4 percent of U.S. faculty across all institutional types, from liberal-arts colleges to research universities to community colleges. A study released by the U.S. House of Representatives in January reveals that the majority of these adjuncts live below the poverty line. Over spring break, Cerasoli publicly protested her working conditions on the steps of New York Department of Education wearing a vest emblazoned with the words “Homeless Prof” on it. Her efforts dovetail with a national labor movement in which thousands of adjuncts are fighting for change within the higher-education system. In the short-term, adjuncts are demanding a living wage, but they are also proposing long-term solutions to structural problems ailing universities. Many argue that the dependence on contingent labor is part of a larger pattern of corporatizing the university, which they believe is harming not just professors and students, but society more broadly. “While there are micro-tragedies in the lives of individual adjuncts, there is also a macro, systemic problem unfolding,” said Adrianna Kezar, co-founder of the Delphi Project which examines how the changing faculty affects student success. Her data consistently shows that students who take more classes with adjuncts are more likely to drop out. Kezar told me that this high attrition rate has nothing to do with the quality of instruction adjuncts provide; it is entirely a function of the compromised working conditions adjuncts face. Tenure-track professors have a wealth of career-development tools at their disposal; in contrast, Kezar says, universities do not give adjuncts the basic resources they need to properly teach their courses, such as sample syllabi or learning objectives. Since most departments hire adjuncts at the last minute, they are often inadequately prepared to enter the classroom. Universities do not provide adjuncts with office space, making it difficult for them to meet with students outside class. To make matters worse, many adjuncts teach at several colleges to make ends meet: Commuting—sometimes between great distances—further reduces the time they can devote to individual students. Despite challenging working conditions, many adjuncts continue to meet with students and perform other time-consuming tasks they are not compensated for, such as writing recommendation letters or attending departmental meetings. “Students aren’t getting what they pay for or, if they are, it is because adjuncts themselves are subsidizing their education,” Maria Maisto, president of the adjunct activist group New Faculty Majority, told me. “Adjuncts are donating their time; they are providing it out of pocket.” The presence of adjuncts also affects the quality of education in subtler ways. The tenure system was originally designed to foster academic freedom by allowing professors to voice unpopular opinions without the fear of being fired: in contrast, adjuncts can have their contracts terminated without a grievance process. Maisto told me that many adjuncts are afraid to challenge their students in class because poor student evaluations could cost them their jobs. “College is no longer creating a critically-thinking citizenry who can participate actively in a democracy,” she said. Emily Van Duyne, an adjunct professor in New Jersey, told me she finds it uncomfortable to teach her students about issues like the American Civil Rights Movement when she feels unable to change her own unjust working conditions. “It feels very strange asking students to hone their critical thinking skills about an oppressive culture and the ways you can respond effectively, when you are teaching out of a broken system,” she told me. The adjunct crisis also restricts the research output of American universities. For adjuncts scrambling between multiple short-term, poorly paid teaching jobs, producing scholarship is a luxury they cannot afford. “We have lost an entire generation of scholarship because of this,” Debra Leigh Scott, an adjunct activist and documentary filmmaker, told me. “Adjunct contracts not only drive professors into poverty, it makes it next to impossible for them to do the kind of scholarship they have trained an average of ten years to do.” Scott suggests that the loss of academic scholarship has ripple effects throughout society, since fewer scholars are contributing to national discussions on issues like the ethics of business and the value of the humanities. “If you lose these expert voices then who is really left speaking?” she asks. “You get the pundits on either side, but there is not a lot of depth to the conversations being held. There has been a dumbing down of discourse across all platforms.” How did it come to this? Jeffrey Selingo, author of College Unbound: The Future of Higher Education and What it Means for Students, argues that the shift towards contingent labor occurred because university administrators began to focus on enhancing the student experience outside—rather than inside—the classroom. “We moved away from a faculty-centric university to one focused on serving students,” he told me. “To attract students, universities need amenities to keep up in an arms race with other institutions,” he says. Instead of being an institution of public good, the university began to look more and more like a business in which the student was the customer. Selingo points out that university administration costs have ballooned over the last two decades, as universities hired non-faculty staff to run the growing list of campus amenities. Given these skyrocketing expenses, administrators felt pressure to cut costs. “As professors started to retire, administrators realized that if they did not hire tenure-track professors, they could have more flexibility with their workforce,” explains Selingo. At the same time, graduate schools were churning out large numbers of Ph.D.s willing to teach single courses for a few thousand dollars, so hiring adjuncts seemed like a simple solution. Maisto argues that in the midst of these changes administrators lost sight of the university’s mission. “This adjunct crisis did not happen because of some grand, nefarious plot,” she told me. “It has to do with the reactive character of university leadership who got caught up in short-term thinking rather than intentional, long-term strategic planning.” Yet, Maisto and other activists believe that it is not too late to change the system. For many adjuncts, the first step is to fight for better compensation and benefits. Apart from improving their quality of life, adjuncts believe increased wages will more accurately reflect their value and give them more influence within the university.

#### Educations primary role within politics enables us to disconnect from technocratic modes of thinking – the plan creates a class of radicals who are willing to challenge dominant ideology.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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) 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) 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) 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.

# 2AC – Role of Ballot/Judge

## AT: Alt RoB

### Education: Power Relation

#### Finding the best political strategy for education is a priori.

Giroux 9 (Henry Giroux. Giroux currently holds the Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department and a Distinguished Visiting Professorship at Ryerson University. 2009. [“Youth in a Suspect Society.”)

**For education to be civic, critical, and democratic rather than privatized**, militarized, and commodiﬁed, the work that academics do cannot be defended exclusively within the discourse of specialization, technological mastery, or a market-driven rationality concerned about efﬁciency and proﬁt margins. On the contrary, **academic labor is distinctive by virtue of its commitment to modes of education that take seriously** John Dewey’s notion that democracy is a “way of life” that must be constantly nurtured and defended, or as Richard Bernstein puts it: Democracy, according to Dewey, does not consist exclusively of a set of institutions, formal voting procedures, or even legal guarantee of rights. These are important, but they require a culture of everyday democratic cooperative practices to give them life and meaning. Otherwise institutions and procedures are in danger of becoming hollow and meaningless. **Democracy is “a way of life,” an ethical ideal that demands active and constant attention**. And if we fail to work at creating and re-creating democracy, there is no guarantee that it will survive. Democracy involves a reﬂective faith in the capacity of all human beings for intelligent judgment, deliberation, and action if the proper social, educational, and economic conditions are furnished. 102 Education should not be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always “be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indeﬁnitely improving itself.” Democracy is not cheap and neither are the political, economic, and social conditions that make it possible. **If academics believe that the university is a space for and about democracy, they need to become more attentive to addressing the racial, economic, and political conditions that ﬁll their ranks with adjuncts**, **remove faculty from exercising power in university gover**- **nance**, and work towards eliminating the economic conditions that prevent working-class and middle-class youth from getting a decent post-secondary education. **Moreover, a critical pedagogy that values a democratic and open society should be engaged at all levels of schooling.** It must gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues, and workplaces in orderto produce new ideas, concepts, and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. **This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the insular, overly pragmatic, and privileged isolation of the academy while afﬁrming a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-deﬁnition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic** freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. This is the kind of intellectual practice that Zygmunt Bauman calls “taking responsibility for our responsibility,” one that is attentive to the suffering of others and “will not allow conscience to look away or fall asleep.” 105 In order for pedagogy that encourages critical thought to have a real effect, it must include the message that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. **If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to provide the opportunities for students to learn that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges**, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them. **Simply put, educators need to argue for forms of pedagogy that close the gap between the university and everyday life**. Their curricula need to be organized around knowledge about communities, cultures, and traditions that give students a sense of history, identity, and place. Said illuminates this process when he urges academics and students to accept the demands of “worldliness,” which include “lifting complex ideas into the public space,” recognizing human injury inside and outside of the academy, and using theory as a critical resource to change things. Worldliness suggests that we must not be afraid of controversy and that we must make connections that are otherwise hidden, deﬂate the claims of triumphalism, and bridge intellectual work and the operation of politics. It means combining rigor and clarity, on the one hand, and civic courage and political commitment, on the other. 106 **A critically engaged pedagogy also necessitates that we incorporate in our classrooms those electronically mediated knowledge forms that constitute the terrain of mass and popular culture**. I am referring here to the world of **media texts—videos,** ﬁlms, the Internet, podcasts, and other elements of the new electronic technologies that operate through a combination of visual and print culture. **Such an approach not only challenges the traditional deﬁnition of schooling as the only** 104 **site of pedagogy by widening** the **application and sites of education to a variety of cultural locations but also alerts students to the educational force of the culture at large**, what I have called elsewhere the ﬁeld of public pedagogy. **Any viable notion of critical pedagogy should afﬁrm and enrich the meaning, language, and knowledge forms that students actually use to negotiate and inform their lives**. **Academics can, in part, exercise their role as public intellectuals via such approaches by giving students the opportunity to understand how power is organized through an enormous number of “popular” cultural spheres**, including libraries, movie theaters, schools, and high-tech media conglomerates that circulate signs and meanings through newspapers, magazines, advertisements, new information technologies, computers, and television programs. Needless to say, this position challenges neoconservative Roger Kimball’s claim that “[p]opular culture is a tradition essential to uneducated Americans.” **By laying claim to popular, mass, and alternative cultural spaces as important sites of public pedagogy, educators have the opportunity, if not the responsibility, to raise important questions about how knowledge is produced, circulated, and taken up in different pedagogical sites**. **They can also provide the foundation for students to become competent and critically versed in a variety of literacies** (not just the literacy of print), **while at the same time expanding the conditions and options for the roles students might play as cultural producers** (as opposed to simply teaching them to be critical readers). **At stake here is an understanding of literacy as both a set of competencies to be learned and a crucial condition for developing ways of intervening in the world**. 107 I have suggested that educators need to become provocateurs; they need to take a stand while refusing to be involved in either a cynical relativism or doctrinaire politics. **This suggests that central to intellectual life is the pedagogical and political imperative that academics engage in rigorous social criticism while becoming a stubborn force for challenging false prophets**, ﬁghting against the imposed silence of normalized power, and critically engaging all those social relations that promote material and symbolic violence. 108 **There is a lot of talk among social theorists about the death of politics brought on by a negative globalization characterized by markets without frontiers**, deregulation, militarism, and armed violence, all of which not only feed each other but produce global unlawfulness and reduce politics to merely an extension of war. **I would hope that, of all groups, educators would vocally and tirelessly challenge this ideology by mak- ing it clear that expanding the public good and promoting democratic social change are at the very heart of critical education and are preconditions for global justice**. The potential for a better future further increases when critical education is directed toward young people. As a result, public and higher education may be among the few spheres left in which the promise of youth can be linked to the promise of democracy.

### Giroux: We Preclude

#### We must rupture the neoliberal imagination in order to generate a different worldview – everything you think, you think because of neolib.

Giroux 12 (Henry A Giroux [American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy], “Dangerous Pedagogy in the Age of Casino Capitalism and Religious Fundamentalism”, truthout, 29 Feb 2012, BE

All over the world, the forces of neoliberalism are on the march, dismantling the historically guaranteed social provisions provided by the welfare state, defining profit-making and market freedoms as the essence of democracy while diminishing civil liberties as part of the alleged "war" against terrorism. **Secure in its dystopian vision that there are no alternatives to a market society, free-market fundamentalism eliminates issues of contingency, struggle and social agency by celebrating the inevitability of economic laws in which the ethical ideal of intervening in the world gives way to the idea that we "have no choice but to adapt both our hopes and our abilities to the new global market**."[1] Coupled with an ever-expanding culture of fear, market freedoms seem securely grounded in a defense of national security and the institutions of finance capital. Under such circumstances, **a neoliberal model now bears down on American society, threatening to turn it into an authoritarian state.** The script is now familiar: there is no such thing as the common good; market values become the template for shaping all aspects of society; the free, possessive individual has no obligations to anything other than his or her self-interest; profit-making is the essence of democracy; the government, and particularly the welfare state, is the arch-enemy of freedom; private interests trump public values; consumerism is the essence of citizenship; privatization is the essence of freedom; law and order is the new language for mobilizing shared fears rather than shared responsibilities; war is the new organizing principle for organizing society and the economy; theocracy now becomes the legitimating code for punishing women, young people, the elderly, and those groups marginalized by class, race and ethnicity when religious moralism is needed to shore up the war against all social order.[2]¶ **Given this current crisis, educators need a new political and pedagogical language for addressing the changing contexts and issues facing a world in which capital draws upon an unprecedented convergence of resources** - financial, cultural, political, economic, scientific, military and technological - to exercise powerful and diverse forms of control. **If educators and others are to counter global capitalism’s increased ability to separate the traditional nation-state-based space of politics from the transnational reach of power, it is crucial to develop educational approaches that reject a collapse of the distinction between market liberties and civil liberties, a market economy and a market society. This suggests developing forms of critical pedagogy capable of challenging neoliberalism** and other anti-democratic traditions, such as the emerging religious fundamentalism in the United States, while resurrecting a radical democratic project that provides the basis for imagining a life beyond the "dream world" of capitalism. Under such circumstances, education becomes more than testing, an obsession with accountability schemes, zero-tolerance policies and a site for simply training students for the workforce. At stake here is recognizing the power of education in creating the formative culture necessary to both challenge the various threats being mobilized against the very idea of justice and democracy while also fighting for those public spheres and formative cultures that offer alternative modes of identity, social relations and politics.

# 2AC – Case Debate

## AT: Academia Already Liberal

### Giroux XT

#### Right wing extremists are coopting the academy now – I control uniqueness.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

Under the current regime of neoliberal savagery and its cruel austerity policies, Walker is not a political exception; he is the rule. The extremist wing of the Republican Party hates the notion that the university might function primarily to address important social issues in the name of the public good. Couple this particular fear and ideological fundamentalism with the rampant idiocy and anti-intellectualism that has become an organizing principle of the new extremists at all levels of government and it becomes clear that public and higher education are prime targets in the struggle to create a fundamentalist-driven culture that supports those identifications, desires and modes of agency receptive to the rise of an authoritarian society and police state in which criticism is viewed as a form of treason and even the mildest of liberal rhetoric is disparaged or dismissed out of hand. For instance, in Oklahoma, the state's politicians and lawmakers have introduced a bill that eliminates the teaching of Advanced Placement US history courses in the public high schools. (29) The reason behind the bill defies logic and reflects the new stupidity and religious fundamentalism that are at the heart of the conservative assault against reason and critical thinking. According to Judd Legum, "Oklahoma Rep. Dan Fisher (R) has introduced 'emergency' legislation 'prohibiting the expenditure of funds on the Advanced Placement United States History course.' Fisher is part of a group called the 'Black Robe Regiment' which argues that 'the church and God himself has been under assault, marginalized, and diminished by the progressives and secularists.'" (30) Ben Carson, a potential GOP presidential candidate and pediatric neurosurgeon, stated that the students who finished the course would be "ready to sign up for ISIS." (31) The essence of the push back against the AP US history course was echoed by the Republican National Committee in a resolution claiming that it was too negative, and reflected "a radically revisionist view of US history that emphasizes negative aspects of our nation's history while omitting or minimizing positive aspects." (32) What at first glance appears to be a case of egregious ignorance is in reality a religious fundamentalist attack on any viable notion of historical consciousness and public memory. (33) These politicians are the ground troops for the new authoritarianism that rewards and revels in thoughtlessness and despises any criticism of US domestic and foreign policy. Truly, the brownshirts of our time, they are a new breed of ideological muggers whose minds are unburdened by a complicated thought, who choke on their own ignorance and sutured political certainties. They represent another one of the forces, in addition to the apostles of a savage neoliberalism and the hedge fund criminals, out to destroy public and higher education, in the United States, even in its weakest liberal version.

### Class Divide/Elites

#### Current education locks in the status quo – the university contributes to class divides and constructs an institutional separation.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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. 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)

## AT: Inherency

### Multiple Jobs

#### Contingent faculty who don’t earn a living wage are forced to work a litany of jobs.

Allison et al 14 (Marisa Allison Randy Lynn Victoria Hoverman Doctoral Students Department of Sociology and Anthropology George Mason University, “Indispensable But Invisible,” October 2014, http://www.unitedworkerscongress.org/uploads/2/4/6/6/24662736/gmu-contingent-faculty-study.pdf)//ghs-VA

With so many contingent faculty only able to earn a part-time salary without benefits at the university, it is not surprising that a sizable number look for employment at other universities as well. Over one-third of our respondents reported that they had been employed at more than one institution during a semester—with 26 percent employed at two, 8 percent employed at three, and 2 percent employed at four or more. This finding is consistent with other studies that have identified a significant minority of contingent faculty who are attempting to cobble together a living wage by rushing back and forth between as many institutions as possible. In addition, it is likely that many other GMU contingent faculty who cannot find work at other colleges or universities must supplement their income by finding other non-academic work.

### Inherency: Untouchables

#### Contingent faculty members specifically don’t earn a living wage – this results in them becoming the untouchables of the academy.

Eisenberg 12 (Pablo, leading scholar and advocate for greater accountability and commitment by philanthropy in the United States to the poor, people of color and social justice issues, “Campus Workers' Wages: a Disgrace to Academe,” September 10, 2012, http://chronicle.com/article/A-Living-Wage-for-Campus/134232/)//ghs-VA

More than 700,000 employees at American colleges—gardeners, security guards, cleaning crews, janitors, food-service personnel, etc.—do not earn a living wage, the bare-bones amount sufficient to provide a minimally decent standard of living for their families. This is a disgrace to our system of higher education and a sad reflection on the moral leadership of our colleges. For a wage earner with a family of four to meet the federal poverty line of just over $23,000 a year, he or she would have to net about $13 an hour, seven hours a day, five days a week, for all 52 weeks of the year. Such an income would normally not include health benefits, sick leave, or vacation pay. It would provide for few amenities that make up a decent life, not to mention the capacity to meet health crises and unforeseeable family problems. Very few low-wage workers on American campuses even earn a poverty-level income, let alone receive health benefits. Many work only nine or 10 months a year and are often barred from receiving unemployment benefits during the few summer months they are unemployed. Yet their work is an essential ingredient of college life; without them, campuses couldn't function. Why are they so poorly valued and treated? Why have they become the "untouchables" of our higher-education caste system? The answer is complex. It is in part the result of our growing class divide, in which blue-collar and low-level service workers are granted little or no respect and are treated accordingly. The fact that so many of these workers are members of minority groups taps into lingering negative attitudes about immigrant workers and people of color. Moreover, many colleges have become big businesses, reflecting corporate values: management efficiency, top-down decision making, a wide divide between top salaries and those of the lowest-paid workers, and trustees who care little about academic matters but a great deal about finances and fund raising. Like corporate executives who want to cut budgets and maximize profits, college administrators say there is no money in their budgets to raise the wages of their low-income employees. Yet they find plenty of money for athletics, new buildings, and additional highly paid administrators. Over the past two decades, campus student groups and their faculty supporters have pressured college administrations to raise the pay of low-wage employees and, in some cases, to unionize those workers. The activists have conducted living-wage campaigns throughout the country, but, for the most part, their efforts have failed to produce more than a few victories. The opposition of college administrations in general has been surprisingly fierce, often led by chancellors and presidents otherwise known for their liberal perspectives and moderate views. At a relatively few institutions, the student and union campaigns have forced colleges to change their positions, increase wages and benefits, and engage in dialogues with workers and students. At Georgetown University, an undergraduate-led living-wage coalition won a victory over a recalcitrant university administration. At Harvard and the University of Miami, pressure from students and unions prompted the institutions to raise the wages of both their direct and contract employees, yet the negotiations were protracted and painful. During the struggles, students at Harvard pointed out that the university at the time had a $19-billion endowment. At Miami, President Donna Shalala enjoyed a $500,000-plus salary and a large university house. The treatment of low-wage workers on campus is an issue that flies below the public radar, is ignored by public-policy officials and college trustees, and is dismissed by college administrators as little more than a nuisance. The insouciance and apathy of faculty members throughout academe has permitted administrators to avoid taking any action to remedy these inequities. Professional associations like the American Association of University Professors seem to have ignored the matter. College chief executives and administrators are the primary culprits in denying living wages to low-wage employees. They say that in a time of fiscal austerity, their institutions don't have the money to grant additional funds to their blue-collar staff. Yet the cost of providing such increases is often a tiny percentage of the institutions' budgets. For example, Georgetown's cost of providing a living wage to its approximately 500 campus workers amounted to only a little over $2-million a year. Georgetown's annual budget in 2010 was more than $900-million. In 2009, 36 private-college presidents each received more than $1-million in salaries, while provosts and other high-level administrators also received more than ample compensation packages. Public officials responsible for overseeing state colleges are clearly not doing their jobs in ensuring decent working conditions at their institutions. Trustees of private colleges seem to have washed their hands of their obligation to monitor and, where necessary, change the policies and practices of the institutions for which they are ultimately responsible. The democratic values of our higher-education system have been turned upside down. Equity, fair play, and justice have given way to bureaucratic greed and unprincipled practices. The system has become increasingly dysfunctional; its poorest elements­—the low-wage workers and contingent faculty (who now constitute more than 75 percent of all higher-education faculty)—are given short shrift, while top administrators reap the benefits. But the real losers are the students and their parents.

### Empirics: Not Covered

#### Not paid now – empirics.

Grove 13 (Jack, writer @ timeshighereducation, “Almost 13,000 university employees ‘paid less than living wage’,” NOVEMBER 2013, http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/many-university-employees-paid-less-than-living-wage/2008727.article)//ghs-VA

Some 80 institutions pay less than the Living Wage, which is set independently and is based on the amount required for minimum living standards, according to the data obtained from higher education institutions via the Freedom of Information Act. Both bodies are calling for universities to become accredited Living Wage institutions. Speaking at the start of Living Wage Week, Dom Anderson, vice-president of the NUS, said: “The higher education strikes last week displayed the understandable strength of feeling about the lack of a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work in too many of our universities.

### FLSA Laws: No Coverage

#### Contingent faculty exploited now – uniquely don’t have coverage because of employment laws.

Honey 14 (Christopher, Professor @ Maryland Washington, “Adjunct Action Report Investigates Faculty Working Conditions, Advocates for Federal Labor Protections and Accountability from Employers,” November 18, 2014, http://www.seiu500.org/2014/11/adjunct-action-report-investigates-faculty-working-conditions-advocates-for-federal-labor-protections-and-accountability-from-employers/)//ghs-VA

A new SEIU/Adjunct Action report released today called Crisis at the Boiling Point tells an important story of what’s happening in academic labor by documenting and analyzing just how much work part-time faculty are doing, when they are doing it for free and how federal employment laws often fail to protect the contingent workforce. This report also offers recommendations and actions that faculty, students and concerned members of the community can take to begin to reclaim our higher education system. Faculty from 238 colleges and universities completed the national survey. Respondents include faculty teaching at every type of degree-granting institution: non-profit, state universities, community colleges and for-profit colleges and universities, both faculty teaching on physical campuses and at on-line institutions. Faculty responded to the national survey from 32 states with the highest percentages coming from Massachusetts (20 percent), New York (14 percent), and California (14 percent). In addition, to date, over 40 in-depth interviews have been completed with faculty to gather detailed data on working conditions. Institutions of higher education can and do take advantage of contingent faculty’s precarious status under current employment laws and dedication to their profession to get long hours of teaching work for little—and at times delayed—payment in return. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), the federal law setting minimum wage, overtime, and timely pay standards for both hourly and salaried workers, currently does not cover contingent faculty—regardless of how poorly or how often they are paid—simply because they are teachers. In addition, eligibility for important federal programs under the Family and Medical Leave Act and Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program depends in part on the number of hours worked, limiting or complicating adjuncts’ access to those benefits. The long hours contingent faculty work outside of the classroom often outnumber the hours worked in the classroom, but laws and regulations often fail to set accurate standards to account for all hours worked. Respondents were asked to calculate the number of hours they work, and among those who provided sufficient data, approximately: 16 percent are paid below the federal minimum wage of $7.25 per hour; 24 percent are paid below $10/hour; and 43 percent are paid below $15/hour. 38 percent of respondents are paid below $455 per week, the minimum salary that almost all professional employees must receive to be deemed exempt under the current Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) regulations. If teachers were not carved out of the FLSA salary basis requirement, those respondents could potentially access the legal protections against wage theft under the FLSA. Many work full-time hours and most put in a significant amount of time outside the classroom, even being asked or assumed to work unpaid. Although by definition an adjunct is “part-time” 40 percent say the work more than 40 hours a week for their university employer(s). Almost all respondents say they are asked or expected to perform work outside the classroom and 28 percent indicated that they spend more than 20 hours a week on work-related tasks outside of the classroom. When asked if they have ever been asked or expected to perform work that they were not paid for by their academic employers, 73 percent of survey respondents stated “yes” or “maybe.” Examples of unpaid work they have performed, include: advising students enrolled in the major or minor; writing recommendations; attending trainings; presenting talks on campus; advising student groups; attending student events; sitting on committees; planning and presenting at orientation or informational meetings for the department; and designing or developing new courses. 18 percent said they have received a late paycheck in the last year. The public shouldn’t be in the dark about how colleges and universities really work. This report gives faculty, parents and elected officials new insight into what’s happening on campus to ensure they have a voice about the quality of education students receive. Issues like unpaid work, long hours, access to Federal programs and employment law protections are part of a broad need for change on campuses across America.

## AT: Unemployment

### Case Extensions

#### 1. Cross apply Mahoney – no uniqueness for the impact – let me quote the card, “conditions have gotten so bad, that adjuncts have reached a point of no return, there is nothing left to lose, it’s either stand up and fight or further sink into poverty.” Try or die for the aff.

#### 2. Cross apply Giroux – neoliberal ideology constructs the frame for economic arguments – liberalizing the academy solves how we view individuals therefore causes a re-prioritization that solves.

### Strobl: Sufficient Money

#### Impact outweighs – the number of adjunct employees has increased by 70% and it’s affordable to pay them now.

Strobl 15 (Erik, master’s degree in English from Washington University in 2010 and I’m currently finishing my Ph.D, “Adjuncts deserve living wage, and University would benefit from paying it,” February 22, 2015, http://www.studlife.com/forum/op-ed-submission/2015/02/22/adjuncts-deserve-living-wage-and-university-would-benefit-from-paying-it/)//ghs-VA

Education, my parents always said, is everything. Neither graduated from college themselves: my father left community college after a semester and, for lack of money, my mother never went. There’s no higher calling than academia, they told me, and there’s no better way to move up in the world. They were half right. I received my master’s degree in English from Washington University in 2010 and I’m currently finishing my Ph.D. Getting my terminal degree from a top-tier research institution like Wash. U., I thought, would launch a successful career. The faculty and students here are all first-rate and it’s by any account a fantastic place to go to school. It can also be a great place to work. If you have a high school diploma or GED, “good oral and written communication skills,” “information gathering skills” and the “ability to walk and stand for long periods of time,” you can make $30,000 a year plus retirement, three weeks of paid vacation, free life insurance and tuition benefits for yourself, your spouse and children by working as a security guard on the medical campus (job ID 28602). You even get a MetroLink pass! If, however, you work as adjunct faculty, you’re probably not living that well. I’d hope my dissertation showcases information-gathering and written communication skills and teaching three sections of College Writing 1 each semester should demonstrate strong oral communication and the ability to stand, but I don’t receive benefits comparable to those above. I make only about $26,000 per year and work is never guaranteed. I spent the week before Thanksgiving praying I’d have a job in January. “Please don’t call me ‘Professor,’” I sheepishly tell my students. They imagine everyone teaching here is tenured, but the number of adjunct faculty has increased nationwide from about 25 percent to about 70 percent over the past 50 years. This means the vast majority of instructors on college campuses are paid far below what their qualifications recommend. My students are rightly proud of Wash. U.; I too love its institutional prestige. I’ve learned quickly, though, that you can’t eat prestige and it doesn’t keep you warm. Nationally, 31 percent of adjuncts live near the federal poverty level. My students don’t know that I’ve spent spring weekends taking Craigslist landscaping jobs and fall weekends moving firewood because I needed an extra $50 for rent or groceries. Forget luxuries like paid vacations—a mechanic or emergency room visit would ruin me. I can’t imagine tuition-paying parents know this either. Between 2003 and 2013, tuition increased 91 percent at state schools and 74 percent at private universities while spending on instructions decreased 24 percent. If not to their kids’ instructors, then, where do tuition checks actually go? In short, up the food chain. In the last 35 years, top administrative pay has increased three times as much as that of faculty. At private institutions, the average salary of top administrators rose 170 percent. The shift away from investment in educators and affordable, accessible higher education and toward a big-business model is a crisis of priorities. Of course, administrators do important work, and I don’t mean to disparage them (as I don’t mean to disparage security guards). But contract faculty struggle to survive. Contingent faculty and students across the country have joined to urge universities to compensate all faculty members fairly, pushing for a national standard of $15,000 per course in pay and benefits. This proposed investment in quality of education for students and quality of life for faculty is feasible, especially given our means. Not counting our $6,700,000,000 endowment, Wash. U.—a tax-exempt non-profit institution—had a net income of $221,979,129 in 2012. Tripling adjunct compensation would still leave one-fifth of a billion dollars in profits. It’d also be a PR boon for the University (and not only for parents investing in their kids’ education). Peer institutions would envy our press as Wash. U. becomes the national model for treating contract labor fairly. Paying adjuncts a living wage benefits everyone. Enhancing our reputation—defining ourselves as part of the solution, not part of the problem—and improving the lives of a staggering percentage of our faculty while not suffering financially is a win on every front. Adjunct faculty are talented, hard-working instructors who give their time and effort to students both inside and outside the classroom. We mentor, advise and write letters of recommendation not because we’re paid to do so—we aren’t—but because we care. Please don’t let our passion and dedication go unrecognized.

### Junc-et: Alt Cause

#### There’s sufficient money, a litany of alt causes, and the case is key to solving unemployment by establishing an economic base.

Junc-et 13 (Junc-et, group of individuals who have a variety of qualifications from film analysts to PhD’s in film studies, all of which are actively involved in higher education, most are professors at Universities, “The Trashing of Higher Ed. in America,” 2013, http://www.2255films.com/)//ghs-VA

Many universities claim that use of a part-time, contingent faculty is a way to keep costs down. But in addition to the enormous increase in administrative jobs and salaries, there are increased costs in new campus buildings and sports teams, coaches salaries; and tuitions have gone through the roof. Even at public universities, the costs are far beyond what is affordable to the average middle-class family. Loans -- enormous loans -- are the way this is being financed. Students and their parents are still being fed the myth that a college education is the only way to guarantee a good "job"....so more and more of the focus is on vocation rather than education. The sad reality is that there are no jobs. 20% of all college graduates remain unemployed, the majority of the rest of them are underemployed, working service jobs, retail jobs, jobs they could have gotten without a degree, earning very low wages, at the same time that the average student loan debt is $80,000.00. This generation of students is graduating to jobs with no living wage, and to enormous debt that they'll be paying for 30 years. This is a scam. It should be a crime. This is the creation of a whole generation of indentured workers. So on one hand we have the impoverished faculty; on the other hand we have the impoverished student. The only people benefitting here are the management class. And they aren't doing the teaching or the learning.....they are just doing the EARNING.

### Case Outweighs

#### A mandatory living wage would lift millions out of poverty—outweighs negative effects on employment by 96%.

Riley 13 (Rebecca Riley, National Institute of Economic & Social Research and Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies, “Modelling Demand for Low Skilled/Low Paid Labour: Exploring the Employment Trade-Offs of a Living Wage,” NIESR Discussion Paper No. 404, 20 January 2013, http://www.labourmarketnortheast.co.uk/app/assets/files/news/modellinglowskill\_lowdeman d\_feb13.pdf)//ghs-VA

This paper considers what might happen to labour demand if all employers signed up to the Living Wage. To this end labour demand models are developed for workers in five different groups, distinguished by age and qualifications. Because the Living Wage represents a substantial rise in average wages and labour costs for younger employees, particularly those with intermediate or no qualifications, and because labour demand for younger less skilled workers is relatively elastic we find that a move to the Living Wage could significantly reduce employers' demand for this group. Aggregate labour demand is reduced by less because employers substitute more experienced workers for younger workers. It is important to keep in mind that the labour demand effects calculated in this paper are conditional on both the scale of output, labour force participation and labour efficiency. This means that the labour demand effects discussed here do not necessarily provide estimates of the employment effects of the Living Wage. One way of illustrating this is to consider the evidence on the introduction of the NMW, which led to an increase in wages for the lowest paid and a rise in hourly labour costs. A simple labour demand model would predict that the introduction of the NMW led to a reduction in labour demand. Indeed, the labour demand model presented in this paper would suggest that the introduction of the NMW led to a reduction in conditional labour demand of approximately 22,000 employees in the private sector.16 While this is little more than 0.1% of private sector employees it amounts to just under 2% of low paid employees. In contrast, the majority of empirical research to date, which analyses the impacts of the NMW in an ex-post natural experiment approach, finds little evidence to suggest that the NMW has reduced employment significantly amongst low paid workers (Butcher, 2012). These separate pieces of evidence are not obviously inconsistent; the adverse effects on labour demand calculated here may, for example, be offset to some extent by other changes in the labour market brought about by the NMW. The reduction in labour demand associated with the NMW, implied by the model in this paper, is significantly smaller than the reduction in labour demand associated with a wage floor set at the Living Wage. This is because a pay floor set at the Living Wage would reach much higher up the wage distribution than the NMW, potentially increasing wages for more than three times the number of workers who benefit from the NMW and for many by a more significant amount than with the NMW. Indeed, assuming employment and hours worked were unchanged, the calculations using the LFS in this paper suggest that more than 4 million employees in the market sector would see a rise in their earnings with widespread adoption of the Living Wage; on average, earnings would rise by 15% for these employees. The estimated reduction in labour demand is small in comparison, equivalent to less than 4% per cent of the number who might benefit.

### Increases Growth

#### This is your argument? Go home, this evidence is a game ender, Madland and Miller ‘14

Evidence Shows Increasing the Minimum Wage Is No Threat to Employment, Center For American Progress Action Fund, By [David Madland](https://www.americanprogressaction.org/about/staff/madland-david/bio/) and [Keith Miller](https://www.americanprogressaction.org/about/staff/miller-keith/bio/) | February 18, 2014, David Madland is Director of the American Worker Project at the Center for American Progress Action Fund. Keith Miller is a Research Associate with the American Worker Project. https://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/labor/news/2014/02/18/84257/evidence-shows-increasing-the-minimum-wage-is-no-threat-to-employment/

As the debate heats up in Congress over increasing the federal minimum wage from $7.25 per hour to $10.10 per hour, critics of the minimum wage are trotting out the same tired arguments that doing so will harm the national economy and increase unemployment. A review of the most recent evidence makes clear, however, that raising the minimum wage does not result in inevitable job losses—even during periods of high unemployment—and may in fact be good for the economy.¶ The easiest way to illustrate this point is simply to look at how unemployment rates have responded to past minimum-wage increases. To do so, [we analyzed](http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/labor/news/2013/12/03/80222/raising-the-minimum-wage-would-help-not-hurt-our-economy/) more than two decades’ worth of minimum-wage increases in U.S. states; we found no clear evidence that the minimum-wage increases affect aggregate job creation when unemployment rates are high.¶ Our analysis included every state that saw its effective minimum wage increase between 1987 and 2012 when the state’s unemployment rate was at or above 7 percent. In 48 of the 92 times this occurred, the unemployment rate actually decreased over the next 12 months, and in 4 other cases, the unemployment rate remained unchanged.\* In contrast, there were only 40 instances when the unemployment rate increased. That means when a minimum-wage increase occurred during a period of high unemployment, unemployment rates actually declined 52 percent of the time.¶ The fact that the nation’s current unemployment rate of 6.6 percent is actually well below the threshold used in our analysis suggests that there is even less reason to be concerned about negative employment effects.¶ While this basic state-by-state comparison starkly illustrates the flaws of overly simplistic arguments that claim minimum-wage increases inevitably result in higher unemployment, it alone cannot identify the causal impacts of minimum-wage increases on employment. This is because a host of other economic factors besides minimum-wage policies—such as decades-long industrial restructuring processes and divergent population trends—also affect unemployment rates and must be taken into account before arriving at any definitive conclusion.¶ Fortunately, a number of [academic studies](http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/labor/news/2011/06/07/9747/an-increased-minimum-wage-is-good-policy-even-during-hard-times/) utilize research designs that control for such factors; among these there exist at least five that include periods of high unemployment in their samples. These five studies cover different geographical areas and different time periods and use a range of methodologies—from small case studies to large econometric analysis—lending great credibility to their findings. But despite their varying methods, all came to the same conclusion: Raising the minimum wage has no discernable effect on employment levels.¶ Contrary to most of the rhetoric, the results of these studies are not surprising to those who understand how the minimum wage affects the labor market. The minimum wage may make some employers reluctant to hire—as critics maintain—but the many positive effects of the policy counteract this negative effect. A higher minimum wage creates new customers by [boosting demand](http://www.chicagofed.org/digital_assets/publications/working_papers/2007/wp2007_23.pdf) and also lowers some costs for employers by, for example, [reducing turnover](http://ftp.iza.org/dp5811.pdf). Furthermore, such wage hikes are particularly beneficial to [working women](http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/labor/news/2013/12/09/80484/raising-the-minimum-wage-would-boost-the-incomes-of-millions-of-women-and-their-families/) and can cut the costs that low-road employers [impose on taxpayers](http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/publiccosts/fast_food_poverty_wages.pdf).¶ In short, the evidence shows that the U.S. economy has much to gain from increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 and comparatively little to fear. Policymakers should feel confident that raising the minimum wage will not hurt employment, and they should immediately take the steps necessary to ensure that all Americans are guaranteed a wage high enough to allow them to live with dignity and to contribute positively to lasting economic growth.

## Solvency

### Solvency: Scholarship

#### The plan is key to produce effective scholarship for change.

Segran 14 (Elizabeth, writer based in Cambridge, Massachusetts for the Atlantic, “The Adjunct Revolt: How Poor Professors Are Fighting Back,” APR 28, 2014, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/04/the-adjunct-professor-crisis/361336/)//ghs-VA

A spate of research about the contingent academic workforce indicates that Cerasoli’s circumstances are not exceptional. This month, a report by the American Association of University Professors showed that adjuncts now constitute 76.4 percent of U.S. faculty across all institutional types, from liberal-arts colleges to research universities to community colleges. A study released by the U.S. House of Representatives in January reveals that the majority of these adjuncts live below the poverty line. Over spring break, Cerasoli publicly protested her working conditions on the steps of New York Department of Education wearing a vest emblazoned with the words “Homeless Prof” on it. Her efforts dovetail with a national labor movement in which thousands of adjuncts are fighting for change within the higher-education system. In the short-term, adjuncts are demanding a living wage, but they are also proposing long-term solutions to structural problems ailing universities. Many argue that the dependence on contingent labor is part of a larger pattern of corporatizing the university, which they believe is harming not just professors and students, but society more broadly. “While there are micro-tragedies in the lives of individual adjuncts, there is also a macro, systemic problem unfolding,” said Adrianna Kezar, co-founder of the Delphi Project which examines how the changing faculty affects student success. Her data consistently shows that students who take more classes with adjuncts are more likely to drop out. Kezar told me that this high attrition rate has nothing to do with the quality of instruction adjuncts provide; it is entirely a function of the compromised working conditions adjuncts face. Tenure-track professors have a wealth of career-development tools at their disposal; in contrast, Kezar says, universities do not give adjuncts the basic resources they need to properly teach their courses, such as sample syllabi or learning objectives. Since most departments hire adjuncts at the last minute, they are often inadequately prepared to enter the classroom. Universities do not provide adjuncts with office space, making it difficult for them to meet with students outside class. To make matters worse, many adjuncts teach at several colleges to make ends meet: Commuting—sometimes between great distances—further reduces the time they can devote to individual students. Despite challenging working conditions, many adjuncts continue to meet with students and perform other time-consuming tasks they are not compensated for, such as writing recommendation letters or attending departmental meetings. “Students aren’t getting what they pay for or, if they are, it is because adjuncts themselves are subsidizing their education,” Maria Maisto, president of the adjunct activist group New Faculty Majority, told me. “Adjuncts are donating their time; they are providing it out of pocket.” The presence of adjuncts also affects the quality of education in subtler ways. The tenure system was originally designed to foster academic freedom by allowing professors to voice unpopular opinions without the fear of being fired: in contrast, adjuncts can have their contracts terminated without a grievance process. Maisto told me that many adjuncts are afraid to challenge their students in class because poor student evaluations could cost them their jobs. “College is no longer creating a critically-thinking citizenry who can participate actively in a democracy,” she said. Emily Van Duyne, an adjunct professor in New Jersey, told me she finds it uncomfortable to teach her students about issues like the American Civil Rights Movement when she feels unable to change her own unjust working conditions. “It feels very strange asking students to hone their critical thinking skills about an oppressive culture and the ways you can respond effectively, when you are teaching out of a broken system,” she told me. The adjunct crisis also restricts the research output of American universities. For adjuncts scrambling between multiple short-term, poorly paid teaching jobs, producing scholarship is a luxury they cannot afford. “We have lost an entire generation of scholarship because of this,” Debra Leigh Scott, an adjunct activist and documentary filmmaker, told me. “Adjunct contracts not only drive professors into poverty, it makes it next to impossible for them to do the kind of scholarship they have trained an average of ten years to do.” Scott suggests that the loss of academic scholarship has ripple effects throughout society, since fewer scholars are contributing to national discussions on issues like the ethics of business and the value of the humanities. “If you lose these expert voices then who is really left speaking?” she asks. “You get the pundits on either side, but there is not a lot of depth to the conversations being held. There has been a dumbing down of discourse across all platforms.” How did it come to this? Jeffrey Selingo, author of College Unbound: The Future of Higher Education and What it Means for Students, argues that the shift towards contingent labor occurred because university administrators began to focus on enhancing the student experience outside—rather than inside—the classroom. “We moved away from a faculty-centric university to one focused on serving students,” he told me. “To attract students, universities need amenities to keep up in an arms race with other institutions,” he says. Instead of being an institution of public good, the university began to look more and more like a business in which the student was the customer. Selingo points out that university administration costs have ballooned over the last two decades, as universities hired non-faculty staff to run the growing list of campus amenities. Given these skyrocketing expenses, administrators felt pressure to cut costs. “As professors started to retire, administrators realized that if they did not hire tenure-track professors, they could have more flexibility with their workforce,” explains Selingo. At the same time, graduate schools were churning out large numbers of Ph.D.s willing to teach single courses for a few thousand dollars, so hiring adjuncts seemed like a simple solution. Maisto argues that in the midst of these changes administrators lost sight of the university’s mission. “This adjunct crisis did not happen because of some grand, nefarious plot,” she told me. “It has to do with the reactive character of university leadership who got caught up in short-term thinking rather than intentional, long-term strategic planning.” Yet, Maisto and other activists believe that it is not too late to change the system. For many adjuncts, the first step is to fight for better compensation and benefits. Apart from improving their quality of life, adjuncts believe increased wages will more accurately reflect their value and give them more influence within the university.

#### Research and scholarship expansion key to solve colonization.

Tuck and Yang – ’14 – Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, SUNY New Paltz and Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies, UC San Diego (Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing Research, <https://faculty.newpaltz.edu/evetuck/files/2013/12/Tuck-and-Yang-R-Words_Refusing-Research.pdf>, p. 223, MM)

Research is a dirty word among many Native communities (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), and arguably, also among ghettoized (Kelley, 1997), Orientalized (Said, 1978), and other communities of overstudied Others. The ethical standards of the academic industrial complex are a recent development, and like so many post-civil rights reforms, do not always do enough to ensure that social science research is deeply ethical, meaningful, or useful for the individual or community being researched. Social science often works to collect stories of pain and humiliation in the lives of those being researched for commodification. However, these same stories of pain and humiliation are part of the collective wisdom that often informs the writings of researchers who attempt to position their intellectual work as decolonization. Indeed, to refute the crime, we may need to name it. How do we learn from and respect the wisdom and desires in the stories that we (over) hear, while refusing to portray/betray them to the spectacle of the settler colonial gaze? How do we develop an ethics for research that differentiates between power—which deserves a denuding, indeed petrifying scrutiny—and people? At the same time, as fraught as research is in its complicity with power, it is one of the last places for legitimated inquiry. It is at least still a space that proclaims to care about curiosity. In this essay, we theorize refusal not just as a "no," but as a type of investigation into "what you need to know and what I refuse to write in" (Simpson, 2007, p. 72). Therefore, we present a refusal to do research, or a refusal within research, as a way of thinking about humanizing researchers.

### Solvency: Attitudes

#### The plan is key to breaking down neoliberal attitudes – causes a shift. Key to making movements stronger.

Burns 15 (Rebecca, Education Reporter @ Alternet, “The Fight of Their Lives: Can Adjuncts Finally Win a Living Wage?” March 23, 2015, http://www.alternet.org/education/fight-their-lives-can-adjuncts-finally-win-living-wage)//ghs-VA

Seattle may have become one of the first cities to pass a $15 minimum wage last year, but the city’s adjunct instructors say that the dictum for fair pay has yet to penetrate the Ivory Tower. The median pay for adjuncts, who as professional workers are exempt from most minimum wage and overtime protections, is $2,700 per course nationwide, or just over $16,000 annually for a full teaching load. At Seattle University (SU), the city’s premier Jesuit college, they are paid as little as $2,200 per course, according to crowdsourced data from the Adjunct Project. When all the hours spent grading, meeting with students and preparing for class are factored in, the school’s instructors say that this likely amounts to less than minimum wage—a claim echoed by adjuncts instructors nationwide. As a result, the “Fight for 15” is now headed to college, as adjunct instructors at SU and a host of other schools press for union representation, a wage bump and expanded job protections for contingent faculty who often live course to course, with no long-term contract or track to tenure. Last month, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) announced a new nationwide “Faculty Forward” campaign that will push for a minimum compensation standard of $15,000 per college course taught, plus benefits. That figure would represent a dramatic increase over adjunct instructors’ current pay, but the same was true when SEIU-affiliated groups began demanding $15 for fast-food workers three years ago. Could the Fight for 15 gain traction in the academy? Thou Shalt Not Unionize Momentum for adjunct justice is building in the wake of National Adjunct Walkout Day on February 25, when faculty members and supporters at more than 100 campuses nationwide held walkouts, teach-ins and rallies. At Seattle University, adjunct instructors say about 400 faculty and students participated in a walkout and march through campus. Now, a string of recent decisions by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is likely to provide a boost to the campaign by clearing a path for new adjunct unions at SU and a host of other schools. Earlier this month, Seattle University’s regional NLRB removed a major barrier to collective bargaining at the school, ruling that it could not claim exemption from federal labor law based on its Jesuit identity. Following an SEIU-assisted organizing effort, adjunct faculty at SU voted in June 2014 on whether or not to affiliate with the union. But as the result of a challenge from the university, which claimed that as a religiously affiliated school it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the NLRB—and that submitting to this jurisdiction would violate its free-speech rights—the union ballots have been impounded ever since. Louisa Edgerly, an adjunct instructor of journalism and communications at SU, says that the school’s response to adjunct organizing has been a “study in stall tactics.” She says that in addition to claiming a religious exemption, the university has retained an anti-union law firm and enlisted academic deans in a “no” campaign. “Most religiously-affiliated universities make this claim when they face union activity,” she says. “It’s an obvious delay tactic, meant to drag out the process as long as possible in a contingent and temporary workforce where that is very effective [in defeating unions].” Unless the university appeals the decision this month, the ballots will be counted, and if the ayes have it, the union certified. Asked by AlterNet if the university would appeal, an SU spokesperson said the administration was “reviewing the decision and considering next steps.” A statement provided said that the university “has taken significant steps to improve the compensation and working conditions for both full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty and make sure they a voice in faculty governance.” Even prior to the announcement of the new Faculty Forward campaign, adjunct organizing was on the rise, as non-academic unions like SEIU and the United Steelworkers (USW) have won bids in recent years to represent non-tenure-track faculty at dozens of private colleges and universities. Faced with this flurry of union activity, universities have responded with measures that critics say derive straight from the union-busting playbook, in many cases retaining top-dollar “union avoidance” lawyers and sending videos and letters discouraging faculty from voting “yes” to union representation. At least six religiously affiliated universities facing union campaigns have claimed that their employees are not entitled to collective bargaining, despite, in some cases, religious doctrine and social teachings on workers' rights that say just the opposite. But in December, the NLRB issued a game-changing ruling in the case of Pacific Lutheran University, which had sought to block a union petition on the grounds of both a religious exemption and the claim that its full-time non-tenure-track faculty had managerial powers that made them ineligible for collective bargaining. The NLRB’s decision stipulates that just because a school is religious, doesn’t mean its faculty can’t unionize—instead, the school must demonstrate that the faculty attempting to organize perform specific religious duties. The NLRB also created new standards to determine whether faculty members have enough power to be considered “managerial” employees and therefore ineligible for union membership. All in all, the ruling could open the door for scores of new union campaigns at private universities among both contingent and tenure-track faculty, who at present are effectively barred from unionizing. Whither 15? Even with unions, adjuncts face an uphill battle in changing their working conditions. William Herbert, executive director of the National Center for Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, notes that the $15,000 figure is “aspirational in nature,” and that per-course compensation for non-tenure-track-faculty negotiated through recent collective bargaining agreements has been much lower. At Tufts University, for example, a contract negotiated last fall by an SEIU-affiliated union provides pay increases of more than 20 percent for non-tenure-track faculty, amounting to a wage floor of $7,300 per course by 2016. But union staffers say Faculty Forward is as much about starting a conversation about higher education spending as it is setting a firm target. Like its fast-food predecessor, the campaign will proceed through media and policy advocacy, in addition to on-the-ground union organizing. To advance the idea of a substantial pay hike for contingent faculty, the union is also gathering data on how much uncompensated work adjuncts do nationwide, and examining state and federal policy initiatives that could improve their eligibility for public benefit programs and help hold particularly bad employers accountable. As it stands, adjuncts often struggle with eligibility for benefits such as unemployment insurance and have been rebuffed by the courts in previous attempts to gain access to overtime pay through state minimum wage laws. For now, says SEIU, the $15,000 proposal will not necessarily serve as a benchmark in contract negotiations at individual schools where adjuncts have won unions. Some recently unionized adjuncts are balking, however, at a strategy of proposing one figure to the media while asking for substantially less at the bargaining table. At Bentley University, where adjuncts voted to unionize with SEIU last month, some faculty organizers say they were confused when the union rolled out the $15,000 proposal publicly, then told them that aiming for a pay increase of that magnitude in their upcoming contract negotiations was unrealistic. “This doesn’t seem to square with the Faculty Forward initiative,” says Jack Dempsey, an adjunct professor of English at Bentley who helped lead the union drive. “Why should our own negotiators be telling us to settle before we even reach the bargaining table?” Seattle University’s Louisa Edgerly, meanwhile, acknowledges that $15,000 is a “long-term goal,” but sees value in symbolically linking the struggles of low-wage workers inside and outside of the academy. “Frequently, there’s a public perception that professors have it all,” she notes. “Sharing our experiences with other low-wage workers shows them that they are not uniquely persecuted in their particular jobs—this whole economy is bad for workers.” She adds that the campaign for a $15 minimum wage in Seattle likewise “galvanized” her fellow instructors: “The more we can see the connections between the conditions we are struggling with and the conditions other workers are struggling with, the stronger we get.”

### Solvency: Black Power

#### The plan is key to black political power – black scholarship is uniquely harmed with neoliberal ideology.

Cottom 14 (Tressie, Slate writer and Ph.D. candidate in sociology at Emory University, “The New Old Labor Crisis,” JAN. 24 2014, http://www.slate.com/articles/life/counter\_narrative/2014/01/adjunct\_crisis\_in\_higher\_ed\_an\_all\_too\_familiar\_story\_for\_black\_faculty.html)//ghs-VA

The New York Times reported recently on an adjunct instructor, James Hoff, who walks like a professor, talks like a professor, and teaches like a professor, but has none of the benefits of being a professor, because he is an adjunct. Adjunct labor in higher education has revealed the structural flaw in our post-recession reality: The prescription for poverty—educational attainment—has become a condition for poverty. The high price, in dollars and opportunity costs, of getting All the Education™ has to be reconfigured, because tenured jobs with their tenured wages are declining. And that has made lots of people angry. I’m actually quite glad people are getting angry about adjunct-ification. On Friday, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce issued a 36-page report chronicling the low salaries, long hours, and lack of benefits and job security that “contingent faculty” face. (The report puts an adjunct’s average annual pay at just under $25,000.) But to be clear, there’s been a labor crisis in higher ed for a long time. It just hasn’t always been a crisis for everyone in higher ed. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has pretty much confirmed what the stories about adjuncts on food stamps and dying without health coverage illustrate: A “long-term fiscal crisis” has crushed Ph.D.s into adjunct spackle, to be applied liberally to cracks in university foundations. The report also shows something else: “The proportion of African-Americans in non-tenure-track positions (15.2 percent) is more than 50 percent greater than that of whites (9.6 percent).” In 2009, the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education analyzed data from the Department of Education and projected that if current rates of hiring and promotion of black Ph.D.s remained steady, it would “take nearly a century and a half for the percentage of African-American college faculty to reach parity with the percentage of blacks in the nation’s population.” African-Americans make up just 5 percent of full-time faculty. If you leave out the high proportion of black Ph.D.s working in historically black colleges and universities, black full-time faculty in the U.S. barely clears 4 percent. You have two sets of conditions unfolding against these statistics. On the one hand, African-Americans are less likely to attend graduate school than whites for myriad reasons. First, you have to know that graduate school exists and is a practical option for someone like you. That often takes sharing a network—family, friends, mentors—who can model how that’s done and what it looks like. But historical discrimination in college enrollment and persisting inequalities from kindergarten through college means black students are less likely to know someone who has been to graduate school. Should you discover graduate school and meet the institutional requirements for graduate school, you still have to pay for graduate school. Everything from shelling out a couple hundred dollars per application to funding a move to get there would be a whole lot easier with inherited wealth or parents with home equity and a good credit score. Again, for reasons well-documented by sociologists like James Shapiro, the hidden cost of being black in America makes getting there a lot harder. On the other hand, there is also a set of social conditions—or what sociologists call structure—at play. The structural fissures in higher education labor are now becoming more visible to all sectors of the higher education labor market. Tenure isn’t just about managing labor costs. Tenure is and always has been political. For minorities, particularly African-Americans, tenure and academic labor have long looked like managing bottom lines and keeping the upper echelons of the Ivory Tower white and male. That “long-term fiscal crisis” the AAUP cites? It came first for all the places black folks gather in groups of two or more. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education predicts it will come first and stay longest for black faculty, who are often last hired, first fired. Departments with a lot of black faculty are “more likely have to surrender faculty slots,” JBHE warns. That’s a prediction in line with history. Black faculty and the departments where they are found in the greatest numbers have been the most vulnerable since their inception. When the AAUP was issuing its first report on adjunct professors in the early 1980s, black students and faculty had been protesting the ghettofication of black scholars in adjunct roles for almost 20 years. In 1968, black students took over an administration building at Columbia; among their demands was a call for more tenured black faculty. In 1969, the Black Student Union at San Francisco State University drafted a document justifying the establishment of an African-American Studies department. These protests were extensions of the black power and civil rights movements: Essentially, young people looked around at the institutions that produced all the science and expert opinions that had rationalized their legal and social oppression, and they decided that universities were ripe for disruption. They were not just demanding student access but more tenured black faculty; they understood that tenure was a political tool. Tenure is so political that departments, administrators, and even faculty have used tenure to restrict black academics’ access to university resources. One story from a history of black studies programs recounts a Wellesley College dean telling the department’s first black faculty member to come up for tenure that “the college had decided in its wisdom that the tenure quota for Black Studies would be capped at one for all time.” James Karabel’s excellent history of admissions at Ivy League universities includes correspondence among the presidents of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton as student protests spread throughout the country in the ’60s. They were more than a little terrified by the unrest. Their elegant solution was the careful recruitment of black students and black faculty within reason, so as not to disturb the universities’ culture or labor structure. It was a popular strategy. Accounts abound from minority faculty who were hired to assuage demand for diversity only to find rules for tenure and promotion that effectively trapped them in nontenure-track roles. Last year, I moderated a panel on black academic women’s health in the academy. The administrators were overwhelmed by the intensity of response. Hundreds of essays poured in about the racism and sexism that stymied their academic careers. Many felt silenced by faculty groups that were supposed to protect them, ignored by comrades in the adjunct struggle who did not address how racism compounded its effects, and exhausted from straddling so many worlds. Problems like these have been so systemic that some disciplines, such as the American Anthropological Association, have produced white papers (no pun intended) on racism, tenure, and hiring. I agree with the AAUP that the racial disparities in adjuncting are disturbing, just as I agree with the JBHE that it is systemic and historical. Our current anger about class divides in higher education labor cannot be separated from its racist roots. Or, rather, it can—but then it is about something altogether different.

### Solvency: Lifeless Theory

#### Living wage is key to rectify current barriers.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Although there are still a number of academics such as Noam Chomsky, Angela Davis, John Rawlston Saul, Bill McKibben, Germaine Greer and Cornel West who function as public intellectuals, they are often shut out of the mainstream media or characterized as marginal, unintelligible, and sometimes as unpatriotic figures. At the same time, many academics find themselves laboring under horrendous working conditions that either don't allow them to write in a theoretically rigorous and accessible manner for the public because they do not have time - given the often intensive teaching demands of part-time academics and increasingly of full-time, non-tenured academics as well. Or they retreat into a kind of theoreticism in which theory becomes lifeless, detached from any larger project or the realm of worldly issues. In this instance, the notion of theory as a resource, if not theoretical rigor itself, are transformed into a badge of academic cleverness shorn of the possibility of advancing thought within the academy or reaching a larger audience outside of their academic disciplines. Consequently, such intellectuals often exist in hermetic academic bubbles cut off from both the larger public and the important issues that impact society. To no small degree, they have been complicit in the transformation of the university into an adjunct of corporate power. Such academics run the risk of not only becoming incapable of defending higher education as a vital public sphere, but also of having any say over the conditions of their own intellectual labor. Without their intervention as public intellectuals, the university defaults on its role as a democratic public sphere willing to produce an informed public, enact and sustain a culture of questioning, and enable a critical formative culture capable of producing citizens "who are critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question so that democracy again becomes society's movement."34

### Solvency: Death Spiral

#### The power to fight the death spiral of neolib is uniquely because of the position of contingent faculty – the plan is key to solve.

Junc-et 13 (Junc-et, group of individuals who have a variety of qualifications from film analysts to PhD’s in film studies, all of which are actively involved in higher education, most are professors at Universities, “The Trashing of Higher Ed. in America,” 2013, http://www.2255films.com/)//ghs-VA

Political Scientists and Policy Analysts are saying that American public higher education has entered a "death spiral", which signals not only the ruination of the American university system, but of democracy itself. Gone are the days when public higher education was viewed as a public good; the entire system has been under attack by the same elitist powers that have been causing a wider ruination of the middle class. Many people outside of academia are not aware of what has happened to higher education of the last twenty-five years. Most believe that it remains the same institution that they attended back in the 1960s or 1970s, or even the early 1980s. This is not the case. It has become corporatized, a managerial class has taken over, in much the same way that it did in the American medical system, and this has caused a significant shift away from the mission of public education for the good of the citizens and the community, to a pursuit of more and more profit through the implementation of a strict capitalist corporate model. How did this happen? Why didn't those inside, that last generation of full-time faculty, who valued the traditional educational model, push back against these changes? Cary Nelson, President of AAUP, explains that it was difficult to resist changes that were being implemented at the same time that our profession was being destroyed. And by now, nearly 2/3 of all faculty in the country are now on contingent appointments, and have no real "job" in the system, let alone any significant power. This has been called the "casualization" or the "deprofessionalization" of university faculty, and in 2011, nearly one million of us who have labored in academia over the last twenty years, are migrant workers, earning less than $25K a year with no job security, no benefits...and little real power in the university. Chris LaBree of 2255 Films and Debra Leigh Scott, of Hidden River Arts are co-producing the documentary called 'Junct: The Trashing of Higher Ed. in America, about the tremendous damage that has been done to the American university system through its over use of "adjunct" faculty, the out of control and increasingly unaffordable tuitions, and the loss of actual high-quality education, which has been replaced with what many are calling low-quality vocational training. Adjunct university professors can't afford the most basic of needs. Many are on food stamps, most work three and four jobs, some sell their sperm, others sell their blood, here a faculty member lives in his van, there another is fired when he gets caught sleeping in his lab because he has no money to rent an apartment. All the while, these people were teaching, often carrying full-time loads between two or three universities. This is widespread labor abuse, a national disgrace that too few seem to know about. And, true to the corporate model, as the impoverishment of the faculty continues, the managerial class continues to increase - administrators now outnumber faculty on every campus across the country. Their salaries are increasing enormously, even though it's nearly impossible to figure out what their jobs ARE. University presidents, once grown within ranks of the faculty, have become CEOs, often with business degrees, rarely having set foot in a classroom at any point in their career. They are earning high six figure salaries, additional deferred compensation, have access to discretionary funds, and are often given homes, cars and drivers. Higher Education has become an Edu-Factory. Those of us who come from a working class background, understood the exploitation very early, even as we were helpless to prevent it. It becomes increasingly difficult for professional educators to actually DO the job of educating, when they are denied offices or supplies, staff support or professional development; when they are working several jobs while living in poverty.

### Solvency: Voices

#### Living wage key internal link to faculty power – allows for incorporation of faculty into the university to break it down from the inside.

Junc-et 13 (Junc-et, group of individuals who have a variety of qualifications from film analysts to PhD’s in film studies, all of which are actively involved in higher education, most are professors at Universities, “The Trashing of Higher Ed. in America,” 2013, http://www.2255films.com/)//ghs-VA

So how is this endangering our democracy? In several ways. First, the voices of the faculty, the scholars and intellectuals of the society, have been silenced largely through their poverty and desperation. Second, the education provided has been designed by administrative committees, and no longer includes rigorous intellectual questioning or training, focusing instead on job training for non-existent jobs. Third, this younger generation is also now highly indebted and at risk of poverty. This speaks to Naomi Klein's Shock Doctrine -- keeping people in a state of trauma makes them more docile. Democracies can't survive a docile, impoverished population. We need to write articles, blog about this, meet with parent and student groups, lobby our legislators, make documentaries.....and join forces as workers. To restore the institution of higher education, we have to take it back, move from the corporatized edu-factory to a model that is education- and student-focused. We need to create a system of real faculty-governance, and encourage students to refuse to attend college until the tuitions are under control, until we have good jobs with living wages and a restored, healthy middle class lifestyle our students can reasonably aspire to. The same way that citizens boycott when they know a product was created by abused labor in Third World countries, we should encourage boycotts of universities that refuse to provide secure jobs with good pay to their faculty.

### Solvency: Spillover Wages

#### We have a spillover impact – causes a raise in other professors wages.

Nelson 10 (Cary, professor of English and Jubilee Professor of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “No University Is an Island: Saving Academic Freedom,” 2010)//ghs-VA

On the other hand, some non-AAUP faculty unions behave as if every dollar won by contingent teachers is a dollar taken from their own pockets. Yet denying contingent faculty a living wage and salary parity actually helps keep tenure-track faculty salaries low in a number of disciplines. A faculty union that either passively or actively collaborates in the exploitation of its brothers and sisters has simply lost its soul. At some level, it has become an arm of administrators devoted to extracting labor at its lowest possible cost. Worse still are those faculty unions that grieve their own workplace inequities while tolerating the mistreatment of contingent faculty or graduate employees down the hall.

### Solvency: Corporatization

#### The plan is key to breaking down the corporate hold on high education – changes the academic culture and curriculum.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

4. The debates that have raged within and about higher education over vocational versus liberal education, tenure, the “corporatization” of higher education, governmental oversight and accreditation, and funding models and sources have obscured, deferred, or overridden the need for action on the fundamental ethical and practical concerns that attend the professional and personal needs of faculty on contingent appointments. Yet, ironically, attending to those concerns—ensuring a living wage, access to health care, professional development, and the protections of academic freedom—would exercise the very values of academic democracy that these debates are really all about. While the roots of contingent academic employment go back many decades, and surged in the early 1970s (Berry 2005), it was not until the 1980s that the higher education community really began to notice that contingency had exploded to a level of concern. Marked by radically reduced wages, frequent lack of access to benefits, limited access to professional support and opportunities for advancement, and institutional disrespect, contingency is one of higher education’s darker secrets. In the last twenty-five years, however, and particularly in the last decade, there have been sincere, if belated, efforts to respond. These include a proliferation of studies, articles, and books; resolutions, statements, guidelines, and best-practice publications by unions, institutions, and associations; and most effectively, both union- and nonunion-affiliated organizing efforts leading to successful collective bargaining, cooperative negotiations with receptive administrations, and groundbreaking litigation and legislation. All of these efforts have resulted, practically speaking, in some improved working conditions for many adjunct faculty members. Yet, paradoxically, even as these accomplishments have signaled a huge step forward, they have not succeeded in substantially alleviating the sense of foreboding over the status and future of the professoriate, or the ramifications for education that the higher education community began to recognize a generation ago. In fact, that sense of crisis has been heightened as the federal government, allied with major corporations, seeks greater influence over college curricula, particularly at the community college level, with the danger of minimal—or token—consultation with higher education faculty (Wilson 2010). Several years ago, activists in the contingent faculty movement recognized the impasse at which the movement found itself in the face of this lack of progress (Hoeller 2007), and initiated discussion about the need for a structured national organization. In 2009, such an organization was founded. New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity (NFM) is the only national organization exclusively devoted to improving the quality of higher education by improving the working conditions of the majority of its faculty. NFM came into existence because we believe that higher education needs to move into a new phase of coordinated, intentional, and ethically grounded activity to confront contingency. The goal of such efforts should be to repair the damaging effects on students, faculty, and the country of the haphazard and shortsighted decisions that led to the spread of contingency in the first place, and to bring to fruition the valiant but uncoordinated and all too often superficial reforms that a generation of educators has tried to implement. And, while incremental change may continue to be the only way forward, we believe that what is needed is a new sense of urgency and a defined goal that acknowledges the need for a transformation of academic culture from its current hierarchical, stratified structure into real academic democracy rooted in the values of liberal education.

### Solvency: Radicalism

#### Living wage causes the academy to be more successful – the radicalism of the act breaks current ideologies.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

From ivory tower to academic democracy To many observers, the formation of NFM was puzzling and counterintuitive; hadn’t unionization efforts among contingent faculty increased and hadn’t advances been made through collective bargaining? And weren’t many institutions now paying attention to and implementing the types of reforms and strategies that for years had been recommended for the purpose of “integrating” contingent faculty more effectively into the life of the college and university and showing them respect? If the concerns of contingent faculty had only to do with working conditions, then the progress made over the last generation might not have required NFM’s formation. Contingent faculty would have continued to support local organizing efforts and internal reform efforts, celebrating advances as they have occurred and fighting for change where necessary. But NFM is not just about improving working conditions. It is about improving working conditions for an ultimate purpose: to ensure the quality of education and the integrity of the profession. NFM aims to remind the academy that it exists not for itself, and not simply to preserve itself­­­, but for the common good—and that the operative definition of “common” in that expression should not evoke the unfortunate connotation of “second rate,” but rather its root, communis, or community. Clearly, the contingent faculty crisis is simply the most obvious manifestation of the steady erosion of community in higher education. The faculty (in part, through its own doing) has moved, or been pushed, away from its role as a full partner in higher education to a literally “adjunct” position—peripheral, disempowered—in terms of either numbers or function. Tenure-stream faculty, who have authority over the curriculum and at least a nominal role in governance, are now too small in number or too cowed to initiate or resist change effectively, while faculty off the tenure track, though the majority in number, must risk their livelihoods to do so. To fight against this trend is to “reclaim” the ivory tower, as Joe Berry (2005) has put it, by transforming it into the academic democracy that it is really supposed to be. If the marginalization of the faculty as a whole is the disease whose most obvious symptom is the mistreatment of those with the lowest status, then what is needed is a cure that builds on the body’s natural strengths. What is needed is a revitalization of the concept of academic democracy, one rooted in the social contract that has traditionally defined faculty work and that embodies the values of liberal education. Again, as Moser (2004, 2) explains, “as students, faculty, and campus workers make common cause to secure workplace rights and basic economic security, we must also articulate new ideals and mobilize alternative forms of community. We could organize such a project under the rubric of ‘campus democracy, community and academic citizenship’: ideals of service that revisit classical conceptions of the university, are grounded in existing economic and political conditions, rooted in democratic traditions of freedom, and already legible in the many struggles for justice on today’s campuses.” It is those ideals and traditions—along with sheer willpower—that will be needed to combat the pessimistic notion that “once the university budget has absorbed their [nontenure-track faculty] lower cost . . . it becomes almost impossible to retreat” (Cross and Goldenberg 2002, 27–28). Confronting contingency is not an impossible task, though it is a formidable one. As Caryn McTighe Musil has pointed out, it is “radical”—but only because it is so necessary: “Of course, treating the contingent faculty like ‘real’ faculty, especially women and women with children, is a radical act. It requires considerable shifts in attitude, in economic remuneration, and in job security. It means incorporating these faculty members as equal partners in departments, welcoming them as academic colleagues, and nurturing their professional growth” (Musil 2009). As daunting as this task is, however, Musil reminds us that we can do it—because we’ve done it before. “The academy figured out how to rethink entire fields when DNA was discovered and mapped, when technology changed everything about our lives and work, and when women’s studies and ethnic studies forever altered the foundations of knowledge. The academy should be able to make this other change too” (Musil 2009).

# 2AC – Neolib Bad

## Neolib Bad: Generics

### Ableism

#### Cap root cause of ableism—it’s based in a drive for production.

Slorach 11 (Roddy slorach, Disability Advisor at St. George's University of London, past Disability discrimination caseworker at Disability Law Service "Marxism and disability" pg online @ http://www.isj.org.uk/?id=702//ghs-mli )

Weaker, older or impaired members of pre-class societies were more likely to survive with the development of settled agricultural production and surplus crops. Feudal societies saw impairment in religious terms, as a mark of either good or evil, which meant those affected often faced persecution. However, the rural production process, and the extended nature of the feudal family, allowed many to make a genuine contribution to daily economic life. Families living and working as large groups were able to provide networks of care for children and the elderly. This way of life, typical for much of the world’s population for thousands of years, was to virtually disappear in the last three centuries.¶ The rise of capitalism forced people off the land. In Britain production for the market began on a scale sufficiently small as to be carried out in the home, and therefore impaired people could still play a role. However:¶ the rural population was being increasingly pressed by the new capitalist market forces, and when families could no longer cope the crippled members would have been most vulnerable and liable to turn to begging and church protection in special poor houses. Market forces soon favoured machinery which was more efficient and able to produce cheaper more plentiful woven material. Those working larger looms would more likely survive and cripples would have had greater difficulty working such equipment.7¶ The Industrial Revolution accelerated the pace of change enormously. Larger-scale machinery concentrated in factory towns increasingly destroyed the old cottage industries as well as traditional family structures, with members forced to find work away from the home or patch of land. The new factory worker “could not have any impairment which would prevent him or her from operating the machine. It was, therefore, the economic necessity of producing efficient machines for large-scale production that established ablebodiedness as the norm for productive (ie socially integrated) living…production for profit undermined the position of physically impaired people within the family and the community”.8¶ Working lives previously shaped by the hours of daylight and the seasons were now determined by the rhythm of the factory—even more so with the invention of gaslight and round the clock working. People’s bodies were now valued according to their ability to function like machines:¶ Factory discipline, time keeping and production norms broke with the slower, more self-determined and flexible work pattern into which many disabled people had been integrated. As work became more rationalised, requiring precise mechanical movements of the body, repeated in quicker succession, impaired persons—the deaf or blind, and those with mobility difficulties, were seen as—and without job accommodations to meet their impairments, were—less “fit” to do the tasks required of factory workers, and were increasingly excluded from paid employment. [The Industrial Revolution] removed crippled people from social intercourse and transformed them into disabled people.9¶ Specialisms were developed to help maintain and reproduce the new working class. Poor Law officials and an expanding medical profession developed pseudo-scientific categories to identify those of the poor who were unfit for work—”the sick, the insane, defectives, and the aged and infirm”. Dependence on others was now identified as a social problem and impairment equated with sickness and illness. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries those identified as disabled were segregated into workhouses, asylums, prisons and special schools. This had “several advantages over domestic relief: it was efficient, it acted as a major deterrent to the able-boded malingerer, and it could instil good work habits into the inmates”.10¶ Isolating disabled people in institutions—barbaric and oppressive as they were—led to the intensive study and treatment of impairments, creating the basis for clearer scientific understanding and classification. Mental impairment, for example, was seen as a single category until Langdon Down’s reports for the London Hospital in 1866. These identified, among other conditions, what later became known as Down’s Syndrome.11¶ With labour power now a commodity whose components were separately identified and valued, people with mental health problems were also increasingly categorised and placed in segregated institutions. In 1826, the first year for which statistics are available, fewer than 5,000 people were confined in asylums throughout England. By 1900, this had increased to 74,000.12¶ Capitalism represented a huge advance from previous societies in many ways. For the first time in history the productive capacity existed to feed, clothe and house the entire global population, while scientific and medical advances offered the prospect of understanding and curing diseases. But the new working class creating this wealth were excluded from any say over what was produced and how, suffering for their pains physical and mental impairment on an unprecedented scale. Those marginalised or excluded from production, either by injury or already existing impairments, also became marginalised or excluded from wider society. In this way capitalism created disability as a particular form of social oppression.

#### We should focus on historical antagonisms rather than current identity crises—turns case and guts solvency.

CLOUD 3 (Prof. Comm at UT) 3 [Dana, “Marxism and Oppression”, Talk for Regional Socialist Conference, April 19, 2003, p. online //wyo-tjc]

That title demonstrates the major flaw of identity politics, namely, that it encourages people to target the wrong enemies. If oppression is thought to be a matter of maligned identities rather than historical and systematic efforts to divide and conquer, then Black people will see their fight as being against white people; women against men; gay people against straight people; immigrants against the native born; and so on. This logic actually replicates the ideologies of the capitalist system and does the bosses’ work for them. As the Black abolitionist Frederick Douglass noted about the beneficiaries of slavery, “The slaveholders by encouraging the enmity of the poor, laboring white man against the Blacks, succeeded in making the said white man almost as much a slave as the Black himself. Both are plundered and by the same plunderers. They divided both to conquer each.” Identity politics cooperates with that division. It obscures the fact that white straight men can fight oppression, and can be convinced that their long-term interests are not served by perpetuating racism, sexism, or homophobia. Identity politics hides the fact that whenever capitalists can threaten to replace one group of workers with another, poorly paid group of workers, neither group benefits. And it obscures the fact that the majority of the world’s population is at the mercy of a tiny elite at the top of society, a few percent of the world’s population that controls most of the world’s wealth and power. Every specially oppressed group is divided by class, and elite members of those groups don’t necessarily share interests in common with working class members of the same group. However, class also can bring together the vast majority of oppressed people around the world in a common fight. We are going to have to get together to challenge that system and make a world based on different priorities, one that does not require division and scapegoating to enable a few people to profit at the expense of the many. The politics of identity cannot point the way towards building the kind of movement which can actually end oppression. Among existing organizations founded on the basis of identity politics, the tendency has been toward fragmentation and disintegration rather than growth and effectiveness. The tactics of identity politics are often limited to people with the resources to commit cultural actions and shocking displays. The lifestyle emphasis of identity politics guarantees that movements will remain fragmented, middle class in nature, an therefore unable to confront the basic antagonism of capitalist society.

#### As long as we live in a capitalist society we will never free the oppressed. Capitalism is what introduced us to discrimination.

Gleeson 98 Brendan Gleeson Justice and the Disabling City Urban planning and governance Political economy of planning Social policy and the city The geography of disability Public land development Environmental policy and theory Transport and urban governance March 20, 1998, ISBN-10: 1572303115

**A further major feature of urban disbalement is poverty, due largely to the exclusion of disabled people from main stream employment markerts observes that "Poverty is disability's close companion"** and, like Liachowitz (1988) and Oliver (1991), traces this relationship back to the growth of urbanization in 19th-century Europe. As I have argued elsewhere (Gleeson, 1993), **the motive force for this urbanization was the rise of competitive capitalism, a mode of production that fashioned workplaces, and entire cities, around industrial labor markets that excluded "slow" or "incapable" workers. The economies of contemporary capitalist cities thus reveal a legacy of discriminatory industrial labor markets by continuing to valorize nondisabled labor power over all other forms**. Both Liachowitz ( 1988) and Alcock ( 1993) argue that contemporary **capitalist cities both reflect and entrench disablement through their physical inaccessibility and discriminatory labor markets.** Alcock (1993) **draws** particular **attention to the link between inaccessibility and poverty, arguing that there are many "additional costs of coping with a disability in the able-bodied world"** (Alcock, 1993, p. 188**). Inaccessibility also often means that disabled people are unable to engage in mainstream consumption activities, thereby reducing their capacity to purchase goods and services at optimal prices. These goods and services include major urban consumption items, such as housing, education, transport, and finance** (Oliver, 1991).

#### Under an ableist society people with disabilities are not seen as human but as a commodity.

Gleeson 98 Brendan Gleeson Justice and the Disabling City Urban planning and governance Political economy of planning Social policy and the city The geography of disability Public land development Environmental policy and theory Transport and urban governance March 20, 1998, ISBN-10: 1572303115

**The postpositivist position accepted by most contemporary human geographers problematizes an absolute view of space and the belief this encourages of urban geographical change** as primarily the rearrangement of objects on a flat, isotropic surface. Historical-geographical theorists (e.g., Harvey, 1990, 1996; N. Smith, 1984; Soja, 1989) and other postpositivist geographers have argued for a view of space as socially produced-a sociospatial dialectic, which sees society and space as mutually constituting material dynamics. **In this view, capitalist social space arises from the territorialization of, among other things, deep structural forces such as commodity relations, which in the process of materialization are themselves mediated by existing spatial patterns.** **Critically, the historical-geographical view locates the origins of disablement in capitalist society at the unseen and dynamic structural level of sociospatial transformation: a dialectic of social and spatial change that has devalued the capacities of impaired people.** One historical example of this dialectic is the growth of commodity relations in late feudal society that slowly eroded the labor power of impaired people. Market relations, and the commodification of labor, introduced a social evaluation of work-the law of value into peasant households. Heretofore, these households had been relatively autonomous production units, largely clustered in small rural communities (cities and large towns were few in number-most Europeans in the Middle Ages lived in hamlets and villages).

### Democracy

#### Cap kills democracy

Chomsky 13 – (Noam [Chomsky is emeritus professor of linguistics and philosophy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology] "Noam Chomsky: Will Capitalism Destroy Civilization?" http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/14980-noam-chomsky-will-capitalism-destroy-civilization) GHS//GB

Dewey called for workers to be “masters of their own industrial fate” and for all institutions to be brought under public control, including the means of production, exchange, publicity, transportation and communication. Short of this, Dewey argued, politics will remain “the shadow cast on society by big business.”¶ The truncated democracy that Dewey condemned has been left in tatters in recent years. Now control of government is narrowly concentrated at the peak of the income scale, while the large majority “down below” has been virtually disenfranchised. The current political-economic system is a form of plutocracy, diverging sharply from democracy, if by that concept we mean political arrangements in which policy is significantly influenced by the public will.¶ There have been serious debates over the years about whether capitalism is compatible with [and] democracy. If we keep to really existing capitalist democracy – RECD for short – the question is effectively answered: They are radically incompatible.¶ It seems to me unlikely that civilization can survive RECD and the sharply attenuated democracy that goes along with it. But could functioning democracy make a difference?¶ Let’s keep to the most critical immediate problem that civilization faces: environmental catastrophe. Policies and public attitudes diverge sharply, as is often the case under RECD. The nature of the gap is examined in several articles in the current issue of Daedalus, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.¶ Researcher Kelly Sims Gallagher finds that “One hundred and nine countries have enacted some form of policy regarding renewable power, and 118 countries have set targets for renewable energy. In contrast, the United States has not adopted any consistent and stable set of policies at the national level to foster the use of renewable energy.”¶ It is not public opinion that drives American policy off the international spectrum. Quite the opposite. Opinion is much closer to the global norm than the U.S. government’s policies reflect, and much more supportive of actions needed to confront the likely environmental disaster predicted by an overwhelming scientific consensus – and one that’s not too far off; affecting the lives of our grandchildren, very likely.¶ As Jon A. Krosnick and Bo MacInnis report in Daedalus: “Huge majorities have favored steps by the federal government to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions generated when utilities produce electricity. In 2006, 86 percent of respondents favored requiring utilities, or encouraging them with tax breaks, to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases they emit. Also in that year, 87 percent favored tax breaks for utilities that produce more electricity from water, wind or sunlight. These majorities were maintained between 2006 and 2010 and shrank somewhat after that.

### Gender Violence

#### Authentic equality for women cannot exist under capitalism – small reforms are useless crumbs

Proletarian Revolution 4 (No. 72, September, http://www.lrp-cofi.org/PR/reprorightsPR72.html)

For working-class women, their oppression as women cannot so easily be separated from their exploitation. The two are tied together as one predicament. The fact that women workers remain largely in unskilled job ghettoes, the lack of day care facilities, the high infant mortality rates suffered among Blacks and Latinos, enforced “workfare” job slavery -- all these are women’s “issues.” Anti-gay attacks, anti-immigrant and racist attacks, attacks on unions, economic hardship -- these likewise are key “women’s issues.” The notion that “women’s struggles,” “Black struggles,” “union struggles” and the “anti-war struggles” are fundamentally separate is just a surface appearance. None of the miseries imposed by imperialist capitalism can be tackled head-on without the development of revolutionary working-class consciousness and working-class unity. Yet this year we had the spectacle of a “March for Women’s Lives” whose message was that we must vote for a party and candidate that stand for the continuation of all these attacks, including an imperialist war that has massacred Iraqi men, women and children by the thousands. Authentic revolutionary socialism means an end to racism and sexism and imperialist war. The working class is the only social force that can create its own leadership, a revolutionary party, to unite workers and all the oppressed, to end all oppression and exploitation. Then we can talk about real “choice,” not the pathetic crumbs of promises thrown to some women today. Unless imperialism and its political parties are overthrown, the sufferings of the masses of oppressed women in the U.S. and across the globe will only escalate. A revolutionary workers’ state will provide jobs for all with a shorter work day and universal wage hikes. The new society will provide extensive child care as well as kitchen, laundry and other collective facilities to release women from the drudgery of individuated household labor and caretaking burdens. It will mean free transport, health care, education and housing. The essential ingredient right now is that more and more working-class women join in the struggle for revolutionary socialism.

#### Capitalism veils gender questions while oppressing women

Smith 83 (Dorothy, professor of sociology @ Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, “Women, Class, And Family” P. 2-4 JF)

The tack I have taken is somewhat different. I cannot see a mode of production as excluding the organisation of gender relation. In pre-capitalist societies, gender is basic to the 'economic' division of labour and how labour resources are controlled. In other than capitalist forms, we take for granted that gender relations are included. In peasant societies for example, the full cycle of production and subsistence is organised by the household and family and presupposes gender relations. Indeed, we must look to capitalism as a mode of production to find how the notion of the separation of gender relations from economic relations could arise. It is only in capitalism that we find an economic process constituted independently of the daily and generational production of the lives of particular individuals and in which therefore we can think economy apart from gender. In treating patriarchy and capitalism as distinct systems, we are reading back into history and into other kinds of societies a state of affairs peculiar to our own. We have come slowly to the discovery that gender permeates all aspects of social, political and economic organisation; that what has been seen as not gendered is in fact largely an exclusively male arena of action and that from that viewpoint, gender relations are only present when women are. But from the standpoint of women, we are coming to recognise the pervasive effect or presence of gender.5 To posit a distinct sex/gender systems is to inhibit analysis and understanding of the gender-saturated character of social relations by sectioning off those involving women. I have taken the view that we must begin by including women from the outset in our attempt to make out the historical processes in which we are implicated and which launch us towards the future we try to grasp and make. In so doing the concepts we are familiar with and which have been built upon an assumption of a universe which has excluded gender by excluding women must be pulled, stretched and if necessary remade. For we are addressing the reality of a world which is put together as it is in the actual activities of actual individuals and in that world women are really present. They are as much in class, part of class and class struggle as men. Gender relations are, I shall try to show, an integral constituent of the social organisation of class7 Looked at in this way, the problem of patriarchy versus class takes on a different cast. The interpersonal relations of direct dominance, between women and men, are implicated in a larger organisation of the society. Even if we see the patriarchal principle at work in each new setting, in government, business, professions, labour unions, yet that personal relation of dominance and inequality is articulated to the larger social, political and economic organisation of the society. It cannot be separated from it. The direct and personal character of men's domination over women takes on its actual character within determinate social relations specific to capitalism and to its development over the past 150 or so years. The relation between the actual forms of men's dominance over women, and women's general inequality in the society, are specific to this kind of society, to this historical epoch. These are the forms in which we experience oppression. They are the only forms of oppression we know. Whether there is something beyond or beneath which is general is not our first question. Our first question is to understand the relation between what we find at the level of experience and the larger social, economic and political process, viewing the latter as historical processes. For of course, this place, this time, these material conditions, these social relations, are where we do our work. This is what we must understand.

### Oppression

#### Focusing on specific types of oppression, such as structural violence, obscures the underlying root causes, which turns the case.

Slavoj Zizek 99, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana,1999, The Ticklish Subject, page 352-355

The big news of today’s post-political age of the ‘end of ideology’ is thus the radical depoliticization of the sphere of the economy: **the way the economy functions** (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) **is accepted as** a simple insight into **the objective state of things. However, as long as this** fundamental **depoliticization** of the economic sphere **is accepted,** all the talk about **active citizenship**, about public discussion leading to responsible collective decisions, and so on, **will remain limited to the ‘cultural’ issues of religious, sexual, [and] ethnic** and other way-of-life **differences, without** actually **encroaching upon the level at which long-term decisions** that affect us all **are made.** In short, the only way effectively to bring about a society in which risky long-term decisions would ensue from public debate involving all concerned is some kind of radical limitation of Capital’s freedom, the subordinated of the process of production to social control – the radical *repoliticization of the economy*. That is to say: if the problem with today’s post-politics (‘administration of social affairs’) is that it increasingly undermines the possibility of a proper political act, this undermining is directly due to the depoliticization of economics, to the common acceptance of Capital and market mechanisms as neutral tools/ procedures to be exploited. We can now see why today’s post-politics cannot attain the properly political dimension of universality; because it silently precludes the sphere of economy from politicization. The domain of global capitalist market relations in the Other Scene of the so-called repoliticization of civil society advocated by the partisans of ‘identity politics’ and other postmodern forms of politicization: all the talk about **new forms of politics** bursting out all over, **focused on particular issues** (**[such as] gay rights, ecology, [and] ethnic minorities…**), all this incessant activity of fluid, shifting identities, of **build**ing **multiple *ad hoc* coalitions**, and so on, has something inauthentic about it, and ultimately resembles the obsessional neurotic who talks all the time and is otherwise frantically active precisely in order to **ensur[ing] that** something – **what *really matters*** – **will *not* be disturbed**, that it will remain immobilized. **So, instead of celebrating** the **new freedoms** and responsibilities brought about by the ‘second modernity’, **it is much more crucial to focus on what *remains the same*** in this global fluidity and reflexivity, on what serves as the very motor of this fluidity: **the inexorable logic of Capital.** The spectral presence of Capital is the figure of the big Other which not only remains operative when all the traditional embodiments of the symbolic big Other disintegrate, but even directly causes this disintegration: far from being confronted with the abyss of their freedom – that is, laden with the burden of responsibility that cannot be alleviated by the helping hand of Tradition or Nature – today’s subject is perhaps more than ever caught in an inexorable compulsion that effectively runs his life.

### Racism

#### Capitalism is the root cause of racism

Selfa 10 - (Lance [Lance Selfa is a frequent contributor to the ISR, and writes a column on U.S. politics in Socialist Worker newspaper. He is the author of The Democrats: A Critical History (Haymarket Books, 2012).] "The Roots of Racism" http://socialistworker.org/2010/10/21/the-roots-of-racism) GHS//GB

IT'S ONE of the oldest truisms around. Racism, it's said, is as old as human society itself. As long as human beings have been around, the argument goes, they have always hated or feared people of a different nation or skin color. In other words, racism is just part of human nature. If racism is part of human nature, then socialists have a real challenge on their hands. If racism is hard-wired into human biology, then we should despair of workers ever overcoming the divisions between them to fight for a socialist society free of racial inequality. Fortunately, **racism isn't part of human nature**. The best evidence for this assertion is the fact that **racism has not always existed. Racism is a particular form of oppression**. It stems from discrimination against a group of people based on the idea that some inherited characteristic, such as skin color, makes them inferior to their oppressors. Yet **the concepts of "race" and "racism" are modern inventions. They arose and became part of the dominant ideology of society in the context of the African slave trade at the dawn of capitalism in the 1500s and 1600s**. Although it is a commonplace for academics and opponents of socialism to claim that Karl Marx ignored racism, Marx in fact described the processes that created modern racism. His explanation of the rise of capitalism placed the African slave trade, the European extermination of indigenous people in the Americas and colonialism at its heart. In Capital, Marx writes: The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the indigenous population of the continent, the beginnings of the conquest and plunder of India, and the conversion of Africa into a preserve for the commercial hunting of black skins are all things that characterize the dawn of the era of capitalist production. Marx connected his explanation of the role of the slave trade in the rise of capitalism to the social relations that produced racism against Africans. In Wage Labor and Capital, written 12 years before the American Civil War, he explains: What is a Negro slave? A man of the black race. The one explanation is as good as the other. A Negro is a Negro. **He only becomes a slave in certain relations. A cotton spinning jenny is a machine for spinning cotton. It only becomes capital in certain relations. Torn away from these conditions, it is as little capital as gold by itself is money, or as sugar is the price of sugar.** In this passage, Marx shows no prejudice to Blacks ("a man of the black race," "a Negro is a Negro"), but he mocks society's equation of "Black" and "slave" ("one explanation is as good as another"). He shows how the **economic and social relations of emerging capitalism thrust Blacks into slavery** ("he only becomes a slave in certain relations"), **which produce the dominant ideology that equates being African with being a slave.** These fragments of Marx's writing give us a good start in understanding the Marxist explanation of the origins of racism. As the Trinidadian historian of slavery Eric Williams put it: "**Slavery was not born of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery.**" And, one should add, the consequence of modern slavery at the dawn of capitalism. While **slavery existed as an economic system for thousands of years before the conquest of America, racism as we understand it today did not exist. The classical empires of Greece and Rome were based on slave labor. But ancient slavery was not viewed in racial terms**. Slaves were most often captives in wars or conquered peoples. If we understand white people as originating in what is today Europe, then **most slaves in ancient Greece and Rome were white. Roman law made slaves the property of their owners, while maintaining a "formal lack of interest in the slave's ethnic or racial provenance,"** wrote Robin Blackburn in The Making of New World Slavery. Over the years, slave manumission produced a mixed population of slave and free in Roman-ruled areas, in which all came to be seen as "Romans." The Greeks drew a sharper line between Greeks and "barbarians," those subject to slavery. Again, this was not viewed in racial or ethnic terms, as the socialist historian of the Haitian Revolution, C.L.R. James, explained**: [H]istorically, it is pretty well proved now that the ancient Greeks and Romans knew nothing about race. They had another standard--civilized and barbarian--and you could have white skin and be a barbarian, and you could be black and civilized.** More importantly, encounters in the ancient world between the Mediterranean world and Black Africans did not produce an upsurge of racism against Africans. In Before Color Prejudice, Howard University classics professor Frank Snowden documented innumerable accounts of interaction between the Greco-Roman and Egyptian civilizations and the Kush, Nubian, and Ethiopian kingdoms of Africa. He found substantial evidence of integration of Black Africans in the occupational hierarchies of the ancient Mediterranean empires and Black-white intermarriage. Black and mixed race gods appeared in Mediterranean art, and at least one Roman emperor, Septimius Severus, was an African. Between the 10th and 16th centuries, the chief source of slaves in Western Europe was Eastern Europe. In fact, **the word "slave" comes from the word "Slav," the people of Eastern Europe**. This outline doesn't mean to suggest a "pre-capitalist" Golden Age of racial tolerance, least of all in the slave societies of antiquity. Empires viewed themselves as centers of the universe and looked on foreigners as inferiors. Ancient Greece and Rome fought wars of conquest against peoples they presumed to be less advanced. Religious scholars interpreted the Hebrew Bible's "curse of Ham" from the story of Noah to condemn Africans to slavery. Cultural and religious associations of the color white with light and angels and the color black with darkness and evil persisted. But none of these cultural or ideological factors explain the rise of New World slavery or the "modern" notions of racism that developed from it. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - The African slave trade The slave trade lasted for a little more than 400 years, from the mid-1400s, when the Portuguese made their first voyages down the African coast, to the abolition of slavery in Brazil in 1888. Slave traders took as many as 12 million Africans by force to work on the plantations in South America, the Caribbean and North America. About 13 percent of slaves (1.5 million) died during the Middle Passage--the trip by boat from Africa to the New World. The African slave trade--involving African slave merchants, European slavers and New World planters in the traffic in human cargo--represented the greatest forced population transfer ever. The charge that **Africans "sold their own people"** into slavery has become a standard canard against "politically correct" history that condemns the European role in the African slave trade. The first encounters of the Spanish and Portuguese, and later the English, with African kingdoms revolved around trade in goods. Only after the Europeans established New World plantations requiring huge labor gangs did the slave trade begin. **African kings** and chiefs **did indeed sell into slavery captives in wars or members of other communities**. Sometimes, they concluded alliances with Europeans to support them in wars, with captives from their enemies being handed over to the Europeans as booty. The demands of the plantation economies pushed "demand" for slaves. Supply did not create its own demand. In any event, it remains unseemly to attempt to absolve the European slavers by reference to their African partners in crime. As historian Basil Davidson rightly argues about African chiefs' complicity in the slave trade: "In this, they were no less 'moral' than the Europeans who had instigated the trade and bought the captives." Onboard, Africans were restricted in their movements so that they wouldn't combine to mutiny on the ship. In many slave ships, slaves were chained down, stacked like firewood with less than a foot between them. On the plantations, slaves were subjected to a regimen of 18-hour workdays. All members of slave families were set to work. Since the New World tobacco and sugar plantations operated nearly like factories, men, women and children were assigned tasks, from the fields to the processing mills. Slaves were denied any rights. Throughout the colonies in the Caribbean to North America, laws were passed establishing a variety of common practices: Slaves were forbidden to carry weapons, they could marry only with the owner's permission, and their families could be broken up. They were forbidden to own property. Masters allowed slaves to cultivate vegetables and chickens, so the master wouldn't have to attend to their food needs. But they were forbidden even to sell for profit the products of their own gardens. Some colonies encouraged religious instruction among slaves, but all of them made clear that a slave's conversion to Christianity didn't change their status as slaves. Other colonies discouraged religious instruction, especially when it became clear to the planters that church meetings were one of the chief ways that slaves planned conspiracies and revolts. It goes without saying that slaves had no political or civil rights, with no right to an education, to serve on juries, to vote or to run for public office. The planters instituted barbaric regimes of repression to prevent any slave revolts. Slave catchers using tracker dogs would hunt down any slaves who tried to escape the plantation. The penalties for any form of slave resistance were extreme and deadly. One description of the penalties slaves faced in Barbados reports that rebellious slaves would be punished by "nailing them down on the ground with crooked sticks on every Limb, and then applying the Fire by degrees from Feet and Hands, burning them gradually up to the Head, whereby their pains are extravagant." Barbados planters could claim a reimbursement from the government of 25 pounds per slave executed. The African slave trade helped to shape a wide variety of societies from modern Argentina to Canada. These differed in their use of slaves, the harshness of the regime imposed on slaves, and the degree of mixing of the races that custom and law permitted. But none of these became as virulently racist--insisting on racial separation and a strict color bar--as the English North American colonies that became the United States. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Unfree labor in the North American colonies Notwithstanding the horrible conditions that African slaves endured, it is important to underscore that when European powers began carving up the New World between them, African slaves were not part of their calculations. When we think of slavery today, we think of it primarily from the point of view of its relationship to racism. But planters in the 17th and 18th centuries looked at it primarily as a means to produce profits. **Slavery was a method of organizing labor to produce sugar, tobacco and cotton. It was not, first and foremost, a system for producing white supremacy.** How did slavery in the U.S. (and the rest of the New World) become the breeding ground for racism? For much of the first century of colonization in what became the United States, the majority of slaves and other "unfree laborers" were white. The term "unfree" draws the distinction between slavery and servitude and "free wage labor" that is the norm in capitalism. One of the historic gains of capitalism for workers is that workers are "free" to sell their ability to labor to whatever employer will give them the best deal. Of course, this kind of freedom is limited at best. Unless they are independently wealthy, workers aren't free to decide not to work. They're free to work or starve. Once they do work, they can quit one employer and go to work for another. But the hallmark of systems like slavery and indentured servitude was that slaves or servants were "bound over" to a particular employer for a period of time, or for life in the case of slaves. The decision to work for another master wasn't the slave's or the servant's. It was the master's, who could sell slaves for money or other commodities like livestock, lumber or machinery. The North American colonies started predominantly as private business enterprises in the early 1600s. Unlike the Spanish, whose conquests of Mexico and Peru in the 1500s produced fabulous gold and silver riches for Spain, settlers in places like the colonies that became Maryland, Rhode Island, and Virginia made money through agriculture. In addition to sheer survival, the settlers' chief aim was to obtain a labor force that could produce the large amounts of indigo, tobacco, sugar and other crops that would be sold back to England. From 1607, when Jamestown was founded in Virginia to about 1685, the primary source of agricultural labor in English North America came from white indentured servants. **The colonists first attempted to press the indigenous population into labor.** But the Indians refused to be become servants to the English. **Indians resisted being forced to work, and they escaped into the surrounding area, which, after all, they knew far better than the English**. One after another, **the English colonies turned to a policy of driving out the Indians**. The colonists then turned to white servants. Indentured servants were predominantly young white men--usually English or Irish--who were required to work for a planter master for some fixed term of four to seven years. The servants received room and board on the plantation but no pay. And they could not quit and work for another planter. They had to serve their term, after which they might be able to acquire some land and to start a farm for themselves. They became servants in several ways. Some were prisoners, convicted of petty crimes in Britain, or convicted of being troublemakers in Britain's first colony, Ireland. Many were kidnapped off the streets of Liverpool or Manchester, and put on ships to the New World. Some voluntarily became servants, hoping to start farms after they fulfilled their obligations to their masters. For most of the 1600s, the planters tried to get by with a predominantly white, but multiracial workforce. But as the 17th century wore on, colonial leaders became increasingly frustrated with white servant labor. For one thing, they faced the problem of constantly having to recruit labor as servants' terms expired. Second, after servants finished their contracts and decided to set up their farms, they could become competitors to their former masters. And finally, the planters didn't like the servants' "insolence." The mid-1600s were a time of revolution in England, when ideas of individual freedom were challenging the old hierarchies based on royalty. The colonial planters tended to be royalists, but their servants tended to assert their "rights as Englishmen" to better food, clothing and time off. Most laborers in the colonies supported the servants. As the century progressed, the costs of servant labor increased. Planters started to petition the colonial boards and assemblies to allow the large-scale importation of African slaves. Black slaves worked on plantations in small numbers throughout the 1600s. But until the end of the 1600s, it cost planters more to buy slaves than to buy white servants. Blacks lived in the colonies in a variety of statuses--some were free, some were slaves, some were servants. The law in Virginia didn't establish the condition of lifetime, perpetual slavery or even recognize African servants as a group different from white servants until 1661. Blacks could serve on juries, own property and exercise other rights. Northampton County, Virginia, recognized interracial marriages and, in one case, assigned a free Black couple to act as foster parents for an abandoned white child. There were even a few examples of Black freemen who owned white servants. Free Blacks in North Carolina had voting rights. In the 1600s, the Chesapeake society of eastern Virginia had a multiracial character, according to historian Betty Wood: There is persuasive evidence dating from the 1620s through the 1680s that there were those of European descent in the Chesapeake who were prepared to identify and cooperate with people of African descent. These affinities were forged in the world of plantation work. On many plantations, Europeans and West Africans labored side by side in the tobacco fields, performing exactly the same types and amounts of work; they lived and ate together in shared housing; they socialized together; and sometimes they slept together. The planters' economic calculations played a part in the colonies' decision to move toward full-scale slave labor. By the end of the 17th century, the price of white indentured servants outstripped the price of African slaves. A planter could buy an African slave for life for the same price that he could purchase a white servant for 10 years. As Eric Williams explained: Here, then, is the origin of Negro slavery. The reason was economic, not racial; it had to do not with the color of the laborer, but the cheapness of the labor. [The planter] would have gone to the moon, if necessary, for labor. Africa was nearer than the moon, nearer too than the more populous countries of India and China. But their turn would soon come. **Planters' fear of a multiracial uprising also pushed them towards racial slavery. Because a rigid racial division of labor didn't exist in the 17th century colonies, many conspiracies involving Black slaves and white indentured servants were hatched and foiled.** We know about them today because of court proceedings that punished the runaways after their capture. As historians T.H. Breen and Stephen Innes point out, "These cases reveal only extreme actions, desperate attempts to escape, but for every group of runaways who came before the courts, there were doubtless many more poor whites and blacks who cooperated in smaller, less daring ways on the plantation." The largest of these conspiracies developed into Bacon's Rebellion, an uprising that threw terror into the hearts of the Virginia Tidewater planters in 1676. Several hundred farmers, servants and slaves initiated a protest to press the colonial government to seize Indian land for distribution. The conflict spilled over into demands for tax relief and resentment of the Jamestown establishment. Planter Nathaniel Bacon helped organize an army of whites and Blacks that sacked Jamestown and forced the governor to flee. The rebel army held out for eight months before the Crown managed to defeat and disarm it. Bacon's Rebellion was a turning point. After it ended, the Tidewater planters moved in two directions: first, they offered concessions to the white freemen, lifting taxes and extending to them the vote; and second, they moved to full-scale racial slavery. Fifteen years earlier, the Burgesses had recognized the condition of slavery for life and placed Africans in a different category as white servants. But the law had little practical effect. "Until slavery became systematic, there was no need for a systematic slave code. And slavery could not become systematic so long as an African slave for life cost twice as much as an English servant for a five-year term," wrote historian Barbara Jeanne Fields. Both of those circumstances changed in the immediate aftermath of Bacon's Rebellion. In the entire 17th century, the planters imported about 20,000 African slaves. The majority of them were brought to North American colonies in the 24 years after Bacon's Rebellion. In 1664, the Maryland legislature passed a law determining who would be considered slaves on the basis of the condition of their father--whether their father was slave or free. It soon became clear, however, that establishing paternity was difficult, but that establishing who was a person's mother was definite. So the planters changed the law to establish slave status on the basis of the mother's condition. Now white slaveholders who fathered children by slave women would be guaranteed their offspring as slaves. And the law included penalties for "free" women who slept with slaves. But what's most interesting about this law is that it doesn't really speak in racial terms. It attempts to preserve the property rights of slaveholders and establish barriers between slave and free which were to become hardened into racial divisions over the next few years. Taking the Maryland law as an example, Fields made this important point: Historians can actually observe colonial Americans in the act of preparing the ground for race without foreknowledge of what would later arise on the foundation they were laying. [T]he purpose of the experiment is clear: to prevent the erosion of slaveowners' property rights that would result if the offspring of free white women impregnated by slave men were entitled to freedom. The language of the preamble to the law makes clear that the point was not yet race. Race does not explain the law. Rather, the law shows society in the act of inventing race. After establishing that African slaves would cultivate major cash crops of the North American colonies, the planters then moved to establish the institutions and ideas that would uphold white supremacy. Most unfree labor became Black labor. **Laws and ideas intended to underscore the subhuman status of Black people**--in a word, the ideology of racism and white supremacy--emerged full-blown over the next generation. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - "All men are created equal" Within a few decades, the ideology of white supremacy was fully developed. Some of the greatest minds of the day--such as Scottish philosopher David Hume and Thomas Jefferson, the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence--wrote treatises alleging Black inferiority. **The ideology of white supremacy based on the natural inferiority of Blacks, even allegations that Blacks were subhuman, strengthened throughout the 18th century.** This was the way that the leading intellectual figures of the time reconciled the ideals of the 1776 American Revolution with slavery. The American Revolution of 1776 and later the French Revolution of 1789 popularized the ideas of liberty and the rights of all human beings. The Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal" and possess certain "unalienable rights"--rights that can't be taken away--of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." As the first major bourgeois revolution, the American Revolution sought to establish the rights of the new capitalist class against the old feudal monarchy. It started with the resentment of the American merchant class that wanted to break free from British restrictions on its trade. But its challenge to British tyranny also gave expression to a whole range of ideas that expanded the concept of "liberty" from being just about trade to include ideas of human rights, democracy, and civil liberties. It legitimized an assault on slavery as an offense to liberty. Some of the leading American revolutionaries, such as Thomas Paine and Benjamin Franklin, endorsed abolition. Slaves and free Blacks also pointed to the ideals of the revolution to call for abolishing slavery. But because the revolution aimed to establish the rule of capital in America, and because a lot of capitalists and planters made a lot of money from slavery, the revolution compromised with slavery. The Declaration initially contained a condemnation of King George for allowing the slave trade, but Jefferson dropped it following protests from representatives from Georgia and the Carolinas. How could the founding fathers of the U.S.--most of whom owned slaves themselves--reconcile the ideals of liberty for which they were fighting with the existence of a system that represented the exact negation of liberty? The ideology of white supremacy fit the bill. We know today that "all men" didn't include women, Indians or most whites. But to rule Black slaves out of the blessings of liberty, the leading head-fixers of the time argued that Blacks weren't really "men," they were a lower order of being. Jefferson's Notes from Virginia, meant to be a scientific catalogue of the flora and fauna of Virginia, uses arguments that anticipate the "scientific racism" of the 1800s and 1900s. With few exceptions, no major institution--such as the universities, the churches or the newspapers of the time--raised criticisms of white supremacy or of slavery. In fact, they helped pioneer religious and academic justifications for slavery and Black inferiority. As C.L.R. James put it, "[T]he conception of dividing people by race begins with the slave trade. This thing was so shocking, so opposed to all the conceptions of society which religion and philosophers had, that the only justification by which humanity could face it was to divide people into races and decide that the Africans were an inferior race." White supremacy wasn't only used to justify slavery. It was also used to keep in line the two-thirds of Southern whites who weren't slaveholders. Unlike the French colony of St. Domingue or the British colony of Barbados, where Blacks vastly outnumbered whites, Blacks were a minority in the slave South. A tiny minority of slave-holding whites, who controlled the governments and economies of the Deep South states, ruled over a population that was roughly two-thirds white farmers and workers and one-third Black slaves. The slaveholders' ideology of racism and white supremacy helped to divide the working population, tying poor whites to the slaveholders. Slavery afforded poor white farmers what Fields called a "social space" whereby they preserved an illusory "independence" based on debt and subsistence farming, while the rich planters continued to dominate Southern politics and society. "A caste system as well as a form of labor," historian James M. McPherson wrote, "slavery elevated all whites to the ruling caste and thereby reduced the potential for class conflict." The great abolitionist Frederick Douglass understood this dynamic: The hostility between the whites and blacks of the South is easily explained. It has its root and sap in the relation of slavery, and was incited on both sides by the cunning of the slave masters. Those masters secured their ascendancy over both the poor whites and the Blacks by putting enmity between them. They divided both to conquer each. [Slaveholders denounced emancipation as] tending to put the white working man on an equality with Blacks, and by this means, they succeed in drawing off the minds of the poor whites from the real fact, that by the rich slave-master, they are already regarded as but a single remove from equality with the slave. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Slavery and capitalism Slavery in the colonies helped produce a boom in the 18th century economy that provided the launching pad for the industrial revolution in Europe. From the start, **colonial slavery and capitalism were linked.** While it is not correct to say that slavery created capitalism, it is correct to say that slavery provided one of the chief sources for the initial accumulations of wealth that helped to propel capitalism forward in Europe and North America. The clearest example of the connection between plantation slavery and the rise of industrial capitalism was the connection between the cotton South, Britain and, to a lesser extent, the Northern industrial states. Here, we can see the direct link between slavery in the U.S. and the development of the most advanced capitalist production methods in the world. Cotton textiles accounted for 75 percent of British industrial employment in 1840, and, at its height, three-fourths of that cotton came from the slave plantations of the Deep South. And Northern ships and ports transported the cotton. To meet the boom in the 1840s and 1850s, the planters became even more vicious. On the one hand, they tried to expand slavery into the West and Central America. The fight over the extension of slavery into the territories eventually precipitated the Civil War in 1861. On the other hand, they drove slaves harder--selling more cotton to buy more slaves just to keep up. On the eve of the Civil War, the South was petitioning to lift the ban on the importation of slaves that had existed officially since 1808. Karl Marx clearly understood the connection between plantation slavery in the cotton South and the development of capitalism in England. He wrote in Capital: While the cotton industry introduced child-slavery into England, in the United States, it gave the impulse for the transformation of the more or less patriarchal slavery into a system of commercial exploitation. In fact, **the veiled slavery of the wage-laborers in Europe needed the unqualified slavery of the New World as its pedestal. Capital comes dripping from head to toe, from every pore, with blood and dirt. The close connection between slavery and capitalism, and thus, between racism and capitalism, gives the lie to those who insist that slavery would have just died out. In fact, the South was more dependent on slavery right before the Civil War than it was 50 or 100 years earlier.** Slavery lasted as long as it did because it was profitable. And it was profitable to the richest and most "well-bred" people in the world. The Civil War abolished slavery and struck a great blow against racism. But racism itself wasn't abolished. On the contrary, **just as racism was created to justify colonial slavery, racism as an ideology was refashioned. It now no longer justified the enslavement of Blacks, but it justified second-class status for Blacks as wage laborers and sharecroppers. Racist ideology was also refashioned to justify imperialist conquest at the turn of the last century.** As a handful of competing world powers vied to carve up the globe into colonial preserves for cheap raw materials and labor, racism served as a convenient justification. The vast majority of the world's people were now portrayed as inferior races, incapable of determining their own future. **Slavery disappeared, but racism remained as a means to justify the domination of millions of people by the U.S.,** various European powers, and later by Japan. Because racism is woven right into the fabric of capitalism, new forms of racism arose with changes in capitalism. **As the U.S. economy expanded and underpinned U.S. imperial expansion, imperialist racism--which asserted that the U.S. had a right to dominate other peoples, such as Mexicans and Filipinos--developed. As the U.S. economy grew and sucked in millions of immigrant laborers, anti-immigrant racism developed.** But these are both different forms of the same ideology--of white supremacy and division of the world into "superior" and "inferior" races--that had their origins in slavery. Racism and capitalism have been intertwined since the beginning of capitalism. You can't have capitalism without racism. Therefore, **the final triumph over racism will only come when we abolish racism's chief source--capitalism--and build a new socialist society**.

## Neolib Bad: Environment

### Clark: Ecological Collapse

#### Capitalist social relations in the ocean are unsustainable and guarantee extinction—vote neg and reject the AFFs economic intrusion

Clark and Clausen 8—Brett, assistant professor of sociology and sustainability studies at the University of Utah and Rebecca, Professor of Sociology at Fort Lewis College in Durango, Colorado. “The Oceanic Crisis: Capitalism and the Degradation of Marine Ecosystem,” 60(3): online http://monthlyreview.org/2008/07/01/the-oceanic-crisis-capitalism-and-the-degradation-of-marine-ecosystem

Turning the Ocean into a Watery Grave The world is at a crossroads in regard to the ecological crisis. Ecological degradation under global capitalism extends to the entire biosphere. Oceans that were teeming with abundance are being decimated by the continual intrusion of exploitive economic operations. At the same time that scientists are documenting the complexity and interdependency of marine species, we are witnessing an oceanic crisis as natural conditions, ecological processes, and nutrient cycles are being undermined through overfishing and transformed due to global warming. The expansion of the accumulation system, along with technological advances in fishing, have intensified the exploitation of the world ocean; facilitated the enormous capture of fishes (both target and bycatch); extended the spatial reach of fishing operations; broadened the species deemed valuable on the market; and disrupted metabolic and reproductive processes of the ocean. The quick-fix solution of aquaculture enhances capital’s control over production without resolving ecological contradictions. It is wise to recognize, as Paul Burkett has stated, that “short of human extinction, there is no sense in which capitalism can be relied upon to permanently ‘break down’ under the weight of its depletion and degradation of natural wealth.”**44** Capital is driven by the competition for the accumulation of wealth, and short-term profits provide the immediate pulse of capitalism. It cannot operate under conditions that require reinvestment in the reproduction of nature, which may entail time scales of a hundred or more years. Such requirements stand opposed to the immediate interests of profit. The qualitative relation between humans and nature is subsumed under the drive to accumulate capital on an ever-larger scale. Marx lamented that to capital, “Time is everything, man is nothing; he is at the most, time’s carcase. Quality no longer matters. Quantity alone decides everything.”45 Productive relations are concerned with production time, labor costs, and the circulation of capital—not the diminishing conditions of existence. Capital subjects natural cycles and processes (via controlled feeding and the use of growth hormones) to its economic cycle. The maintenance of natural conditions is not a concern. The bounty of nature is taken for granted and appropriated as a free gift. As a result, the system is inherently caught in a fundamental crisis arising from the transformation and destruction of nature. István Mészáros elaborates this point, stating: For today it is impossible to think of anything at all concerning the elementary conditions of social metabolic reproduction which is not lethally threatened by the way in which capital relates to them—the only way in which it can. This is true not only of humanity’s energy requirements, or of the management of the planet’s mineral resources and chemical potentials, but of every facet of the global agriculture, including the devastation caused by large scale de-forestation, and even the most irresponsible way of dealing with the element without which no human being can survive: water itself….In the absence of miraculous solutions, capital’s arbitrarily self-asserting attitude to the objective determinations of causality and time in the end inevitably brings a bitter harvest, at the expense of humanity [and nature itself].46 An analysis of the oceanic crisis confirms the destructive qualities of private for-profit operations. Dire conditions are being generated as the resiliency of marine ecosystems in general is being undermined. To make matters worse, sewage from feedlots and fertilizer runoff from farms are transported by rivers to gulfs and bays, overloading marine ecosystems with excess nutrients, which contribute to an expansion of algal production. This leads to oxygen-poor water and the formation of hypoxic zones—otherwise known as “dead zones” because crabs and fishes suffocate within these areas. It also compromises natural processes that remove nutrients from the waterways. Around 150 dead zones have been identified around the world. A dead zone is the end result of unsustainable practices of food production on land. At the same time, it contributes to the loss of marine life in the seas, furthering the ecological crisis of the world ocean. Coupled with industrialized capitalist fisheries and aquaculture, the oceans are experiencing ecological degradation and constant pressures of extraction that are severely depleting the populations of fishes and other marine life. The severity of the situation is that if current practices and rates of fish capture continue marine ecosystems and fisheries around the world could collapse by the year 2050.47 To advert turning the seas into a watery grave, what is needed is nothing less than a worldwide revolution in our relation to nature, and thus of global society itself.

### Smith: Democracy

#### Neoliberalism’s narcissistic drive makes democratization of the market impossible—humanity is at a crossroads—the timeframe is now

Richard A. Smith 7, Research Associate at the Institute for Policy Research & Development, UK; PhD in History from UCLA, June 2007, “The Eco-suicidal Economics of Adam Smith,” Capitalism Nature Socialism, Vol. 18, No. 2, p. 22-43

So there you have it: insatiable growth and consumption is destroying the planet and dooming humanity-but without ceaselessly growing production and insatiably rising consumption, we would be even worse off. Such is the lunatic suicidal logic of capitalist economics. Adam Smith's fatal error was his assumption that the "most effectual" means of promoting the public interest of society is to just ignore it and concentrate instead on the pursuit of economic self-interest. In the 18th century, this narcissistic economic philosophy had little impact on the natural world. Today it has a huge impact and is, moreover, totally at odds with the world's scientific bodies who are crying out for a PLAN to stop global warming and save nature. Capitalist Limits to Corporate Environmentalist!! Corporations aren't necessarily evil, but corporate managers are legally responsible to their owners, the shareholders, and not to society. This means that the critical decisions about production and resource consumption-decisions that affect our health and survival-are mainly the private prerogative of large corporations and are often only marginally under the control of governments. The blunt reality of this situation was well summed up by Joel Bakan in his recent book (and film), The Corporation: Corporations are created by law and imbued with purpose by law. Law dictates what their directors and managers can do, what they cannot do, and what they must do. And, at least in the United States and other industrialized countries, the corporation, as created by law, most closely resembles Milton Friedman's ideal model of the institution: it compels executives to prioritize the interests of their companies and shareholders above all others and forbids them from being socially responsible - at least genuinely so.38 So when corporate and societal interests conflict, even the "greenest" of corporate CEOs often have no choice but to make decisions contrary to the interests of society. British Petroleum's CEO, Lord John Browne, is good example. In the late 1990s, Browne had an environmental epiphany, broke ranks with oil industry denial, and became the first oil company executive to warn that fossil fuels are accelerating global warming. BP adopted the motto "Beyond Petroleum" in its advertisements, painted its service stations green and yellow, and bought a boutique solar power outfit. But under Browne, BP has spent far more on advertising its green credentials than it invests in actual green power production. Fully 99 percent of its investments still go into fossil fuel exploration and development, while solar power is less than 1 percent and seems to be declining. 9 In 1999, BP spent $45 million to buy the solar power outfit Solarex. By comparison, BP paid $26.8 billion to buy Amoco in order to enlarge its oil portfolio. BP's 2004 revenues topped $285 billion, while its solar power sales were just over $400 million. In February 2006, Browne told his board that the company had more than replenished its marketed output in 2005 with new proven reserves of oil and gas, and that "with more than 20 new projects due on stream in the next three years, and assuming the same level of oil price, the annual rate of increase should continue at some 4 percent through 2010."40 So, far from shifting to renewable sources of energy, BP is not only expanding its output of fossil fuels but increasing its overall reliance on fossil fuel sources of profit. BP now possesses proven reserves of 19 billion barrels produced in 23 countries, and the company currently explores for oil in 26 countries. Given the proven and stupendous profits of oil production versus the unproven profitability of alternative energy, how can Brown go "green" in any serious way and remain responsible to his owner-investors?41 Were he to do so, he would soon be out of a job.42 Ecosocialism or Collapse If we're going to stop the capitalist economic locomotive from driving us off the cliff, we are going to have to fundamentally rethink our entire economic life, reassert the visible hand of conscious scientific, rational economic planning, and implement democratic control over our economies and resources. We're going to have to construct an entirely different kind of economy, one that can live within its ecological means. Such an economy would have to be based around at least the following principles: An Ecosocialist Economy of Stasis First, in a world of fast-diminishing resources, a sustainable global economy can only be based on near-zero economic growth on average. That means that to survive, humanity will have to impose drastic fixed limits on development, resource consumption, the freedom to consume, and the freedom to pollute. Given existing global inequities and the fact that the crisis we face is overwhelmingly caused by overconsumption in the industrialized North, equity can only be achieved by imposing massive cutbacks in the advanced countries combined with a program of rational planned growth to develop the Third World, with the aim of stabilizing at zero growth on average. This will require drastically cutting back many lines of production, closing down others entirely, and creating socially and environmentally useful jobs for workers made redundant by this transition. This will also require physical rationing of many critical resources on a per capita basis for every person on the planet. Human survival will thus require a profound rethinking of our most fundamental ideas-bourgeois ideas-of economic freedom. For too long, many Americans, in particular, have come to identify their notion of "freedom," if not their very being and essence, with insatiable consumption-unlimited freedom of "choice" in what to buy. But 50 styles of blue jeans, 16 models of SUVs and endless choices in "consumer electronics" will all have dramatically less value when Bloomingdales is under water, Florida disappears beneath the waves, malarial mosquitos blanket Long Island beaches, and the U.S. is overrun with desperate environmental refugees from the South. Once we as a society finally admit the "inconvenient truth" that we have no choice but to drastically cut production and severely reduce consumer choice, it will also become apparent that we have to put in place a planned economy that will meet our needs and those of future generations as well as the other species with whom we share the planet. A Restructured Economy of Production for Social Need and for Use Second, we need to massively restructure the global economy. Enormous sectors in the global capitalist economy-plastics, packaging, much of the manufactured consumer electronics, petrochemical-based and other synthetic products, many pharmaceuticals, all genetically modified foods, and the vast and ever-growing production of arms-are either completely unnecessary or waste increasingly scarce resources and produce needless pollution.44 Our parents did without nearly all of this before WWII, and they were not living in caves. Many lines of production and most retail industries are built around unnecessary replacement and designed-in obsolescence. How much of the American economy from cars and appliances to clothes is purposefully designed to be "consumed, burned up, worn out, replaced, and discarded at an ever-increasing rate"46 so the cycle of waste production can begin all over again? How much of the planet's natural resources are consumed every year in completely unnecessary annual model changes, fashion updates, and "new and improved" products whose only purpose is simply to sell and sell again? If a global population of 6 to 9 billion people is going to survive this century, what choice do we have but to reorganize the global economy to conserve what shrinking natural resources we have left, reorient production for need rather than profit, design products to last as long as possible, enforce as close to total recycling as possible, and aim for as close to zero pollution as is possible? A Socialist Economic Democracy Third: an ecosocialist democracy. Endless growth or stasis? Resource exhaustion or conservation? Automobilization of the planet or enhanced public transport? Deforestation or protection of the wild forests? Agro poisons or organic farming? Hunt the fish to extinction or protect the fisheries? Raze the Amazon forest to grow MacBurgers or promote a more vegetarian diet? Manufacture products designed to be "used up, burned up, consumed as rapidly as possible" or design them to last, be repaired, recycled and also shared? Enforce private interests at the expense of the commons or subordinate private greed to the common good? In today's globalized world, decisions about such questions will determine the fate of humanity. Who can make these critical economic and moral decisions in society's interest and in the interest of preserving a habitable planet? In Adam Smith's view, which is still the operable maxim of modern capitalists and neoliberal economists, we should all just "Look out for Number 1," and the common good will take care of itself. If Smith were right, the common good would have taken care of itself long ago, and we wouldn't be facing catastrophe. After centuries of Smithian economics, the common good needs our immediate and concentrated attention. Corporations can't make such decisions in the best interests of society or the future, because their legal responsibility is to their private owners. The only way such decisions can be scientifically rational and socially responsible is when everyone who is affected participates in decision-making. And time is running out. We don't have 20 or 30 years to wait for Ford and GM to figure out how they can make a buck on electric cars. We don't have 60 or 70 years to wait while investors in coal-powered power plants milk the last profits out of those sunk investments before they consider an alternative. Humanity is at a crossroads. Either we find a way to move toward a global economic democracy in which decisions about production and consumption are directly and democratically decided by all those affected, or the alternative will be the continuing descent into a capitalist war of all-against-all over ever-diminishing resources that can only end in the collapse of what's left of civilization and the global ecology. To be sure, in an economic democracy, society would sometimes make mistakes in planning. We can't have perfect foresight, and democracies make mistakes. But at least these would be honest mistakes. The conclusion seems inescapable: Either we democratize the economy, construct the institutions of a practical working socialist democracy, or we face ecological and social collapse.

## Neolib Bad: War

### Szentes: Extinction

#### The war against nature is invisible but its real—it turns the AFFs war impacts and culminates in extinction

Tamás Szentes 8, Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest. “Globalisation and prospects of the world society” 4/22/08 http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.\_\_\_prospects\_-\_jav..pdf

It’ s a common place that human society can survive and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but --numerous local wars took place, --terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, --arms race and militarisation have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development, --many “invisible wars” are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that --the “war against Nature”, i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and “invisible wars” we find striking international and intrasociety inequities and distorted development patterns , which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus paving the way for unrest and “visible” wars. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of “invisible wars”, of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations. It further requires a pluralistic democracy on global level with an appropriate system of proportional representation of the world society, articulation of diverse interests and their peaceful reconciliation, by non-violent conflict management, and thus also a global governance with a really global institutional system. Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalisation and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and cannot be safeguarded in one part of the world when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Thus, peace requires, indeed, a new, demilitarised and democratic world order, which can provide equal opportunities for sustainable development. “Sustainability of development” (both on national and world level) is often interpreted as an issue of environmental protection only and reduced to the need for preserving the ecological balance and delivering the next generations not a destroyed Nature with overexhausted resources and polluted environment. However, no ecological balance can be ensured, unless the deep international development gap and intra-society inequalities are substantially reduced. Owing to global interdependencies there may exist hardly any “zero-sum-games”, in which one can gain at the expense of others, but, instead, the “negative-sum-games” tend to predominate, in which everybody must suffer, later or sooner, directly or indirectly, losses. Therefore, the actual question is not about “sustainability of development” but rather about the “sustainability of human life”, i.e. survival of mankind – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. When Professor Louk de la Rive Box was the president of EADI, one day we had an exchange of views on the state and future of development studies. We agreed that development studies are not any more restricted to the case of underdeveloped countries, as the developed ones (as well as the former “socialist” countries) are also facing development problems, such as those of structural and institutional (and even system-) transformation, requirements of changes in development patterns, and concerns about natural environment. While all these are true, today I would dare say that besides (or even instead of) “development studies” we must speak about and make “survival studies”. While the monetary, financial, and debt crises are cyclical, we live in an almost permanent crisis of the world society, which is multidimensional in nature, involving not only economic but also socio-psychological, behavioural, cultural and political aspects. The narrow-minded, election-oriented, selfish behaviour motivated by thirst for power and wealth, which still characterise the political leadership almost all over the world, paves the way for the final, last catastrophe. One cannot doubt, of course, that great many positive historical changes have also taken place in the world in the last century. Such as decolonisation, transformation of socio-economic systems, democratisation of political life in some former fascist or authoritarian states, institutionalisation of welfare policies in several countries, rise of international organisations and new forums for negotiations, conflict management and cooperation, institutionalisation of international assistance programmes by multilateral agencies, codification of human rights, and rights of sovereignty and democracy also on international level, collapse of the militarised Soviet bloc and system-change3 in the countries concerned, the end of cold war, etc., to mention only a few. Nevertheless, the crisis of the world society has extended and deepened, approaching to a point of bifurcation that necessarily puts an end to the present tendencies, either by the final catastrophe or a common solution. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the Earth can no longer afford to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, wellfed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other. Dangerous 'zero-sum-games' (which mostly prove to be “negative-sum-games”) can hardly be played any more by visible or invisible wars in the world society. Because of global interdependencies, the apparent winner becomes also a loser. The real choice for the world society is between negative- and positive-sum-games: i.e. between, on the one hand, continuation of visible and “invisible wars”, as long as this is possible at all, and, on the other, transformation of the world order by demilitarisation and democratization. No ideological or terminological camouflage can conceal this real dilemma any more, which is to be faced not in the distant future, by the next generations, but in the coming years, because of global terrorism soon having nuclear and other mass destructive weapons, and also due to irreversible changes in natural environment.

### Han: Increases Prob of War

#### Market liberalization increases statistical risk of war

Zhen Han 12, MA, Political Science, University of British Columbia, March 2012, “The Capitalist Peace Revisited: A New Liberal Peace Model and the Impact of Market Fluctuations,” https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/41809/ubc\_2012\_spring\_han\_zhen.pdf?sequence=1

The third causal mechanism is socialization theory. Market integration provides more forums allowing national policy makers to meet, thus policy transparency can be increased, and misinterpretations, which can lead to more conflicts, are reduced62 . Similar policy interests can also be developed through the socialization processes63. \*\*\*TO FOOTNOTES\*\*\* 63 This is the hypothesis 3 in Gartzke’s Capitalist Peace argument. Gartzke, 2007. \*\*\*END FOOTNOTES\*\*\* However, Waltz argues that as the number of contracts increases through international market integration, the number of contract default will also increase64; therefore, socialization under globalization can work in a negative way and make conflicts more likely. On the other hand, the socialization effect caused by financial market integration can be limited, as the highly professionalized nature of financial markets creates interactions only within a small group of experts. Chewieroth suggests that state leaders often have little to say in the norm building of international financial structure, and the self-interested bureaucrats of IMF and other international financial organizations have a significant impact on financial liberalization65. These discussions suggest there are some reasons to argue that the pacifying effects of financial liberalization are not as strong as commodity international trade. The causal mechanisms of conventional commercial peace may not function well with the financial integration. Furthermore, the possible negative impact of liberalization needs to be considered, as liberalization does not always bring stability. Financial market fluctuations, often marked by significant amount of capital inflows and outflows, can destabilize economy and cause further crisis. While the negative impact of large capital outflows, often known as the capital flight, are well recognized, this paper suggests that large capital inflows can be risky too. One can observe a large foreign capital inflow in cases of speculative accumulation, which often leads to financial crises when market confidence starts to collapse. The Asian Crisis in 1997 is an example of this type of crisis66. A large capital inflow also can be observed if the state is consistently borrowing from international financial markets to fix its budget deficits, such as the case in the 2011 Euro crisis. In both cases, large capital net inflows destabilize the economy and causes economic crisis. In the processes discussed above, higher level of financial deregulation provides the tool for states to borrow more from foreign capitals market, and it also encourages foreign capitals to take the risk of entering a foreign market, as liberalization guarantee foreign capitals can pull out at any time as they want. For these reasons, it is reasonable to observe increasing capital net inflows67 before a crisis breaks out, and a higher level of liberalization increases the vulnerability of the state. These discussions lead to the Hypothesis 5 and 6 of this thesis. H5: A higher level of financial liberalization leads to a higher chance of having militarized interstate conflicts. H6: A higher level of capital flight leads to a higher chance of having militarized interstate Conflicts.

## Neolib Bad: Economy

### Gill: Un-sustainable

#### Neoliberal economics is a failed system---continued belief in the system’s efficacy creates blindness to its failures that guarantees future crises

Gill 12 (Stephen Gill, Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science, York University, Toronto, and a former Distinguished Scholar in International Political Economy of the International Studies Association, 2012, Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership, p. 29-32

One of the more interesting questions concerning the nature of leadership in global capitalism relates to the role of experts, or epistemic communities that define forms of regulation and governance in key sectors of the global political economy. Until the financial collapse of 2007, most mainstream macroeconomists and financial economists assumed that the propensity to slump and depression in modern capitalism had been conquered, with the result that macroeconomic planning had become a technical exercise concerned simply with the fine tuning of the business cycle. It was further assumed that the spreading of risk through financial innovations such as derivatives and the self-regulation of financial capitalism introduced over the past three decades had made for a much less risky and more stable system – one that would continue to deliver prosperity. Indeed, much of the reasoning of this fraternity of economists was underpinned by an almost religious belief in the validity of the so-called ‘efficient markets hypothesis’. Another way to look at this is to see that certain members of these epistemic communities act as organic intellectuals from the vantage point of dominant political and economic interests. Organic intellectuals both articulate the goals and legitimate the actions and institutions of the ruling elements of a given society, seeking to stabilize the basic relations between rulers and ruled, simultaneously marginalizing and incorporating opposition. One function of these organic intellectuals is to depoliticize fundamental questions relating to the nature of capitalism, transforming political debates into technical questions directed at appropriate means rather than at questioning the fundamental ends of the capitalist system; they represent accumulation through the commodity form and markets as if it were common sense. In this way, despite the economic slump of 2007–10, and the collapse of the theories meant to explain it, the dominant narratives are still represented as the only credible ways to address economic problems. It is, of course, important to underline the context. When the financial meltdown occurred credit lines were frozen and banks refused to lend to each other, confidence collapsed and the central banks of the world engaged in a huge financial rescue operation, costing according to some estimates as much as $17 trillion.2 A particular curiosity of that moment was the way in which the economic experts scrambled to explain the financial collapse, which, according to their theories, was an impossible occurrence. This was then followed by a series of mea culpas premised upon the idea that, very soon, they would resume their positions of authority as leading economists, and that normalcy would be restored. An amusing example concerns a high-level group of private sector economists, bankers and academics convened by the British Academy, following a state visit to the London School of Economics in November 2008 by Queen Elizabeth II. After being taken around the school and shown charts indicating the scale of the financial collapse, the queen asked why it was that, if the collapse was so enormous, nobody had anticipated it, or indeed acted to prevent it. The British Academy decided to write a letter in response to the monarch’s question. It concluded: ‘Your Majesty, the failure to foresee the timing, extent and severity of the crisis and to head it off, while it had many causes, was principally a failure of the collective imagination of many bright people [sic], both in this country and internationally, to understand the risks to the system as a whole.’3 Paul Krugman (2009b) has noted that those US economists who gave warnings were ignored or marginalized as cranks. A further example Krugman recounts is instructive. It occurred at a special conference convened in 2005 to honour Alan Greenspan’s long tenure as chairman of the US Federal Reserve System. Greenspan, a market guru and follower of the individualist philosopher Ayn Rand, has views close to leading neoliberals such as Friedrich von Hayek and Milton Friedman. Greenspan was a firm believer in the wisdom of financial economics and the providential self-regulating capacity of financial markets. At the special conference a contrarian paper was presented warning that the US financial system was taking on potentially dangerous levels of risk. The paper was mocked as misguided ‘by almost all present’, including Ben Bernanke, Greenspan’s successor at the Fed; Obama’s economic czar (and former president of Harvard) Lawrence Summers; and his Treasury secretary, Tim Geithner. Their views were consistent with the neoliberal conventional wisdom of the time, as expressed by the IMF in its Global Financial Stability Report of April 2006, which cited, approvingly, comments by Greenspan that the global financial system was ‘far more flexible, efficient, and hence resilient. . .than existed just a quarter-century ago’. This Panglossian report argued that banks had dispersed and diversified credit risk, and that technical innovations now allowed supervisors and firms to monitor market and credit risks in ‘real time’ (IMF 2006: 1–2). The IMF’s chairman summarizes the key finding of the report thus (ibid.: 132): [IMF] Directors welcomed the continued resilience of the global financial system, which has been supported by solid global growth, low inflation, abundant liquidity, and flat yield curves. They considered that financial conditions will likely remain benign in the most likely scenario of continued growth, contained inflation, and stable inflationary expectations. The IMF view, therefore, was that the financial system was ‘much more resilient’ and far less prone to bank failures and credit problems than it had been for a quarter of a century! Krugman (2009b; emphasis added) also notes: ‘Economics, as a field, got in trouble because economists were seduced by the vision of a perfect, frictionless market system’ so that they became ‘blind’ to the very possibility of ‘catastrophic failures in a market economy.’ Krugman is referring to the hegemony of the efficient markets hypothesis in the thinking of neoliberal economists. Nevertheless, by October 2008 Greenspan finally admitted that he was in a state of ‘shocked disbelief ’, as his ‘whole intellectual edifice. . .collapsed’ (Krugman 2009b). However, with respect to financial reforms, Wall Street maintained control over the policy response to the crisis and debates on changes, confining the policy discussion principally to modifications to the existing forms of regulation.

### Monbiot: Error Replication

#### Neoliberalism makes economic growth unstable and unequal---every neoliberal policy is counter-productive for the overall economy

George Monbiot 13, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science), 1/14/13, “If you think we're done with neoliberalism, think again,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/14/neoliberal-theory-economic-failure

How they must bleed for us. In 2012, the world's 100 richest people became $241 billion richer. They are now worth $1.9 trillion: just a little less than the entire output of the United Kingdom. This is not the result of chance. The rise in the fortunes of the super-rich is the direct result of policies. Here are a few: the reduction of tax rates and tax enforcement; governments' refusal to recoup a decent share of revenues from minerals and land; the privatisation of public assets and the creation of a toll-booth economy; wage liberalisation and the destruction of collective bargaining. The policies that made the global monarchs so rich are the policies squeezing everyone else. This is not what the theory predicted. Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman and their disciples – in a thousand business schools, the IMF, the World Bank, the OECD and just about every modern government – have argued that the less governments tax the rich, defend workers and redistribute wealth, the more prosperous everyone will be. Any attempt to reduce inequality would damage the efficiency of the market, impeding the rising tide that lifts all boats. The apostles have conducted a 30-year global experiment, and the results are now in. Total failure. Before I go on, I should point out that I don't believe perpetual economic growth is either sustainable or desirable. But if growth is your aim – an aim to which every government claims to subscribe – you couldn't make a bigger mess of it than by releasing the super-rich from the constraints of democracy. Last year's annual report by the UN Conference on Trade and Development should have been an obituary for the neoliberal model developed by Hayek and Friedman and their disciples. It shows unequivocally that their policies have created the opposite outcomes to those they predicted. As neoliberal policies (cutting taxes for the rich, privatising state assets, deregulating labour, reducing social security) began to bite from the 1980s onwards, growth rates started to fall and unemployment to rise. The remarkable growth in the rich nations during the 50s, 60s and 70s was made possible by the destruction of the wealth and power of the elite, as a result of the 1930s depression and the second world war. Their embarrassment gave the other 99% an unprecedented chance to demand redistribution, state spending and social security, all of which stimulated demand. Neoliberalism was an attempt to turn back these reforms. Lavishly funded by millionaires, its advocates were amazingly successful – politically. Economically they flopped. Throughout the OECD countries taxation has become more regressive: the rich pay less, the poor pay more. The result, the neoliberals claimed, would be that economic efficiency and investment would rise, enriching everyone. The opposite occurred. As taxes on the rich and on business diminished, the spending power of both the state and poorer people fell, and demand contracted. The result was that investment rates declined, in step with companies' expectations of growth. The neoliberals also insisted that unrestrained inequality in incomes and flexible wages would reduce unemployment. But throughout the rich world both inequality and unemployment have soared. The recent jump in unemployment in most developed countries – worse than in any previous recession of the past three decades – was preceded by the lowest level of wages as a share of GDP since the second world war. Bang goes the theory. It failed for the same obvious reason: low wages suppress demand, which suppresses employment. As wages stagnated, people supplemented their income with debt. Rising debt fed the deregulated banks, with consequences of which we are all aware. The greater inequality becomes, the UN report finds, the less stable the economy and the lower its rates of growth. The policies with which neoliberal governments seek to reduce their deficits and stimulate their economies are counter-productive. The impending reduction of the UK's top rate of income tax (from 50% to 45%) will not boost government revenue or private enterprise, but it will enrich the speculators who tanked the economy. Goldman Sachs and other banks are now thinking of delaying their bonus payments to take advantage of it. The welfare bill approved by parliament last week will not help to clear the deficit or stimulate employment: it will reduce demand, suppressing economic recovery. The same goes for the capping of public sector pay. "Relearning some old lessons about fairness and participation," the UN says, "is the only way to eventually overcome the crisis and pursue a path of sustainable economic development." As I say, I have no dog in this race, except a belief that no one, in this sea of riches, should have to be poor. But staring dumbfounded at the lessons unlearned in Britain, Europe and the US, it strikes me that the entire structure of neoliberal thought is a fraud. The demands of the ultra-rich have been dressed up as sophisticated economic theory and applied regardless of the outcome. The complete failure of this world-scale experiment is no impediment to its repetition. This has nothing to do with economics. It has everything to do with power.

### Stiglitz: Energy & Prices

#### Neoliberal policies fail inevitably, locking in energy price spikes and cyclical global economic crises---no economic theory supports it

Stiglitz 8 (Joseph E., Nobel laureate in economics and University Professor at Columbia University, was Chairman of President Bill Clinton’s Council of Economic Advisers and served as Senior Vice President and Chief Economist of the World Bank, 7/7/8, “The End of Neo-liberalism?,” <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-end-of-neo-liberalism->)

The world has not been kind to neo-liberalism, that grab-bag of ideas based on the fundamentalist notion that markets are self-correcting, allocate resources efficiently, and serve the public interest well. It was this market fundamentalism that underlay Thatcherism, Reaganomics, and the so-called “Washington Consensus” in favor of privatization, liberalization, and independent central banks focusing single-mindedly on inflation. For a quarter-century, there has been a contest among developing countries, and the losers are clear: countries that pursued neo-liberal policies not only lost the growth sweepstakes; when they did grow, the benefits accrued disproportionately to those at the top. Though neo-liberals do not want to admit it, their ideology also failed another test. No one can claim that financial markets did a stellar job in allocating resources in the late 1990’s, with 97% of investments in fiber optics taking years to see any light. But at least that mistake had an unintended benefit: as costs of communication were driven down, India and China became more integrated into the global economy. But it is hard to see such benefits to the massive misallocation of resources to housing. The newly constructed homes built for families that could not afford them get trashed and gutted as millions of families are forced out of their homes, in some communities, government has finally stepped in – to remove the remains. In others, the blight spreads. So even those who have been model citizens, borrowing prudently and maintaining their homes, now find that markets have driven down the value of their homes beyond their worst nightmares. To be sure, there were some short-term benefits from the excess investment in real estate: some Americans (perhaps only for a few months) enjoyed the pleasures of home ownership and living in a bigger home than they otherwise would have. But at what a cost to themselves and the world economy! Millions will lose their life savings as they lose their homes. And the housing foreclosures have precipitated a global slowdown. There is an increasing consensus on the prognosis: this downturn will be prolonged and widespread. Nor did markets prepare us well for soaring oil and food prices. Of course, neither sector is an example of free-market economics, but that is partly the point: free-market rhetoric has been used selectively – embraced when it serves special interests and discarded when it does not. Perhaps one of the few virtues of George W. Bush’s administration is that the gap between rhetoric and reality is narrower than it was under Ronald Reagan. For all Reagan’s free-trade rhetoric, he freely imposed trade restrictions, including the notorious “voluntary” export restraints on automobiles. Bush’s policies have been worse, but the extent to which he has openly served America’s military-industrial complex has been more naked. The only time that the Bush administration turned green was when it came to ethanol subsidies, whose environmental benefits are dubious. Distortions in the energy market (especially through the tax system) continue, and if Bush could have gotten away with it, matters would have been worse. This mixture of free-market rhetoric and government intervention has worked particularly badly for developing countries. They were told to stop intervening in agriculture, thereby exposing their farmers to devastating competition from the United States and Europe. Their farmers might have been able to compete with American and European farmers, but they could not compete with US and European Union subsidies. Not surprisingly, investments in agriculture in developing countries faded, and a food gap widened. Those who promulgated this mistaken advice do not have to worry about carrying malpractice insurance. The costs will be borne by those in developing countries, especially the poor. This year will see a large rise in poverty, especially if we measure it correctly. Simply put, in a world of plenty, millions in the developing world still cannot afford the minimum nutritional requirements. In many countries, increases in food and energy prices will have a particularly devastating effect on the poor, because these items constitute a larger share of their expenditures. The anger around the world is palpable. Speculators, not surprisingly, have borne more than a little of the wrath. The speculators argue: we are not the cause of the problem; we are simply engaged in “price discovery” – in other words, discovering – a little late to do much about the problem this year – that there is scarcity. But that answer is disingenuous. Expectations of rising and volatile prices encourage hundreds of millions of farmers to take precautions. They might make more money if they hoard a little of their grain today and sell it later; and if they do not, they won’t be able to afford it if next year’s crop is smaller than hoped. A little grain taken off the market by hundreds of millions of farmers around the world adds up. Defenders of market fundamentalism want to shift the blame from market failure to government failure. One senior Chinese official was quoted as saying that the problem was that the US government should have done more to help low-income Americans with their housing. I agree. But that does not change the facts: US banks mismanaged risk on a colossal scale, with global consequences, while those running these institutions have walked away with billions of dollars in compensation. Today, there is a mismatch between social and private returns. Unless they are closely aligned, the market system cannot work well. Neo-liberal market fundamentalism was always a political doctrine serving certain interests. It was never supported by economic theory. Nor, it should now be clear, is it supported by historical experience. Learning this lesson may be the silver lining in the cloud now hanging over the global economy.

## AT: Neolib K2 Peace

### Han: Correlation & Dem

#### To the extent that capitalism creates peace, it’s only through social democratic capitalism, not neoliberalism---market liberalization has no theoretical correlation to peace

Mousseau 12 (Michael, Professor of International Relations at Koç University and Director of the Center for Conflict Studies in Istanbul, “A Market-Capitalist or a Democratic Peace?,” in What Do We Know About War, second edition, ed. Vasquez, p. 207-208)

This chapter explored the state of theory and evidence on the capitalist peace and its prospects for explaining the democratic peace. Two kinds of capitalist peace theories were distinguished, the free-market and the social-market, yielding four observable causal mechanisms: trade, capital openness, and size of private sector as free-market theories, and contract-intensive economy as the social-market theory. Analyses of these causal mechanisms indicate that the free-market theories are not viable explanations for the democratic peace or the peace among the advanced industrial nations, primarily because none of them correlate substantially with democracy or developed democracy; they do not even correlate much with each other. Only the social-market measure of contract-intensive economy correlates moderately with democracy and developed democracy. Application of the theories to the case of the Falklands/ Malvinas War yields similar results: this war appears as an anomalous case for the trade (Weede 1996) and capital openness (Gartzke et al. 2001) models, while the public sector model (McDonald 2007) identifies Britain as a non-capitalist state; only the social-market model (Mousseau 2000) offers an account for this conflict. Finally, analyses of fatal militarized interstate disputes from 1961 to 2001 corroborate that the democratic peace is spurious, with contract-intensive economy the more likely explanation for both democracy and the "democratic" peace. The free-market theories also face problems of internal and external validity. Regarding internal validity, to account for a peace between developed nations, all of these theories critically assume that free markets cause economic development. Yet the scientific evidence tells us this is not so (Gurr, Jaggers, and Moore 1990). Regarding external validity, for all but the most myopic observers of global affairs it is clear that the peace among the advanced capitalist nations is much more than restraint due to the high cost of killing each other (Weede 1996), fear of each other's resolve (Gartzke et al. 2001), or the credibility in their commitments (McDonald 2007). These theories may be correct, but it is apparent that these nations do more than just tolerate each other; they are friends. This is evident from the fact that whenever a capitalist economy takes a turn for the worse, the other capitalist nations seek to boost it back up, overcoming collective action problems with negotiations enhanced by shared norms of equity and law. The capitalist nations are not better balancers: they do not balance. They do not simply read each other's signals better or send or receive better information: they know that other capitalist nations will never attack them. Indeed, the very image of war today between France and Germany is comical, yet until they became market capitalist only five decades ago these two nations slaughtered each other with seeming zeal roughly every generation.

### AT Gartzke

#### Gartzke’s model has significant missing values which biases its findings

Han 12 (Zhen, MA, Political Science, University of British Columbia, March 2012, “The Capitalist Peace Revisited: A New Liberal Peace Model and the Impact of Market Fluctuations,” https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/41809/ubc\_2012\_spring\_han\_zhen.pdf?sequence=1)

The missing value problem needs serious attention for the students who study liberal peace models. Dafoe finds that missing values in Gartzke’s models are systematically associated with its major explanatory variable—market openness96 , thus leads to a biased conclusion. For example, China, the U.S.S.R, and North Korea were involved in several militarized interstate conflicts, but a significant part of the market openness is missing for these countries97, and excluding these cases from the model leads to a bias. While Dafoe assigns value 1 (least open to financial market) to all the missing values of China, U.S.S.R and North Korea, he finds that market openness lost its significance and democracy become significant again98. But Dafoe’s approach can be problematic as well, because these nations may be open to each other while staying closed to the west or the global financial markets. In case of North Korea, foreign capital from the U .S.S.R and China are pivotal to the survival of the regime.

#### Correcting for those missing values proves market liberalization causes conflict---Gartzke’s backwards

Han 12 (Zhen, MA, Political Science, University of British Columbia, March 2012, “The Capitalist Peace Revisited: A New Liberal Peace Model and the Impact of Market Fluctuations,” https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/41809/ubc\_2012\_spring\_han\_zhen.pdf?sequence=1)

Model 1 replicates Model 5 of Gartzke’s capitalist peace paper100. A major difference between the findings of Model 1 and Gartzke’s capitalist peace Model 5 is that, Model 1 of this paper shows that higher level of financial market openness is positively associated with more conflict, while Gartzke finds his market openness index is negatively associated with more conflict101. As Dafoe points out, Gartzke’s finding can be damaged by the missing values in his market openness variable, and the temporal dependence and cross-sectional dependence are not properly controlled102. Model 1 pays close attention to these problems, and finds that, at least in this period, market openness is positively associated with more conflicts. As the data of this paper focuses on a different time period, this result does not suggest Gartzke is wrong, but further explanation of why market openness is positively associated with more conflict is necessary. The low value of democracy is negatively associated with conflicts, and this finding is consistent with the argument of democratic peace theory. The positive impact of the high value of democracy possibly shows that a discrepant dyad—when the democracy low value is controlled—is more likely to fight each other. As Choi points out, the interpretation of the democracy high variable is often difficult, but it seems the democratic peace theory is well supported by this data. The traditional commercial peace theory, which focuses on the trade dependency created by international commodity trade, is also supported by this model. Development makes noncontiguous states more likely to fight each other, as the development facilitated the capacity of states to project power to a longer distance, but development also makes contiguous states less likely to fight each other103. This finding supports that the interaction effect between contiguity and development is also robust in this period. Being a major power makes the state more likely to be involved in conflicts. Similar to this finding, a state is more likely to be involved in MIDs if its national power index is higher. However, formal alliances have no significant impact on the probability of MIDs. Model 2 replaces the high value of democracy with the democracy distance variable104 . Since the democracy distance variable is a linear transformation of the high value of democracy105 , this replacement produces identical results to Model 1, but the interpretation of democratic peace in this model is much easier. The positive and significant impact of the democracy distance variable supports the expectation from Choi: politically different countries— the authoritarian states and the democratic states—are more likely to fight each other 106 . Different political ideology can be the underlining reason for tension. As this paper suggests before, since many pacifying mechanisms available for democracies do not exist in autocratic and discrepant dyads, the same democracy distance should have different impact in different types of dyad. Model 3.1 applies this proposal and makes the lower value of democracy interact with the democracy distance variable. The findings are impressive: The negative coefficient of the lower value of democracy becomes significant again; the coefficient of democracy distance loses its significance, but the interaction effects between these two variables are positively significant. This finding supports the democratic peace argument: countries are less likely to fight if they both are highly democratic, but this pacifying effect has been mitigated if the democracy distance is getting bigger. Figure 1 presents a prediction of the probability of conflict based on Model 3.1. It shows that the probability of conflict is almost the same for autocratic and discrepant dyads, and both of them are much higher than the probability for democratic dyads. Model 3.2 replaces the low value of democracy with a three-category indicator of dyad type 107 and makes the dyad type indicator interacting with the democracy distance variable. The result shows that, compared with the base category (democratic dyad), the risk of fighting is higher in the other two types of dyads. In the base category, democratic distance does not have significant impact on their chance of fighting. Figure 2 shows how the predicted probability of conflict, based on Model 3.2, changes across different dyad types. The predicted probability shows that one can confidently claim that democratic dyads are more peaceful than other types of dyad, but the upward trend, which is similar to the trend showing in the predicted chance of fighting for autocracies, shows that bigger democracy distance leads to more conflicts in these two types of dyads. The discrepant dyad group generally behaves similarly to the autocracy group, except that the downward trend of the curve, showing that instead of fighting for different democratic ideology, shows discrepant dyads often fight for other reasons. However, the confidence interval of the discrepant dyad group largely overlaps with the confidence interval of the autocracy group, so more data are needed to distinguish whether discrepant dyads behave differently from autocracy dyads. In conclusion, this paper argues that the democratic peace model can be improved by interacting the democracy distance variable with the other democracy measurement of the dyad. Findings from these interaction models support the dyadic claim that ―democratic countries are unlikely to fight each other‖, but they also suggest one cannot extend this claim to the monadic level. Democratic countries are not more peaceful, as the chance of conflicts is high in a discrepant dyad. Increasing ideological differences, as measured by the democracy distance variable in these models, can increase the chances of conflicts. On the commercial peace aspect, Model 1 of this paper suggests that higher market openness can lead to more conflicts. This positive correlation might be explained by the spillover effect of market fluctuation. In order to capture the impact of market fluctuation, Model 4 added a set of variables related to the measurement of foreign capital net inflows to the model. The results show that, once the capital flow factors are considered in the model, the market openness variable loses its significance, and a higher level of capital net inflow is positively associated with more interstate conflicts. The missing value indicator of capital net inflows is included in the model to control the damage caused by missing data in the capital net inflow variable. This missing indicator is positive and significant, suggesting that missing economic data are systematically associated with militarized conflicts. The lagged capital net inflows variable, measured as the percentage of GDP, is included in the model, and higher level of capital net inflows is associated with a higher risk of conflicts. The change of capital net inflow variable, which is measured by the level of current capital net inflows minus the level of the one-year lagged capital net inflows, is also positively associated with more conflicts, meaning the risk of conflict is higher if there are more foreign capitals pouring into the country. These findings support the theory of this paper that large capital inflows can destabilize the domestic economy and cause crises, but they are also contrary to the conventional understanding that foreign capital will leave the conflicting region. However, it can be explained by the following reasons.

#### Consensus of new studies rejects Gartzke’s capitalist peace model---neoliberal market volatility means it doesn’t contribute to peace

Zhen Han 12, MA, Political Science, University of British Columbia, March 2012, “The Capitalist Peace Revisited: A New Liberal Peace Model and the Impact of Market Fluctuations,” https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/41809/ubc\_2012\_spring\_han\_zhen.pdf?sequence=1

Erik Gartzke’s prize-winning paper “the Capitalist Peace” is a pioneer of testing the relations between market openness in this new era and interstate conflicts by combining commercial peace data and economic data on market openness4 . He finds that if two states have a higher level of market openness, they are less likely to have interstate conflicts5 . His findings also challenge the democratic peace theory, as he finds that democracy has no significant correlation with peace once control for market openness6 . These findings raise questions of the two major components—democratic peace and commercial peace—of the liberal peace model. Some recent studies challenge Gartzke by arguing that 1.) His measurement of democracy is problematic7 ; 2.) Missing values in his data has created a selection bias in his conclusion; 3.) Temporal dependence and regional dependence are not properly controlled for in his statistical model8 . The debate between Gartzke and his critics begs a new liberal peace model—a model in which democracy and market openness are properly measured, and dependence across cases are properly controlled. This thesis tries to build and test such a model with data focusing on later time periods when the data availability is better. In section 2, this paper reviews the current debate on the two pillars of liberal peace—democratic peace theory and commercial peace theory, and suggests some new measurements to improve conventional quantitative studies on liberal peace. Section 3 reviews the debate on methodological issues, such as the proper way to control temporal dependence, and proposes a new statistical model to test the liberal peace theory. Section 4 introduces the datasets used in this study. The missing variable problem, which has poisoned some previous studies on commercial peace, is also discussed in this section. Section 5 reports the findings from the new liberal peace models of this paper, and section 6 provides some discussion for future studies. The results of these new statistical models of liberal peace theorie shows that while traditional democratic peace and commercial peace remain robust in the new era of global financial integration, the pacifying effect of commercial ties is weakened by the volatile fluctuations in the international financial market.

## AT: Transition

### Transition Inevitable

#### Transition wars are an ideological lie---they’re happening now as neolib inevitably collapses---it’s try or die for embracing alternative social models that challenge green capitalist measures like the plan

Ingar Solty 12, Politics Editor of Das Argument, and co-founder and Board member of the North-Atlantic Left Dialogue (NALD), an annual summit of left intellectuals organized by the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation and funded by the German Foreign Office, 2012, “After neoliberalism: left versus right projects of leadership in the global crisis,” in Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership, ed. Gill, p. 213-215

The alternative to a failure of utilizing this crisis for a renewal of capitalism and hegemony appears to be an increasing slide into some form of barbarism. Again, barbarism should also be understood as a cipher, inasmuch as it means an acceleration of trends already present within neoliberal capitalism. This includes the rise of authoritarian forms of rule as well as the forceful management of the growing contradictions of global capitalism through new imperial endeavours, motivated both by geo-economic and geopolitical considerations and the likely growth of ‘blowbacks’ and neoliberal ‘boomerangs’ from the global South. In other words, this development should be understood as a radicalization of the ‘new imperialism’ that emerged precisely in response to the crises produced by neoliberalism and particularly the attempt of the United States to use force as a means to avoid or deter hegemonic decline. The strengthening of elements of authoritarian capitalism would suggest growing inter-imperial rivalries, especially between the United States and China but possibly also between the United States and a German-led European Union. This scenario would also involve a potential fragmentation of the world market (e.g. through protectionism against German exports in the European Union, and possibly also in the United States, and against Chinese exports, especially in the United States but potentially also in Europe), a growing geoeconomic conflict over the world’s resources, particularly fossil fuels, and the necessary internal authoritarianism to complement and reinforce such inter-imperial rivalries. Nonetheless, this historic moment is open, and a third alternative does exist. This can be seen partly in the emergence of the BRIC states (Brazil, Russia, India, China) and their attempts at developing not only growing economic, political and ideological independence from the global North but also social and political alternatives to the status quo. At the same time, these semi-peripheral big players are in ideological struggles with, for example, those states of the Latin American ALBA coalition (the Bolivarian Alliance for the People of Our America), which includes Venezuela and Bolivia, that seems to be moving more or less in the direction of an alternative to capitalism, or what it calls ‘twenty-first-century socialism’ – a move that is complemented by new regional military alliance structures. Similarly, also in the global North, the crisis of neoliberal hegemony has led not only to a vacuum filled by right-wing populist parties but, in some cases, most notably in Germany, the rise of political forces that, at least nominally, strive to replace capitalism with democratic socialism, understood as an economic system based on different forms of collective ownership. It is clear that the German situation is an exception throughout the (leading states of the) global North. All the same, it does mean that alternative political projects exist that challenge green capitalist ‘alternatives’ to neoliberal capitalism. Of course, it might be exactly the emergence and growing strength of such projects, alongside a noticeable new militancy within labour movements across Europe, that fuels the reestablishment of a new form of capitalist hegemony under a green capitalist order. At the same time, the differences between green capitalism and authoritarian capitalism must under no circumstances be downplayed, since, as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels noted in a clear non-teleological moment in probably their most historico-philosophical text, the Manifesto of the Communist Party, the history of class struggle may also end with the ‘common demise of the struggling classes’ (Marx and Engels 1974 [1848]).

## AT: Squo Improving

### Gill: Shaped by Neolib

#### The claim that the squo is improving is neoliberal ideology with no evidence---the system’s getting more unequal and more environmentally destructive

Stephen Gill 12, Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science, York University, Toronto, and a former Distinguished Scholar in International Political Economy of the International Studies Association, 2012, Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership, p. 13

The enormous business literature on global leadership is also concerned with the problems confronting the transnational capitalist class, but sees these principally not as political and ecological challenges (and implicitly questions of legitimacy) but as problems of efficient corporate management or administration, decision-making and processes, and cultural and political sensitivity to local conditions. The litmus test of leadership is the level of profit in global markets. Oddly enough, relatively neglected in the management literature – as well as in much of the literature just reviewed – are the many important global forums that help to shape the strategic perspectives of capital and the state. Examples include the World Business Council on Sustainable Development and the scenario planning used by corporations and government agencies (e.g. by Shell, whose methods have been used by the CIA) not only to influence policy but also to anticipate political challenges to economic and cultural globalization. Organizations such as the World Economic Forum, the Trilateral Commission and the new Clinton Global Initiative (CGI) bring together dominant globalizing elites from government, corporations, universities, political parties, media, entertainment, the sciences and the arts to forge a consensus and to initiate strategic concepts of global leadership. What seems to be missing from these initiatives is precisely what Sklair (2000) claims was being attempted over a decade ago: comprehensive *evidence* of well-resourced, broad-based and serious efforts to deal with ever-widening global inequality, the systematic undermining and dispossession of livelihoods and growing threats to the integrity of the biosphere. The fact that this evidence is not forthcoming is perhaps not surprising if one reflects on the realities of the existing state of relations between rulers and ruled on a world scale. Why should international capitalists worry about growing global inequality and class polarization, or, indeed, the future of the planet, if there are no powerful political forces that force them to do so? Perhaps a more convincing hypothesis is that, far from creating a coherent redistributive and ecologically sustainable structure of globalization presided over by a transnational capitalist class, the opposite is true. What is gradually emerging is a more and more unequal and increasingly hierarchical global political and civil society directed by dominant social forces associated with disciplinary neoliberalism that seek to extend market civilization on a world scale, in ways that will further class polarization and the ecological crisis alike.

### Goodman: Snapshot

#### Their ev is a snapshot that can’t account for the future trajectory of neolib---it’s unsustainable and causes environmental system collapse

Goodman 11 (Benny, Faculty of Health, Education and Society, Plymouth University, June 2011, “Transformation for Health and Sustainability: “Consumption is Killing Us,”” http://www.academia.edu/666114/Transformation\_for\_health\_and\_sustainability\_Dualism\_and\_Anthropocentrism)

Ben Ami (2010) tells us however that growth is good, consumption is good and we could have "Ferraris for air. He argues that in advanced industrial societies we have seen decreases in infant and maternal mortality rates and increasing life expectancy coupled with control of infections. We live longer healthier lives. Hans Rosling in his online gapminder series also points out that these indicators are also rising in many developing countries, but he warns that success may literally cost the earth. So how can consumption be killing us? Well, it isn't. Goklany (2006) argues that economic growth, technological change and free trade has helped to power a "cycle of progress" that in the last two centuries enabled unprecedented improvements in every objective measurement of human well-being. Poverty, hunger, malnutrition, child labor, illiteracy and unsafe water have ceased to be global norms; infant mortality has never been lower; and we live longer and healthier lives. Further, Goklany’s research suggests that global agricultural productivity is up, food prices are down, hunger and malnutrition have dropped worldwide, public health has improved, mortality rates are down, and life expectancies are up. So that its then, we are fine. Except that since he wrote that in 2006 the world saw one food crisis in 2008 and this year 2011 the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation are giving the global food market 'critical' status, again. The Millennium Development Goals have still to be met and maternal and infant mortality is still at numbers too high in many countries to enable any level of complacency. However, if you view the world anthropocentrically within the frame of reference of consumer capitalism and you happen to live in advanced industrial nations in wealthy suburbs. You can even muster hard empirical evidence to show the beneficence of the global economic system. The problem with this viewpoint is time frame. Seen from the last 200 years enormous, unprecedented progress has without doubt been made. However the time frame for a proper assessment of the current global system is much longer than that. Even in human time frames the last 200 years is a very short period of history. Depending on definition, the Roman Empire lasted over 400 years, and from the steps of the senate, Julius Ceaser may have dreamed of a millennium of Roman domination. World history is littered with the ruins of human civilizations, hubris comes before a fall. We are not Rome or Byzantium. We have controlled the natural environment (up to a point) to produce food and shelter for billions. However there is a poverty of spirit, a neglect of the 'bottom billion', willful ignorance of the casualties of inequalities based capitalism, a disconnect from environmental destruction and a lack of vision of alternatives that may lead to more healthy, sustainable lives on a finite planet as we bump up against limits. Of course, assertions about limits needs some evidence. A key paper in this respect is that which addresses the issue of planetary boundaries - i.e. that there are limits to what we can achieve on this planet, that we need urgently to identify what these limits are and then to address what socioeconomic conditions would allow all of humanity to live within the planet boundaries. If we do not do this, the argument runs, then the ecosystem services upon which all of us (the biosphere) may well collapse leading to a cull of humanity in line with the extinctions we are already exacting on the living world right now. Rockstrom et al (2009) have tried to identify what the key boundaries are and what the limits are within each. They suggest that humanity has already transgressed three of nine boundaries: 1. CO2 emissions for climate change. 2. Biodiversity loss. 3. Biochemical boundaries - the nitrogen cycle (the phosphorous cycle has not yet been transgressed) The other boundaries discussed include: 4. Ocean acidification 5. Stratospheric ozone depletion 6. Global fresh water use 7. Change in land use 8. Atmospheric aerosol loading (not yet quantified). 9. Chemical pollution (not yet quantified). They also argue: "In the last 200 years, humanity has transitioned into a new geological era—termed the Anthropocene—which is defined by an accelerating departure from the stable environmental conditions of the past 12,000 years into a new, unknown state of Earth". "In order to maintain a global environment that is conducive for human development and well-being, we must define and respect planetary boundaries that delineate a 'safe operating space' for humanity. We must return to the long-term stable global environment that nurtured human development'.

### AT: Empirics

#### The status quo only appears to be structurally improving because elites are gaining so much while the masses starve---aggregate measurements overlook structural inequality that makes the system unsustainable

Stephen Gill 12, Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science, York University, Toronto, and a former Distinguished Scholar in International Political Economy of the International Studies Association, 2012, Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership, p. 6-8

Nonetheless, some might query whether there really is, actually or potentially, a ‘global’ organic crisis, since many parts of the world, such as India and China, have continued to grow and develop; indeed, Craig Murphy has noted that many parts of the global South have had a ‘good crisis’, insofar as many of the reforms that they implemented in response to the Asian financial and economic crisis of 1997–8 have made their financial structures and patterns of economic development more internally robust and better insulated from external financial shocks originating in New York, London or Tokyo (Murphy 2010). Murphy’s point is well made. It is of course important to emphasize the geographical and social unevenness of both the experience and impacts of financial and economic crises across the global social and geopolitical hierarchy. However, this is only part of the story. It is also important to reflect critically on the nature and quality of existing development patterns, particularly those that serve to generalize the dominant model of market civilization – a development model that is wasteful, energy-intensive, consumerist, ecologically myopic and premised on catering mainly to the affluent. Moreover, the development of China and India is far from the happy story some seem to paint – a point that the Chinese leadership seems to have recently acknowledged by prioritizing redistribution and social welfare in its next five-year plan, not least to deal with growing social and ecological contradictions and widespread political unrest. For example, every day in China there are enormous numbers of localized protests concerning living conditions and corruption. Illustrating the displacement of livelihoods and the crisis of social reproduction that characterizes the present phase of primitive accumulation in China, the government estimates that 58 million ‘left-behind children’ (almost 20 per cent of all children in China and about a half of the children living in the countryside) now live with their grandparents or in foster centres, because their parents have left to earn income in the factories and cities (Hille 2011): Mao sent millions of parents into labour camps and their children to the countryside; he forced families to abandon the stoves in their homes and to use communal kitchens and dorms. Even so, Mao failed, ultimately, to destroy the family as the basic cell of Chinese society. Today, what the dictator was unable to accomplish with force is being realized instead by the lure of money. Meanwhile, in India, we see mass suicides of farmers as a debt crisis envelops their lives; elsewhere in the country perhaps as many as 800 million poor people have been hardly touched by the changes. Most live in the shadow of ‘shining India’. The global situation is therefore replete with deep contradictions. On the one hand, few would deny that material conditions are improving for many Chinese and Indians, and that this should continue to be the case. On the other hand, if the market civilization model of capitalist development not only continues in the wealthier countries but also becomes more generalized in India, China and other large developing countries such as Brazil (notwithstanding President Lula’s redistributive policies), and also assuming that the US rulers sustain their policies and military capabilities along similar lines to now in order to defend and extend that model, I hypothesize that the global organic crisis will intensify. Its effects will be felt in ways that will be uneven geographically, unequal politically and socially and materially hierarchical. Put differently, the organic crisis may also be globalizing across regions and societies at varying speeds, and it will probably be differentiated in its effects on life chances and basic conditions of existence, generating diverse political effects within and across jurisdictions and throughout the social and political spectrum. Politically, and perhaps paradoxically, at this moment the global organic crisis has not been manifested as a crisis of legitimacy in the global North (although less so in many parts of the global South).However, the question is: will this situation persist – and, indeed, can the current neoliberal frameworks of global leadership retain legitimacy and credibility while developing a constructive and meaningful set of policies to address it? If not, what are the prospects for alternative concepts of global leadership and frameworks of rule?

### AT Goklany

#### Goklany’s wrong, oversimplified, and neolib destroys all the reasons the status quo is improving

Surowiecki 7 (James, journalist and financial writer for The New Yorker, 7/18/7, “The Myth of Inevitable Progress,” http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/the\_myth\_of\_inevitable\_progres.hstml)

"Day by day, in every way, I am getting better and better." That mantra, invented by the self-taught psychologist Émile Coué in the nineteenth century, kept running through my head as I read Indur Goklany's new book on the relationship between economic growth and human and environmental progress, The Improving State of the World. Just as Coué told his patients that incessant repetition of his mantra would make it come true, Goklany seems to believe that saying often enough -- and in enough different ways -- that life today is better than ever will make it so.¶ Goklany depicts a global economy in which nearly all signs are positive -- and in which the problems that do exist, such as stagnation or setbacks in sub-Saharan Africa and the former Soviet Union, will be solved if economic growth and technological improvements are allowed to work their magic. Nor is this, in Goklany's account, a new phenomenon. He marshals an impressive array of historical data to argue that the trajectory of the twentieth century has been generally upward and onward. Taken as a whole, Goklany argues, humanity really has been getting better and better day by day, so that today, as his subtitle puts it, "we're living longer, healthier, more comfortable lives on a cleaner planet."¶ Seen from a broad historical perspective, this description is, for most people, accurate enough. Just about everyone living today is the beneficiary of what can almost certainly be called the single most consequential development in human history -- namely, the onset of industrialization. As the economic historian Angus Maddison has shown in a series of studies of economic development over the past two millennia, human economies grew very little, if at all, for most of human history. Between 1000 and 1820 or so, Maddison estimates, annual economic growth was around 0.05 percent a year -- which meant that living standards improved incredibly slowly and that people living in 1800 were only mildly better off than people living in 1000. But sometime around 1820, that all began to change. Between 1820 and today, world per capita real income grew 20 times as fast as it did in the previous eight centuries. ¶ In the West, above all, the effects of this transformation have been so massive as to be practically unfathomable. Real income, life expectancy, literacy and education rates, and food consumption have soared, while infant mortality, hours worked, and food prices have plummeted. And although the West has been the biggest beneficiary of these changes, the diffusion of technology, medicine, and agricultural techniques has meant that developing countries have enjoyed dramatic improvements in what the United Nations calls "human development indicators," even if most of their citizens remain poor. One consequence of this is that people at a given income level today are likely to be healthier and to live longer than people at the same income level did 40 or 50 years ago. ¶ In one sense, all of this should be obvious, since a moment's thought -- or a quick read of a nineteenth-century novel -- should suffice to remind you of how much better, at least in material terms, life is today than it was a century ago, let alone in the 1600s. But as behavioral economists have persuasively demonstrated, human beings quickly adapt to their surroundings and come to take their current state of affairs for granted. In other words, it is difficult, even after your life has changed dramatically for the better, to remain aware of just how much better it is, and even harder to truly appreciate how much better you have it than your great-grandparents did. So part of Goklany's project here -- and it is a valuable part -- is to make clear just how much real progress there has been over the past two centuries and even (in many places) over the past two decades in the life of the average human being. ¶ THE ANTI-MALTHUS¶ Goklany's target is not just the natural tendency of human beings to take things for granted. His real opponents are what he calls the "neo-Malthusians" -- those who are convinced that there are natural limits to growth and that humanity has been butting up against them for quite some time now. The neo-Malthusians had their heyday in the 1960s and early 1970s, with works such as Paul Ehrlich's The Population Bomb and the Club of Rome's appropriately titled The Limits to Growth. Although their doomsaying about population growth and industrialization is no longer front-page news, their deep-seated skepticism about the virtues of economic growth and their conviction that the richer people get, the worse things become for the earth remain an important strand of modern environmentalism. If Goklany sees progress everywhere he looks, the neo-Malthusians see impending disaster: air pollution, the disappearance of habitats, the emptying of aquifers, the demolition of forest cover, and the proliferation of new diseases. Day by day, in every way, in other words, we are getting worse and worse. ¶ The problem with neo-Malthusianism, as Goklany appropriately suggests, is that it has consistently underestimated the beneficial effects of technological change. The e = mc2 of the neo-Malthusians was introduced three decades ago, when Paul Ehrlich and John Holdren invented the equation I = PAT. Environmental impact (I) was said to be the product of population size (P), level of affluence (A), and technological efficiency (T). According to this logic, not only are population growth and economic growth bad for the earth, but so, too, is technological change, since it has a multiplier effect on the other two factors. The only way to save the planet, from the neo-Malthusians' perspective, is to set strict limits on human behavior, doing everything possible to rein in businesses and consumers. ¶ The I = PAT formula was not pulled completely out of thin air. As societies get richer and more populous, they do consume more resources, and, especially in the early phases of economic growth, they do so with a measure of indifference to the overall impact on the environment. But what the equation misses, and what Goklany spends a good chunk of his book demonstrating, is that technology can actually reduce environmental impact, thereby diminishing the demands made by affluence and population growth. A classic example of this effect is the massive expansion in the efficiency of agricultural productivity over the past 40 years. Productivity gains have dramatically reduced the environmental burden of farming (at least on the land -- there have not been similar advances in the efficient use of water) and shrunk the amount of land needed to feed the world. More recently, technological improvements in the scrubbing of power-plant smokestacks have brought about a sharp reduction in the amount of sulfur dioxide in the air. Improvements in the efficiency of wind and solar power have reduced (albeit only a little) the demand for fossil fuels. And although the impact of these innovations has been felt most strongly in the developed world, they have also improved conditions in the developing world, at least with regard to things such as access to clean water and some types of air emissions. Goklany may be exaggerating somewhat when he says that the entire planet -- as opposed to just the developed world -- is cleaner, but it is in fact not an outrageous claim. ¶ The paradox here is that technological change is generally associated with (or is actually the result of) increased affluence, which makes it likely that an economy will get cleaner even as it gets richer. And empirically, that does seem to be the case. After all, developed countries do generally have cleaner air, cleaner water, more forest cover, and less cropland devoted to food production than developing countries do, even though the latter are much poorer. The obvious, and important, exception is CO2 emissions and the broader problem of climate change. But Goklany -- who spends too much of his book offering an overly familiar critique of excessive action in response to global warming -- argues that now that Americans are increasingly concerned about climate change, technology will soon help mitigate the problem. ¶ All of this does not mean that the United States is less polluted than it was in 1787, let alone than it was when it was inhabited only by Native Americans. But it does mean that the United States is arguably less polluted today than at any time in the last 100 years and that the last 40 years or so, in particular, have seen a dramatic improvement in the quality of air and water. And the same is true, to lesser and greater extents, in the rest of the developed world. One hypothesis for why this has historically occurred is demonstrated by what is called the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC). When graphed, the relationship between prosperity and environmental degradation looks like an upside-down U. Initially, as countries grow, they trade off environmental well-being for economic growth -- that is, as they get richer, they also get more polluted. At some point, however, they become prosperous enough to shift their priorities and begin to seek out ways to grow more cleanly. Goklany suggests a variation on the EKC, the "environmental transition hypothesis," which tries to account for time and technology as well as affluence. The invention and spread of new technologies, he suggests, make it easier and more likely for countries to get on the right side of the U-curve quickly, even before they have become rich; the "green revolution," for instance, allowed poor countries to reduce the environmental burden of farming. ¶ FREE MARKETS, FREE PEOPLE¶ The environmental transition hypothesis is a reasonable way of thinking about the relationship between prosperity, technology, and people's expectations about the environment. And Goklany's rebuttal to the environmental doomsayers is both welcome and convincing. So why, then, is his overall take on the world -- and in particular on how we got to where we are and what we need to do to keep things moving in the right direction -- unsatisfying in that Couéist way? The simple answer is that Goklany's account leaves out too much that matters and pretends that incredibly complex phenomena can be explained away with a few catch phrases. In its overly sanguine and simplistic take on globalization, regulation, and the role of state and economic power, The Improving State of the World is symptomatic of what has become, in the eyes of many, a quintessentially American point of view -- a view according to which the task of creating a better world can ultimately be boiled down to the motto of the Wall Street Journal editorial page: "free markets and free people." ¶ Free markets and free people are, to be sure, wonderful things. But what Goklany offers up in his book is a fundamentally deterministic take on the world: as countries get richer and more technologically advanced, their citizens (all, or almost all, of them) naturally get healthier and better educated, eat better, live longer, and care more about the environment. The free market, recognizing people's resulting desires, delivers the goods they want. ¶ The environmental transition hypothesis is the most striking example of this view, since it postulates that environmental improvement happens, as it were, naturally. The reality, of course, is that the fight over environmental regulation, at least in the United States, was -- and remains -- a fierce one and that environmental skeptics and businesses have done their best to prevent regulations such as the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts from ever becoming law. It is also the case that without those regulations, the "cleaner planet" Goklany sees today would not exist. Goklany attempts the argument that air and water pollution in the United States were declining long before regulations were put into effect. Unfortunately, his own evidence shows that emissions for a host of pollutants peaked right around 1970, when the Clean Air Act was passed, or after, and myriad studies demonstrate that the United States' rivers and lakes are dramatically more swimmable and fishable today than they were before the Clean Water Act. ¶ The point is that far from being the inevitable product of a strong economy, environmental improvement is often the result of political struggles that could very easily have gone the other way. It is also unlikely to occur in the absence of a strong state that is accountable to its citizens. Yet Goklany's entire work -- perhaps not surprisingly for someone at the libertarian Cato Institute -- is predicated on the idea that the state mostly functions as an obstacle to the benevolent workings of the market. This assumption is especially peculiar in the context of a discussion of pollution, since economic theory tells us that polluters, in the absence of regulation, have no reason to take the costs of their emissions into account. Pollution is the quintessential case of a negative externality and, accordingly, of market failure: since polluters do not pay the cost of their pollution, they will produce more than is socially optimal even if they may reduce their emissions as a byproduct of improvements in overall efficiency. The only way, ultimately, to reduce pollution is to constrain polluters to do otherwise. It is not, in other words, free-market-driven economic growth and technological change alone that make the I = PAT equation false; it is those things coupled with the right incentives, incentives that the market by itself cannot provide. ¶ The same facile assumption that the unfettered market is the solvent for all serious problems pervades Goklany's discussion of globalization and its impact on global well-being. As Goklany points out, correctly, it is a myth that the advent of globalization has been accompanied by a rise in poverty and inequality. In fact, the percentage of the world's population that is poor has actually fallen over the past two decades (although 2.7 billion people still live on less than $2 a day). And inequality -- at least among individuals globally -- has actually declined some as well. The surprisingly persistent picture of globalization as a process whereby the developed world exploits and immiserates the developing one is just wrong. ¶ The problem, however, is that the number of countries that have dramatically improved their standards of living in the era of globalization is surprisingly small -- and most of them are in Asia. So even if economic growth is, as it seems to be, fundamental to "the improving state of the world," we have not done a very good job of figuring out how to spread the benefits of that growth around the globe. As Goklany acknowledges, the economies of sub-Saharan Africa and the former Soviet Union have in many cases not just stopped growing but actually shrunk over the past 15 years or so. Most of Latin America has seen only trivial economic growth in the past two decades, while even Asia's "little tigers" (Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand) -- whose economies have grown rapidly since the 1970s -- have spent much of the past seven years recovering from the damage wrought by the 1990s Asian financial crisis. It is true that most of these countries have nonetheless seen their human development indicators improve, thanks to the diffusion of technology and health care. But outside of Asia (and a few places such as Botswana and Chile), the economic benefits of globalization have been hard to find, which is precisely why there has been such a backlash against what has come to be known as the Washington consensus. Goklany argues that it only makes sense to attack globalization if there is evidence that rich countries are getting richer on the backs of the poor. But it is not surprising that people are made unhappy by the sight of others getting richer while they stay the same or actually get poorer.

# 2AC – CP Frontlines

## AT: Agent CP’s Generic

### No Jurisdiction: Fed Key

#### Only the federal government has jurisdiction – your counterplan has no solvency.

U.S. Department of Education 12 (U.S. Department of Education, “The Federal Role in Education,” 02/13/2012, http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html)//ghs-VA

The passage of the Second Morrill Act in 1890 gave the then-named Office of Education responsibility for administering support for the original system of land-grant colleges and universities. Vocational education became the next major area of Federal aid to schools, with the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act and the 1946 George-Barden Act focusing on agricultural, industrial, and home economics training for high school students. World War II led to a significant expansion of Federal support for education. The Lanham Act in 1941 and the Impact Aid laws of 1950 eased the burden on communities affected by the presence of military and other Federal installations by making payments to school districts. And in 1944, the "GI Bill" authorized postsecondary education assistance that would ultimately send nearly 8 million World War II veterans to college. The Cold War stimulated the first example of comprehensive Federal education legislation, when in 1958 Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in response to the Soviet launch of Sputnik. To help ensure that highly trained individuals would be available to help America compete with the Soviet Union in scientific and technical fields, the NDEA included support for loans to college students, the improvement of science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools, graduate fellowships, foreign language and area studies, and vocational-technical training. The anti-poverty and civil rights laws of the 1960s and 1970s brought about a dramatic emergence of the Department's equal access mission. The passage of laws such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which prohibited discrimination based on race, sex, and disability, respectively made civil rights enforcement a fundamental and long-lasting focus of the Department of Education. In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act launched a comprehensive set of programs, including the Title I program of Federal aid to disadvantaged children to address the problems of poor urban and rural areas. And in that same year, the Higher Education Act authorized assistance for postsecondary education, including financial aid programs for needy college students. In 1980, Congress established the Department of Education as a Cabinet level agency. Today, ED operates programs that touch on every area and level of education. The Department's elementary and secondary programs annually serve nearly 14,000 school districts and some 56 million students attending roughly 99,000 public schools and 34,000 private schools. Department programs also provide grant, loan, and work-study assistance to more than 15 million postsecondary students. Mission Despite the growth of the Federal role in education, the Department never strayed far from what would become its official mission: to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access. The Department carries out its mission in two major ways. First, the Secretary and the Department play a leadership role in the ongoing national dialogue over how to improve the results of our education system for all students. This involves such activities as raising national and community awareness of the education challenges confronting the Nation, disseminating the latest discoveries on what works in teaching and learning, and helping communities work out solutions to difficult educational issues. Second, the Department pursues its twin goals of access and excellence through the administration of programs that cover every area of education and range from preschool education through postdoctoral research. For more information on the Department's programs see the President's FY 2013 Budget Request for Education.

Wetzel 11 (Jennifer, student at Vanderbilt University, “Higher education, federal government ‘intimately connected’,” Dec. 9, 2011, http://news.vanderbilt.edu/2011/12/higher-education-federal-government-intimately-connected/)//ghs-VA

The development of this partnership between higher education and the federal government marked a major departure from the highly decentralized relationship that existed prior to World War I. Before the war, a longstanding belief that politics and academia did not mix had created a buffer between the government and higher education—even at publicly supported land-grant institutions, which were coordinated and lightly funded by the government but exercised vast autonomy over their day-to-day operations. The distance between the government and higher education closed during the 1930s and 1940s, when economic depression and then war forced both parties to forge a new partnership, Loss found. Unlike most studies that have focused on the history of federally sponsored research, Loss’ study examines the politics of federal student aid policy, uncovering the relationship between and among the “big three” aid policies of the last century: the 1944 GI Bill, the 1958 National Defense Education Act and the 1965 Higher Education Act.

#### USFG is key— it regulates institutions of higher education.

**Huma and Staurowsky 11**, Ramogi Huma [NCPA President] and Ellen J. Staurowsky [Ed.D., Professor Sport Management, Drexel University], "The Price of Poverty in Big Time College Sport", 2011, National College Players Association, BE

While the DOJ should clearly become heavily involved in addressing NCAA antitrust violations, the United States Congress is a vehicle that can bring forth comprehensive reform. It has jurisdiction over both higher education and interstate commerce and can implement uniform legislation nationwide. States cannot implement reforms such as multiple year scholarships and athletic grant-in-aid scholarships that equal the cost of attendance without risking the exclusion of their athletic programs from NCAA competition. The NCAA threatened pro-reform states such as California and Nebraska of the loss of NCAA membership and revenue that would accompany the implementation of these types of changes (Ryan, 2003; Nebraska legislature..., 2003). Ultimately, the NCAA's monopoly power renders state governments impotent in their quest for reform. In addition, college athletes lack the leverage to negotiate directly with the NCAA since the NCAA strategically used its "amateurism" and "student-athlete" propoganda to prevent them from acquiring the employee rights that would allow them to organize and negotiate. Without an act of Congress and support from the DOJ, universities, athletic programs, coaches, and players will continue to spiral embarrassingly into the abyss that has been on full display over the past 12 months and beyond. College athletes will also continue to drift as a group of Americans harmed by the NCAA's unAmerican, monopolistic arrangements.

### Private School Jurisdiction

## AT: Wage Subsidy

### Incentives Don’t Work

#### Incentives don’t make sense – universities already have major tax breaks – means they ultimately end up defending the squo.

Hirsch 11 (Michelle, She is a graduate of Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, writes about economics, tax policy and personal finance out of The Fiscal Times’ Washington, D.C. Bureau, “The Rich University: The Mother of all Tax Breaks,” October 7, 2011, http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2011/10/07/The-Rich-University-The-Mother-of-all-Tax-Breaks)//ghs-VA

As nonprofits, those investment returns are exempt from the 15 percent capital gains and dividends tax private companies, investors, and individuals pay on investment income -- **so long as** that **income is used to further the university’s tax-exempt function, in this case education**. **Universities**, like all nonprofits, **are** also **exempt from paying federal corporate income taxes, and state and local sales and property taxes**.

## AT: Collective Bargaining

### Living Wage Key Priority

#### The plan is a first step to allow bargaining to happen – key stepping stone.

Lee 15 (John B, Partner @ JBL Associates A research think tank, “Contingent Faculty Bargaining,” January 2015, http://www.nea.org/home/12679.htm)//ghs-VA

Policy aside, it is NEA contingent faculty members themselves who, through bargaining surveys and union democracy, set actual bargaining priorities. Invariably, contingents across the country reduce the hot issues down to decent pay, job security/continuing employment, benefits, due process/fair treatment, support for professional responsibilities, and a voice on the job. Boiled down to the basics, it's all about respect, equal pay for equal work, and a living wage. DEVELOP A FULL PROPOSED AGREEMENT When contingent faculty win bargaining rights, the elected bargaining team determines what is legally negotiable, examines good contracts negotiated in similar units, and compiles a list of all work rules, policies, practices, and benefits already in effect. Bargainers then survey members on needed improvements, while developing a full proposed agreement that includes standard Association contract provisions—such as a union "recognition" clause, a salary schedule, intellectual property and academic freedom provisions, and a grievance procedure with binding arbitration.\* AIM FOR PAY PARITY AND A LIVING WAGE One burning issue that must be confronted in bargaining: the wide pay gap between contingent and tenure system faculty. According to a study done for the NEA Research Department, a full-time tenure system professor receives, on average, $10,563 per class in salary without benefits, compared with $2,836 received by a part-time contingent.\*\* Before aiming for pay parity with tenure system colleagues, negotiators should first a pursue—as a rock-bottom floor—a living wage as the minimum starting pay for all contingents. A living wage is, quite simply, what a worker needs to pay for basic family needs—food, housing, transportation, health and child care, clothing, personal care, taxes, and even modest savings—while surviving without outside jobs or government or family assistance. To quickly research the monthly living wage in any region, go the Economic Policy Institute's basic family budget calculator.

### Gunn: Education Quality

#### Empirically denied – you eat up the budget and don’t solve.

Gunn 13 (Steve, writer @ eagnews, “Article addresses how union collective bargaining has crippled K-12 education,” September 9, 2013, http://eagnews.org/a-bad-bargain-for-america-article-addresses-how-union-collective-bargaining-has-crippled-k-12-education/)//ghs-VA

Beach traces the incredible growth of teachers unions over the past 50 years, and the domination they’ve developed over the nation’s K-12 public education system. He notes how union **collective bargaining has allowed teacher salaries and benefits to eat up gigantic percentages of American education spending, yet taxpayers aren’t getting any bang for their buck**. Student test scores continue to wither, particularly in science, technology, engineering and math, and a continuation of this trend could mean “the United States stands to lose its position as a global leader.” “Out-educating the rest of the world will not be easy … particularly as the process for K-12 public education in the United States remains at the mercy of teachers unions and **collective bargaining contracts that clearly define the work rules of teachers but have no discernible impact on improving public education** in America since they were introduced 54 years ago,” Beach writes.

### Williams: No Changes

#### No solvency – the counterplan doesn’t result better wages or conditions.

Williams 15 (Joseph, veteran journalist and former White House correspondent for Politico, Joseph Williams is a freelance writer, blogger, and essayist in Washington, D.C, “Tuition Is Up, So Why Are College Profs on Welfare?” February 24, 2015, http://www.takepart.com/article/2015/02/24/adjunct-faculty-walk-out)//ghs-VA

The adjunct crisis is one piece of this puzzle,” National Adjunct wrote. “The short answer is that higher education [is] losing its mission. At the same time tuition, student fees, and student debt have increased at unprecedented rates, administrative positions and salaries have risen, while reliance on contingent faculty has jumped to 75 percent. That's really a stunning number—75 percent of college courses in the U.S. are taught by contingent faculty, most of whom do not earn a living wage, and have no job security!” For higher education to be in this kind of situation “is detrimental to departments, discipline, student learning, and student success,” wrote National Adjunct. “It also negates one of the very message colleges “sell” (again, at increasing debt rates to students)—that education has value.” At the same time, college administrators are under pressure, too. A survey of school provosts by Inside Higher Ed found that most of administrators aren’t feeling the effects of the economic rebound, particularly those working at publicly funded universities, and they expect things will get worse before they improve. “Most provosts expect to continue to rely on non–tenure track faculty members and are skeptical that unionizing will lead to substantial changes in adjunct pay and working conditions,” according to the survey summary. “But provosts at public colleges and universities (who are more likely to operate on campuses with collective bargaining) see more potential for gains for adjuncts than do private college provosts.”

### Gunn: Teach Retention

#### Collective Bargaining destroys the education sector – specifically doesn’t solve our advantage.

Gunn 13 (Steve, writer @ eagnews, “Article addresses how union collective bargaining has crippled K-12 education,” September 9, 2013, http://eagnews.org/a-bad-bargain-for-america-article-addresses-how-union-collective-bargaining-has-crippled-k-12-education/)//ghs-VA

**How does collective bargaining hurt education**? Beach cites a Harvard University report from Frederick Hess and Martin West, titled “A Better Bargain: Overhauling Teacher Collective Bargaining for the 21st Century.” According to that report, “**collective bargaining contracts are problematic on three fronts: 1) they restrict efforts to use compensation as a tool to recruit, reward and retain the most essential and effective teachers**, 2) **they impede attempts to assign or remove teachers on the basis of fit(ness) or performance** and, 3) they over-regulate school life with work rules that stifle creative problem-solving without demonstrably improving teachers’ ability to serve students.” **One major problem is the lack of teacher retention**. That’s due to work rules that are heavily biased in favor of the most senior teachers, not necessarily the best teachers. For example, Beach claims that many union contracts allow senior teachers to have their first choice of class assignments, meaning younger teachers are often left with the more difficult and mundane subjects. That’s a big reason why so many walk away from the profession, according to Beach. The intellectual stagnation of a profession that lacks competition and incentives is also a factor, according to Beach. Beach interviewed one former teacher who said she left the field because “I became disillusioned with the lack of interest by school administrators, my fellow teachers and my professors in graduate school, in how to continually improve as a teacher. I am a goal-driven person. And utter disinterest in striving for goals within the system created an environment that was toxic for me.”

### Gunn: STEM DA

#### STEM is on the brink the alt drives that down.

Gunn 13 (Steve, writer @ eagnews, “Article addresses how union collective bargaining has crippled K-12 education,” September 9, 2013, http://eagnews.org/a-bad-bargain-for-america-article-addresses-how-union-collective-bargaining-has-crippled-k-12-education/)//ghs-VA

 “One impact collective bargaining does have is to drive up the cost of public education,” Beach writes. “The latest data (2008) from the National Center for Education Statistics, the research arm for the U.S. Department of Education, claims that 89 percent of the $600 billion annually spent on K-12 public education in America goes into two buckets: teacher/administrative salaries (67 percent) and employee benefits (22 percent). Bottom line: expenditures per pupil skyrocketed 140 percent during the analyzed period while there was literally no improvement in math and reading scores, and science scores actually dropped.” Beach suggests that lower student aptitude in the STEM subjects does not bode well for the economic future of the U.S.

#### STEM education key to solving warming

Mejia 9 – \* Employment Services Manager at South Bay Workforce Investment Board, City University of New York-Baruch College (education) [Robert T. Mejia, “What’s Old is New: Green Jobs & What America’s Federal Workforce Investment System Can Do Now to Develop a Green Workforce”, 1/14/09, www.southbayresource.net/articles/whatsoldisnew.pdf, tables, charts, and graphs omitted]

Green tech , environmental technology, competitiveness in the market is key

In addition to adaptation, science, technology and innovation may prove to be our greatest allies in the battle to defeat global warming. A number of promising eco-tech solutions to our environmental challenges are starting to emerge; they hinge on further research and development, access to capital, and accommodating government regulations. Innovations such as Bio-char (a stable and rich charcoal produced from biomass) for carbon sequestration, improved soil fertility, sustainable (carbon-negative) energy production, and poverty reduction; the use of algae as an alternative fuel source; and bioorganisms and nano devices that clean up toxic spills and improve solar technology hold great potential for solving some of the world’s most difficult consumption challenges and contamination problems. Sustained advances and U.S. leadership in environmental technologies, not only in terms of global warming, but in terms of competitiveness, will rely on an expansion of the nation’s knowledge workforce, with a strong emphasis on green-centered science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Sadly, the U.S. lags other developed countries in its preparation of technologists, scientists, engineers and mathematicians. The U.S.’ share of the world’s scientists and engineers is projected to fall from 40 percent in 1975 to 15 percent in 2010.22 This trend must be reversed. As reported by the U.S. Department of Labor on January 15, 2008 in the Federal Register: There is a broad consensus that the long-term key to continued U.S. competitiveness and growth in an increasingly global economic environment is the adequate supply of qualified Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) workers capable of translating knowledge and skills into new processes, products and services. According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), scientific innovation has produced roughly half of all U.S. economic growth in the last fifty years and the STEM disciplines, including those who work in them, are critical engines to that innovation and growth--one recent estimate, while only five percent of the U.S. workforce is employed in STEM fields, the STEM workforce accounts for more than fifty percent of the nation’s sustained growth (Babco 2004). The National Academy of Sciences study, Rising Above the Gathering Storm (2006), argues that: Absent a serious and rapid response, the U.S. will lose quality jobs to other nations; lowering our standard of living, reducing tax revenues, and weakening the domestic market for goods and services. Once this cycle accelerates, it will be difficult to regain lost pre-eminence in technology-driven innovation and its economic benefits.23 In Thrive: The Skills Imperative, the Council on Competitiveness states that: Looking ahead, skills for sustainability could become a key competitive differentiator. As Joseph Stanislaw has noted: we are at the very beginning of a global race to create dominant green economies.(42) Global warming and competition for resources could very well change the ground rules of globalization-at the very least, the need to reduce carbon footprints and achieve higher resource productivity could alter corporate calculations about where and how to distribute operations and assets globally. America could get out in front of this paradigm shift. But it is not clear that the United States will have enough talent with the right set of skills, or has even defined the path forward on skills for sustainability.24 To defeat global warming, we must focus on developing both the intellectual and physical infrastructure of our country. A national campaign to promote STEM education in environmental technologies, with strong federal financing of community and public sector organizations to provide career and academic support, will make a difference.

#### Extinction

Dyer ‘12 (London-based independent journalist, PhD from King's College London, citing UC Berkeley scientists (Gwynne, "Tick, tock to mass extinction date," The Press, 6-19-12, l/n, accessed 8-15-12)

Meanwhile, a team of **respected scientists warn** that life on **Earth may be** on the way **to an** irreversible **"tipping point".** Sure. Heard that one before, too. Last month one of the world's two leading scientific journals, Nature, published a paper, "Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere," pointing out that more than 40 per cent of the Earth's land is already used for human needs. With the human population set to grow by a further two billion by 2050, that figure could soon exceed 50 per cent. "It really will be a new world, biologically, at that point," said the paper's lead author, Professor Anthony Barnofsky of the University of California, Berkeley. But Barnofsky doesn't go into the details of what kind of new world it might be. Scientists hardly ever do in public, for fear of being seen as panic-mongers. Besides, it's a relatively new hypothesis, but it's a pretty convincing one, and it should be more widely understood. Here's how bad it could get. The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees C of warming by 2100, but that's just warming caused by human greenhouse- gas emissions. The problem is that +3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger is actually around 2C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. **After that** we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon- dioxide emissions would no longer be enough to stop the warming. **We** may **end up trapped on** an escalator heading up to +6C (+10.5F), with no way of getting off. And +6C gives you the **mass extinction**. There have been five mass extinctions in the past 500 million years, when 50 per cent or more of the species then existing on the Earth vanished, but until recently the only people taking any interest in this were paleontologists, not climate scientists. They did wonder what had caused the extinctions, but the best answer they could come up was "climate change". It wasn't a very good answer. Why would a warmer or colder planet kill off all those species? The warming was caused by massive volcanic eruptions dumping huge quantities of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for tens of thousands of years. But it was very gradual and the animals and plants had plenty of time to migrate to climatic zones that still suited them. (That's exactly what happened more recently in the Ice Age, as the glaciers repeatedly covered whole continents and then retreated again.) There had to be a more convincing kill mechanism than that. The paleontologists found one when they discovered that a giant asteroid struck the planet 65 million years ago, just at the time when the dinosaurs died out in the most recent of the great extinctions. So they went looking for evidence of huge asteroid strikes at the time of the other extinction events. They found none. What they discovered was that there was indeed major warming at the time of all the other extinctions - and that the warming had radically changed the oceans. The currents that carry oxygen- rich cold water down to the depths shifted so that they were bringing down oxygen- poor warm water instead, and gradually the depths of the oceans became anoxic: the deep waters no longer had any oxygen. When that happens, the **sulfur bacteria** that normally live in the silt (because oxygen is poison to them) come out of hiding and begin to multiply. Eventually they **rise** all the way **to the surface over the** whole **ocean, killing** all **the oxygen-breathing life. The ocean** also **starts emitting** enormous amounts of lethal hydrogen sulfide **gas** that **destroy the ozone** layer **and** directly **poison land**- dwelling **species**. This has happened many times in the Earth's history.

### Perm: Do Both

#### Permutation do both: Makes logical sense.

Kearney 8 (Neil, General Secretary, “BARGAINING FOR A LIVING WAGE,” October 7, 2008, http://www.cleanclothes.org/resources/recommended-reading/bargaining-for-a-living-wage-a-trade-union-guide)//ghs-VA

The time-honoured manner of improving pay and working conditions is through collective bargaining between unions and employers. But collective bargaining cannot take place in a void: workers must have the right to organise and the right to negotiate must be upheld - rights which are systematically denied in many producing countries. That’s why the ITGLWF’s living wage campaign includes not only a demand that merchandisers and retailers require the payment of a living wage to all workers, and that they should factor in this obligation to their price negotiations, but also that the right of workers to organise and bargain collectively must be upheld. Unions then need to begin to bargain with employers nationally, regionally and at factory level. Even if this is not achieved the target should be maintained and publicised in an effort to gain wider acceptance for the figure. Unions also need to be pressing for regular increases in the minimum wage in order to ensure that it amounts to a living wage in order to ensure that all workers – whether or not they are covered by collective bargaining - benefit from improved wages. Of course, both employers and governments in any particular country are likely to argue that wages need to be contained in order to remain competitive in international markets. That is why bargaining for a living wage requires a coordinated concerted international effort.

### ILO: Perm Best

#### Your author affirms – perm solves best, bargaining can’t solve alone.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

In designing minimum wages policies, two key principles should be kept in mind. The first is to use the minimum wage in the manner it was intended, namely to provide a decent wage floor. The second principle is to involve social partners – not only in the design and monitoring of the minimum wage system, but also in the decision-making related to setting the level of the minimum wage. What is a decent wage floor? As a general principle, the ILO Convention No. 131 calls on countries to take a balanced approach when determining levels of minimum wages. They should take into account both the needs of workers and their families and economic factors such as productivity and the need to maintain high levels of employment. The actual levels of minimum wages will, of course, vary according to national perceptions of a decent wage floor. The term “decent wage floor” implies that the level of a minimum wage should be set high enough to be considered as decent but low enough to remain a wage floor. Figure 22 shows that the levels of minimum wages relative to average wages vary widely across countries, but that there is a relatively high frequency at around 40 per cent of average wages. This may serve as a useful reference point when considering the ideal level for a minimum wage. Beyond this very rough reference level, the level of a minimum wage should be determined through much more refined country-specific analysis. Indeed, to maximize the benefits of a minimum wage while minimizing the potential negative impacts, it is essential that the level of the minimum wage is determined through research-based policy decisions and that its application is accompanied by systematic monitoring. It must also be remembered that to reduce the gender pay gap at the bottom end of the wage distribution, the minimum wage should be set at a level above that prevailing in female-dominated occupations or sectors. 89 It is not uncommon that well-intended policy decisions on minimum wages lack solid evidence and analysis and thus defy their goals. Good policies and good social dialogue on minimum wages need good research. 90 Decisions on minimum wages should always involve social partners. These partners should be involved in the decision-making regarding both the coverage and the rates of minimum wages. In the majority of countries, governments take the final decision on uprating minimum wages, after some consultation with social partners. In a sizeable minority of countries, the minimum wages rates are set directly through social dialogue by independent tripartite bodies. When decisions are made by tripartite bodies, governments are in effect required to come to an agreement with employers’ and workers’ representatives. In a few cases, a national minimum wage rate is negotiated directly by social partners – such as in Belgium and Greece – and the government’s only official role is to validate the outcome of negotiations.

### ILO: Bargaining Fails

#### Collective bargaining alone is useless and locks in the squo.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

In other countries, sectoral minimum wages are determined exclusively through collective bargaining. This is the case, for example, in Germany, Italy and Switzerland. This system certainly provides the most flexibility and avoids state intervention into minimum wage fi xing. There are, however, some increasingly obvious limitations. First, whereas such systems can effectively protect a majority of workers in some European countries, which have well-established collective bargaining, they would be mainly ineffective in developing countries, where the coverage of collective bargaining is typically very low. Second, even in European countries, the recent decline in collective bargaining coverage and the increase in the number of “working poor” in the unregulated part of the labour market have created strong social tensions. In Germany and – to a lesser extent – Switzerland, these shortcomings have revived the debate about the possible introduction of a national minimum wage to provide a decent wage floor for all wage earners.

### AT: Crowding Out

#### The perm solves crowding out.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

Well-designed minimum wages will avoid the “crowding out” of collective bargaining. For minimum wages and collective bargaining to operate as complementary and mutually reinforcing elements of comprehensive wage policies, governments should accompany their reliance on minimum wages with measures and incentives to promote collective bargaining. This section addresses how this should be done and how it can be done.

### State Key: Alt Fails

#### State intervention is key to collective bargaining – plan precludes counterplan solvency.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

Recent experience in Latin America suggests that state intervention can be effective in activating or reactivating collective bargaining. In the 1990s, shortcomings in social dialogue and the search for flexibility and promotion of enterprise-level bargaining throughout the region had been identified as some of the causes explaining its large wage inequalities. The ILO considered that countries in “Latin America recovered more slowly from external shocks because they lacked institutions that would have allowed them to process distributive conflicts generated by international turbulences”. 102 Since then, however, a number of countries in the region have tried to redevelop their wage and collective bargaining institutions. The stimulation of collective bargaining turned out to be an important channel through which economic growth led to improvement in wage trends in Argentina, where the Government’s decision to push for higher wages ultimately stimulated collective bargaining. There, the Government, in agreement with social partners, imposed fixed general wage increases by decree – which were incorporated as of 2003 by social partners into collective agreements. This progressively reactivated genuine collective bargaining to all sectors of activity, and the number of workers covered increased from 1.2 million in 2004 to 2.1 million in 2005 and 3.5 million in 2006. Another example in Latin America is the case of Uruguay, where the Government implemented an active tripartite policy (see box 3).

### ILO: Concludes Aff

#### The conclusion says the perm is the best option.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

What can be done? In the short term, governments are encouraged to display a strong commitment towards protecting the purchasing power of their populations and hence stimulating internal consumption. This requires a coherent combination of wage policies. First, collective bargaining should be promoted, and social partners should be encouraged to negotiate ways to prevent a further deterioration in the wage share and growth of wage differentials – while taking into account the specifi c conditions in their sector or enterprise. Second, the levels of minimum wages should be maintained wherever possible to protect the most vulnerable workers. In the current context, it would be neither fair nor economically desirable to make wages the only adjustment variable. If wages bear a disproportionate part of the burden, the result will be a further decline in the share of wages relative to the share of profi ts in GDP.

### Top Down Key

#### No collectivity

Jean Scheid 11 [freelance writer on business], “Challenges of Collective Bargaining”, Bright Hub, 20 Feb 2011, BE

The primary challenges of collective bargaining lies in ensuring “collectivity.” The collective bargaining takes place with a group of negotiators representing the management on one side, and another group representing the workers, usually the trade union, on the other side.¶ Not all employees need be members of the trade union, and not all workers need to subscribe to the demands put forth by the group representing the employees. The biggest challenge in collective bargaining is ensuring consensus among the workers, so that the group representing the workers can negotiate without distraction of conflicting and divergent demands made by workers. The group representing workers negotiating without the consent of a good majority of the workers can lead to problems during the implementation of the negotiated settlement. The collective bargaining effort serves no purpose unless an overwhelming majority of the workers acquiesces with the settlement effected by the negotiators. Otherwise, the discontent and underlying issues that cause the need for the collective bargaining remain.¶ On the other hand, top management also needs to agree to the collective bargaining agreement struck by the negotiators representing them. Instances of top management striking down such collective bargaining agreements, leading to the entire exercise becoming futile are commonplace. The solution to this issue is keeping the top management informed throughout the process and getting their approval before making concessions.

### Gridlock and No Reps

#### Can’t please all and doesn’t apply to some issues—overshadows important stuff

Jean Scheid 11 [freelance writer on business], “Challenges of Collective Bargaining”, Bright Hub, 20 Feb 2011, BE

Even if a majority or all the workers accept the collective bargaining settlement, the underlying issues still need not be resolved. Collective bargaining is a “please all” settlement that aims to strike a compromise by identifying a common ground between two divergent positions. A settlement depends on acceptance by both parties, and neither party would agree to a settlement that requires them to give something with nothing in return, or agree to one-sided drastic changes, even when such an approach might the remedy to the issue.¶ Again, collective bargaining is concerned only with issues that affect the workforce in general. Matters concerning individual employees or small groups of employees need not be resolved through this exercise, even when such matters remains more pressing and important than the scope of the collective bargaining exercise.

### Not Sustainable

#### Not sustainable

Jean Scheid 11 [freelance writer on business], “Challenges of Collective Bargaining”, Bright Hub, 20 Feb 2011, BE

Collective bargaining is a lengthy process and aims to effect a long-term agreement. This remains unsuited to the present day business environment, which remains in a constant state of flux. Businesses need to make frequent and fast changes in all aspects of their operations, including working conditions to respond to the challenges posed by such changes, and take advantage of emerging opportunities.¶ Innovation in goods and services owing to changes in the business environment leads to new work activities, obsolesce of existing work processes, and new forms of business organization. All these can lead to the collective bargaining agreement becoming redundant.¶ The new realties have led to dominance of individual agreements and negotiations over collective bargaining, and decentralized collective bargaining agreements at group and individual unit levels as a means to overcome the challenges of collective bargaining at a centralized level.

### Unemployment and Perm

#### The alt fails and raising the minimum wage solves.

Harry 14 (Steve, think tank, “The Illogic of Collective Bargaining,” June 2014, http://www.steveharrypublicpolicy.com/Unions/illogicofcollectivebargaining.htm)//ghs-VA

In light of the following, **I have a hard time understanding why people think collective bargaining is a good thing**: Economists say **unions cause unemployment and reduce total income**. Heavily-**unionized Michigan has led** the nation in **unemployment** since 2003. Here are some possible explanations why collective bargaining supporters think the way they do: Union workers are better paid than non-union workers. Collective bargaining has been law for 75 years (since 1935). If it were wrong, the Wagner Act would have been repealed long ago. Congress makes no mistakes. The Wagner Act was signed into law by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the president who got us out of the Depression and led us to victory in World War II. There are folk songs about the struggles of union workers. Would Joan Baez, Bob Dylan and Pete Seeger steer us wrong? Supporters are Democrats, and union PACs provide huge amounts of campaign contributions to the Democratic party. Whether unions are bad or good is not something they give much thought, but people they respect, like President Barack Obama, are union supporters. They are among the diminishing number of private sector union members who still have a job, and they are paid good union wages. They are among the growing number of public sector union members, and they are paid good union wages. They had a parent who was a union member which enabled them to get a college degree so they don't have to work in a factory. They are retired union workers getting generous pensions and health insurance. Collective bargaining believers apparently think the employee should determine how much he is to be paid, not the employer. But that isn't going to work, is it? The employee thinks mainly of his own needs, while the employer is concerned with survival of the business. Who would you trust to make the right decision? Of course, a government arbitrator could be called in. Does he know better than the employer? What special wisdom does he have that would allow him to determine the proper wage? Could he possibly be influenced by the political beliefs of the people he is working for? The most common argument for collective bargaining is that it gets workers better wages. If it was simple as that, why don't we just set the minimum wage to $20 an hour? Hell, why stop there - make it $100 an hour. More is better, right? We'd all like everyone to have a good-paying job, and we know how to make that happen: help people get the job skills that are in demand. As long as society is making an honest effort at that, we have no need to worry about how much workers are paid. A free labor market rewards them according to how much we value their contribution. But we don't trust the market, so we support the notion that employees should demand the wage they think they deserve, and that it is OK for them to shut down an employer when he doesn't give in. Or we believe that a government arbitrator is blessed with the wisdom to know what is fair and the integrity to so choose.

## AT: UBI

### Case Cross Apps

#### 1. Solvency deficit – UBI dis-incentivizes work which doesn’t solve for our advantage. Employment is key to liberalize higher education, which solves neolib.

Cowen 14 (Tyler Cowen, writer @ Marginal Revolution Magazine, “What are some of the biggest problems with a guaranteed annual income?” November 14, 2013, http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2013/11/what-are-some-of-the-biggest-problems-with-a-guaranteed-annual-income.html)//ghs-VA

Maybe this isn’t the biggest problem, but it’s been my worry as of late. Must a guaranteed income truly be unconditional? Might there be circumstances when we would want to pay some individuals more than others? Many critics for instance worry that a guaranteed income would excessively reduce the incentive to work. So it might be proposed that the payment be somewhat higher if low income individuals go get a job. That also will make the system more financially sustainable. But wait — that’s the Earned Income Tax Credit, albeit with modifications. Might we also wish to pay more to some individuals with disabilities, perhaps say to help them afford expensive wheelchairs? Maybe so. But wait — that’s called disability insurance (modified, again) and it is run through the Social Security Administration. As long as we are moving toward more cash transfers, why don’t we substitute cash transfers for some or all of Medicare and Medicaid health insurance coverage benefits, especially for lower-value ailments? But then we are paying more cash to the sick individuals. That doesn’t have to be a mistake, but it does mean that an initially simple, “dogmatic” payment scheme now has multiplied into a rather complex form of social welfare assistance, contingent on just about every relevant factor one might care to cite. You can see the issue. Whether on grounds of justice, practicality, or just public choice considerations (“you can keep your current welfare payments if you like them”), we should not expect everyone to be paid the same under a guaranteed annual income. And with enough tweaks, this version of the guaranteed income suddenly starts resembling…the welfare state, albeit the welfare state plus. Unemployment insurance benefits wouldn’t end. More people could get on disability, and without those pesky judges asking so many questions. The potential problem is that we inherit and in some ways magnify the problems with the current welfare state, rather than doing away with those problems. Or we could be truly dogmatic about it, and simply pay each person the same amount of money no matter what. But then do we take away the various forms of in-kind aid which are already in place? And what about all those former EITC recipients, whose incentive to work is now lower than ever? Part of the original appeal of the guaranteed income idea, especially as expressed by Milton Friedman, is that it would substitute for welfare programs and bureaucracies, not all of which work well. On first hearing, the guaranteed income proposal sounds quite “clean.” In reality, that is unlikely to be the case. And once we recognize the proposal may be “the current welfare state plus some extra and longer-term payments,” one has to ask whether this is really what we had in mind in the first place. It seems that if you wanted to reform current programs and also pay people more (debatable, of course), there may be better and easier ways of doing that than reforms which have to fit under the umbrella of “a guaranteed annual income.” I still think the core idea is a good one, but perhaps “what the core idea is” is less pinned down than I might have wished.

#### 2. Cross apply Giroux – Living wage is key because it provides the necessary job security that is critical for contingent faculty to stay and work.

### Street: Rejection/Ethics

#### It is the rejection of the unethical nature of the current wage system that transforms the university.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

4. The debates that have raged within and about higher education over vocational versus liberal education, tenure, the “corporatization” of higher education, governmental oversight and accreditation, and funding models and sources have obscured, deferred, or overridden the need for action on the fundamental ethical and practical concerns that attend the professional and personal needs of faculty on contingent appointments. Yet, ironically, attending to those concerns—ensuring a living wage, access to health care, professional development, and the protections of academic freedom—would exercise the very values of academic democracy that these debates are really all about. While the roots of contingent academic employment go back many decades, and surged in the early 1970s (Berry 2005), it was not until the 1980s that the higher education community really began to notice that contingency had exploded to a level of concern. Marked by radically reduced wages, frequent lack of access to benefits, limited access to professional support and opportunities for advancement, and institutional disrespect, contingency is one of higher education’s darker secrets. In the last twenty-five years, however, and particularly in the last decade, there have been sincere, if belated, efforts to respond. These include a proliferation of studies, articles, and books; resolutions, statements, guidelines, and best-practice publications by unions, institutions, and associations; and most effectively, both union- and nonunion-affiliated organizing efforts leading to successful collective bargaining, cooperative negotiations with receptive administrations, and groundbreaking litigation and legislation. All of these efforts have resulted, practically speaking, in some improved working conditions for many adjunct faculty members. Yet, paradoxically, even as these accomplishments have signaled a huge step forward, they have not succeeded in substantially alleviating the sense of foreboding over the status and future of the professoriate, or the ramifications for education that the higher education community began to recognize a generation ago. In fact, that sense of crisis has been heightened as the federal government, allied with major corporations, seeks greater influence over college curricula, particularly at the community college level, with the danger of minimal—or token—consultation with higher education faculty (Wilson 2010). Several years ago, activists in the contingent faculty movement recognized the impasse at which the movement found itself in the face of this lack of progress (Hoeller 2007), and initiated discussion about the need for a structured national organization. In 2009, such an organization was founded. New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity (NFM) is the only national organization exclusively devoted to improving the quality of higher education by improving the working conditions of the majority of its faculty. NFM came into existence because we believe that higher education needs to move into a new phase of coordinated, intentional, and ethically grounded activity to confront contingency. The goal of such efforts should be to repair the damaging effects on students, faculty, and the country of the haphazard and shortsighted decisions that led to the spread of contingency in the first place, and to bring to fruition the valiant but uncoordinated and all too often superficial reforms that a generation of educators has tried to implement. And, while incremental change may continue to be the only way forward, we believe that what is needed is a new sense of urgency and a defined goal that acknowledges the need for a transformation of academic culture from its current hierarchical, stratified structure into real academic democracy rooted in the values of liberal education.

### Street: Radical Act

#### Treating them as “real faculty” is a radical act that breaks the current neolib mindset.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

From ivory tower to academic democracy To many observers, the formation of NFM was puzzling and counterintuitive; hadn’t unionization efforts among contingent faculty increased and hadn’t advances been made through collective bargaining? And weren’t many institutions now paying attention to and implementing the types of reforms and strategies that for years had been recommended for the purpose of “integrating” contingent faculty more effectively into the life of the college and university and showing them respect? If the concerns of contingent faculty had only to do with working conditions, then the progress made over the last generation might not have required NFM’s formation. Contingent faculty would have continued to support local organizing efforts and internal reform efforts, celebrating advances as they have occurred and fighting for change where necessary. But NFM is not just about improving working conditions. It is about improving working conditions for an ultimate purpose: to ensure the quality of education and the integrity of the profession. NFM aims to remind the academy that it exists not for itself, and not simply to preserve itself­­­, but for the common good—and that the operative definition of “common” in that expression should not evoke the unfortunate connotation of “second rate,” but rather its root, communis, or community. Clearly, the contingent faculty crisis is simply the most obvious manifestation of the steady erosion of community in higher education. The faculty (in part, through its own doing) has moved, or been pushed, away from its role as a full partner in higher education to a literally “adjunct” position—peripheral, disempowered—in terms of either numbers or function. Tenure-stream faculty, who have authority over the curriculum and at least a nominal role in governance, are now too small in number or too cowed to initiate or resist change effectively, while faculty off the tenure track, though the majority in number, must risk their livelihoods to do so. To fight against this trend is to “reclaim” the ivory tower, as Joe Berry (2005) has put it, by transforming it into the academic democracy that it is really supposed to be. If the marginalization of the faculty as a whole is the disease whose most obvious symptom is the mistreatment of those with the lowest status, then what is needed is a cure that builds on the body’s natural strengths. What is needed is a revitalization of the concept of academic democracy, one rooted in the social contract that has traditionally defined faculty work and that embodies the values of liberal education. Again, as Moser (2004, 2) explains, “as students, faculty, and campus workers make common cause to secure workplace rights and basic economic security, we must also articulate new ideals and mobilize alternative forms of community. We could organize such a project under the rubric of ‘campus democracy, community and academic citizenship’: ideals of service that revisit classical conceptions of the university, are grounded in existing economic and political conditions, rooted in democratic traditions of freedom, and already legible in the many struggles for justice on today’s campuses.” It is those ideals and traditions—along with sheer willpower—that will be needed to combat the pessimistic notion that “once the university budget has absorbed their [nontenure-track faculty] lower cost . . . it becomes almost impossible to retreat” (Cross and Goldenberg 2002, 27–28). Confronting contingency is not an impossible task, though it is a formidable one. As Caryn McTighe Musil has pointed out, it is “radical”—but only because it is so necessary: “Of course, treating the contingent faculty like ‘real’ faculty, especially women and women with children, is a radical act. It requires considerable shifts in attitude, in economic remuneration, and in job security. It means incorporating these faculty members as equal partners in departments, welcoming them as academic colleagues, and nurturing their professional growth” (Musil 2009). As daunting as this task is, however, Musil reminds us that we can do it—because we’ve done it before. “The academy figured out how to rethink entire fields when DNA was discovered and mapped, when technology changed everything about our lives and work, and when women’s studies and ethnic studies forever altered the foundations of knowledge. The academy should be able to make this other change too” (Musil 2009).

### Perm: Laundry List

#### PERM – Do Both – living wages can be implemented in a way that enhances UBI. Net beneficial because living wages allow individuals to work and decrease dependency

Jerry Waltman 02 [University of Southern Mississippi], "Civic Republicanism, The Basic Income Guarantee, and the Living Wage," USBIG Discussion Paper No. 25, March 2002, GHS//MM

[**NOTE:** the USS (universal service set) is basically a combination between UBI and jobs. So the perm is a fusion between UBI and Living wage even if the title is different]

The Western political tradition is composed of two distinct strains, liberal individualism and civic republicanism. For several reasons, liberal individualism largely came to occupy the field in both academic and popular political discourse in the thirty odd years following the end of World War II. Within the last decade or so, however, academics have been busy resurrecting and rehabilitating civic republicanism. (1) **The purpose of this paper is to** lay out the basic model of civic republicanism, stressing how it handles poverty and economic inequality, and then **assess the universal basic income grant (UBI) and the living wage** in light of these principles. **I conclude by arguing that a melding of the two policies-a Universal Service Set and a living wage-provide the best approach**. THE CIVIC REPUBLICAN POLITY¶ Civic republicanism's origins lie in the ancient world, in the political theory undergirding several notable Greek city-states and the Roman republic. (2) Thereafter, it lay dormant until resurrected in the Italian city-states of the Renaissance, and then by the "Commonwealth men" of seventeenth century England. From the latter, it was transported to the American colonies and flowered during the Revolutionary era and immediately afterward. While republican thinkers from these various periods parted company on several matters, their unifying focus was that the polity is a self-governing community of citizens.¶ The aim of the civic republican polity is maintaining the liberty of its citizens. Since liberty cannot be achieved outside a community-a wild animal can be "free" but it cannot be said to have "liberty"-the individual citizen must be intimately connected to the community. He must believe that his interests are inseparable from those of the community, and that the role of citizen is a natural part of life. The state can rely on its citizens, who after all are the state, to exercise civic virtue and to consider the needs of the community along with their own. The citizenry governs itself by the process of deliberation, a deliberation devoted to finding and pursuing the public interest. To this end, political institutions in a republic should evidence a certain balance and be rather slow acting, at least under ordinary circumstances. Representative democracy, which allows republics to be larger than city-states, is a method for the further protection of liberty. It is not, pointedly, an end in itself.¶ Unlike liberal individualism, which posits no overriding end for the polity, civic republicanism stands emphatically on liberty as its central value. Liberty is taken to mean being free from domination. More formally, according to Richard Petit, a leading contemporary republican theorist, "One agent dominates another if and only if they have a certain power over that other, in particular a power of interference on an arbitrary basis." (3) Domination can therefore take either of two forms. In the first, one private individual holds power over another (dominium); in the second, it is the state which exercises the domination (imperium). Both are equally odious to republicanism. If I am dominated, I am not free, no matter what the source of the domination. To be a citizen is to be at all times and all places free of domination, since citizenship is synonymous with the enjoyment of liberty.¶ Prohibiting dominium presupposes that no citizen can be the servant of another, for servanthood brings domination with it by its very nature. If you are my servant and I order you around, you are quite clearly being dominated. Nevertheless, it is important to note that you are dominated even if I chose not to order you around (for whatever reason). You still cannot look me in the eye as an equal, for we both know that "The Remains of the Day" is more realistic than Wooster and Jeeves. Not only may I alter my reserved role at any time without consulting you, but you will also be ever mindful of my ability to do so, and that cannot help but affect how you think, feel, and act. You and I are both aware that there may come a time when you will have to tread gingerly. Citizens of a republic simply cannot have such a relationship. As Petit said of civic republicans:¶ The heights that they identified held out the prospect of a way of life within which none of them had to bow and scrape to others; they would each be capable of standing on their own two feet; they would each be able to look others squarely in the eye. (4)¶ Or, as Walt Whitman succinctly described a citizen, "Neither a servant nor a master am I." (5)¶ Governmental power can of course be a source of domination also, for the enormous power of the state is ever pregnant with the potential for domination. There is, however, a critical difference here. Whereas interference, real or potential, by one individual over another's choices is by its nature domination, governmental interference in one's affairs may or may not be. This is because liberty can only be made meaningful in a community, and the needs of the community will necessarily at times come into conflict with one or more individuals' autonomy, or at least with individuals' autonomy as they would define it. It is the community that makes liberty possible, and a citizen's freedom is inseparable from the interests and health of the community. As Blackstone noted, "laws, when prudently framed, are by no means subversive but rather introductive of liberty." (6)¶ This is where civic republicanism and political theories based in neoclassical economics (as well as those based on extreme versions of a right to privacy, it should be added to be fair) clash. Take Milton Friedman's argument that the right to buy and sell property at market prices is a fundamental liberty that should be guaranteed in the Constitution. (7) The civic republican would reply that, first, while a citizen certainly has property rights (and indeed that they are important rights), he/she also has property in rights. James Madison endorsed this sentiment in 1792 when he wrote that "as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights." Government, he went on, should "impartially secure to every man whatever is his own." (8) What he meant is that the liberty of the person, considered as a citizen, is the central concern. The right of property refers not merely, and certainly not exclusively, to the right to possess and accumulate physical goods; a person's property includes the possession and exercise of civil and political liberties.¶ Moreover, our civic republican would continue, economic life is not separable from political life. It is the pursuit of the collective interest of the citizenry in preserving their liberty that is paramount. Thus, I cannot claim that the state can brook no interference in my right to sell my apples at price X or construct a high-rise office building on my real estate. Of course it may interfere with my doing these, and a host of other activities for that matter. Its only constraints are utilizing proper procedures in adopting the policy, non-arbitrariness in carrying it out, and the maintenance of contestability. My rights are as a citizen, not as the owner of a lemonade stand. Thomas Jefferson argued in a letter to a friend in 1816 that governments do not exist to protect property. They exist, rather, to promote access to property, which, he said, is why he changed John Locke's trilogy of "life, liberty, and property" to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." (9) ¶ Critics sometimes contend that civic republicanism, by granting the state such extensive powers, can suffocate the individual. Of course, it is theoretically possible that it could, but that is a faint threat in a viable republic. Republican politics endeavors to construct a society in which individuals are free to make the choices that they wish, to be truly free from domination today and the threat of domination tomorrow. If the citizenry, though, becomes selfish and irresponsible, then, yes, republican governments could become arbitrary and destructive of liberty. It is often, though, a rampant individualism that undermines individual freedom. In part, this is because it turns a blind eye to the domination that can be inherent in individuals' relations with each other. But it is also because that by asserting that there is no higher good than self-interest it destroys the whole. Tocqueville, it is worth recalling, was strongly in favor of "individuality," attainable only when people are free from domination, but deeply skeptical of "individualism," where people acknowledge no higher good than the pursuit of their own self-interest. In fact, one of the major concerns voiced throughout his writing was whether republican liberty could be maintained as democracy spread, or whether the offspring would swallow the parent. (10)¶ Consequently, "rights," whether the economic rights favored by Friedmanites or the privacy rights cherished by the left, cannot stand as impenetrable barriers to policies designed to achieve the public good. (11) To do so is to champion an individualism that is the path to isolation and ultimately to anarchy. Rights are a means to the accomplishing of liberty, not zones that by absolutely restricting state action are subversive of it.¶ POVERTY¶ Republics are composed of and governed by their citizens. Seeking to secure and protect the liberty of the citizenry, republics depend on both widespread civic virtue and active participation in public affairs. The role of citizen is not merely a legal status conferred by the state; it is rather a central component of the individual's life.¶ To be free in the republican sense, free from domination, requires that each citizen be autonomous. Without autonomy, the citizen cannot make the choices that are the benefits of liberty. Further, without autonomy the citizen is liable to be unduly swayed by others, and unable to reach her own conclusions about the needs of the community. Richard Dagger has defined autonomy as "the right to the protection and promotion of the ability to lead a self-governed life." (12)¶ Autonomy is not a dichotomous variable, however, something either present or absent. "Autonomy, like other abilities," Dagger explains, " is not something we either do nor do not have; it is something we may possess to a greater or lesser extent, just as the ability to speak English or play chess varies considerably among English speakers and chess players." (13) It is a continuum, therefore, and it is not necessary that every citizen have an identical amount; what is required instead is merely that no citizen should be below a certain threshold of autonomy. Above that, "increasing someone's autonomy by widening the range of choices available . . . becomes less and less valuable. Rather than maximize autonomy, either in a select few individuals or in some abstract sense, as if we could pile up units of autonomy, we ought to be concerned with bringing as many people as possible up to that threshold. The idea is to promote autonomy by recognizing the right of autonomy, not to produce more and more autonomy for its own sake." (14)¶ What must we as citizens have, then, to reach this threshold of autonomy? First, of course, we must possess certain basic civil liberties, such as those found in the Bill of Rights. We must be free from unjust criminal prosecutions; we must be free to speak our minds and write what we wish; we must be free to exercise freedom of conscience; our private effects must be shielded from arbitrary intrusions; and our property must not be taken without just compensation. Additionally, we must have a guarantee of political participation, participation in which each counts as one and only one. In a representative democracy, this means voting, running for office if we choose, petitioning government, and organizing with others to promote our views.¶ But it also requires something more, namely the ability to live without depending on others. James Harrington, the foremost of the English republican writers of the seventeenth century, included these among his "Aphorisms" regarding politics:¶ The man that cannot live upon his own must be a servant; but he that can live upon his own may be a freeman.¶ Where a people cannot live upon their own, the government is either a monarchy or aristocracy; where a people can live upon their own, the government may be a democracy. (15)¶ Or, as Richard Petit put it in more modern language, "To be independent in the intended sense is to have the wherewithal to operate normally and properly in your society without having to beg or borrow from others, and without having to depend on their beneficence." (16)¶ If you do not live upon your own, therefore, your citizenship is wanting. Not only are you not free of the domination your purse-string holders have over you; your capacity for developing the independence of mind needed for the expeditious and just conduct of public business is also called into serious question. You must have the capacities to make choices both in your private sphere and when you participate in public affairs.¶ Without question, the economist and philosopher Amartya Sen has done the best thinking in this area. (17) He begins by laying out two concepts, "functionings" and "capabilities." Goods, he maintains, have four discrete aspects. There is first the notion of the good, say bread. We have a referent for "bread," defining it as a mixture of so much dough, so much water, and so forth. Second, there are the characteristics of goods, in this instance its color or nutritional value. Third, there is the function of the good, preventing hunger and providing nourishment in bread's case. Fourth, there is the utility of the good, that is, how much pleasure one derives from consuming it.¶ It is the "functionings" of the goods that are germane here. What we want people to possess is adequate health and vigor. It follows that to achieve an acceptable level of these "functionings," people must have the "capabilities" to secure certain goods. They need what Sen refers to as an adequate "capability set." In a modern society, part of the "capability set" will consist of non-material matters, such as the ability to read, to have access to knowledge, and the like. (18) Part of it, however, will be purely economic, the enjoyment of a certain standard of living. "In this approach what is valued is the capability to live well, and, in the specific economic context of standard of living, it values the capabilities associated with economic matters." Being free, therefore, he argues, requires a "basic capability set" composed of both economic and non-economic elements. Without this, one cannot be a citizen as republicans envisage citizenship.¶ Moreover, the capability set and the functionings it produces vary significantly from one society to another. Merely to have a roof over one's head, one set of clothes, and three bowls of gruel a day cannot fulfil the functioning requirement in a modern, prosperous society. Adam Smith himself addressed this point in 1776 in The Wealth of Nations:By necessaries I understand, not only the commodities necessary for the support of life, but whatever the custom of the country renders it indecent for creditable people, even of the lowest order, to be without. A linen shirt, for example, is, strictly speaking, not a necessary of life. The Greeks and Romans lived, I suppose, very comfortably, though they had no linen. But in the present times, through the greater part of Europe, a creditable day-labourer would be ashamed to appear in public without a linen shirt, the want of which would be supposed to denote that disgraceful state of poverty, which, it is presumed, no body can well fall into without extreme bad conduct. Custom, in the same manner, has rendered leather shoes a necessary of life in England. The poorest creditable person of either sex would be ashamed to appear in public without them . . . Under necessaries, therefore, I comprehend, not only those things which nature, but those things which the established rules of decency, have rendered necessary to the lowest rank of people. (19)¶ Sen made the same point two hundred years later regarding peoples' basic standard of living in modern rich countries.¶ Can they take part in the life of the community? Can they appear in public without shame and without feeling disgraced? Can they find worthwhile jobs? Can they use their school education? Can they visit friends and relations if they choose? It is a question of what the persons can do or can be, and not just a question of their earnings and opulence, nor of their being contended. Freedom is the issue; not commodities, nor utility as such. (20)¶ Thomas Jefferson saw as clearly as Amartya Sen the link between republican citizenship and a base line of economic independence, and was more than willing to use public policies to bring people up to that level. Daniel Boorstin has argued that Jefferson was deeply concerned throughout his public career with how best to use government to provide the conditions for people to reach their potential. (21) Joyce Appleby adds that as early as 1784, he wished "to use constitutional and statutory measures to make the poor independent." (22) He proposed, for example, adopting a 50 acre property qualification for the right to vote in Virginia-and giving every landless adult white male 50 acres.¶ Jefferson's praise of the role of independent small farmers is often painted as a nostalgia trip, a utopian fantasy that, if it were ever feasible in the past, certainly was not in the emerging commercial republic of his middle age. A laudable ideal, perhaps, but hopelessly naive as a social blueprint in the early nineteenth century. But that is simply inaccurate. Jefferson in fact looked forward to and actively supported the commercialization of agriculture. "Working with a completely commercial mode of agriculture, Jefferson projected for America a dynamic food-producing and food-selling economy which promised the best of both worlds: economic independence for the bulk of the population and a rising standard of living." (23) It was the expansion of the stock of available arable land that was the key to securing the republican ideal of small farmers into the foreseeable future. If the land could be provided, Jefferson was optimistic about the American future of commercialized agriculture. In 1817 he wrote to a French correspondent that his optimism was "built much on the enlargement of the resources of life going hand in hand with the enlargement of territory, and the belief that men are disposed to live honestly, if the means of doing so are open to them." (24)¶ In sum, to be a citizen one must have a certain basic level of economic well-being, and that level must be judged by the standards of each society. Without it, no person can be free, and when people are not free the republican polity disintegrates. Adrian Oldfield has summed it up this way:¶ For activity of any kind, including that involved in the practice of citizenship, people need certain resources. Some of these have to do with . . . civil, political, and legal rights. Others have to do with economic and social resources. Without health, education, and a reasonable living income, for instance, individuals do not have the capacity to be effective agents in the world, and the possibilities of a practice of citizenship are thus foreclosed in advance. Such rights and resources have to be secured for citizens, for citizenship is an egalitarian practice." (25)¶ Richard Petit put the same point more briefly. "If a republican state is committed to advancing the cause of freedom as non-domination among its citizens, then it must embrace a policy of promoting socioeconomic independence." (26)¶ A good case can be made, of course, that poverty is an evil in itself and requires a moral response. Every major American religious tradition, in fact, includes that position, to one degree or another. Catholicism, mainstream Protestantism, evangelical Protestantism, and Judaism all concur that poverty is a blot on God's world and that there is a duty to respond, disagree though they may about the causes of poverty and the appropriateness of public versus private means of addressing it. (27) The point here is different. Poverty is an evil because of its political consequences. By stunting the mind and warping the spirit, it makes people unfit for republican citizenship. Since the freedom of all citizens is dependent on the health of the political system, which in turn is dependent on the continuing practice of citizenship, the viability of a republican polity is threatened, and ultimately destroyed, by the threat of poverty.¶ To be sure, even at its most generous the reach of who could be considered a citizen in the historical republics was quite restricted-to a small coterie of property-owning males who stood ready for military service. However, republican theory loses none of its cogency when the definition of citizen is expanded to include all adults. Rather than limit citizenship to those who already have the educational attainments and a degree of personal prosperity, the question for modern societies is how to make all adults fit for citizenship The framework for political organization civic republicanism embodies can be as relevant to the politics of today as at those historical moments when it was dominant, if steps are taken to make citizenship a condition of every adult.¶ We must be at pains to point out that securing an acceptable level of material well-being for all is not a sufficient condition for keeping a republic, merely a necessary one. Republican citizenship requires that citizens utilize their well-being responsibly and for wise ends. They are free to be foolish and intemperate, but a republic cannot endure if they are. Rereading Harrington's aphorisms, the use of the word "may" in both of them is striking, and far more than merely suggestive. Here, of course, is where the role of education in the promotion of virtue becomes critical, but that is another avenue entirely. For the moment, we must address ourselves solely to the best mechanism for securing a basic level of material well-being to every citizen. First, however, we need to take up the issue of equality and inequality.¶ INEQUALITY¶ Republics, we have established, must address the problem of poverty. Further, the attack on poverty must be mounted by the state, for to leave it to private efforts is to leave its eradication uncertain. Citizenship must be preserved by removing citizens from poverty, opening up the vistas of choice that are the essence of freedom. But what about equality of choice? Citizenship is by its nature egalitarian, as each person has to count and measure as one and only one. Does it follow that republican governments must secure material equality among its citizens? In a word, no.¶ A viable republic will, instead, have to adhere to three conditions. First, it must free all its citizens of the stain of poverty. Second, it must establish and maintain what Richard Petit calls "structural equality" among the citizenry. Third, it must soften the extremes of material inequality.¶ The issue of poverty has already been addressed. Passing on, we need only pause momentarily to dispense with the structural issue. What is required to meet this criterion is complete legal and political equality. When people appear before the courts and other institutions of government, they must be treated as equals. No citizen may stand outside the law, or have special rules apply to him. The principles and practices of the law must be shaped and applied in a completely non-arbitrary fashion. Turning to political equality, it is essential that political participation be conducted on the basis of one person one vote. No citizen may be denied the right to participation (in all its guises) and none can have more voice than another.¶ Let us turn now to the matter of material equality. As with poverty, a moral case can be made for material equality, but that is irrelevant here. In political terms, furthermore, an arguable case can be made that a republic would function better if there were material equality among its citizens. None would surely then have to bow and scrape. They could all eat at the same restaurants, afford similar clothes, and ride in the same section of the train or plane; and the similarity of their economic condition would bind their interests tightly together. If a society existed, then, with absolute, or even rough, pre-existing material equality, a republic would be an ideal and natural choice for the political system. However, republican political theory is not designed merely to provide a guide to what would be desirable in a social utopia; it is designed to be a program for the real world.¶ Therefore, two factors must be kept in mind. First, a market economy is the natural outgrowth of republican political structure. If people have even qualified property rights, then they must have the right to dispose of their property as they see fit. Transactions among private parties will thereby automatically characterize much of the economic activity in a republic. Because people have different endowments and different luck, inequalities in the possession of property will be an inevitability. Such inequalities are simply a natural by-product of a market economy, and it cannot be otherwise. Since there is no way to maintain republican freedom without an accompanying market economy, we must accept that some economic inequality is going to be a fact of life in a republic. ¶ Second, any attempt to legislate material equality would vest far too much power in the state to suit republican tastes. It would lead, that is, to imperium, which would demolish what you were trying to save. This is because the magnitude of the undertaking would create a state the scale of which would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to tether it to republican political institutions. Besides, how could it be done? If some people have a certain skill (say, hitting a little white ball with a stick) which others do not, and if people are willing to pay to watch those with the skill demonstrate it, how would you achieve material equality? You could not physically endow everyone with the skill. So, you would have to lower the skill level of those with it to make abilities equal. At my physical peak, for example, for Barry Bonds and I to be equal at the plate, he would have to have 25 pound weights attached to each wrist and bat blindfolded (at least). While the republic might not collapse if everyone was made equal in sports, if you did this to artists, musicians, dancers, and various other talented individuals, what a drab and oppressive world it would be. Or, you could make the recipients of the largesse fork all of it over to a common pool, to be distributed to everyone. But would not at least some of the incentive go away? And what about the rules, regulations, and bureaucracy that would be required? At the same time, there are entrepreneurs who do serve the greater good while pursuing riches for themselves. New products and better ways of doing things spring from people whose creative abilities lie in these areas. To deprive them of the reasonable fruits of their labors hardly seems fair, and would surely lessen their propensity to tinker in the garage. No, a republican state that tried to utilize governmental power to enforce anything approaching material equality would likely not survive. ¶ Nevertheless, too much inequality in material possessions is an equally serious problem. Again, both the moral case and the economic efficiency case against too much inequality, powerful though they may be, must yield to the political case. Severe inequalities in material conditions, to put it straightforwardly, can destroy the very bases on which legal and political equality are built. This is true for three reasons.¶ First, when citizens enjoy vastly different incomes, they begin to lose the sense of seeing each other as equals. When housing, clothes, vacations, food, and so forth differ enormously, people invariably become detached from those who are on the other side of the chasm. Their experiences cannot help but disconnect them, and they begin to see fellow citizens as somehow the "other," different from themselves, unapproachable and perhaps vexing. Everyone need not be able to afford an identical house, but the square footage and the acreage on which it sits should not be too far apart. If it is a matter of choice, of course-citizen A spends his discretionary income on a large house while citizen B enjoys expensive wines in a smaller house-that is altogether different. That very act of choice makes them similar. Second, too much economic inequality can lead to skewed political participation. Any form of clientelism is obviously incompatible with republicanism. However, even far short of that, marked economic inequalities open up the possibility that some can, if not the guarantee that they will, buy ever larger megaphones to amplify their voices. In a healthy republic, every citizen's views need to be heard and considered, much as in a Quaker meeting. If one group of citizens can drown out others' voices, then a republic cannot be maintained. It is inevitable that economic power is going to lead to political power. And with the disparities that accompany a market economy, it is also inevitable that in a republic some are going to have more wherewithal to invest in the political debate than others. But that gap should be narrow rather than large. If we cannot eliminate megaphones, we can at least restrict their size.¶ Third, vast economic inequalities impair the public institutions that are a vital component of republican life. Republics require more domains than the courtroom and the polling station where citizens meet as equals, unaffected by wealth and income. Public parks, for example, are much more than attractive and pleasant locales. They are places where citizens can see each other and interact as equals. When those with superior wealth erect their private enclaves to enjoy tennis, picnics, and the outdoors, a link in the citizenship chain is broken. The same is true for public transport and public schools. When people do not see their personal fate linked to public institutions, they lose interest in them. Why should, I, the wealthy begin to think, pay for these facilities which I do not use? When that happens a vital thread of a common citizenship is cut. Of even more central concern is the military. Citizen service in the military is the hallmark of a republic. When the army becomes largely a semi-mercenary force of those for whom it presents an attractive economic alternative, one of the central vestiges of citizenship is removed.¶ Republican theorists down through the ages have, consequently, been concerned with the political implications of economic inequality. James Harrington, for example, proposed an "agrarian law" that would limit the amount of land someone could own, a law "designed to control the distribution of land in such a way that there should always be enough free proprietors to constitute a many." (28) Throughout his writings, he speaks of the need for "balance," and part of that balance was in the distribution of material resources. Charles Blitzer explained that "Harrington is disturbed by the existence of extremes of wealth and poverty and prefers a more equal distribution of small holdings. But his justification was not a moral one; rather he argues that it will be economically efficient and productive as well as politically desirable." (29)¶ In the United States, James Madison, according to the respected historian Lance Banning, seconded Harrington believing "that power follows property [and] that great extremes of poverty and wealth are incompatible with freedom." (30) During the Revolution, Jefferson wrote to Madison that "Legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property." (31) In 1792 the Republican party oriented National Gazette published an article critical of policies that would serve to "increase inequalities of wealth, and to undermine the character of the people." (32) Banning sums up the ideology of the early Republican party leaders as follows:¶ America had come to be defined, in part, in terms of its relatively equal, agrarian balance of property. Republicans held it as a first principle that private morality and public virtue depended on the maintenance of this distribution of wealth, a distribution profoundly threatened in their minds by the rise of the monied favorites of a Federalist administration. (33)¶ At the end of the day, then, inequalities of wealth corrode republican politics. They separate citizens one from another, lead to disparities in political participation, and weaken public institutions. While an attempt to effect absolute, or even near, economic equality among citizens would indeed pose a serious danger, failing to adopt public policies to soften the gargantuan inequalities that invariably result from the normal operation of a market economy is equally dangerous. While the state must tread cautiously in this area, therefore, it must not hesitate to tread. Adam Smith can be adduced again in support of this point.¶ Is this improvement in the circumstances of the lower ranks of the people to be regarded as an advantage or as an inconveniency to the society? . . . [W]hat improves the circumstances of the greater part can never be regarded as an inconveniency to the whole. No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable. (34)¶ UBI VERSUS THE LIVING WAGE¶ UBI has been defined by Philippe Van Parijs as "an income paid by a government, at a uniform level and at regular intervals, to each adult member of society. The grant is paid , and its level is fixed, irrespective of whether the person is rich or poor, lives alone or with others, is willing to work or not." (35) Loek Groot and Robert van der Veen shorten this to "an income granted unconditionally to all on an individual basis without a means test or work requirement." (36) My definition of living wage is a wage that will provide someone who works full time year round with a decent standard of living as measured by the criteria of the society in which he/she lives.¶ The first major difference is the work feature of the living wage. Advocates of UBI down play the importance of work, Parijs saying that we need to avoid "work fetishism." To be sure, work can be onerous, unpleasant, degrading and productive of stress. But then anything that is good can have a down side. Most people-intellectuals and survey respondents alike-seem to agree that on the whole, the virtues of work, both for the individual and for society, outweigh the drawbacks. (37) For present purposes, those attributes of work that relate to republican citizenship need to be stressed.¶ First, **work provides structure and routine**. The tendency to entropy pervades human activity as much as it does the physical world. Only a precious few of our fellows can keep their lives on course without structure and routine. Stories from the Depression almost always stress this. People were lost without routines, and an aimlessness soon infected every corner of life. Orderly life began to crumble. Or, listen to the advice of retirement counselors. Only retire, they stress, if you have something you want to do.¶ Second, **work gives** many if not **most people a sense of accomplishment**, which invariably makes people feel better about themselves. Third, and closely related to the second, **work provides a sense of identity**. We all know what the question "What do you do?" means. I play softball and putter around in my wood shop is not the type of answer most people expect. Of course, this can be overdone; but the feeling that "I am this" cannot be ignored either.¶ Fourth, **work forces us to confront the social world. We learn how to interact with others and how to perform in groups**, formal and informal. We learn what society's expectations of us are; we also develop expectations of certain behaviors from others. This leads to greater mental health and better social adjustment.¶ All of these aspects of work contribute to better republican citizenship. An ordered life, a sense of daily accomplishment, an identity that is important to oneself and others, and an ability to interact easily with others all contribute to the kind of character traits needed by republics. They make liberty meaningful and lay the groundwork for confident and intelligent participation in public affairs. **By laying the emphasis on work**, then, the **living wage wins one over UBI**.¶ Some proponents of UBI counter that these same character traits can be developed through engaging in voluntary service, and that UBI will make voluntary service more common by reducing the hours many people need to work. Without question, the first part of this contention is mostly true. Voluntary service might not provide quite as much structure as regular work because of the very fact that it is voluntary; nonetheless, it certainly is beneficial on all the other counts. In addition, of course, society is made better in the process. However, it is surely open to question how much of an upsurge in volunteering would be unleashed by the institution of UBI. A good test: How many retirees devote their time to these activities now? Some, to be sure, but not an army. In any event, most likely those who would volunteer to serve in soup kitchens or care for neglected children already possess the traits needed for healthy citizenship.¶ Another dimension for comparing the UBI with the living wage is the problem of dependency. It was argued forcefully above that citizens cannot be dependent on others, since that is destructive of liberty. In any system of UBI a certain number of people are going to pay for the others, and it will not be difficult to identify the payers and the receivers. Naturally, some people will change categories as they age or their economic fortunes change. But in the short run, which is what matters most in politics, the dividing line will be evident. This fact cannot help but affect how people feel. It may be a sad commentary on human nature, but in such a situation resentment grows on both sides. Moreover, the higher the payments under UBI the greater the level of resentment would be.¶ **If the UBI were set high enough to remove people from poverty, what its devotees obviously hope, it would have the further deleterious effect of spawning a culture of dependency in the recipients**. All the pathologies of the old American AFDC program would develop, with the calamitous political consequences they brought in their train.¶ Republican citizens, recall, need to be able to look each other in the eye. None can be dependent on another, and a UBI, by the straightforward mechanism of a public budgetary transfer, would make some dependent on others (unless the amounts were trivial, in which case, what would be the point?). **By providing payment for work performed, the living wage removes any possible social, and hence, political, stigma from what is received**. The earner of the wage can look anyone in the eye, both because of the source of the income and the fact that it is adequate to allow him or her to live a decent lifestyle.¶ There is also the related problem of political vulnerability. Suppose the UBI were high enough to be a meaningful part of the income of the poor. Suppose further that social values were such that the grant was kept reasonably generous. But the poor are still vulnerable; they have no guarantee that the public budgetary process will always be so benign. They would be in the position of servants who worked for a generous master. Well off, relatively anyway, but subject to his or her whim. A citizen's economic well-being simply cannot be in the hands of others, even a sympathetic political majority. The living wage has some problems in this area also, of course. It would have to be set by statute, and that would inject political majorities into its determination. However, the setting of a wage level would be two or three steps removed from direct budgetary politics, blunting somewhat the us/them divide. Further, those who work would have a far stronger political claim than those who do not. These two facts do not remove political vulnerability, but they do reduce it somewhat.¶ Thus, any attempt to create a UBI which would move people without any other source of income above the poverty level would be beset by problems. The first is that the dollar figures become huge very quickly. Accordingly, a UBI at such a level would magnify all the difficulties sketched above. A living wage would be a much more palatable tool for attacking poverty, and much less costly to the economy. Its chief problem is, of course, that there would need to be a supply of jobs available for all those who wish to work. During periods of economic boom, this would be a minor matter. When recessions struck, however, this would present a serious issue. The only realistic approach would be either public sector jobs or subsidized jobs in the private sector. (38) Personally, I would tend to public sector jobs, real jobs I stress, not answering the phone at the drug rehab center. Subsidized private sector jobs would create too many incentives for firms to pressure politicians to continue the subsidies when the recession ended. (39)¶ When it come to softening inequality, the living wage wins again. Because everyone gets the same UBI, there is no compressing of income skews. In fact, a UBI could actually increase inequality. Affluent people would have more money to invest, and the long term impacts of accumulation versus spending would exacerbate the wealth gap. A living wage, as I define it, would at least keep everyone in sight of the mean.¶ In short, if we apply civic republican ideals, **the living wage is preferable on every score to the UBI. Nevertheless, there is something attractive about the UBI**. I believe **we could get the best of both worlds** by combining what I would call a Universal Service Set (USS) with a living wage.¶ Two key principles would underlie this approach: 1)**No one will be allowed to live in poverty and** 2)with only rare exceptions, **no cash will be paid to anyone without work**. (40)¶ The USS would be universal and free at point of service. There are four services I would provide here. The first of these is health care. A public health system would provide medical care to every citizen. The second is education. Public educational institutions would offer quality education at no cost from kindergarten through graduate and professional school. (Naturally, this would also include vocational training of all kinds.) The other two services are food and housing. How these are provided would depend on individual circumstances. For the elderly, parentless children, and those suffering from disabilities, a clean, well-staffed, and humanely run institution might be best. For others, temporary public housing units might be best. I believe we might even consider public food facilities, where anyone could receive a basic, wholesome, nutritious meal at any time without cost. We might have to think about clothing, but that is a detail. Those who cannot (or will not) take care of themselves will therefore have their basic needs met.¶ **Supplementing the USS would be a statutory living wage set**, in my version, **as a percentage of the mean income of the top five or ten percent of incomes**. (41**) Setting a living wage in this manner draws on the UBI inspired insight that payments should go to individuals** regardless of family size and without means tests. To be effective, of course, such a policy would require a public jobs program, at which anyone could show up to work. If Bill Gates drops by, he can work, and be paid.¶ By combining a USS with a living wage, therefore, we could eliminate poverty, soften inequality, and encourage the development of a viable republican citizenship.

### Perm: Individual Health

#### PERM do both—doesn’t solve the case and hurts individual’s health—only the permutation can solve has a laundry list of net benefits.

Lindsey 14 (Brink Lindsey, senior scholar at the Kauffman Foundation, “Why Living on the Dole Is Bad for You,” JUNE 27, 2014, http://bleedingheartlibertarians.com/2014/06/why-living-on-the-dole-is-bad-for-you/)//ghs-VA

In a post last week, Jessica Flanigan takes me to task for my opposition to a universal basic income. Because I worry that a **UBI would further encourage mass idleness**, a serious and worsening social blight **among the** less educated and **less skilled**, I favor instead social policies that promote engagement in the work force – in particular, through wage subsidies for low-skill work. Flanigan says this makes me a paternalist. There are serious reasons for favoring a UBI, and I applaud Flanigan for raising important issues. But I don’t think the paternalism charge really gets us anywhere. After all, the purpose of both a UBI and wage subsidies is to help people who are failing to support themselves adequately. In one sense, then, both policies are paternalistic, since in both cases the state is assuming a paternal role of providing for dependents. Viewed from another angle, though, neither policy is properly considered paternalistic. Paternalism, after all, is about reducing people’s choices for their own good. But either a UBI or wage subsidies would expand the choices of their intended beneficiaries relative to what they would be in the absence of any government provision at all. Nevertheless, it is true that the choices of UBI recipients are less constrained than those of workers who receive wage subsidies. With a UBI, you get a check every month no matter what, whereas to benefit from wage subsidies you have to get a job. The great virtue of a UBI is its directness and simplicity: people need help, so just give them money. Don’t worry about providing food stamps, public housing, job training, etc. – instead just cut a check and let people figure out for themselves how best to use the money. As the cleanest social policy option, the UBI sets an appropriate benchmark for judging any alternative form of assistance. Supporters of any program of specific government-provided benefits – including wage subsidies – need to be able to show that such in-kind aid helps its beneficiaries more than simply writing checks for the equivalent amount of money. I think a good case can be made that a UBI would be more helpful to the disadvantaged than the patchwork of frequently intrusive, infantilizing, bureaucratic, and wasteful means-tested programs that presently constitutes the American social safety net. So if I could wave a magic wand and replace the policy status quo with a UBI, I would do so. That said, my reading of the available evidence convinces me that **a social policy that channels benefits through work** and thereby encourages paid employment **has important advantages over a UBI in helping the disadvantaged** to live full, happy, productive, and rewarding lives. What evidence? Let’s start with the well-established finding that unemployment has major negative effects on well-being, including both mental and physical health. And the effects are remarkably persistent. A study using German panel data examined changes in reported life satisfaction after marriage, divorce, birth of a child, death of a spouse, layoff, and unemployment. All had predictable effects in the short term, but for five of the six the effect generally wore off with time: the joy of having a new baby subsided, while the pain of a loved one’s death gradually faded. The exception was unemployment: even after five years, the researchers found little evidence of adaptation. Evidence even more directly on point comes from the experience of welfare reform – specifically, the imposition of work requirements on recipients of public assistance. Interestingly, studies of the economic consequences of reform showed little or no change in recipients’ material well-being. But a pair of studies found a positive impact on single mothers’ happiness as a result of moving off welfare and finding work. Flanigan is certainly correct that it’s possible to have an enjoyable and satisfying life without working for pay. Employment’s psychic benefits come from engaging us in challenges to overcome, encouraging us to develop and realize our inborn talents, and involving us in projects and purposes larger than ourselves. But we can obtain these benefits just as well through hobbies, volunteer work, and family life. And indeed, there is a real tension between the demands of a job and these other pathways to happiness, as all of us who struggle for that elusive work-life balance can attest. So you might think that not having to work would free people to spend more time on these other, potentially more rewarding activities. But life doesn’t seem to work that way. Consider the most recent results from the American Time Use Survey, compiled annually by the Bureau of Labor **Statistics. In 2013**, employed men averaged 6.43 hours a day on work and related activities (like commuting). So how did men without jobs fill up all that free time? Well, **compared** to **employed men they spent 19 extra minutes a day on housework, 11 more minutes on socializing**, 9 more minutes on exercise and recreation, 8 more minutes on childcare, and 6 more minutes on organizational, civic, and religious activities. **The really dramatic differences in time use, though, came in two areas: jobless men spent an extra hour sleeping** (for a total of 9.25 hours a day!) **and two extra hours watching TV** (4.05 hours a day!). The evidence is quite clear: people who don’t work can’t be counted on to fill that void with other forms of productive, engaged, goal-oriented activity. Yes, there are plenty of happy students and stay-at-home parents, and retirement apparently improves well-being. You don’t need a paycheck to thrive. But for most working-age people, paid employment is the most reliable path to commitment, engagement, and a sense of purpose. For most people, **joblessness means not only a lack of income, but also lack of status, lack of identity, and lack of direction**. It is the path, not to nonpecuniary forms of fulfillment, but to anomie and despair. Over the past few decades, there has been a steady deterioration in American men’s commitment to work. For so-called prime-age males aged 25-54, the labor force participation rate has fallen from 96 percent in 1970 to 88 percent today. This drop-off in participation is concentrated among the less educated and less skilled. Among all adult men in 2010, the labor force participation rate for college grads was 81 percent – compared to 71 percent for high school grads, and only 59 percent for high school dropouts. What is going on? The emergence of the postindustrial information economy is reducing relative demand for, and the relative wages of, less skilled workers. Meanwhile, eligibility for the dole has expanded (especially disability insurance) while the cultural stigma against idleness has faded. This pincer movement is squeezing less skilled men out of the work force. And in turn, the reduced availability of “marriageable” (i.e., gainfully employed) men is contributing to family breakdown at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale. In 2011, 87 percent of kids who have a parent with a college degree lived with both of their parents – compared to only 53 percent of kids of high school grads, and 47 percent of the kids of high school dropouts. Unstable single-parent families can then be expected to produce another generation of unmarriageable less skilled men, thus perpetuating a vicious circle. The rise of mass joblessness among the less skilled is a catastrophe, plain and simple. Work and family, the two great cornerstones of life satisfaction, are both under assault, and declining commitment to one is feeding declining commitment to the other. Under these circumstances, a UBI cannot be recommended as sound social policy. The great challenge at present is to arrest and reverse the slide of less skilled Americans into a permanent underclass – even as automation and globalization continue to marginalize the role and value of low-skill work. But as the celebrated negative income tax experiments of the late 1960s and early 1970s made clear, unconditional income support reduces labor supply. Perhaps not dramatically, but still the impact is going in the wrong direction. By contrast, wage subsidies in the form of graduated payments to employers of low-skill workers can increase the attractiveness of work and boost labor force participation. It’s entirely possible that the continued progress of automation will eventually make paid employment the exception rather than the rule. We must hope that by then we are up to facing what Keynes called man’s “permanent problem – how to use his freedom from pressing economic cares, how to occupy the leisure, which compound interest and science will have won for him, to live wisely and agreeably and well.” But we’re not ready yet. We cannot maintain our current living standards without a high degree of labor participation, and against that backdrop mass joblessness is a recipe for dysfunction and misery. We may someday enjoy a post-work society of productive, creative leisure, but maintaining and expanding the underclass aren’t the way to get there.

### Perm: Dependency

#### Living wages are a better strategy than government benefits because they reduce dependency, which is uniquely key to solve the security of jobs.

Harvey 3 (Rachel Harvey, BSFS in Foreign Service, Georgetown University, JD, University of Florida College of Law, "Labor Law: Challenges to the Living Wage Movement: Obstacles in a Path to Economic Justice," University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy 13, 2002-2003)//ghs-VA

Increased wages are more favorable to workers than money received through such government benefits as income tax credits and food stamps because they provide workers with independence.123 Workers become less dependent on the government assistance they received through food stamps, public health trusts, and the federal EITC. In an impact study of the potential effects of a living wage ordinance on Miami-Dade County, Bruce Nissen notes that across the political spectrum there seems to be agreement that poor people are better off if they are weaned from dependence on government assistance. "They are better in all respects... if they earn their income from their own work efforts."'124 In addition to these effects, being weaned from government assistance affects workers' sense of dignity.125 When employees receive higher wages they do a better job, as reflected in their improved morale, lower rate of absenteeism, lower turnover, and improvement in the quality of applicants.126 With higher wages rather than government assistance, workers could use their money as they see fit, benefiting from higher spending power and better healthcare in addition to greater credit worthiness and ability to invest in education, homes, cars, etc. 127 Apart from their potential to increase net income in conjunction with tax and benefit programs, living wages have the potential to provide low-wage workers with a greater degree of independence and dignity than a pure system of targeted wage subsidies.

### Inequality Turn

#### UBI increases income inequality. Living wage is preferable

Waltman 2 (Jerry Waltman[University of Southern Mississippi], "Civic Republicanism, The Basic Income Guarantee, and the Living Wage," USBIG Discussion Paper No. 25, March 2002)//ghs-VA

**When it come to** softening **inequality,** the **living wage wins** again. Because everyone gets the same UBI, there is no compressing of income skews. In fact, a **UBI could** actually **increase inequality. Affluent people would have more** money **to invest, and** the **long term impacts of accumulation versus spending would exacerbate the wealth gap. A living wage**, as I define it, **would** at least **keep everyone in sight of the mean.**

### Stigma Turn

#### UBI breeds stigma against the poor. Living wage solves

Waltman 2 (Jerry Waltman[University of Southern Mississippi], "Civic Republicanism, The Basic Income Guarantee, and the Living Wage," USBIG Discussion Paper No. 25, March 2002)//ghs-VA

If the **UBI** were set high enough to remove people from poverty, what its devotees obviously hope, it **would** have the further deleterious effect of **spawning a culture of dependency** in the recipients. All the **pathologies of** the old American **AFDC** program **would develop, with** the **calamitous political consequences** they brought in their train. Republican citizens, recall, need to be able to look each other in the eye. None can be dependent on another, and a **UBI**, by the straightforward mechanism of a public budgetary transfer, **would make some dependent on others** (unless the amounts were trivial, in which case, what would be the point?). **By providing payment for work** performed**,** the **living wage removes** any possible **social, and** hence, **political, stigma from what is received. The earner of the wage can look anyone in the eye**, both because of the source of the income and the fact that it is adequate to allow him or her to live a decent lifestyle.

### Work Flux

#### UBI reduces work ethic.

Manzi 14 (Jim Manzi (Chief Executive Officer of Applied Predictive Technologies (APT), an authority on using pattern recognition and optimization models for sales and marketing application. Prior to co-founding APT, Manzi was a Vice President at Mercer Management Consulting. He is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and has written on a wide variety of public policy subjects. Manzi received a B.S. in mathematics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was subsequently awarded a Dean’s Fellowship in statistics to the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania as one of the eight top matriculants to the business school’s doctoral programs. He has published in the National Review and The American Scene, among others.) “When the Basic Income Guarantee Meets the Political Process.” CATO Unbound. August 8th, 2014. http://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/08/jim-manzi/when-basic-income-guarantee-meets-political-process)

**It is** fairly **extraordinary to claim that** the **government could guarantee every adult** in America **an income** even if they did zero work of any kind, **and that** somehow **this would not reduce work effort**. Zwolinksi should be able to provide strong evidence for such a claim. But **we have scientific gold standard evidence that runs** exactly **the other way. A series of randomized experiments offered a version of Zwolinski’s proposal between** 19**68 and** 19**80**. These tested a wide variety of program variants among the urban and rural poor, in better and worse macroeconomic periods, and in geographies from New Jersey to Seattle. **They consistently found that** the **tested programs reduce** the number of **hours worked** versus the existing welfare system, and the tested levels of progressivity of implicit tax rates did not get around this problem by encouraging work, as Zwolinski’s theoretical argument asserts they should. There was a further series of more than 30 randomized experiments conducted around the time of the welfare debates of the 1990s. These tested many ideas for improving welfare. What emerged from them was a clear picture: work requirements, and only work requirements, could be shown experimentally to get people off welfare and into jobs in a humane fashion. These experiments were an important input into the decision to make work requirements a central tenet of the new welfare regime when the welfare system was converted from AFDC to TANF in 1996. The paper that Zwolinski cites raises three objections to popular interpretations of the first round of experiments, all of which center around the point that we can never know with certainty the impacts any experimental program would have when scaled up. But there is no serious debate that in the dozens of occasions in which it has been put to the test, **changing work requirements changes work effort, just as common sense says** it should. Zwolinski’s proposal would reduce work requirements down two steps from the current policy – from current TANF-level requirements, down through the prior AFDC-level requirements, down to no requirements at all – when each of these steps has been shown to reduce work effort. Human society is complex, but as much as we can make almost any non-trivial prediction of social welfare policy, we can state with confidence that Zwolinski’s proposal would lead to fewer work hours in America.

#### Decreases wages of most workers and creates weird work incentives according to economic theory.

Philip Harvey 6 [Rutgers University], “The Relative Cost of a Universal Basic Income and a Negative Income Tax”, BASIC INCOME STUDIES An International Journal of Basic Income Research, Vol. 1, Issue 2, December 2006, BE

Unfortunately, the tendencies of a BIG in this regard are unsettling. First, the increase in taxes required to implement either a UBI or an equivalent NIT would reduce net wage rates for all workers. This means the substitution effect of these programs should tend to cause all labor-force participants (or potential labor- force participants) to want to work less.¶ Moreover, this tendency would be enhanced for low-income workers by the programs’ income effect. A UBI or an equivalent NIT would increase the real income of persons with incomes below the breakeven level while reducing the real income of persons with incomes above the breakeven level. A conventional analysis would predict that net-income gainers would use at least part of their additional income to “purchase” more leisure. In other words, they would work less because of the income effect of the transfer benefit they received. On the other hand, net-income losers should manifest the opposite tendency, reducing their “consumption” of leisure by working more. In other words, the income effect of a BIG should encourage higher-income workers to work more and lower-income workers to work less.

### No Solvency

#### UBI will get modified a ton, rendering it ineffective.

Cowen 13 (Tyler Cowen (American economist, academic, and writer. He occupies the Holbert C. Harris Chair of economics as a professor at George Mason University and is co-author, with Alex Tabarrok, of the popular economics blog Marginal Revolution). “What are some of the biggest problems with a guaranteed annual income?” Marginal Revolution. November 14th, 2013. http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2013/11/what-are-some-of-the-biggest-problems-with-a-guaranteed-annual-income.html)

Maybe this isn’t the biggest problem, but it’s been my worry as of late.  **Must a guaranteed income** truly **be unconditional?  Might there be circumstances when we would want to pay some** individuals **more than others?** Many critics for instance worry that a guaranteed income would excessively reduce the incentive to work.  So it might be proposed that the payment be somewhat higher if low income individuals go get a job.  That also will make the system more financially sustainable.  But wait — that’s the Earned Income Tax Credit, albeit with modifications. Might we also wish to pay more to some individuals with disabilities, perhaps say to help them afford expensive wheelchairs?  Maybe so.  But wait — that’s called disability insurance (modified, again) and it is run through the Social Security Administration. As long as we are moving toward more cash transfers, why don’t we substitute cash transfers for some or all of Medicare and Medicaid health insurance coverage benefits, especially for lower-value ailments?  But then we are paying more cash to the sick individuals.  That doesn’t have to be a mistake, but it does mean that an initially simple, “dogmatic” payment scheme now has multiplied into a rather complex form of social welfare assistance, contingent on just about every relevant factor one might care to cite. You can see the issue.  **Whether on grounds of justice, practicality, or** just **public choice considerations** (“you can keep your current welfare payments if you like them”), **we should not expect everyone to be paid the same under** a **guaranteed** annual **income**.  And **with enough tweaks,** this version of the **guaranteed income** suddenly **starts resembling**…the welfare state, albeit **the welfare state plus**.  Unemployment insurance benefits wouldn’t end.  More people could get on disability, and without those pesky judges asking so many questions. The potential problem is that **we inherit and in some ways magnify** the **problems with the current welfare state**, rather than doing away with those problems. Or we could be truly dogmatic about it, and simply pay each person the same amount of money no matter what.  But then do we take away the various forms of in-kind aid which are already in place?  And what about all those former EITC recipients, whose incentive to work is now lower than ever?

### Spending DA

#### The budget’s stable now.

Puzzanghera 14, Jim is a staff writer at the Los Angeles Times, 3/21/14, Fitch takes U.S. credit rating off downgrade watch after debt deal, http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-mo-fitch-credit-rating-debt-limit-20140321-story.html

"Strong fiscal consolidation has been achieved," Fitch said, a reference to the automatic spending cuts known as the sequester that began last year.¶ The budget deficit fell to 4% of GDP last year from 6.7% the previous year and 9.8% in 2009, Fitch said. This fiscal year, the company forecasts the deficit to shrink to 2.9% of so-called gross domestic product.¶ A recent two-year budget deal was a sign "there has been some improvement in the coherence of economic policy-making" in Washington, Fitch said. Still, the firm does not expect a broader "grand bargain" on long-term deficit reduction until after the 2016 presidential election.¶ Fitch described the prospects for U.S. economic growth as "more robust" than many other advanced nations. It forecast the economy would expand by 2.8% this year after a 1.9% increase in 2013.¶ In other positive signs, Fitch said the Federal Reserve had started to reduce its stimulus efforts, the U.S. banking system was healthy and dividend payments from seized housing finance giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had offset the cost of their bailouts.¶ Last summer, Moody's upgraded its outlook for the U.S. credit rating to stable, citing the shrinking budget deficit and improved economy.¶ S&P also shifted its outlook to stable from negative in June for similar reasons, but warned the U.S. was still years away from regaining its AAA rating.

#### UBI is hella expensive and consolidating other programs doesn’t solve.

Philip Harvey 6 [Rutgers University], “The Relative Cost of a Universal Basic Income and a Negative Income Tax”, BASIC INCOME STUDIES An International Journal of Basic Income Research, Vol. 1, Issue 2, December 2006, BE

Based on these figures, I estimate that total cash benefits received by persons aged 18 and above under the NIT I have modeled would have equaled $839.9 billion in 2002. NIT benefit payments to persons under the age of 18 would have totaled another $253.3 billion, so the total cost of the program would have been just over $1.09 trillion.¶ As explained above, the UBI that Clark modeled for 2002 would have achieved exactly the same redistributive effect – but with a budgeted cost approximately double that of its NIT equivalent. Based on the figures set forth in Table A3, the cost of a UBI system that included seniors on the same basis as other persons would have totaled $1.96 trillion in 2002 compared to the $1.09 trillion budget of its NIT equivalent.¶ This does not take into account reductions in other transfer benefits made possible by the implementation of a BIG in the form of either an NIT or a UBI. Clark has estimated these savings at $267.3 billion in 2002. As suggested above, I believe Clark’s selection of proposed transfer-program cuts is problematic, but his figures still can be used to estimate the approximate savings governments would have enjoyed if his proposed UBI or an equivalent NIT had been in place in 2002.¶ Subtracting these savings from the budgeted cost of Clark’s proposed UBI and the equivalent NIT I have modeled would have resulted in the same reduction in the additional tax burden required to fund either one. The net additional cost of Clark’s proposed UBI after this adjustment would have been $1.69 trillion (instead of $1.96 trillion). The additional cost of the NIT would have been $826 billion (instead of $1.09 trillion).¶ These figures show that a UBI and an equivalent NIT both would be very costly to implement, but the NIT strategy would be far less costly. On the other hand, remember that the marginal rate at which other income received by program participants would be exactly the same under both systems, so a plausible claim can be made that the two systems would be perceived by taxpayers as costing the same. As explained above, I am skeptical of this claim, but it cannot be dismissed out of hand.

#### Causes credit downgrade.

Newman 13 (US News. Rick Newman is an award-winning finance columnist for US news. “What Will Cause the Next U.S. Credit Downgrade.” Jan. 3, 2013. <https://www.google.com/search?sourceid=chrome-psyapi2&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8&q=%22rick%20newman%20is%22>.)

A failure to cut spending in 2013. Just about everybody agrees that **Washington** still **has to axe hundreds of billions in annual spending to stabilize its finances**. Some hope it will happen as part of a deal to extend the debt ceiling. The problem is that most government spending actually benefits somebody—seniors, home buyers, the poor, defense contractors—and Congress has proven itself particularly reluctant to reduce anybody's benefits. **Moody's wants to see spending cuts,** and perhaps even more tax hikes, **as part of a big budget deal** in the first few months of 2013 **that would** convincingly **improve the government's long-term finances.** **"The debt** trajectory **resulting from this process is likely to determine whether the Aaa rating is returned to a stable outlook or downgraded," Moody's said** in a statement following the January 1 fiscal-cliff deal. **If Congress continually delays spending cuts**—the habit in recent years—**a downgrade could come** by summer.

#### Tubes the economy.

Hill 13 [Patrice, Washington Times. Patrice Hill is the chief economics correspondent for the Washington Times. “With U.S. fiscal problems unresolved, treasured AAA rating may fall off cliff” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/7/us-fiscal-problems-unresolved-aaa-rating-may-drop/?page=all]

Despite the indifference in some parts of Washington, analysts say this time could be different and that a second downgrade by Moody’s or Fitch has the potential to cause significant market turmoil and damage the country’s privileged financial status, which includes the lowest government borrowing rates in the world and the many prerogatives that go with printing the world’s main reserve currency, the U.S. dollar. Rebound would be difficult Economic analysts say that, once lost, it would be difficult for the U.S. to regain its top rating, and the move would confirm in the eyes of much of the world that the U.S. is slowly sliding into second-tier economic status. “The next step is a very serious cliff that involves the credit rating of the U.S. It doesn’t get more serious than that, and one hopes that will cause some to be more responsible than they might otherwise be,” said David Kelleher, president of Better Markets Inc. and a former Senate Democratic aide. “Unfortunately, the last debate over the debt ceiling in 2011 doesn’t give much hope.” The downgrade in August 2011 provoked a major drop in consumer and business confidence and prompted a dizzying drop of more than 600 points in the Dow Jones industrial average the day it happened. But the impact proved to be transient, with most losses recouped within a matter of weeks or months, leading many in Washington to question whether another downgrade will have any lasting significance or effect. “Plus, there are too many saying they are going to hold the credit rating of the U.S. hostage to their policy preferences,” Mr. Kelleher said. “If politicians aren’t careful, they could actually make everything much worse.” Sounding the alarm Some in Congress — mostly Republicans — agree that Washington should be worried about the next downgrade. “America cannot afford for Moody’s alarm to fall on deaf ears,” said Rep. Tim Huelskamp, Kansas Republican. “In 2011, Washington was given ample notice that America’s stellar credit rating was on thin ice, but Washington passed on the opportunity to deliver a solution. Unfortunately for America, the so-called fiscal cliff legislation was another last-minute deal instead of a real solution. There were consequences for inaction last time, and clearly there will be consequences this time around as well.” But skepticism that Washington will rise to the occasion also is plentiful. Liberal groups such as the Economic Policy Institute, a labor-backed think-tank, argue that there is little need to cut the deficit with Treasury’s 10-year borrowing rates at all-time lows of less than 2 percent. They say the U.S. should take advantage of such low rates and increase spending on infrastructure, unemployment benefits and other economic stimulus programs. “Some respected voices on the left believe that a focus on the deficit is an overblown reaction to a manageable problem,” said David Hollingsworth, adviser for the Third Way, a centrist Democratic group that is pushing for further measures to reduce the deficit. “They argue that if our debt was really a big deal, investors wouldn’t be supplying us with capital so cheaply.” Robert Shapiro, an economic adviser in the Clinton administration, advocates additional measures to gradually reduce spending on entitlement programs and bring down the deficit, but he blames the last downgrade on Republicans, not Democrats, and said it could happen again if conservatives insist on coupling an increase in the debt limit with unpopular spending reforms. “The last time that House and Senate hyper-conservatives went down that path, it cost the U.S. government its triple-A rating from one of the three major credit-rating agencies,” he said, suggesting that Democrats will try to pin any further downgrades on Republicans if it happens again this year, and to use it to political advantage. “Any political leader or party that helps to bring about such a catastrophe will prove themselves unfit to govern for a very long time,” he said. Wall Street worries The growing intransigence on the left and right has led many on Wall Street and Main Street to question whether another agreement delivering more budget cuts will emerge from the latest round of negotiations. Tom Porcelli, chief economist at RBC Capital Markets, said he expects Republicans to fight hard for spending cuts that eluded them in last week’s deal, but the outcome is in doubt. “In the absence of a grand bargain in the next two months, it is likely that the U.S. is downgraded,” he said. “And this downgrade is likely to have a more significant market impact than the S&P downgrade,” because it will force investment funds around the world to reshuffle the securities in their portfolios to ensure they are maintaining AAA or other targeted rating levels, he said. This will cause widespread disruptions in global markets as investors recalibrate their portfolios, causing a “cascade effect” on assets other than Treasurys, he said. John Browne, senior economic consultant at Euro Pacific Capital, said the damage from further downgrades would affect the U.S. status in the economic world for a long time. The U.S. dollar is the world’s dominant currency, he said, because debt troubles in the eurozone have tarnished the appeal of the euro, which had been ascending as a replacement for the dollar in the past decade. “This privileged position has conferred on Washington the vital element of time to organize viable revisions to its entitlements,” whose uncontrolled growth is at the root of the U.S. debt problem, he said. But political leaders appear to be “squandering” the luxury of time they got from the ongoing European debt crisis, he said. “The spectacle of American politicians failing to agree on budgets, spending limits or any type of fiscal discipline can affect the credit rating of the U.S. Over the longer term, a major fall in the credit rating is likely to increase U.S. interest rates,” he said. But perhaps the greatest impact is to the U.S. reputation. “The blatant dereliction of duty on display in Washington will diminish national prestige,” Mr. Browne said.

#### Extinction.

Auslin 9 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and **global chaos** followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would **dramatically raise tensions** inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in **all regions of the globe** and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce **into a big bang**.

## AT: EITC

### Case Cross Apps

#### 1. Cross apply Giroux – the specificity of the evidence outweighs – they have no specific solvency that says EITC solves the job security aspect that a living wage does.

#### 2. No solvency – EITC incentivizes contingent faculty to get bad jobs therefore not work the difficult education sector to make ends meet, which doesn’t solve the education internal link to neolib – That’s Mahoney and Giroux.

### Street: Rejection/Ethics

#### It is the rejection of the unethical nature of the current wage system that transforms the university.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

4. The debates that have raged within and about higher education over vocational versus liberal education, tenure, the “corporatization” of higher education, governmental oversight and accreditation, and funding models and sources have obscured, deferred, or overridden the need for action on the fundamental ethical and practical concerns that attend the professional and personal needs of faculty on contingent appointments. Yet, ironically, attending to those concerns—ensuring a living wage, access to health care, professional development, and the protections of academic freedom—would exercise the very values of academic democracy that these debates are really all about. While the roots of contingent academic employment go back many decades, and surged in the early 1970s (Berry 2005), it was not until the 1980s that the higher education community really began to notice that contingency had exploded to a level of concern. Marked by radically reduced wages, frequent lack of access to benefits, limited access to professional support and opportunities for advancement, and institutional disrespect, contingency is one of higher education’s darker secrets. In the last twenty-five years, however, and particularly in the last decade, there have been sincere, if belated, efforts to respond. These include a proliferation of studies, articles, and books; resolutions, statements, guidelines, and best-practice publications by unions, institutions, and associations; and most effectively, both union- and nonunion-affiliated organizing efforts leading to successful collective bargaining, cooperative negotiations with receptive administrations, and groundbreaking litigation and legislation. All of these efforts have resulted, practically speaking, in some improved working conditions for many adjunct faculty members. Yet, paradoxically, even as these accomplishments have signaled a huge step forward, they have not succeeded in substantially alleviating the sense of foreboding over the status and future of the professoriate, or the ramifications for education that the higher education community began to recognize a generation ago. In fact, that sense of crisis has been heightened as the federal government, allied with major corporations, seeks greater influence over college curricula, particularly at the community college level, with the danger of minimal—or token—consultation with higher education faculty (Wilson 2010). Several years ago, activists in the contingent faculty movement recognized the impasse at which the movement found itself in the face of this lack of progress (Hoeller 2007), and initiated discussion about the need for a structured national organization. In 2009, such an organization was founded. New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity (NFM) is the only national organization exclusively devoted to improving the quality of higher education by improving the working conditions of the majority of its faculty. NFM came into existence because we believe that higher education needs to move into a new phase of coordinated, intentional, and ethically grounded activity to confront contingency. The goal of such efforts should be to repair the damaging effects on students, faculty, and the country of the haphazard and shortsighted decisions that led to the spread of contingency in the first place, and to bring to fruition the valiant but uncoordinated and all too often superficial reforms that a generation of educators has tried to implement. And, while incremental change may continue to be the only way forward, we believe that what is needed is a new sense of urgency and a defined goal that acknowledges the need for a transformation of academic culture from its current hierarchical, stratified structure into real academic democracy rooted in the values of liberal education.

### Street: Radical Act

#### Treating them as “real faculty” is a radical act that breaks the current neolib mindset.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

From ivory tower to academic democracy To many observers, the formation of NFM was puzzling and counterintuitive; hadn’t unionization efforts among contingent faculty increased and hadn’t advances been made through collective bargaining? And weren’t many institutions now paying attention to and implementing the types of reforms and strategies that for years had been recommended for the purpose of “integrating” contingent faculty more effectively into the life of the college and university and showing them respect? If the concerns of contingent faculty had only to do with working conditions, then the progress made over the last generation might not have required NFM’s formation. Contingent faculty would have continued to support local organizing efforts and internal reform efforts, celebrating advances as they have occurred and fighting for change where necessary. But NFM is not just about improving working conditions. It is about improving working conditions for an ultimate purpose: to ensure the quality of education and the integrity of the profession. NFM aims to remind the academy that it exists not for itself, and not simply to preserve itself­­­, but for the common good—and that the operative definition of “common” in that expression should not evoke the unfortunate connotation of “second rate,” but rather its root, communis, or community. Clearly, the contingent faculty crisis is simply the most obvious manifestation of the steady erosion of community in higher education. The faculty (in part, through its own doing) has moved, or been pushed, away from its role as a full partner in higher education to a literally “adjunct” position—peripheral, disempowered—in terms of either numbers or function. Tenure-stream faculty, who have authority over the curriculum and at least a nominal role in governance, are now too small in number or too cowed to initiate or resist change effectively, while faculty off the tenure track, though the majority in number, must risk their livelihoods to do so. To fight against this trend is to “reclaim” the ivory tower, as Joe Berry (2005) has put it, by transforming it into the academic democracy that it is really supposed to be. If the marginalization of the faculty as a whole is the disease whose most obvious symptom is the mistreatment of those with the lowest status, then what is needed is a cure that builds on the body’s natural strengths. What is needed is a revitalization of the concept of academic democracy, one rooted in the social contract that has traditionally defined faculty work and that embodies the values of liberal education. Again, as Moser (2004, 2) explains, “as students, faculty, and campus workers make common cause to secure workplace rights and basic economic security, we must also articulate new ideals and mobilize alternative forms of community. We could organize such a project under the rubric of ‘campus democracy, community and academic citizenship’: ideals of service that revisit classical conceptions of the university, are grounded in existing economic and political conditions, rooted in democratic traditions of freedom, and already legible in the many struggles for justice on today’s campuses.” It is those ideals and traditions—along with sheer willpower—that will be needed to combat the pessimistic notion that “once the university budget has absorbed their [nontenure-track faculty] lower cost . . . it becomes almost impossible to retreat” (Cross and Goldenberg 2002, 27–28). Confronting contingency is not an impossible task, though it is a formidable one. As Caryn McTighe Musil has pointed out, it is “radical”—but only because it is so necessary: “Of course, treating the contingent faculty like ‘real’ faculty, especially women and women with children, is a radical act. It requires considerable shifts in attitude, in economic remuneration, and in job security. It means incorporating these faculty members as equal partners in departments, welcoming them as academic colleagues, and nurturing their professional growth” (Musil 2009). As daunting as this task is, however, Musil reminds us that we can do it—because we’ve done it before. “The academy figured out how to rethink entire fields when DNA was discovered and mapped, when technology changed everything about our lives and work, and when women’s studies and ethnic studies forever altered the foundations of knowledge. The academy should be able to make this other change too” (Musil 2009).

### CFHE: Stigma

#### EITC creates a welfare stigma – deters people from entering education.

CFHE 14 (Campaign for the Future of Higher Education, GRASSROOTS NATIONAL CAMPAIGN to support quality higher education. It was initiated in Los Angeles, California, on May 17, 2011, by leaders of faculty organizations from 21 states, “Ivory Tower? Think Again,” February 4, 2014, http://futureofhighered.org/ivory-tower-think/)//ghs-VA

According to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW), the median pay for a 3-unit course is $2,700. Even working more than full-time, a faculty member making this wage would struggle mightily to make ends meet. In fact, according to the report, “A family of three in California relying solely on the median adjunct salary would qualify for, among other things, Medicaid, an earned income tax credit, a child tax credit, and food stamps.” As these numbers suggest, continent faculty may be “college professors,” but they are often also among the ranks of the working poor. Numbers like this, which are unheard of for professional employment anywhere except in academia, shock even in the abstract; but the comments of respondents about how those facts (and other non-economic realities of contingency) affect their lives, their families, and their students are staggering. Just one will suffice to suggest the far-reaching “costs” of this employment model: “I caution my students about choosing education as a career path. I would not wish their lives to turn out like mine has.” As the report makes clear, this is no isolated problem on the margins of the academy. The numbers of contingent faculty continue to grow, now more than 1 million faculty members in American colleges and universities and more than 75% of the faculty workforce nationwide.

## AT: Living Wage Word PIC

### No Reps Focus

#### Exclusive focus on representations erodes meaningful reversal of structures of exploitation---discursive focus must supplement discussion of reform---key to survival.

Henry Giroux 06, prof of edu and cultural studies at Penn State, **6** (Comparative Studies of South Asia)

Abstracted from the ideal of public commitment, the new authoritarianism represents a political and economic practice and form of militarism that loosen[s] the connections among substantive democracy, critical agency, and critical education. In opposition to the rising tide of authoritarianism, educators across the globe must make a case for linking **learning to progressive social change** while struggling to pluralize and critically engage the diverse sites where public pedagogy takes place. In part, this suggests forming alliances that can make sure every sphere of social life is recognized as an important site of the political, social, and cultural struggle that is so crucial to any attempt to forge the knowledge, identifications, effective investments, and social relations that constitute political subjects and social agents capable of energizing and spreading the basis for a substantive global democracy. Such circumstances **require** that pedagogy be embraced as a moral **and** political practice, one that is directive and not dogmatic, an outgrowth of struggles designed to resist the increasing depoliticization of political culture that is the hallmark of the current Bush revolution. Education is the terrain where consciousness is shaped, needs are constructed, and the capacity for individual self-reflection and **broad social change** is nurtured and produced. Education has assumed an unparalleled significance in shaping the language, values, and ideologies that legitimize the structures and organizations that support the imperatives of global capitalism. Efforts to reduce it to a technique or methodology set aside, education remains a crucial site for the production and struggle over those pedagogical and political conditions that provide the possibilities for people to develop forms of agency that enable them individually and collectively to intervene in the processes through which the material relations of power shape the meaning and practices of their everyday lives. Within the current historical context, struggles over power take on a symbolic and discursive as well as a material and institutional form. The struggle over education is about more than the struggle over meaning and identity; it is also about how meaning, knowledge, and values are produced, authorized, and made operational within economic and structural relations of power. Education is not at odds with politics; it is an important and crucial element in any definition of the political and offers not only the theoretical tools for a systematic critique of authoritarianism but also a language of possibility for creating actual movements for democratic social change and a new biopolitics that affirms life rather than death, shared responsibility rather than shared fears, and engaged citizenship rather than the stripped-down values of consumerism. At stake here is combining symbolic forms and processes conducive to democratization with broader social contexts and the **institutional formations** of power itself. The **key point** here is to understand and engage educational and pedagogical practices from the point of view of how they are bound up with larger relations of power. Educators, students, and parents need to be clearer about how power works through and in texts, representations, and discourses, **while at the same time** recognizing that power **cannot be limited** to the study of representations and discourses, even at the level of public policy. Changing consciousness is **not the same** as **altering the** institutional basis of oppression; at the same time, institutional reform c**annot take place** without a change in consciousness capable of recognizing not only injustice but also the **very possibility for reform**, the capacity to reinvent the conditions [End Page 176] and **practices** that make a **more just future possible**. In addition, it is crucial to raise questions about the relationship between pedagogy and civic culture, on the one hand, and what it takes for individuals and social groups to believe that they have any responsibility whatsoever even to address the realities of class, race, gender, and other specific forms of domination, on the other hand. For too long, the progressives have ignored that the strategic dimension of politics is inextricably connected to questions of critical education and pedagogy, to what it means to acknowledge that education is always tangled up with power, ideologies, values, and the acquisition of both particular forms of agency and specific visions of the future. The primacy of critical pedagogy to politics, social change, and the radical imagination in such dark times is dramatically captured by the internationally renowned sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. He writes, Adverse odds may be overwhelming, and yet a democratic (or, as Cornelius Castoriadis would say, an autonomous) society knows of no substitute for education and self-education as a means to influence the turn of events that can be squared with its own nature, while that nature cannot be preserved for long without "critical pedagogy"—an education sharpening its critical edge, "making society feel guilty" and "stirring things up" through stirring human consciences. The fates of freedom, of democracy that makes it possible while being made possible by it, and of education that breeds dissatisfaction with the level of both freedom and democracy achieved thus far, are inextricably connected and not to be detached from one another. One may view that intimate connection as another specimen of a vicious circle—but it is within that circle that human hopes and the chances of humanity are inscribed, and can be nowhere else.59

#### Privileging Reps encourages anti-politics, kills the alternative.

Boggs 97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

Postmodernism and its offshoots (poststructuralism, semiotics, di¡er- ence feminism, etc.) have indeed reshaped much of academia, including such disciplines as sociology, history, literature, ¢lm, and communica- tions. More than that, the theory (if that is the correct label for some- thing so diffuse) amounts to a kind of anti-paradigm paradigm, **which often refocuses debates around** defining motifs of the post-Fordist order: commodification of culture, the media spectacle, proliferation of **images and symbols**, fragmentation of identities, the dispersion of local movements, and loss of faith in conventional political ideologies and organizations. So far as all this is concerned, post-modernism can be viewed as marking a rather healthy break with the past.50 The problem is that the main thrust of postmodernism so devalues the common realm of power, governance, and economy that the dynamics of social and institutional life vanish from sight. Where the reality of corporate, state, and military power wind up vanishing within a post- modern amorphousness, the very effort to analyze social forces and locate agencies or strategies of change becomes impossible. In its reac- tion against the comprehensive historical scope of Marxism, the micro approach dismisses in toto macropolitics and with it any conceivable modern project of radical transformation. An extreme ``micro'' focus is most visible in such theorists as Baudrillard who, as Steven Best and Douglas Kellner put it, in effect ``announce the end of the political project in the end of history and society''51 ^ a stance that replicates the logic of a profoundly depoliticized culture.

### Living Wage Good

#### Living wage rhetoric key to spurring attention to poverty.

Bartik 2 (Timothy, Senior Economist W.E. Upjohn Institute, “Thinking about Local Living Wage Requirements,” March 2002, http://research.upjohn.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1093&context=up\_workingpapers)//ghs-VA

The rhetoric of living wage campaigns stresses the benefits of living wages in reducing poverty. The implicit assumption is that there are plenty of jobs in the United States (or at least there were plenty of jobs during the late 1990s boom) and that the key barrier to reducing poverty is inadequate wages at entry-level jobs. The moral perspective of the living wage campaign is that it is unjust for many workers to be only able to find jobs that pay poverty-level wages. Many living wage activists view wages as determined by employers. Given employer power over wages, it is immoral for an employer that has the ability to pay living wages to refuse to do so. The government should not financially support an employer that enhances its profits by keeping wages down and thereby increases poverty among workers.

# 2AC – DA Frontlines

## AT: Disads General

### Neolib Construction

#### Neoliberalism sustains itself through instrumental use of uncertainty

Luigi Pellizzoni 11, Associate Professor of Environmental Sociology at the University of Trieste, Italy, April 2011, “Governing through disorder: Neoliberal environmental governance and social theory,” Global Environmental Change, Vol. 21, p. 795-803

This article started out with two aims: ﬁrst, to identify at the deepest, ontological, level the underpinnings of widespread environmental policy approaches often associated with neoliberalism. Second, to show that different socio-environmental theoretical perspectives have had difﬁculty confronting these underpinnings, which affects their capacity to interpret the latter’s implications for the governance of the biophysical world. Neoliberalism draws on established traditions in political liberalism and market capitalism, yet is characterized by a novel understanding of the ontological quality of nature. ‘Nature’ is no longer conceived as an objectively given, though cognitively mediated, reality, but as a constitutively ﬂuid entity, a contingency purposefully produced and controlled for instrumental ends. Governance through uncertainty, instability or ‘disorder’ thus seems to be the distinguishing feature of the ‘neoliberalisation of nature’. This ideational core may be considered the ﬁrst reason for the sense of unity often felt when contemplating the array of sectors, approaches and cases characterizing current market-oriented environmental governance, and at the same time for the sense of uneasiness towards neoliberalism that environmental social theory conveys. Whatever the judgment, it is important to grasp what is at stake with neoliberal governance of nature. Browsing social science books and journals, one realizes that much critical energy has been focused on questioning the objectivist account of nature that allegedly dominates current policy narratives and practices. Only a discerning scholarship has begun to realize that objectivism and antiobjectivism are losing relevance as categories capable of distinguishing intellectual and stakeholder positions, and that they increasingly become claims usable in power games over the biophysical world. Attention, for example, has been recently paid to the instrumental use of uncertainty (Freudenburg et al., 2008; Jacques et al., 2008), which, depending on the circumstances, is used either to ask for policy-making (as with GMOs) or to call for policy-avoiding (as with ‘unwarranted’ restrictive measures related to climate change). The very possibility of appealing to ‘sound science’ either for evidence of no problems, or no evidence of problems indicates the fundamentally anti-objectivist attitude that characterizes present political and cultural frameworks. Policy promoters share this attitude with their opponents. Those who ask for ‘precaution’ use the same arguments in reverse, requiring action when and where there is no evidence of no problems. 11 This commonality entails that appeals to uncertainty are devoid of any strategic relevance in current controversies; rather, they play a tactical role. This is likely to represent a problem above all for counter-forces to neoliberalism, to the extent that in a tactical struggle the most advantaged are those provided with greater organizational, economic, cognitive and legal resources (to say nothing of military ones). In short, we are today in front of a refashioning of the symbolic order of society vis-a` -vis its biophysical underpinnings. In this change, neoliberal discourses, policies and practices are at the same time a powerful driver and a result. Disorder becomes order to the extent that uncertainty, contingency and instability are regarded not as disabling by-products of governance but as enabling ways of governing. In the public realm, this ends up constituting a sort of shared horizon of meaning: not only is no new ‘order’ (in the traditional sense) in sight, but anti-essentialism overﬂows from intellectual avant-gardes to become a widespread, albeit often implicit or negotiable, worldview.

## Inflation

### No Link: Empirics

#### No inflation – empirics.

ILO 08 (International Labour Organization, CREDENTIALS, “Minimum wages and collective bargaining: Towards policy coherence”, Published by the International Labour Office, 2008)//ghs-VA

In a context of rising inflation, much has been said about the risk that higher minimum wages may lead to a so-called “wage–price spiral”, which has been defined as a situation in which wages and prices chase each other upwards. 91 This perception is linked to the fact that the minimum wage is often considered as a benchmark in collective bargaining, or even for wages in the informal sector, 92 and hence also affects wages of workers above the minimum wage. But while it is true that minimum wages can affect prices, this effect has generally been found to be modest, especially in the case of simple national minimum wages. 93 Therefore, fears that minimum wages can trigger overall inflation increases throughout the economy are often exaggerated.

## Politics

### Winners Win

#### Winners win – Opposition to providing a living wage is political suicide.

Bender 14 (Minimum Wage Job-Loss Report Is Cause for Republican Punt By Michael C. Bender Feb 19, 2014 9:59 AM CT, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-02-18/cbo-says-minimum-wage-rise-may-ease-poverty-cost-jobs.html)

Maurice “Hank” Greenberg, a Republican donor and former chief executive officer of American International Group Inc., said his party was on the wrong side of the issue. A Jan. 8 [poll](http://bit.ly/1aIeS8X) by [Quinnipiac University](http://topics.bloomberg.com/quinnipiac-university/) found that 71 percent of Americans, including 52 percent of Republicans, support a higher minimum wage.¶ “The Republicans must not be viewed as the party that killed it,” Greenberg said today in a Bloomberg Television interview. “If they do that, they’re going to have a tough time in the forthcoming elections. So from a practical point of view I’d hope they’d get it done.”¶ A campaign built around raising the minimum wage can help Democrats win political races in battleground states, said[Richard Trumka](http://topics.bloomberg.com/richard-trumka/), president of the AFL-CIO federation of 56 unions with 12.5 million members.¶ “Raising wages for Americans, for all workers, is the issue of our time and hopefully will be the issue of this election,” Trumka said today on a conference call with reporters. “They can yell all they want but this is a winning issue.”

### Republicans Support

#### Your link scenario is as silly as Frosty the Snowman singing “Here Comes the Sun” --- if the Republicans continue to fight against minimum wage increases, they’re dead in the water,

Ivatury 14 (Opposition to raising the minimum wage is crumbling¶ 10/14/14 09:54 AM—UPDATED 10/14/14 04:07 PM¶ Arun Ivatury works with the NELP Action Fund. http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/opposition-raising-the-minimum-wage-crumbling)

In an interview last week, the soon-to-be-named chairman of the National Retail Federation (NRF), Container Store CEO Kip Tindell, pledged to try and push the retail store trade group to change its stance against raising the minimum wage.¶ “I’m working, frankly, to get the NRF to maybe moderate its view on that,” he told[Bloomberg](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-10-09/nrf-s-next-chairman-plans-to-push-retailers-toward-minimum-wage.html). “It’s unbecoming to speak out against raising the minimum wage.”¶ If Tindell is successful, the reversal would be stunning. The National Retail Federation has called the proposal to raise the federal minimum wage an “anti-job tax” and has repeatedly warned lawmakers that it will include all minimum wage votes in its legislative scorecard. (For those unfamiliar with Beltway lexicon, that’s lobbyist shorthand for “cross us on this and we’ll break your kneecaps”). The NRF spent $1 million on lobbying in the first three months of 2014 alone, 50% more than the same period in 2013, coinciding with the run-up to a Senate vote on the minimum wage that Republicans filibustered. The NRF has never met a wage increase proposal it didn’t detest. ¶ Changing course would be a bit like a Red Sox fan suddenly declaring undying loyalty to the New York Yankees, or Frosty the Snowman singing “Here Comes the Sun.” ¶ Tindell joins an ever-growing list of unusual suspects who have spoken out in favor of raising wages. Conservative icons [Bill O’Reilly](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/bill-oreilly-backs-10-minimum-wage), [Rick Santorum](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/05/05/santorum-says-gop-should-raise-the-minimum-wage/), and[Phyllis Schlafly](http://www.eagleforum.org/publications/column/minimum-wage-welfare-tradeoff.html) have all expressed support for a higher minimum wage. Fortune 500 companies like [Gap](http://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/gap-applauded-minimum-wage-hike) and[Ikea](http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/ikea-gives-us-employees-raise) have independently raised wages not only as an act of social responsibility but as a way of lowering turnover and boosting employee performance.¶ About [six in ten](http://asbcouncil.org/news/press-release/61-small-businesses-support-1010-federal-minimum-wage-new-national-poll#.VD0mPrDF-bM) small business owners – a group that trends Republican – favor [raising the federal minimum](http://asbcouncil.org/news/press-release/61-small-businesses-support-1010-federal-minimum-wage-new-national-poll#.VD0mPrDF-bM) wage to $10.10 and automatically adjusting it as costs rise, and the same number believe doing so will help the economy. Wealthy investors like Nick Hanauer, Ron Unz, Eli Broad, and Rick Caruso have [passionately argued](http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2013-06-19/the-capitalist-s-case-for-a-15-minimum-wage) for minimum wages as high as $15 as a moral and economic necessity.¶ Actually, in many parts of the country it’s becoming harder and harder to find anyone left who actively opposes raising wages. The NRF’s powerful business group peers like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Restaurant Association have kept up the fight, but as businesses small and large peel away, you get the sense that even their hearts aren’t in it anymore.¶ It’s hard to blame them: this year key business leaders in Seattle not only dropped their opposition to raising that city’s minimum wage but actually threw their weight behind a plan that will lift it to an [unprecedented $15](http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/seattle-its-way-15-minimum-wage). Seattle’s businesses were soon one-upped by the San Francisco business community, which agreed to let one of the country’s most liberal electorates vote on an even faster increase to $15. ¶ Resistance is falling even in places like blood-red South Carolina, where just last month the state’s Small Business Chamber of Commerce [publicly endorsed](http://scsbc.org/south-carolina-small-business-chamber-commerce-endorses-10-10-federal-minimum-wage/) a $10.10 federal minimum wage. ¶ As ever, the last people to get the message can be found in Washington, where in the face of reams of economic data as well as the lived experience of prior wage increases, Republicans in Congress continue to patronizingly warn against “hurting those you are trying to help” and fulminate against government intervention in the free market.¶ When will they get the message? When will they stop stonewalling a common sense measure that the overwhelming majority of Americans support?¶ If what Congressional Republicans need is political cover, they are receiving it. Big businesses are Republicans’ strongest financial backers, so groups like the NRF dropping their opposition to a higher minimum wage would have a huge impact. More entrepreneurs and main street business owners – a critical Republican constituency – speak out for higher wages daily. And four former members of Congress from their own party have now publicly called on them to revive the long tradition of bipartisanship on the issue and pass a minimum wage increase.¶ But Republican members of Congress – and presidential aspirants – must also answer to voters, and that may prove to be their strongest motivator. Tens of millions of Americans are struggling to get by and are increasingly fed up with Congress’ failure to help while corporations and the wealthy prosper. With the 2014 election season entering the home stretch, the crisis of low-wage work has emerged as a key point of debate in races across the country, including state legislative, gubernatorial, and Congressional races. ¶ Midterm elections are typically low-turnout, and with Democrats needing to defend more competitive seats, pundits continue to predict Republican gains in Congress. But under the microscope of a presidential race and with the expected surge in voter interest, it is difficult to imagine any party or politician– Republican or Democrat – winning in 2016 without a clear answer to the question: “What are you doing to raise wages?”¶ In this environment, it may not only be unbecoming to speak out against raising the minimum wage; if Republicans fail to act, it may also be their undoing.

### Plan Popular

#### Living wage popular – empirics.

Luce 5 (Stephanie, pf at CUNY, Lessons From Living-Wage Campaigns, Work and Occupations 2005 32: 423.)//ghs-VA

The living-wage movement has shown that higher wages can also be an overlap issue. Polls consistently show that support for higher minimum wages is popular among voters. In the 2004 election, two statewide ballot initiatives to establish state minimum wages in Florida and Nevada won overwhelmingly: 72% in favor in Florida, 68% in Nevada, and both measures won in every single county in both states. Although politicians from major parties are often lukewarm on wage standards, the idea has broad appeal not only with voters but with religious leaders, community organizations, social service agencies, women’s groups, student activists, and environmentalists.

# 2AC – K Frontlines

## AT: Cap

### Case Cross App Overview

#### 1. Perm do both – The 1AC was a link turn to cap. Resistance must begin at the site of the university. Movements against cap will inevitably fail and be coopted until the machine pumping out mindless workers is broken, liberalizing higher education enables us to fight effectively against cap and gain political consciousness.

#### 2. Perm do the alt – The plan ruptures the dystopian imagination of neolib and makes it possible to have new world views which means the aff is the alt.

#### 3. Perm do the alt except in the instance of the aff – Cross apply Giroux – finding the best education strategies to liberalize academia is essential. In order to solve for cap changing education approaches is a priori which means if I win solvency I’ve won a link turn.

#### 4. Perm do the aff then alt: Case solves the impact – liberalizing academia allows people to make racial, political, and class demands – that’s Giroux. The case functions as a net benefit to the perm.

#### 5. Perm: Do the alt then the aff – The only way to reject cap is to be conscious of what those political structures look like – higher education precludes your alt. Teaching people what cap is and incentivizing the fight against the machine is key.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

Under the current regime of neoliberal savagery and its cruel austerity policies, Walker is not a political exception; he is the rule. The extremist wing of the Republican Party hates the notion that the university might function primarily to address important social issues in the name of the public good. Couple this particular fear and ideological fundamentalism with the rampant idiocy and anti-intellectualism that has become an organizing principle of the new extremists at all levels of government and it becomes clear that public and higher education are prime targets in the struggle to create a fundamentalist-driven culture that supports those identifications, desires and modes of agency receptive to the rise of an authoritarian society and police state in which criticism is viewed as a form of treason and even the mildest of liberal rhetoric is disparaged or dismissed out of hand. For instance, in Oklahoma, the state's politicians and lawmakers have introduced a bill that eliminates the teaching of Advanced Placement US history courses in the public high schools. (29) The reason behind the bill defies logic and reflects the new stupidity and religious fundamentalism that are at the heart of the conservative assault against reason and critical thinking. According to Judd Legum, "Oklahoma Rep. Dan Fisher (R) has introduced 'emergency' legislation 'prohibiting the expenditure of funds on the Advanced Placement United States History course.' Fisher is part of a group called the 'Black Robe Regiment' which argues that 'the church and God himself has been under assault, marginalized, and diminished by the progressives and secularists.'" (30) Ben Carson, a potential GOP presidential candidate and pediatric neurosurgeon, stated that the students who finished the course would be "ready to sign up for ISIS." (31) The essence of the push back against the AP US history course was echoed by the Republican National Committee in a resolution claiming that it was too negative, and reflected "a radically revisionist view of US history that emphasizes negative aspects of our nation's history while omitting or minimizing positive aspects." (32) What at first glance appears to be a case of egregious ignorance is in reality a religious fundamentalist attack on any viable notion of historical consciousness and public memory. (33) These politicians are the ground troops for the new authoritarianism that rewards and revels in thoughtlessness and despises any criticism of US domestic and foreign policy. Truly, the brownshirts of our time, they are a new breed of ideological muggers whose minds are unburdened by a complicated thought, who choke on their own ignorance and sutured political certainties. They represent another one of the forces, in addition to the apostles of a savage neoliberalism and the hedge fund criminals, out to destroy public and higher education, in the United States, even in its weakest liberal version.

#### 6. The root of neolib is the university as it produces a global worker made for the capitalist system which means it’s the lynchpin of production. Severing that ideology prevents feeding the system which makes it die out and causes a transition – That’s Giroux.

### Street: Radical Act

#### Treating them as “real faculty” is a radical act that breaks the current neolib mindset.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

From ivory tower to academic democracy To many observers, the formation of NFM was puzzling and counterintuitive; hadn’t unionization efforts among contingent faculty increased and hadn’t advances been made through collective bargaining? And weren’t many institutions now paying attention to and implementing the types of reforms and strategies that for years had been recommended for the purpose of “integrating” contingent faculty more effectively into the life of the college and university and showing them respect? If the concerns of contingent faculty had only to do with working conditions, then the progress made over the last generation might not have required NFM’s formation. Contingent faculty would have continued to support local organizing efforts and internal reform efforts, celebrating advances as they have occurred and fighting for change where necessary. But NFM is not just about improving working conditions. It is about improving working conditions for an ultimate purpose: to ensure the quality of education and the integrity of the profession. NFM aims to remind the academy that it exists not for itself, and not simply to preserve itself­­­, but for the common good—and that the operative definition of “common” in that expression should not evoke the unfortunate connotation of “second rate,” but rather its root, communis, or community. Clearly, the contingent faculty crisis is simply the most obvious manifestation of the steady erosion of community in higher education. The faculty (in part, through its own doing) has moved, or been pushed, away from its role as a full partner in higher education to a literally “adjunct” position—peripheral, disempowered—in terms of either numbers or function. Tenure-stream faculty, who have authority over the curriculum and at least a nominal role in governance, are now too small in number or too cowed to initiate or resist change effectively, while faculty off the tenure track, though the majority in number, must risk their livelihoods to do so. To fight against this trend is to “reclaim” the ivory tower, as Joe Berry (2005) has put it, by transforming it into the academic democracy that it is really supposed to be. If the marginalization of the faculty as a whole is the disease whose most obvious symptom is the mistreatment of those with the lowest status, then what is needed is a cure that builds on the body’s natural strengths. What is needed is a revitalization of the concept of academic democracy, one rooted in the social contract that has traditionally defined faculty work and that embodies the values of liberal education. Again, as Moser (2004, 2) explains, “as students, faculty, and campus workers make common cause to secure workplace rights and basic economic security, we must also articulate new ideals and mobilize alternative forms of community. We could organize such a project under the rubric of ‘campus democracy, community and academic citizenship’: ideals of service that revisit classical conceptions of the university, are grounded in existing economic and political conditions, rooted in democratic traditions of freedom, and already legible in the many struggles for justice on today’s campuses.” It is those ideals and traditions—along with sheer willpower—that will be needed to combat the pessimistic notion that “once the university budget has absorbed their [nontenure-track faculty] lower cost . . . it becomes almost impossible to retreat” (Cross and Goldenberg 2002, 27–28). Confronting contingency is not an impossible task, though it is a formidable one. As Caryn McTighe Musil has pointed out, it is “radical”—but only because it is so necessary: “Of course, treating the contingent faculty like ‘real’ faculty, especially women and women with children, is a radical act. It requires considerable shifts in attitude, in economic remuneration, and in job security. It means incorporating these faculty members as equal partners in departments, welcoming them as academic colleagues, and nurturing their professional growth” (Musil 2009). As daunting as this task is, however, Musil reminds us that we can do it—because we’ve done it before. “The academy figured out how to rethink entire fields when DNA was discovered and mapped, when technology changed everything about our lives and work, and when women’s studies and ethnic studies forever altered the foundations of knowledge. The academy should be able to make this other change too” (Musil 2009).

### Street: Global Worker

#### The plan is key to breaking down the corporate hold on high education – changes the academic culture and curriculum.

Maisto and Street 11 (Maria Maisto and Steve Street, Adjunct Faculty, English, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH Executive Committee Member, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy,” Winter 2011, Vol. 97, No. 1, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/confronting-contingency-faculty-equity-and-goals-academic)//ghs-VA

4. The debates that have raged within and about higher education over vocational versus liberal education, tenure, the “corporatization” of higher education, governmental oversight and accreditation, and funding models and sources have obscured, deferred, or overridden the need for action on the fundamental ethical and practical concerns that attend the professional and personal needs of faculty on contingent appointments. Yet, ironically, attending to those concerns—ensuring a living wage, access to health care, professional development, and the protections of academic freedom—would exercise the very values of academic democracy that these debates are really all about. While the roots of contingent academic employment go back many decades, and surged in the early 1970s (Berry 2005), it was not until the 1980s that the higher education community really began to notice that contingency had exploded to a level of concern. Marked by radically reduced wages, frequent lack of access to benefits, limited access to professional support and opportunities for advancement, and institutional disrespect, contingency is one of higher education’s darker secrets. In the last twenty-five years, however, and particularly in the last decade, there have been sincere, if belated, efforts to respond. These include a proliferation of studies, articles, and books; resolutions, statements, guidelines, and best-practice publications by unions, institutions, and associations; and most effectively, both union- and nonunion-affiliated organizing efforts leading to successful collective bargaining, cooperative negotiations with receptive administrations, and groundbreaking litigation and legislation. All of these efforts have resulted, practically speaking, in some improved working conditions for many adjunct faculty members. Yet, paradoxically, even as these accomplishments have signaled a huge step forward, they have not succeeded in substantially alleviating the sense of foreboding over the status and future of the professoriate, or the ramifications for education that the higher education community began to recognize a generation ago. In fact, that sense of crisis has been heightened as the federal government, allied with major corporations, seeks greater influence over college curricula, particularly at the community college level, with the danger of minimal—or token—consultation with higher education faculty (Wilson 2010). Several years ago, activists in the contingent faculty movement recognized the impasse at which the movement found itself in the face of this lack of progress (Hoeller 2007), and initiated discussion about the need for a structured national organization. In 2009, such an organization was founded. New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity (NFM) is the only national organization exclusively devoted to improving the quality of higher education by improving the working conditions of the majority of its faculty. NFM came into existence because we believe that higher education needs to move into a new phase of coordinated, intentional, and ethically grounded activity to confront contingency. The goal of such efforts should be to repair the damaging effects on students, faculty, and the country of the haphazard and shortsighted decisions that led to the spread of contingency in the first place, and to bring to fruition the valiant but uncoordinated and all too often superficial reforms that a generation of educators has tried to implement. And, while incremental change may continue to be the only way forward, we believe that what is needed is a new sense of urgency and a defined goal that acknowledges the need for a transformation of academic culture from its current hierarchical, stratified structure into real academic democracy rooted in the values of liberal education.

### Perm: Academic Thinking

#### A manifestation of intellectual rejection of cap beings in the academy – key to alt solvency and the case is a net benefit.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

In a dystopian society, utopian thought becomes sterile, and paraphrasing Theodor Adorno, thinking becomes an act of utter stupidity. Anti-public intellectuals now define the larger cultural landscape, all too willing to flaunt co-option and reap the rewards of venting insults at their assigned opponents while being reduced to the status of paid servants of powerful economic interests. But the problem is not simply with the rise of a right-wing cultural apparatus dedicated to preserving the power and wealth of the rich and corporate elite. As Stuart Hall recently remarked, the state of progressive thought is also in jeopardy in that, as he puts it, "The left is in trouble. It's not got any ideas, it's not got any independent analysis of its own, and therefore, it's got no vision. It just takes the temperature . . . It has no sense of politics being educative, of politics changing the way people see things."28 Of course, Hall is not suggesting the left has no ideas to speak of. He is suggesting that such ideas are removed from the larger issue of what it means to address education and the production and reception of meaningful ideas as a mode of pedagogy that is central to politics itself. The issue of politics being educative, of recognizing that matters of pedagogy, subjectivity and consciousness are at the heart of political and moral concerns, should not be lost on academics. Nor should the relevance of education being at the heart of politics be lost on those of us concerned about inviting the public back into higher education and rethinking the purpose and meaning of higher education itself. Democracy places civic demands upon its citizens, and such demands point to the necessity of an education that is broad-based, critical and supportive of meaningful civic values, participation in self-governance and democratic leadership. Only through such a formative and critical educational culture can students learn how to become individual and social agents, rather than disengaged spectators or uncritical consumers, able both to think otherwise and to act upon civic commitments that "necessitate a reordering of basic power arrangements" fundamental to promoting the common good and producing a strong democracy. This is not a matter of imposing values on education and in our classrooms. The university and the classroom are already defined through power-laden discourses and a myriad of values that are often part of the hidden curriculum of educational politics and pedagogy. A more accurate position would be, as Toni Morrison points out, to take up our responsibility "as citizen/scholars in the university [and] to accept the consequences of our own value-redolent roles." She continues: "Like it or not, we are paradigms of our own values, advertisements of our own ethics - especially noticeable when we presume to foster ethics-free, value-lite education."29

### Uniqueness: Inevitable

#### Without reforming the university, neolib is inevitable.

Giroux 3/3 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” March 3, 2015, http://truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory)//ghs-VA

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. 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)

### Link: Transcends Market

#### The establishment of a living wage is paramount to transcending the market system and enscribing social justice, Alvaro ‘14

Living Wages in the Paradigm Transition – The Imperative Challenge of Transcending the Market, Álvaro de Regil Castilla is Executive Director of The Jus Semper Global Alliance and a member of the Expert Advisors Council of the Global Initiative for Sustainability Ratings, Jus Semper Global Development, May 2014,

The achievement of a universal living wage is contingent on our capacity to transcend the¶ contemporary market-centred paradigm by replacing it with a model that embodies the principles of¶ social justice, true democracy, and ecological sustainability.¶ Transcending the market in turn is contingent on building the new¶ paradigm for the sustainability of people––in the context of social¶ justice––and the planet––in the context of the balanced¶ preservation of the environment. To transition to the new paradigm¶ we must first build a new societal architecture of true democracy. In¶ this way, establishing the living wage ethos as the future universal¶ standard is anchored on two paramount premises: (1) building a¶ new truly democratic ethos, and (2) building the new paradigm of¶ people and planet, in which the living wage would be a core¶ standard of its sustainability. Transcending the market provides the¶ radical paradigmatic shift to build our new edifice of true¶ democracy through a systemic transition, such as the vision¶ depicted in the Great Transition Initiative.24 This edifice entails a¶ completely new conception of life and of our role as individual¶ members of the new society. The living wage––as a core element of¶ the new paradigm––would become the standard of all labour¶ compensations, with a legally-binding stature recognised in national¶ and international laws.This implies that in the sphere of the living wage we must completely redefine the concept of wage¶ remuneration anchored on the balanced use of resources. We cannot propose to close living wage¶ gaps across the world aspiring to provide to all workers the same consumption power of today’s¶ well-off workers following the principle of equal pay for equal work. Consequently, the concept of¶ the living wage must assess both its lowest and highest thresholds. On one hand, it should determine¶ the lowest level of consumption power that ensures that all wages are worthy of human dignity. On¶ the other hand it must assess the highest possible level of remuneration that remains in sync with¶ previously and scientifically defined levels of consumption of resources that guarantee long-term¶ sustainability. In the new transformative model, the living wage must be envisioned with a new lens¶ anchored on sustainability criteria that will inevitably cut drastically the materialistic expectations of all wage earners, both in Centre and Periphery economies. To be sure, Periphery workers will¶ increase their consumption power to enjoy a good life standard but not nearly within the present¶ unsustainable levels of consumption generated by Centre workers. As could be expected, these¶ workers must cut their consumption patterns as much as necessary to put them in sync with¶ predefined sustainable levels of resource use.

### Link: Grassroots

#### The living wage movement offers the opportunity for grassroots political activism to stand up and challenge the system of capital that exploits individuals, Robinson ‘04

HUNGER DISCIPLINE AND¶ SOCIAL PARASITES¶ The Political Economy¶ of the Living Wage¶ TONY ROBINSON¶ University of Colorado at Denver, URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW, Vol. 40, No. 2, November 2004 246-268

As living wage movements across the nation challenge the iron law¶ boundaries of the natural economists, there is the potential for the synergizing¶ of progressive local episodes into a broader transformation of the surrounding¶ political atmosphere and underlying institutional structures—a¶ transformation that will make the low-wage politics of leading American officials¶ and businesses harder to sustain, and that might open the political¶ space for a rejuvenation of the original spirit of the Fair Labor Standards Act¶ of 1938. In this way, the living wage movement is¶ posing an alternative vision. . . . [It] is not simply concerned with improving¶ wages forworkers, employed by businesses holdingmunicipal government contracts.¶ . . . The living wage movement is committed to reversing the economy wide¶ wage squeeze, stopping tax giveaways to big businesses, re-energizing¶ the labormovement, and ending the war on the poor. (Pollin and Luce 1998, 8)¶ This is the old lesson of Piven and Cloward in both Regulating the Poor¶ (1993) and Poor People’s Movements (1979). Attuned to the powerful constellation¶ of structural forces that establish eras of ascendant capital, Piven¶ and Cloward put little faith in the power of liberal theorizing or progressive leadership to create a labor regime that is “more responsible, humane and¶ generous” (1993, xv). The forces of state are too easily subordinated to business¶ interests in capital accumulation that always seek to force a low-wage¶ workforce “to do the harshestwork for the least reward” (p. xix). The only effective¶ strategy to challenge this inherent capitalist tendency toward the¶ immiseration of labor is broad-based protest among the poor, which creates¶ a climate that demands holistic reform to reintegrate alienated groups into¶ the reformed market system (e.g., the New Deal Social contract featuring the¶ FLSA).¶ Across the nation, mobilized activists are writing living wage ordinances¶ into their city code, piecing together a renewed social contract that links¶ state-subsidized growth to improved conditions for the working class. These¶ activists are fueling the rise of popular protest that has always driven the¶ expansion of social welfare policies. We have seen historic moments when¶ the protecting drapery of justifying theory was torn off the powerful due to¶ counterorganizing and countertheorizing among the poor and their advocates.¶ Perhaps today’s episodic bursts of living wage activism are groping¶ their way toward a national upheaval, and we are witnessing the next quickening¶ of effective popular resistance to the eternal efforts of financialized¶ capital to deny and degrade all that binds it to the fate of the real economy.

### Link: Unions

#### Living wage helps form unions—contributes to individual power, so it can help break down corporate domination.

Jacobs et al. 3, Michael Reich [Professor of Economics, UC Berkeley and Research Chair, Institute for Labor and Employment, University of California, Study Director] and Peter Hall [Ph. D. candidate, City and Regional Planning, UC Berkeley] and Ken Jacobs [Project Director, Bay Area Organizing Committee], “LIVING WAGES AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE THE SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT MODEL”, UC Berkeley Research, March 2003, BE

The benefits of living wage policies for unions are especially clear in the public sector, where contracting entities are generally required by law to grant the contract to the lowest qualified bidder. Service contractors have little flexibility in their cost structure outside of employee compensation. In order to put in the lowest bid, they are forced to keep wages and benefits to a minimum.¶ Similar conditions apply in the private sector when service jobs are contracted out. Under conditions of outsourcing, if any single contracting firm is unionized, they will have difficulty meeting demands for increased wages and benefits and retaining the contract, unless competing firms are subject to the same constraints on reducing compensation. In the absence of sufficiently high union density in an industry to set the wage pattern, living wage ordinances provide those constraints by taking wages out of competition, and creating a common floor for all contractors.¶ To the degree that living wage laws reduce worker turnover, they may provide an additional contribution to organizing. Organizing is more difficult in firms where the workforce is unstable and the workers with the greatest leadership skills are more likely to quit for another job than fight. Higher wages increase the value of job security, seniority and other benefits of unionization¶ At SFO, the living wage policies appear to have provided the greatest benefits to union organizing when workers were directly involved in the campaign and worker contact was made in advance of implementation of the policies. When a long period of time elapsed between the mandated raises and the initial worker contact, and workers credited the employers for the raise, the policies may have had a slight negative effect on organizing (See Appendix E).

### Alt: State Key

#### Only using the state’s power can break down neolib

Ferguson 10, Stanford anthropology chair and professor

(James, “Toward a left art of government: from ‘Foucauldian critique’ to Foucauldian politics”,History of the Human Sciences 2011 24: 61, SAGE)

One of the founding premises of this special issue and the conference with which it began is that Foucault has been read, and used, in different ways in different academic disciplines. In this article I will discuss one common way of using Foucault’s thought in my own discipline of anthropology. I will suggest that the strategy of using Foucauldian modes of analysis to ‘critique power’ (as it is often put) has frequently led to a rather sterile form of political engagement. Attention to some of Foucault’s own remarks about politics hints at a different political sensibility, in which empirical experimentation rather than moralistic denunciation takes center place. I will reference some examples of such experimentation that come out of my current research on the politics of social assistance in southern Africa (though I do not have space here to give a full exposition of these). The sort of use of Foucault that I have in mind is well represented in the anthropology of development (and the related field of what is sometimes called critical development studies). Here, the characteristic strategy is to use Foucauldian analysis to reveal the way that interventions, projects, etc., which claim to be merely technical or benevolent, really involve relations of power. This is a perfectly reasonable thing to do, but too often, in this field, such a simple demonstration is apparently seen as the end of the exercise. Power has been ‘critiqued’, an oppressive system has been exposed as such, and that seems to be taken as a satisfactory end to the matter. This impasse in development studies and anthropology is related, I think, to a wider predicament that progressive or left politics seems to find itself in today. The predicament is that the left seems increasingly to be defined by a series of gestures of refusal – what I call ‘the antis’ (anti-globalization, anti-neo-liberalism, anti-privatization, anti-Bush, sometimes even anti-capitalism – but always ‘anti’, never ‘pro’). The current world system, the politics of the ‘anti-’ points out, rests on inequality and exploitation. The global poor are being screwed, while the rich are benefiting. The powerless are getting the short end of the stick. This is all perfectly true, of course, if not terribly illuminating. But such lines of argument typically have very little to propose by way of an alternative ‘art of government’. Governing is exercising power over others, which is what the powerful do to the downtrodden. It appears as something to be resisted or denounced, not improved or experimented with. My first observation about this sort of analysis is that it rests on what seems tome a very un-Foucauldian idea of the political. Foucault did, certainly, valorize certain forms of resistance, and worked tirelessly to undermine and denaturalize taken-for-granted arrangements of power. But he never suggested that power ought not be exercised, or that it was illegitimate for someto seek to govern the conduct of others.On the contrary, he repeatedly insisted that it made no sense (in his scheme of things) to wish for a world without power.1 Naive readings of Foucault turned his skeptical analytics of power into a simple denunciation. Thus the question (once posed to him by an interviewer) of whether it would be an intolerable use of power for a parent to prevent a child from scribbling on the walls of a house. Foucault’s instructive answer was: If I accepted the picture of power that is frequently adopted – namely, that it’s something horrible and repressive for the individual – it’s clear that preventing a child from scribbling would be an unbearable tyranny. But that’s not it. I say that power is a relation. A relation in which one guides the behavior of others. And there’s no reason why this manner of guiding the behavior of others should not ultimately have results which are positive, valuable, interesting, and so on. If I had a kid, I assure you he would not write on the walls – or if he did, it would be against my will. The very idea! (Foucault, 1988a: 11–13) In the same interview, he complained of those who . . . think I’m a sort of radical anarchist who has an absolute hatred of power. No! What I’m trying to do is to approach this extremely important and tangled phenomenon in our society, the exercise of power, with the most reflective, and I would say prudent, attitude. . . . To question the relations of power in the most scrupulous and attentive manner possible, looking into all the domains of its exercise, that’s not the same thing as constructing a mythology of power as the beast of the apocalypse. (ibid.: 11–13) In fact, Foucault was as fascinated and attracted by power as he was by resistance, and his fundamental concern was with how (not whether) power is exercised. This led him, naturally enough, to the problem of government, which he inevitably took up as a pragmatic puzzle. Some contemporary practitioners of what I have termed ‘Foucauldian critique’ seem to think it is some sort of scandal that people should be governed at all – supposing it to be somehow illegitimate that some should seek to guide the conduct of others. But Foucault took a deep and largely sympathetic interest in the development of what he called ‘arts of government’. Indeed, he once suggested (in a provocative set of remarks on neo-liberalism) that while the right had, in the mid- to late 20th century, invented powerful new arts of government, the left had suffered from the ‘absence of a socialist art of government’, and a historic failure to develop an ‘autonomous governmentality’ comparable to liberalism (Foucault, 2008: 93–4). This observation leads to a question that must be a central one for what I am here terming ‘Foucauldian politics’. That is: What might a genuinely ‘left’ art of government look like? And where might we find the specific governmental techniques and rationalities that might enable such an art? Looking at the world as a whole – and especially at the poorest and most disadvantaged parts of it, in which both I and my discipline have long taken a special interest – it seems evident that we can only answer such questions if we are willing to question some of the foundational assumptions that have dominated left thought throughout the last century or more. Let me cite just two reasons for this. First, in much of the world (and especially in the poorest parts of it), formal wage labor does not play the central role that so much left thought ascribes to it. The semimythical figure of the proletarian was, of course, at the heart of ideologies of state socialism, even as the extraction of labor was foundational to its political economy. But the ‘able bodied worker’ was hardly less central to the workings of social democracies and welfare states, where Keynesian policies implied a kind of pact between capital and labor, mediated by the state. ‘Society’, in such a scheme, was grounded on the (normatively male) wage earning worker and ‘his family’, while ‘social welfare’ intervention was available for those left outside the security of labor (whether through injury, old age, or periodic dips in the business cycle). Insurance rationality provided the technical means for universalizing certain sorts of social citizenship (at the level of the nation-state) on the basis of the non-universal (but sufficiently widespread) social condition of wage labor. This template never really applied very well to Africa, where wage laborers have always been a small minority of the population. And it applies even less well today, when economic restructuring and de-industrialization have meant that formal wage employment is ever more the exception than the rule. In the rapidly expanding cities of today’s Africa, the great mass of the population is not ‘employed’ in the usual sense of the word, and increasingly lacks connections (or rights) to land as well. Neither workers nor peasants, they dwell in the socalled ‘informal economy’, eking out a meagre survival through an impressive range of improvised bits of this and that (cf. Davis, 2007). The poverty of our analytical vocabulary in describing such people and their way of life (Are they ‘the lumpen’? ‘The youth’? ‘The informal’ – whatever that means?) ismatched by our inability to conceive of forms of politics that would given them a central place. Certainly, the old left strategy of dismissing such people as a residual and degenerate fringe (Marx’s ‘lumpenproletariat’) can hardly suffice when we are talking (as we often are today) about the majority of the population. The second challenge I wish to note to conventional left thinking is the rise of forms of social assistance that bypass nation-states. The usual left stance identifies ‘neo-liberalism’ as the enemy of the state, and thus of such social goods as welfare and pensions. But in much of Africa, most forms of ‘social assistance’ are funded and implemented by non-state agencies. This has long been the case, in many areas, thanks to the key role of Christian missions in providing education, health care and other social services from the colonial era onward. The NGO revolution of the recent decades has only accentuated the pattern, to the point where many of the key governmental relations that servicer eceiving Africans have are not with state bureaucracies, but with NGOs funded by transnational philanthropic foundations. The most common left response to this transnationalization of ‘the social’ has been to oppose such developments (again, the ‘anti’), and to defend the sovereignty of African states, which are imagined as being (at least potentially) the agents of development and resistors of imperialism. Such stances have sometimes been justified, but they have not led to very effective forms of politics. Might another sort of left politics not be possible – one that would look forward and try to identify new possibilities and openings in the current transnational regime, instead of looking back to an (often misremembered or idealized) era of sovereign ‘developmental states’? And (crucially for my purposes here), might it not be possible to identify or discover new ‘arts of government’ that might take advantage of (rather than simply fighting against) recent transformations in the spatial organization of government and social assistance? This is the sort of rethinking that will be necessary if we are to get beyond the politics of the ‘anti’ and arrive at a convincing response to Foucault’s challenge to develop a true left art of government. Such rethinking will have to be willing to decenter the two sacred touchstones of 20th-century progressive politics – the worker and the nation-state – while finding or reinventing techniques of government that can gain traction in settings where most of ‘the masses’ are not workers, and most social services are not delivered by states. In such circumstances, simply attacking ‘neo-liberalism’ and defending ‘the welfare state’ is not terribly helpful. What is needed instead is a revitalized notion of the political good – and of what ‘social assistance’ might mean in a world where so many of the assumptions of the Keynesian welfare state no longer obtain. In matters of ‘social policy’, Foucault’s 1983 observation remains true nearly a quarter-century later: We are still bound up with an outlook that was formed between 1920 and 1940, mainly under the influence of Beveridge, a man who was born over a hundred years ago. For the moment . . . we completely lack the intellectual tools necessary to envisage in new terms the form in which we might attain what we are looking for. (Foucault, 1988b: 166) My recent work is concerned with empirical domains in which some of the conceptual innovation that Foucault called for may be under way. Perhaps the most provocative finding to date is that some of the most interesting and promising new forms of government being devised seem to be taking market mechanisms that we are used to associating with neo-liberalism, and putting them to new political uses. Consider, for instance, new anti-poverty programs in southern Africa that seek to provide cash support for incomes, and thus (in theory) harness markets to the task of meeting the needs of the poor. This is happening in several African countries, but also in a great many other postcolonial states – from Brazil and Venezuela to Mexico and Bangladesh – where leftist and rightist regimes alike have seen fit to introduce policies that transfer cash directly into the hands of the poor (Fiszbein and Schady, 2009; cf. Ferguson, 2010). The South African Basic Income Grant campaign is the example I know best. This involves a proposal to deal with a crisis of persistent poverty by providing a small unconditional minimum monthly payment to all. The argument goes like this: markets are not working for poor people because they are too poor to participate in them. Government programs are not working for them because the state is inefficient. So: provide income support directly, in the form of cash, then say to the poor: ‘You are now empowered to solve your own problems in the way you see best.’ In contrast to older forms of ‘welfare’ assistance, the claim is that such grants rely on poor people’s own ability to solve their own problems, without imposing the policing, paternalism and surveillance of the traditional welfare state. The ‘social’ of the social welfare state is largely discarded, in this scheme. Assistance is largely decoupled from familistic assumptions and insurance rationality alike, while the state is imagined as both universally engaged (as a kind of direct provider for each and every citizen) and maximally disengaged (taking no real interest in shaping the conduct of those under its care, who are seen as knowing their own needs better than the state does). (See Standing and Samson, 2003; Barchiesi, 20007; Ferguson, 2007.) Similar new lines of thought are visible in recent campaigns for an increased role for direct cash transfers in many forms of social and humanitarian policy. For instance, an increasingly influential argument in the area of humanitarian assistance maintains that hunger is best dealt with by boosting the purchasing power of those at risk, rather than by distributing food aid. The current international food aid system involves taking excess grain (produced under subsidized conditions in rich countries) and transporting it to places (largely in Africa) where people are at risk of hunger. Following Amartya Sen, critics have long noted the perverse effects of this: depressing producer prices for local farmers, and damaging the local institutions for producing and distributing food crops. Once food aid has arrived, local food production often never recovers, and the ‘temporary’ crisis becomes permanent. As an alternative, Sen’s followers have pushed for cash payments to be made directly to those at risk of food deficit. People with money in their pockets, Sen points out, do not starve. And the economic chain of events that is set in motion by boosting purchasing power leads (through market forces) to increased capacity for local production and distribution (Sen, 1983; Dreze and Sen, 1991). The argument recalls Jane Guyer’s groundbreaking work on feeding African cities (1989). Consider, Guyer suggests, how food ends up in bellies in the vast mega-cities of West Africa such as Lagos. The logistical task of moving thousands of tons of food each day fromthousands of local producers to millions of urban consumerswould be beyond the organizational capacity of any state (to say nothing of the less-than-exemplary Nigerian one). Here, market mechanisms, drawing on the power of vast self-organizing networks, are very powerful, and very efficient. Such forms of organization must appear especially attractive where states lack capacity (and let us remember how many progressive dreams in Africa have crashed on the rocks of low state capacity). Why should relying on this sort of mechanism be inherently right-wing? Well, the answer is obvious: markets serve only those with purchasing power. But the food aid example shows a way of redirecting markets toward the poor, by intervening not to restrict the market, but to boost purchasing power. I have become convinced that (at least in the case of food aid) this is good public policy. Is it also neo-liberal? Perhaps that is not the right question. Let us rather ask: Are there specific sorts of social policy that might draw on characteristic neo-liberal ‘moves’ (like using markets to deliver services) that would also be genuinely pro-poor? That seems to me a question worth asking. It seems clear that the governmental programs I have discussed here do draw on recognizably neo-liberal elements (including the valorization of market efficiency, individual choice and autonomy; themes of entrepreneurship; and skepticism about the state as a service provider).2 But those who advocate and fight for these policies would insist that they are, in fact ‘pro-poor’, and that they are ways of fighting against (rather than capitulating to) the growing inequality that recent ‘neo-liberal’ economic restructuring has produced. These claims, I think, are not easily dismissed. And this, in turn, raises the fascinating possibility that the ‘neo-liberal’ and the ‘pro-poor’ may not be so automatically opposed as we are used to supposing. What is of special interest here is the way that certain sorts of new progressive initiatives may involve not simply ‘opposing the neo-liberal project’, but appropriating key mechanisms of neo-liberal government for different ends. This does not mean that these political projects are therefore suspect – ‘contaminated’ by their association with neo-liberal rationality. Rather, it means that they are appropriating certain characteristic neo-liberal ‘moves’ (and I think of these discursive and programmatic moves as analogous to the moves one might make in a game) that while recognizably ‘neo-liberal’, can be used for quite different purposes than that term usually implies. As I have argued in a related paper (Ferguson, 2010), this situation may be analogous to the way that statistical techniques that were developed in the 19th century for calculating the probabilities of workplace injuries eventually became building blocks of the insurance techniques that enabled the rise of the welfare state. Such techniques were originally developed in the 19th century by large employers to control costs, but they eventually became the technical basis for social insurance, and ultimately helped enable unprecedented gains for the working class across much of the world (Ewald, 1986). Techniques have no necessary loyalty to the political program within which they were developed, and mechanisms of government that were invented to serve one purpose can easily enough be appropriated for surprising other uses. ‘Market’ techniques of government such as those I have discussed were, like workplace statistics, undoubtedly conservative in their original uses. But it seems at least possible that they may be in the process of being creatively appropriated, and repurposed for different and more progressive sorts of ends. To be sure: we need to be skeptical about the facile idea that problems of poor people can be solved simply by inviting them to participate in markets and enterprise. Such claims (which often ascribe almost magical transformative powers to such unlikely vehicles as ‘social entrepreneurship’ or ‘microcredit’) are almost always misleading, and often fraudulent. But it would be a mistake to dismiss the coupling of pro-poor social policy with market mechanisms out of hand, out of a reflexive sense that the latter are ‘neo-liberal’ and thus ‘bad’. Again, my interest here is in the potential mobility of a set of governmental devices. These devices originated within a neo-liberal project that deserves all the criticism it gets. But they may be in the process of being redeployed in creative ways. If so, some emergent political initiatives that might appear at first blush to be worryingly ‘neo-liberal’ may, on closer inspection, amount to something a good deal more hopeful. This leaves us with a politics that requires more of us than simply denouncing neo-liberalism. The political demands and policy measures I have mentioned here (whether conditional cash transfers, basic income, or cash-based food aid) do not merit, I think, either wholesale denunciation or uncritical acceptance. Instead, they call on us to remain skeptical and vigilant, but also curious and hopeful. They leave us less with strong opinions than with the sense that we need to think about them a bit more, and learn a bit more about the specific empirical effects that they may produce. Are cash transfers, for instance, a device for demobilizing the poor (as some traditional Marxists claim) – effectively buying the political quiescence of those who have the most to gain from radical social change for a paltry sum? Or do they have the contrary effect, as many proponents of basic income argue – opening up a new space of mobilization and political demand by radically decoupling labor and consumption and opening a new domain of decommodification? This is not a question to be answered theoretically or ideologically; the only answer that really convinces is the empirical and experimental one: Let us find out! Such a stance, I suggest, brings us much closer toward a truly Foucauldian politics. For politics, for Foucault, was always more about experimentation than denunciation. In an interview on social security, Foucault insisted that what was required for a progressive rethinking of social policy was not a theoretically derived ‘line’, but, as he put it, ‘a certain empiricism’. We have to transform the field of social institutions into a vast experimental field, in such a way as to decide which taps need turning, which bolts need to be loosened here or there, to get the desired change. . . . What we have to do . . . is to increase the experiments wherever possible in this particularly interesting and important area of social life. (Foucault, 1988b: 165) What this implies is a form of politics that has less to do with critique and denunciation than with experimentation and assessment. It is a matter not of refusing power, but rather exercising it in a way that would be provisional, reversible, and open to surprise. If we are indeed to arrive at viable left ‘arts of government’, we will need to be open to the unexpected, ready to ‘increase the experiments wherever possible’, and attentive to the ways that governmental techniques originally deployed for nefarious purposes can be appropriated toward other ends. To do this, we will need to forgo the pleasures of the easy, dismissive critique, and instead turn a keen and sympathetic eye toward the rich world of actual social and political practice, the world of tap-turning and experimentation. That is a world still full of invention and surprise, where the landscape of political possibility and constraint that we have come to take for granted is being redrawn, even as we speak.

### Alt: State Rejection Bad

#### Their dismissal of the state maintains neolib—there must be a reform of existing structures.

Doran and Barry 6 – worked at all levels in the environment and sustainable development policy arena - at the United Nations, at the Northern Ireland Assembly and Dáil Éireann, and in the Irish NGO sector. PhD--AND-- Reader in Politics, Queen's University School of Politics, International Studies, and Philosophy. PhD Glasgow (Peter and John, Refining Green Political Economy: From Ecological Modernisation to Economic Security and Sufficiency, Analyse & Kritik 28/2006, p. 250–275, <http://www.analyse-und-kritik.net/2006-2/AK_Barry_Doran_2006.pdf>)

The aim of this article is to offer a draft of a realistic, but critical, version of green political economy to underpin the economic dimensions of radical views of sustainable development. It is written explicitly with a view to encouraging others to respond to it in the necessary collaborative effort to think through this aspect of sustainable development. Our position is informed by two important observations. As a sign of our times, the crises that we are addressing under the banner of sustainable development (however inadequately) render the distinction between what is ‘realistic’ and ‘radical’ problematic. It seems to us that the only realistic course is to revisit the most basic assumptions embedded within the dominant model of development and economics. Realistically the only longterm option available is radical. Secondly, we cannot build or seek to create a sustainable economy ab nihilo, but must begin—in an agonistic fashion—from where we are, with the structures, institutions, modes of production, laws, regulations and so on that we have. We make this point in Ireland with a story about the motorist who stops at the side of the road to ask directions, only to be told: “Now Ma’m, I wouldn’t start from here if I were you.” ¶ This does not mean simply accepting these as immutable or set in stone— after all, some of the current institutions, principles and structures underpinning the dominant economic model are the very causes of unsustainable development— but we do need to recognise that we must work with (and ‘through’—in the terms of the original German Green Party’s slogan of “marching through the institutions”) these existing structures as well as changing and reforming and in some cases abandoning them as either unnecessary or positively harmful to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable economy and society. Moreover, we have a particular responsibility under the current dominant economic trends to name the neo-liberal project as the hegemonic influence on economic thinking and practice. In the words of Bourdieu/Wacquant (2001), neoliberalism is the new ‘planetary vulgate’, which provides the global context for much of the contemporary political and academic debate on sustainable development. For example, there is a clear hierarchy of trade (WTO) over the environment (Multilateral Environmental Agreements) in the international rules-based systems. At the boundaries or limits of the sustainable development debate in both the UK and the European Union it is also evident that the objectives of competitiveness and trade policy are sacrosanct. As Tim Luke (1999) has observed, the relative success or failure of national economies in head-to-head global competition is taken by ‘geo-economics’ as the definitive register of any one nation-state’s waxing or waning international power, as well as its rising or falling industrial competitiveness, technological vitality and economic prowess. In this context, many believe ecological considerations can, at best, be given only meaningless symbolic responses, in the continuing quest to mobilise the Earth’s material resources. ¶ Our realism is rooted in the demos. The realism with which this paper is concerned topromote recognises that the path to an alternative economy and society must begin with a recognition of the reality that most people (in the West) will not democratically vote (or be given the opportunity to vote) for a completely different type of society and economy overnight. This is true even as the merits of a ‘green economy’ are increasingly recognised and accepted by most people as the logical basis for safeguards and guarantees for their basic needs and aspirations (within limits). The realistic character of the thinking behind this article accepts that consumption and materialistic lifestyles are here to stay. (The most we can probably aspire to is a wideningand deepening of popular movements towards ethical consumption, responsible investment, and fair trade.) And indeed there is little to be gained by proposing alternative economic systems which start from acomplete rejection of consumption and materialism. The appeal to realism is in part an attempt to correct the common misperception (and self-perception) of green politics and economics requiring an excessive degree of self-denial and a puritanical asceticism (see Goodin 1992, 18; Allison 1991, 170– 78). While rejecting the claim that green political theory calls for the complete disavowal of materialistic lifestyles, it is true that green politics does require the collective re-assessment of such lifestyles, and does require new economic signals and pedagogical attempts to encourage a delinking—in the minds of the general populus—of the ‘good life’ and the ‘goods life’. This does not mean that we need necessarily require thecomplete and across the board rejection of materialistic lifestyles. It must be the case that there is room and tolerance in a green economy for people to choose to live diverse lifestyles—some more sustainable than others—so long as these do not ‘harm’ others, threaten long-term ecological sustainability or create unjust levels of socio-economic inequalities. Thus, realism in this context is in part another name for the acceptance of a broadly ‘liberal’ or ‘post-liberal’ (but certainly not anti-liberal) green perspective.2¶ 1. Setting Out¶ At the same time, while critical of the ‘abstract’ and ‘unrealistic’ utopianism that peppers green and radical thinking in this area, we do not intend to reject utopianism. Indeed, with Oscar Wilde we agree that a map of the world that does not have utopia on it, isn’t worth looking at. The spirit in which this article is written is more in keeping with framing green and sustainability concerns within a ‘concrete utopian’ perspective or what the Marxist geographer David Harvey (1996, 433–435) calls a “utopianism of process”, to be distinguished from “closed”, blueprint-like andabstract utopian visions. Accordingly, the model of green political economy outlined here is in keeping with Steven Lukes’ suggestion that a concrete utopianism depends on the ‘knowledge of a self-transforming present, not an ideal future’ (Lukes 1984, 158).¶ It accepts the current dominance of one particular model of green political economy—namely ‘ecological modernisation’ (hereafter referred to EM)—as thepreferred ‘political economy’ underpinning contemporary state and market forms of sustainable development, and further accepts the necessity for green politics to positively engage in the debates and policies around EM from a strategic (as well as a normative) point of view.However, it is also conscious of the limits and problems with ecological modernisation, particularly in terms of its technocratic, supply-side and reformist ‘business as usual’ approach, and seeks to explore the potential to radicalise EM or use it as a ‘jumping off’ point for more radical views of greening the economy. Ecological modernisation is a work in progress; and that’s the point. ¶ The article begins by outlining EM in theory and practice, specifically in relation to the British state’s ‘sustainable development’ policy agenda under New Labour.3 While EM as currently practised by the British state is ‘weak’ and largely turns on the centrality of ‘innovation’ and ‘eco-efficiency’, the paper then goes on to investigate in more detail the role of the market within current conceptualisations of EM and other models of green political economy. In particular, a potentially powerful distinction (both conceptually and in policy debates) between ‘the market’ and ‘capitalism’ has yet to be sufficiently explored and exploited as a starting point for the development of radical, viable and attractive conceptions of green political economy as alternatives to both EM and the orthodox economic paradigm. We contend that there is a role for the market in innovation and as part of the ‘governance’ for sustainable development in which eco-efficiency and EM of the economy is linked to non-ecological demands of green politics and sustainable development such as social and global justice, egalitarianism, democratic regulation of the market and the conceptual (and policy)expansion of the ‘economy’ to include social, informal and noncash economic activity and a progressive role for the state (especially at the local/municipal level). Here we suggest that the ‘environmental’ argument or basis of green political economy in terms of the need for the economy to become more resource efficient, minimise pollution and waste and so on, has largely been won. What that means is that no one is disputing the need for greater resource productivity, energy and eco-efficiency. Both state and corporate/business actors have accepted the environmental ‘bottom line’ (often rhetorically, but nonetheless important) as a conditioning factor in the pursuit of the economic ‘bottom line’.

### Alt: Pragmatism Key

#### Pragmatism key and no alt solvency.

James F. Smith 04[Former Communications Director, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Harvard], "Prison Reform Through the Legislature," Chapter 13 of The Politics of Punishment: Evaluating Political Explanations of Incarceration Rates, Journal of Politics,¶ Volume 66, Issue 3, pages 925–938, August 2004, http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/POP.c13.pdf, GHS//MM

**Most leftist groups in America** have been unwilling or unable to participate this way in establishment politics. They **express outrage at the** inhumanity and **repression of the criminal justice system, but refuse to become involved in conventional politics as a way of dealing with these problems. Instead they engage in** armchair discussions of revolution and "increasing political consciousness." For many it is a matter of ideology, a firm belief that the system cannot reform itself. For others it is a matter of life style, an unwillingness to make the personal compromises in dress, language, and personal activity that are necessary to deal with the "straight" world. For some it is a matter of inertia. **The impotence of the American left is not so much a matter of its intrinsic weakness as rather its pervasive unwillingness to unite and gain political power through** established channels. **It is** perhaps **unfortunate, from a moral and pragmatic point of view, that the U**nited **S**tates **is not on the verge of revolution**. But **until a revolutionary situation exists** in the United States, conventional politics has the undeniable advantage over arm-chair revolution **in that it can accomplish some positive changes**. If **prison reform groups** are to have any real hope of modifying the prison system in the foreseeable future, they **must** begin to **focus their energies on established political institutions**, for **in the foreseeable future it is through these institutions that change must come.**

## AT: Eugenics

### Case Cross App Overview

#### Cross apply the Ballot Story: Objectivity is a lie and material analysis is critical which means substantive impacts preclude theoretical ones.

#### 1. Plan key to solve – liberalizing higher education is key to enabling the general public to make demands centering around race and solve for white supremacy, means the case is a link turn – that’s Giroux.

#### 2. You have to know eugenic manifestations to fight it – rejection requires knowing what structures exist and forcing the transition from the current neoliberal mindset that is the root cause of racism.

#### 3. Case Outweighs

#### A. Magnitude – racism and unemployment already happen and are inevitable, only I access a brink impact that complete changes the structure of the country and ideology, there’s no contextualization of their impacts.

#### B. Scope – you only effect individuals in the working class, I affect the entire country.

#### C. Time frame – I impact people immediately there’s no framing about when their impacts occur.

#### 4. Cross apply Mahoney – no uniqueness for the impact – let me quote the card, “conditions have gotten so bad, that adjuncts have reached a point of no return, there is nothing left to lose, it’s either stand up and fight or further sink into poverty.” Try or die for the aff.

#### 5. Cross apply Giroux – neoliberal ideology constructs the frame for economic arguments – liberalizing the academy solves how we view individuals therefore causes a re-prioritization that solves.

### Uniqueness Dump

#### 1. No uniqueness – eugenics is an ideology which means a living wage is a manifestation of the ideology which makes your impacts inevitable.

### Link Dump

#### 1. No link—This is based on historical conceptions of the living wage law, the aff is about current policies.

#### 2. The concept of eugenics is outdated and doesn’t apply to the status quo.

Leonard 4 (Thomas, Department of Economics @ UC Riverside, “Finding an Unusable Past: Why has Eugenics Gone Missing from the History of American Economics?” April 2004, http://www.princeton.edu/~tleonard/papers/unusable.pdf)//ghs-VA

There are, no doubt, many reasons why Progressive-Era eugenics seems to have gone down the memory hole of the history of economics. First, “eugenics” remains a dirty word. The atrocities perpetrated by German National Socialism in the name of eugenics have not only tainted the term, but have so colored our view of eugenics, that even professional historians have struggled not to retroactively implicate the eugenic ideas of a very different time and place.22 Second, and related, contemporary scholarship sometimes inclines to apologize for the now unfashionable enthusiasms of revered ancestors, particularly those who do not fit the standard profile of a eugenicist (Childs 2001). Third, trends in historical writing are often late in arriving to the history of economic thought. The contemporary understanding of the history of eugenics comes from a revisionist history-of-science literature that dates “only” to the 1980s and 1990s, and, what is more, this recent literature is itself mostly unacquainted with the history of political economy.

### Impact Dump

#### 1. No impact—just because it’s a product of eugenics doesn’t mean the policy as implemented in the status quo is bad so you should default towards evaluating the consequences of the plan.

#### 2. No impact – he says white supremacy but hasn’t give a real world contextualization, it’s not like the plan is the root cause. No new 2NR impact framing.

### Cottom: Black Power

#### The plan is key to black political power – black scholarship is uniquely harmed with neoliberal ideology.

Cottom 14 (Tressie, Slate writer and Ph.D. candidate in sociology at Emory University, “The New Old Labor Crisis,” JAN. 24 2014, http://www.slate.com/articles/life/counter\_narrative/2014/01/adjunct\_crisis\_in\_higher\_ed\_an\_all\_too\_familiar\_story\_for\_black\_faculty.html)//ghs-VA

The New York Times reported recently on an adjunct instructor, James Hoff, who walks like a professor, talks like a professor, and teaches like a professor, but has none of the benefits of being a professor, because he is an adjunct. Adjunct labor in higher education has revealed the structural flaw in our post-recession reality: The prescription for poverty—educational attainment—has become a condition for poverty. The high price, in dollars and opportunity costs, of getting All the Education™ has to be reconfigured, because tenured jobs with their tenured wages are declining. And that has made lots of people angry. I’m actually quite glad people are getting angry about adjunct-ification. On Friday, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce issued a 36-page report chronicling the low salaries, long hours, and lack of benefits and job security that “contingent faculty” face. (The report puts an adjunct’s average annual pay at just under $25,000.) But to be clear, there’s been a labor crisis in higher ed for a long time. It just hasn’t always been a crisis for everyone in higher ed. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has pretty much confirmed what the stories about adjuncts on food stamps and dying without health coverage illustrate: A “long-term fiscal crisis” has crushed Ph.D.s into adjunct spackle, to be applied liberally to cracks in university foundations. The report also shows something else: “The proportion of African-Americans in non-tenure-track positions (15.2 percent) is more than 50 percent greater than that of whites (9.6 percent).” In 2009, the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education analyzed data from the Department of Education and projected that if current rates of hiring and promotion of black Ph.D.s remained steady, it would “take nearly a century and a half for the percentage of African-American college faculty to reach parity with the percentage of blacks in the nation’s population.” African-Americans make up just 5 percent of full-time faculty. If you leave out the high proportion of black Ph.D.s working in historically black colleges and universities, black full-time faculty in the U.S. barely clears 4 percent. You have two sets of conditions unfolding against these statistics. On the one hand, African-Americans are less likely to attend graduate school than whites for myriad reasons. First, you have to know that graduate school exists and is a practical option for someone like you. That often takes sharing a network—family, friends, mentors—who can model how that’s done and what it looks like. But historical discrimination in college enrollment and persisting inequalities from kindergarten through college means black students are less likely to know someone who has been to graduate school. Should you discover graduate school and meet the institutional requirements for graduate school, you still have to pay for graduate school. Everything from shelling out a couple hundred dollars per application to funding a move to get there would be a whole lot easier with inherited wealth or parents with home equity and a good credit score. Again, for reasons well-documented by sociologists like James Shapiro, the hidden cost of being black in America makes getting there a lot harder. On the other hand, there is also a set of social conditions—or what sociologists call structure—at play. The structural fissures in higher education labor are now becoming more visible to all sectors of the higher education labor market. Tenure isn’t just about managing labor costs. Tenure is and always has been political. For minorities, particularly African-Americans, tenure and academic labor have long looked like managing bottom lines and keeping the upper echelons of the Ivory Tower white and male. That “long-term fiscal crisis” the AAUP cites? It came first for all the places black folks gather in groups of two or more. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education predicts it will come first and stay longest for black faculty, who are often last hired, first fired. Departments with a lot of black faculty are “more likely have to surrender faculty slots,” JBHE warns. That’s a prediction in line with history. Black faculty and the departments where they are found in the greatest numbers have been the most vulnerable since their inception. When the AAUP was issuing its first report on adjunct professors in the early 1980s, black students and faculty had been protesting the ghettofication of black scholars in adjunct roles for almost 20 years. In 1968, black students took over an administration building at Columbia; among their demands was a call for more tenured black faculty. In 1969, the Black Student Union at San Francisco State University drafted a document justifying the establishment of an African-American Studies department. These protests were extensions of the black power and civil rights movements: Essentially, young people looked around at the institutions that produced all the science and expert opinions that had rationalized their legal and social oppression, and they decided that universities were ripe for disruption. They were not just demanding student access but more tenured black faculty; they understood that tenure was a political tool. Tenure is so political that departments, administrators, and even faculty have used tenure to restrict black academics’ access to university resources. One story from a history of black studies programs recounts a Wellesley College dean telling the department’s first black faculty member to come up for tenure that “the college had decided in its wisdom that the tenure quota for Black Studies would be capped at one for all time.” James Karabel’s excellent history of admissions at Ivy League universities includes correspondence among the presidents of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton as student protests spread throughout the country in the ’60s. They were more than a little terrified by the unrest. Their elegant solution was the careful recruitment of black students and black faculty within reason, so as not to disturb the universities’ culture or labor structure. It was a popular strategy. Accounts abound from minority faculty who were hired to assuage demand for diversity only to find rules for tenure and promotion that effectively trapped them in nontenure-track roles. Last year, I moderated a panel on black academic women’s health in the academy. The administrators were overwhelmed by the intensity of response. Hundreds of essays poured in about the racism and sexism that stymied their academic careers. Many felt silenced by faculty groups that were supposed to protect them, ignored by comrades in the adjunct struggle who did not address how racism compounded its effects, and exhausted from straddling so many worlds. Problems like these have been so systemic that some disciplines, such as the American Anthropological Association, have produced white papers (no pun intended) on racism, tenure, and hiring. I agree with the AAUP that the racial disparities in adjuncting are disturbing, just as I agree with the JBHE that it is systemic and historical. Our current anger about class divides in higher education labor cannot be separated from its racist roots. Or, rather, it can—but then it is about something altogether different.

### AT PV Leonard Conclusion

#### 1. If they win this proves our uniqueness arguments – you cannot reject Darwinism and eugenics as an ideology because it will inevitably infect legislation. Means the link is tenuous and the case outweighs.

## AT: Poverty Rhetoric

### No Reps Focus

#### Exclusive focus on representations erodes meaningful reversal of structures of exploitation---discursive focus must supplement discussion of reform---key to survival.

Henry Giroux 06, prof of edu and cultural studies at Penn State, **6** (Comparative Studies of South Asia)

Abstracted from the ideal of public commitment, the new authoritarianism represents a political and economic practice and form of militarism that loosen[s] the connections among substantive democracy, critical agency, and critical education. In opposition to the rising tide of authoritarianism, educators across the globe must make a case for linking **learning to progressive social change** while struggling to pluralize and critically engage the diverse sites where public pedagogy takes place. In part, this suggests forming alliances that can make sure every sphere of social life is recognized as an important site of the political, social, and cultural struggle that is so crucial to any attempt to forge the knowledge, identifications, effective investments, and social relations that constitute political subjects and social agents capable of energizing and spreading the basis for a substantive global democracy. Such circumstances **require** that pedagogy be embraced as a moral **and** political practice, one that is directive and not dogmatic, an outgrowth of struggles designed to resist the increasing depoliticization of political culture that is the hallmark of the current Bush revolution. Education is the terrain where consciousness is shaped, needs are constructed, and the capacity for individual self-reflection and **broad social change** is nurtured and produced. Education has assumed an unparalleled significance in shaping the language, values, and ideologies that legitimize the structures and organizations that support the imperatives of global capitalism. Efforts to reduce it to a technique or methodology set aside, education remains a crucial site for the production and struggle over those pedagogical and political conditions that provide the possibilities for people to develop forms of agency that enable them individually and collectively to intervene in the processes through which the material relations of power shape the meaning and practices of their everyday lives. Within the current historical context, struggles over power take on a symbolic and discursive as well as a material and institutional form. The struggle over education is about more than the struggle over meaning and identity; it is also about how meaning, knowledge, and values are produced, authorized, and made operational within economic and structural relations of power. Education is not at odds with politics; it is an important and crucial element in any definition of the political and offers not only the theoretical tools for a systematic critique of authoritarianism but also a language of possibility for creating actual movements for democratic social change and a new biopolitics that affirms life rather than death, shared responsibility rather than shared fears, and engaged citizenship rather than the stripped-down values of consumerism. At stake here is combining symbolic forms and processes conducive to democratization with broader social contexts and the **institutional formations** of power itself. The **key point** here is to understand and engage educational and pedagogical practices from the point of view of how they are bound up with larger relations of power. Educators, students, and parents need to be clearer about how power works through and in texts, representations, and discourses, **while at the same time** recognizing that power **cannot be limited** to the study of representations and discourses, even at the level of public policy. Changing consciousness is **not the same** as **altering the** institutional basis of oppression; at the same time, institutional reform c**annot take place** without a change in consciousness capable of recognizing not only injustice but also the **very possibility for reform**, the capacity to reinvent the conditions [End Page 176] and **practices** that make a **more just future possible**. In addition, it is crucial to raise questions about the relationship between pedagogy and civic culture, on the one hand, and what it takes for individuals and social groups to believe that they have any responsibility whatsoever even to address the realities of class, race, gender, and other specific forms of domination, on the other hand. For too long, the progressives have ignored that the strategic dimension of politics is inextricably connected to questions of critical education and pedagogy, to what it means to acknowledge that education is always tangled up with power, ideologies, values, and the acquisition of both particular forms of agency and specific visions of the future. The primacy of critical pedagogy to politics, social change, and the radical imagination in such dark times is dramatically captured by the internationally renowned sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. He writes, Adverse odds may be overwhelming, and yet a democratic (or, as Cornelius Castoriadis would say, an autonomous) society knows of no substitute for education and self-education as a means to influence the turn of events that can be squared with its own nature, while that nature cannot be preserved for long without "critical pedagogy"—an education sharpening its critical edge, "making society feel guilty" and "stirring things up" through stirring human consciences. The fates of freedom, of democracy that makes it possible while being made possible by it, and of education that breeds dissatisfaction with the level of both freedom and democracy achieved thus far, are inextricably connected and not to be detached from one another. One may view that intimate connection as another specimen of a vicious circle—but it is within that circle that human hopes and the chances of humanity are inscribed, and can be nowhere else.59

#### Privileging Reps encourages anti-politics, kills the alternative.

Boggs 97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

Postmodernism and its offshoots (poststructuralism, semiotics, di¡er- ence feminism, etc.) have indeed reshaped much of academia, including such disciplines as sociology, history, literature, ¢lm, and communica- tions. More than that, the theory (if that is the correct label for some- thing so diffuse) amounts to a kind of anti-paradigm paradigm, **which often refocuses debates around** defining motifs of the post-Fordist order: commodification of culture, the media spectacle, proliferation of **images and symbols**, fragmentation of identities, the dispersion of local movements, and loss of faith in conventional political ideologies and organizations. So far as all this is concerned, post-modernism can be viewed as marking a rather healthy break with the past.50 The problem is that the main thrust of postmodernism so devalues the common realm of power, governance, and economy that the dynamics of social and institutional life vanish from sight. Where the reality of corporate, state, and military power wind up vanishing within a post- modern amorphousness, the very effort to analyze social forces and locate agencies or strategies of change becomes impossible. In its reac- tion against the comprehensive historical scope of Marxism, the micro approach dismisses in toto macropolitics and with it any conceivable modern project of radical transformation. An extreme ``micro'' focus is most visible in such theorists as Baudrillard who, as Steven Best and Douglas Kellner put it, in effect ``announce the end of the political project in the end of history and society''51 ^ a stance that replicates the logic of a profoundly depoliticized culture.

### Link: Empowerment Turn

#### Turn – the 1ac is a call to action that helps break down distinctions by empowering people.

Schram 93, Postmodern Policy Analysis: Discourse and Identity in Welfare Policy Author(s): Sanford F. Schram Source: Policy Sciences, Vol. 26, No. 3, Democracy and the Policy Sciences (Aug., 1993), pp. 249 -270 Published by: Springer Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4532290

**W**elfare policy is constitutive of the reality against which it is directed (Schram, 1992; Hawkesworth, 1988; Stone, 1988). Contemporary welfare policy helps usher in the ‘postindustrial reality’ of low-wage work and families pushed to the limit (see Schor, 1991). In its commitment to the two-parent family as a fundamental constitutive element of the market system, ‘postindustrial welfare policy’ resists providing assistance to alternative families even as the dynamics of the postindustrial economy and accompanying cultural changes increase their numbers (Connolly, 1991). These practices are likely to continue the bias in favor of the two-parent family as the route of poverty and are just as likely to accelerate the trend toward the ‘feminization of poverty.’ For Nancy Fraser (1989), this is a discursively constituted reality that is reproduced through public policy: Of course, the welfare system does not deal with women on women’s terms. On the contrary, it has its own characteristics ways of interpreting women’s needs and positioning of women as subjects…Clearly, this system creates a double bind for women raising children without a male breadwinner. By failing to offer these women day care for their children, job training, a job that pays a ‘family wage,’ or some combination of these, it constructs them exclusively as mothers. As a consequence, it interprets their needs as maternal needs and their sphere of activity as that of ‘the family.’…Yet…instead of providing them a guaranteed income equivalent to a family wage as a matter of right the system stigmatizes, humiliates, and harasses them. In effect, it decrees simultaneously that these women must be and yet cannot be normative mothers. ¶ There is no better evidence that welfare policy discourse is constitutive of the problem it addresses than its counterproductive effects. This is especially the case with the 'feminization of poverty,' which reveals the deleterious con-sequences of gendered distinctions in welfare policy discourse. While much has been made of the 'feminization of poverty' as an recent and increasing phenomenon, the welfare state has historically been built on gendered distinctions that work to the disadvantage of female-headed families in ways which make it seem to be their own fault. Indeed, as we shall see, the persistence of poverty among mother-only families is a historically embedded phenomenon, not just a recent development; and prevailing discursive practices have sought to reinforce the inferiority of female-headed families by blaming them for their own problems. Welfare policy discourse has helped to reproduce the impoverishment of mother-only families by structuring policy in ways which constrain the extent to which the state assists them.

### Link: Narratives Turn

#### Living wage rebukes the harms of the squo poverty narrative—fosters independence.

Erin Riordan 13 [Georgetown student, radical feminist, and worker justice advocate], “Living Wage is a Feminist Issue”, Feminists-At-Large, 14 Mar 2013, BE

Yet living wage is not legally mandated in the U.S., and 3.8 million hourly-paid workers are paid at or below the minimum wage. And according to the Economic Policy Institute **roughly 28% of workers were paid poverty wages in 2010**, a number that is expected to hold steady without improvement through 2020. Another study indicates that 1 in 4 private sector workers earns less than $10 an hour, well below the wage needed to stay out of poverty. Shamus Khan writes, “A minimum wage earner working 40 hours a week without ever taking a vacation will earn $15, 080 a year…Most minimum wage workers are adults, not teens, and most work for large corporations, not mom-and-pop stores,” indicating that **for many people minimum wage is the standard of their adult life, and thus a life in poverty is experienced and expected both in the present and in the future**.¶ The number of Americans living in poverty is not only unconscionable; it is also bad for the economy. **Workers making a living wage will not only be less reliant on government programs they will also be spending more as consumers.** Various studies have found that increasing minimum wage had no effect on employment, and in fact increased consumer spending as workers had more disposable income to pour back into the economy. Higher wages also reduce worker turnover, thus reducing costs to the employer. Raising the minimum wage makes jobs sustainable, and begins to chip away at poverty experienced by the working poor.¶ Living wage is a feminist issue. **Feminists from the second wave on through present day have strived for the independence of women, and our right to choose our own lifestyles and careers**, and to do so without being dependent on men. **If we truly believe each woman should be able to live her life freely and as she chooses we need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage.** When someone is not paid a living wage they cannot afford to pay for housing and food and childcare and healthcare. Instead they must make choices between all of these, prioritizing some over others. For a woman paid less than a living wage birth control is not a basic medical expense, it is a luxury. And without birth control it is harder to control the size and future of one’s family, something that dramatically impacts one’s economic reality. Healthcare decisions are harder, and for many people healthcare isn’t a reality at all. Childcare decisions are complicated, and women making minimum wage are more likely to work multiple jobs to make ends meet. Women work 2/3 of minimum wage jobs. **If we want women to have the freedom to live their lives as they choose and to do so independently, we need to pay women a living wage**.

### Link: Blame Turn

#### Our discourse flips the onus—blame is on corporations, not individuals.

NELP 13 [responds by working to restore the promise of economic opportunity in the 21st century economy. In partnership with national, state and local allies, we promote policies and programs that create good jobs, strengthen upward mobility, enforce hard-won worker rights, and help unemployed workers regain their economic footing through improved benefits and services], “Soaring Poverty at the Philadelphia International Airport”, National Employment Law Project, 9 Jun 2013, BE

Poor working conditions and low wages for contracted airport workers don’t just affect workers on the job; when workers can’t make a decent living, communities and taxpayers are left to provide a safety net to ensure these families survive. Philadelphia’s residents, already hit hard by economic recession and poverty, end up subsidizing low-paying jobs for the airlines. A 2004 study in California studied the self-sufficiency gap for working families – the extent to which wages did not allow them to meet basic family needs – and found that nearly half of public safety net expenditures went to help working families make ends meet, including health care, housing assistance,childcareandschoollunches.83 Similarly,¶ a 2006 study of public benefits in Illinois found that year-round working families accounted for 37 percent of all public benefits spending, and that two-thirds of these families had primary breadwinners earning $10 per hour or less.84¶ By outsourcing work to low-wage contractors, airlines operating out of PHL are counting on publicly funded safety net programs to fill the self-sufficiency gap for their workers. Their business model is designed to exter- nalize the costs of basic operations while maximizing profits and paychecks for executive officers. Workers and their communities suffer as a result.

## AT: Tuck and Yang

### 1AR Overview

#### The academy is already coopted – no uniqueness for any of your impacts which means it’s try or die for the aff neoliberalism threatens human existence – that’s Giroux.

#### Cross apply Giroux – the aff is necessary to liberalize the academy from its current militarized state – commodification can only be prevented via the intervention of critical educators which the aff does.

#### The plan is key to produce effective scholarship for change.

Segran 14 (Elizabeth, writer based in Cambridge, Massachusetts for the Atlantic, “The Adjunct Revolt: How Poor Professors Are Fighting Back,” APR 28, 2014, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/04/the-adjunct-professor-crisis/361336/)//ghs-VA

A spate of research about the contingent academic workforce indicates that Cerasoli’s circumstances are not exceptional. This month, a report by the American Association of University Professors showed that adjuncts now constitute 76.4 percent of U.S. faculty across all institutional types, from liberal-arts colleges to research universities to community colleges. A study released by the U.S. House of Representatives in January reveals that the majority of these adjuncts live below the poverty line. Over spring break, Cerasoli publicly protested her working conditions on the steps of New York Department of Education wearing a vest emblazoned with the words “Homeless Prof” on it. Her efforts dovetail with a national labor movement in which thousands of adjuncts are fighting for change within the higher-education system. In the short-term, adjuncts are demanding a living wage, but they are also proposing long-term solutions to structural problems ailing universities. Many argue that the dependence on contingent labor is part of a larger pattern of corporatizing the university, which they believe is harming not just professors and students, but society more broadly. “While there are micro-tragedies in the lives of individual adjuncts, there is also a macro, systemic problem unfolding,” said Adrianna Kezar, co-founder of the Delphi Project which examines how the changing faculty affects student success. Her data consistently shows that students who take more classes with adjuncts are more likely to drop out. Kezar told me that this high attrition rate has nothing to do with the quality of instruction adjuncts provide; it is entirely a function of the compromised working conditions adjuncts face. Tenure-track professors have a wealth of career-development tools at their disposal; in contrast, Kezar says, universities do not give adjuncts the basic resources they need to properly teach their courses, such as sample syllabi or learning objectives. Since most departments hire adjuncts at the last minute, they are often inadequately prepared to enter the classroom. Universities do not provide adjuncts with office space, making it difficult for them to meet with students outside class. To make matters worse, many adjuncts teach at several colleges to make ends meet: Commuting—sometimes between great distances—further reduces the time they can devote to individual students. Despite challenging working conditions, many adjuncts continue to meet with students and perform other time-consuming tasks they are not compensated for, such as writing recommendation letters or attending departmental meetings. “Students aren’t getting what they pay for or, if they are, it is because adjuncts themselves are subsidizing their education,” Maria Maisto, president of the adjunct activist group New Faculty Majority, told me. “Adjuncts are donating their time; they are providing it out of pocket.” The presence of adjuncts also affects the quality of education in subtler ways. The tenure system was originally designed to foster academic freedom by allowing professors to voice unpopular opinions without the fear of being fired: in contrast, adjuncts can have their contracts terminated without a grievance process. Maisto told me that many adjuncts are afraid to challenge their students in class because poor student evaluations could cost them their jobs. “College is no longer creating a critically-thinking citizenry who can participate actively in a democracy,” she said. Emily Van Duyne, an adjunct professor in New Jersey, told me she finds it uncomfortable to teach her students about issues like the American Civil Rights Movement when she feels unable to change her own unjust working conditions. “It feels very strange asking students to hone their critical thinking skills about an oppressive culture and the ways you can respond effectively, when you are teaching out of a broken system,” she told me. The adjunct crisis also restricts the research output of American universities. For adjuncts scrambling between multiple short-term, poorly paid teaching jobs, producing scholarship is a luxury they cannot afford. “We have lost an entire generation of scholarship because of this,” Debra Leigh Scott, an adjunct activist and documentary filmmaker, told me. “Adjunct contracts not only drive professors into poverty, it makes it next to impossible for them to do the kind of scholarship they have trained an average of ten years to do.” Scott suggests that the loss of academic scholarship has ripple effects throughout society, since fewer scholars are contributing to national discussions on issues like the ethics of business and the value of the humanities. “If you lose these expert voices then who is really left speaking?” she asks. “You get the pundits on either side, but there is not a lot of depth to the conversations being held. There has been a dumbing down of discourse across all platforms.” How did it come to this? Jeffrey Selingo, author of College Unbound: The Future of Higher Education and What it Means for Students, argues that the shift towards contingent labor occurred because university administrators began to focus on enhancing the student experience outside—rather than inside—the classroom. “We moved away from a faculty-centric university to one focused on serving students,” he told me. “To attract students, universities need amenities to keep up in an arms race with other institutions,” he says. Instead of being an institution of public good, the university began to look more and more like a business in which the student was the customer. Selingo points out that university administration costs have ballooned over the last two decades, as universities hired non-faculty staff to run the growing list of campus amenities. Given these skyrocketing expenses, administrators felt pressure to cut costs. “As professors started to retire, administrators realized that if they did not hire tenure-track professors, they could have more flexibility with their workforce,” explains Selingo. At the same time, graduate schools were churning out large numbers of Ph.D.s willing to teach single courses for a few thousand dollars, so hiring adjuncts seemed like a simple solution. Maisto argues that in the midst of these changes administrators lost sight of the university’s mission. “This adjunct crisis did not happen because of some grand, nefarious plot,” she told me. “It has to do with the reactive character of university leadership who got caught up in short-term thinking rather than intentional, long-term strategic planning.” Yet, Maisto and other activists believe that it is not too late to change the system. For many adjuncts, the first step is to fight for better compensation and benefits. Apart from improving their quality of life, adjuncts believe increased wages will more accurately reflect their value and give them more influence within the university.

### Link: Research Good

#### Research is uniquely good in context of the aff – a combination of desire and pain centered narratives, the perm, solves the impact to the K

\* By having our desire and the damage research together, we generate productive tension between different epistomologies

Tuck and Yang – ’14 – Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, SUNY New Paltz and Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies, UC San Diego (Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing Research, <https://faculty.newpaltz.edu/evetuck/files/2013/12/Tuck-and-Yang-R-Words_Refusing-Research.pdf>, p. 237, MM)

Research is just one form of knowing, but in the Western academy, it eclipses all others. In this way, the relationship of research to other human ways of knowing resembles a colonizing formation, acquiring, claiming, absorbing, consuming. In the current neoliberal moment, there are few spaces that remain dedicated to human curiosity and human inquiry aside from research. This component of research is valuable, and worth sustaining, yet we must simultaneously protect and nurture other nonresearch spaces/approaches for curiosity and inquiry. Calling everything research doesn't help to ensure that there are multiple opportunities to be curious, or to make meaning in life. We aren't advising anyone to insert artificial or insurmountable barriers between research and other forms of human inquiry, or to think of research and art as impermeable or discrete—just to attend to the productive tensions between genres/epistemologies, to gather the benefits of what might be a dialogical relationship between research and art.

### Impact: Try or Die

#### TRY OR DIE FOR RESEARCH – research may be coopted, but it’s the only hope for inquiry

Tuck and Yang – ’14 – Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, SUNY New Paltz and Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies, UC San Diego (Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing Research, <https://faculty.newpaltz.edu/evetuck/files/2013/12/Tuck-and-Yang-R-Words_Refusing-Research.pdf>, p. 223, MM)

Research is a dirty word among many Native communities (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), and arguably, also among ghettoized (Kelley, 1997), Orientalized (Said, 1978), and other communities of overstudied Others. The ethical standards of the academic industrial complex are a recent development, and like so many post-civil rights reforms, do not always do enough to ensure that social science research is deeply ethical, meaningful, or useful for the individual or community being researched. Social science often works to collect stories of pain and humiliation in the lives of those being researched for commodification. However, these same stories of pain and humiliation are part of the collective wisdom that often informs the writings of researchers who attempt to position their intellectual work as decolonization. Indeed, to refute the crime, we may need to name it. How do we learn from and respect the wisdom and desires in the stories that we (over) hear, while refusing to portray/betray them to the spectacle of the settler colonial gaze? How do we develop an ethics for research that differentiates between power—which deserves a denuding, indeed petrifying scrutiny—and people? At the same time, as fraught as research is in its complicity with power, it is one of the last places for legitimated inquiry. It is at least still a space that proclaims to care about curiosity. In this essay, we theorize refusal not just as a "no," but as a type of investigation into "what you need to know and what I refuse to write in" (Simpson, 2007, p. 72). Therefore, we present a refusal to do research, or a refusal within research, as a way of thinking about humanizing researchers.

### Impact: Reps Turn

#### We will impact turn any representations link you win—the endorsement of reading trauma in the as an understanding of individualized violence and cultural genocide is the only way to challenge status quo attitudes of colonialism

Bronmer 13 (Barbara Brommer, Department of American Studies, Utrecht University, “Representing Native American Trauma through Literature,” June 28th, 2013 (http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/278845)

Yet Eyerman clearly divides cultural trauma from personal traumas, when he claims that “there is a difference between trauma as it affects individuals and as cultural process,” since the latter aims mainly at the formation of collective identity through the memory of a traumatic event (1). My argument, on the other hand, through the analysis of Silko’s narratives, seeks to emphasize the relation between personal and cultural trauma. Eyerman forgets that personal trauma, like cultural trauma, is also inseparably connected to language. In “The Premises and Technique of Interpretation,” Sigmund Freud discusses the psychoanalyst’s manner of interpreting dreams and states clearly that “it is the dreamer himself who should tell us what his dream means” (54). Personal act of communication, putting a mental image into language is what enables us to know the meaning of a dream. Furthermore, witnessing trauma, especially through a narrative, also happens on a personal rather than collective level. The act of reading enables mediation of trauma. Thus, reading ceases to be a neutral passive act, and becomes active participation in the creation of meaning. The psychoanalysis perspective therefore coincides with Susan Sontag’s definition of a narrative as “an instrument of modifying consciousness and organizing new modes of sensibility” (qtd. in Nicol 40). Therefore, I argue that Ceremony and Almanac of the Dead mediate personal trauma to establish the connection with the reader on an individual level. Through personal identification the narrative enables the change of consciousness and new sensibility to occur within the reader.Rather than remaining on the level of cultural trauma, Silko shows the experience of trauma through individualized physical pain and suffering to evoke readers’ empathy and identification. Only later does she connect the personal traumas of her characters to the larger political context. Silko is not alone in seeing the value of representing individualized pain. Elaine Scarry in The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World believes that voicing pain is crucial to its elimination (9). Brommer 3907694 9 Pain, according to Scarry, “has no voice” (3), and no object (4), and as such it is problematic to communicate. Scarry shows how difficult the feeling of empathy is to evoke, for, as she claims, “to have great pain is to have certainty; to hear that another person has pain is to have doubt” (7). The task of conveying pain rests on language representations, which adequately communicate pain to evoke empathy. Empathy, on the other hand, becomes the responsibility of the reader interwoven in the readerly response to the text. In the context of trauma mediation, readers’ approach to the narrative coincides with the stance of a trauma witness. In “Silko’s Blood Sacrifice: The circulating Witness in Almanac of the Dead,” David Moore distinguishes the role of a witness from disengaged watching or voyeurism. He claims that “witnessing recognizes its own implications in the other” (161). Silko’s experimental narratives serve to connect personal trauma to the larger historical and cultural context of Native American on-going colonization. As such the narratives not only allow readers to identify personally with the traumatized, but also force the readers to recognize broader cultural implications. In making this argument about trauma, this thesis takes a different tack than prior criticism, which has tended to focus on oral tradition and Native American culture. Indeed, the usual interpretative approach to Silko assumes that her narratives originate within the Native American tradition of storytelling. Likewise, most scholars have analyzed how Silko’s novels incorporate Native American concepts into new genre, namely the novel. Yet, Silko’s introduction to Ceremony in which Ts’its’tsi’nako, Thought Woman creates the world through a story (1) shows how Silko’s view of stories resembles the postmodern concept of a narrative. According to Nicol, postmodernism “rests on the assumption that fiction – no matter how realist or experimental – is always, to use Robbe Grillet’s terms, a matter of ‘constructing’ rather than ‘transcribing reality’” (21). Even though Nicol claims that postmodernism insists the world of the novel is “heterocosmic”, complete in itself, he also acknowledges the need for the reader to actually recreate the described world through readers’ imagination (25). The act of reading a novel therefore resembles the act of storytelling, which assumes participative roles of the storyteller and listeners. Moreover, the reader of postmodern fiction becomes the link between the world of the novel and reality making postmodern fiction both self-reflexive and referential. Silko’s representations of trauma reconstruct the reality that acknowledges Native American genocide and larger cultural trauma. Silko’s readers, following the author’s instructions, bring her narratives into being and anchor the narrative-created world in the readers’ own reality.

### Impact: Inevitable

#### Pain and suffering cannot be separated from political methodology – their attempt to links to the 1AC

**Ahmed 4** (Sara, Australian and British academic working at the intersection of feminist theory, queer theory, critical race theory and postcolonialism “The Cultural Politics of Emotion”, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=QT8YAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Emotion+Pain+Spectacle&ots=G1xGus-RMD&sig=WTOzM5XSx5ggYFmCKBHpZj4aW-g#v=onepage&q=Emotion%20Pain%20Spectacle&f=false>)

The relation between injustice and feeling bad is complicated. Lauren Berlant has argued that injustice cannot be reduced to pain, or feeling bad (Berlant 2000: 35). Although pain and injustice cannot be reduced, they also cannot be separated: the fact of suffering, for example, has something to do with what is ‘wrong’ about systematic forms of violence, as relations of force and harm (see Chapter 1). The effects of violence arc something to do with why violence can be judged as ‘bad’. Now, this is not to say that what makes violence bad is the other’s suffering. To make such a claim is dangerous: it makes the judgement of right and wrong dependent upon the existence of emotions. The reduction of judgements about what is bad or wrong to ex­periences of hurt, pain or suffering would be deeply problematic. For the claim would allow violence to be sustained in the event that the other claimed not to suffer, or that I claimed the other did not suffer. We must remember that some forms of violence remain concealed as violence, as effects of social norms that are hidden from view. Given this, violence itself could be justified on the grounds of the absence of consciously-felt suffering. The reduction of injustice to emotions also ‘justifies’ claims of access to the inferiority of the feelings of others. We have probably all heard arguments that justify power relations through the claim that this other is in fact ‘not hurting,’ or might even be ‘content,’ or ‘happy’. Indeed, I could make this claim about myself: ‘I do not hurt, I am happy, therefore it is not wrong.’ But emotions are not transparent and they are not simply about a relation of the subject to itself, or even the relation of the subject to its own history.

### Alt: No Solvency and Links

#### Their argument creates the personal as inevitably inferior – recreates our impacts

**Ahmed 4** (Sara, Australian and British academic working at the intersection of feminist theory, queer theory, critical race theory and postcolonialism “The Cultural Politics of Emotion”, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=QT8YAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Emotion+Pain+Spectacle&ots=G1xGus-RMD&sig=WTOzM5XSx5ggYFmCKBHpZj4aW-g#v=onepage&q=Emotion%20Pain%20Spectacle&f=false>)

I have associated emotions not with individuals, and their interior states or character, nor with the quality of objects, but with ‘signs’ and how they work on and in relation to bodies. Of course, emotions have often been linked to the power of language. But they are often constructed as an instrument: as something that we use simply to persuade or seduce others into false belief (emotion as rhetoric, rhetoric as style without content). Such a view constructs emotion as a possession, at the same time that it presumes that emotions are a lower form of speech. This presumption in turn elevates reasonableness or detachment into a better address, one that does not seek to stir up trouble. I have offered an alternative view of emotions as operating precisely where we don’t register their effects in the determination of the relation between signs, a relation that is often concealed by the form of the relation: the metonymic proximity between signs. In Chapter 4, I called this determination ‘stickiness’, examining how ‘signs’ become sticky or saturated with affect. My discussion of emotive language was not then a discussion of a special class or genre of speech, which can be separated from other kinds of speech. Rather this model of ‘sticky signs’ shows us how language works as a form of power in which emotions align some bodies with others, as well as stick different figures together, by the way they move us. If emotions are not possessions, then the terrain of (in)justice cannot be a question of ‘having’ or ‘not having’ an emotion. Interestingly, in moral and political philosophy, those who argue that emotions are relevant to justice, often do so via a model of character and virtue. Robert C. Solomon, for example, following from a classical view of justice as virtue, and David Hume’s and Adam Smith’s concept of moral sentiments, argues that: ‘Justice is first of all a function of personal character, a matter of ordinary, everyday feeling’ (Solomon 1995:3). Justice becomes a form of feeling, which is about ‘fellow-feeling’, a capacity to feel for others, and to sympathise with their pain (Solomon 1995:3, see also Smith 1966:10). We have already seen the risks of justice defined in terms of sympathy or compassion: justice then becomes a sign of what I can give to others, and works to elevate some subjects over others, through the reification of their capacity for love or ‘fellow-feeling’ (see Chapters 1 and 6). But we must also challenge the view that justice is about having the right kind of feelings, or being the right kind of subject. Justice is not about ‘good character’. Not only does this model work to conceal the power relations at stake in defining what is good-in-itself, but it also works to individuate, personalize and privatize the social relation of (in) justice. Character is, after all, an effect rather than a ground of social life. Emotions then cannot be installed as the ‘truth’ of injustice, partly as they do not simply belong to subjects.

# 2AC – NC Frontlines

## Ethic Frameworks

### Case Cross Apps

#### 1. The way we formulate ethics is all shaped via neoliberal imagination, only rupturing that political imagination can allow us to really understand ethics which means case precludes.

#### 2. Cross apply the role of the ballot – power relations need to be analyzed as a prerequisite to ethics because that’s the only way to produce effective education, means your ethics are complicit in neolib.

#### 3. Objectivity is a lie and material analysis is critical which means substantive impacts preclude theoretical ones.

### Zizek: Ethical Obligation

#### The silence of neolib is the danger – it’s made its way into the seams of the system which you have an ethical obligation to reject.

Zizek and Daly 04- (Glyn [Senior Lecturer in Politics at University College in Northampton], Slajov [Slavoj Žižek is a Slovenian Marxist philosopher, psychoanalyst and cultural critic. He is a senior researcher at the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia] “Conversations with Zizek”, p. 14-16) GHS//GB

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world**. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology** attempts to **naturalize[s] capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human [humyn] cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

### Giroux: Grammar of Suffering

#### Ethical focuses locks in a grammar of suffering – turns the NC.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."6 One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems."6 Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility. Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."8 Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice. Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.9 Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt.

## AT: Levinas NC

### Case Cross Apps

#### 1. The way we formulate ethics is all shaped via neoliberal imagination, only rupturing that political imagination can allow us to really understand ethics which means case precludes.

#### 2. No uniqueness – otherization always already occurs in the system of neolib which means its try or die for the aff.

#### 3. Turn – we transition from a system that sees individuals as disposable to having value which means the case precludes and turns the NC.

#### 4. Cross apply the role of the ballot – power relations need to be analyzed as a prerequisite to ethics because that’s the only way to produce effective education, means your ethics are complicit in neolib.

### Ethics = Neolib

### Framework: Consequences

#### The Aff turns their ethical obligation – even if we have an ethical obligation to help the other it doesn’t justify flawed policy-making that hurts the other You must observe consequences of your actions on the third party –the impact is racism and nihilism. This means, we must look to consequences of actions

Burggraeve 05 (Roger, Professor of Theology, Catholic University of Leuven, “The Good and its Shadow: The View of Levinas on Human Rights as the Surpassing of Political Rationality,” HUMAN RIGHTS REVIEW, Jan-March,)GHS//GB

**The unique other and I are, after all, not alone in the world; there are many of us. Moreover, there are not only the ones who are near, but the ones who are far and absent, this both in time and space. Well then, even these “third parties” fall under our responsibility. Ethics cannot limit itself to the strictly interpersonal relationship between the I and the unique other.** This flows directly forth from the “nakedness” of the face itself. As radical alterity, the face points to the being-other of the other as such and thus to all possible others. The nakedness of the face consists precisely in the fact that in and through the fortuitous characteristics and traits of the face (the countenance), the immediate presence of someone “else” unconditionally pushes forth. **In the face, I experience not only the presence of one single “other,” but also of each and every “other” insofar as the face confronts me with the “others” as other, namely insofar as the other is radically separated from us and thereby is irreducible to us** (LC 57). “The epiphany of the face opens humanity” (TI 188). After all, **if one would exclude certain people, namely the absent ones, from the ethical responsibility for the other, then one would inadvertently fall into racism**. In this regard, from the face all others appear to us as “equals,” who all fall under our responsibility. As far as we are concerned, **responsibility is utterly singular,** but as far as its breadth is concerned **it is utterly universal in time and space** (AE 148). **No one falls outside of the responsibility of the one for the other: it is unending,** or rather it makes itself unending time and again. **The absence of the “third party” does not discharge us from our responsibility.** We discover ourselves as beings bound in fate. We stand in a relationship of solidarity with each other, and with the whole of humanity, here and far away, now and tomorrow, in spite of ourselves (DEHH 196).**The question now is how this responsibility for all can be realized. As long as responsibility only runs from the single unique one to the other unique other, it literally has a single sense. But when the third party enters, the question arises: “Who is most near to me? Who comes first: the neighbor or the third party?”** The third party is equally my “neighbor” as the first near other. Moreover, **the other and the third party also have their “neighbors,” these are their near ones and third parties (AE 200). This conflict in responsibility itself calls for the need “to compare the incomparable”** (AE 152), meaning to say to bring to balance the incomparableness of the good, which directs itself towards the other as unique, with the rights of all the others. **The generality of our responsibility obliges us to compare the unique other with all others, meaning to say to bring in equal treatment and calculation. That is why we must judge, prioritize, make distinctions, calculate and weigh out on the basis of priorities and urgencies, and thus treat everyone in an equal and fair manner.** By means of the entrance of the third party, the care of the one-for-the-other must become justice.

### Framework: Foresight

#### Foresight makes them complicit for the AC impacts

Cameron 89 (Professor of Logic and Head of the Philosophy Department at the University of Aberdeen, '89 (Robin, "Ethics and Environmental Responsibility" p 60)GHS//GB

The argument involved here can be presented most plausibly by linking it with the following observation. **Where out actions may by their consequences affect others, the responsibility which falls upon us on account of these possible effects relates to the foreseeable consequences of our actions**. We are not responsible for the actual consequences, if we could not have foreseen these consequences. Nor on the other hand is it simply the consequences we intend that matter: **we cannot defend our actions by pointing to the good consequences we intended.** Rather**, we are responsible to the extent that we could have foreseen certain consequences as bound to**, or liable to, the **flow from our actions**. Thus, for example, we do not hold our ancestors responsible for reprivations we suffer now though damage to our environment resulting from their actions, if we recognize that they could not have foreseen these consequences of their actions. Similarly, **our responsibility to our successors it to avoid inflicting foreseeable harms on them, and to act where we can in ways which we can foresee will it may work to their benefit. ('Could have foreseen**' here **means** 'could reasonably have been expected to foresee'; and the things that are foreseeable in this sense are not just those which the knowledge we happen to have should have enabled us to foresee, but also **those consequences** which **we could have come to be in a position to foresee by enquiry**, by seeking and winning new knowledge. **Our responsibility may include a responsibility to try to find out.)**

### Government Intervention

#### LW decreases government intervention

Nick Hanauer 13 [founder of Second Avenue Partners, a venture capital company in Seattle specializing in early-stage startups and emerging technology. He has founded or financed dozens of companies, including aQuantive Inc. and Amazon.com, and is the co-author of two books, “The True Patriot” and “The Gardens of Democracy”], “The Capitalist’s Case for a $15 Minimum Wage”, Bloomberg View, 19 Jun 2013, BE

**Raising the minimum wage** to $15 an hour **would inject about $450 billion into the economy each year. That would give more purchasing power to millions of poor and lower-middle-class Americans, and would stimulate buying, production and hiring**.¶ Studies by the Economic Policy Institute show that a $15 minimum wage would directly affect 51 million workers and indirectly benefit an additional 30 million. That’s 81 million people, or about **64 percent of the workforce**, and their families who **would be more able to buy cars, clothing and food from our nation’s businesses**.¶ This virtuous cycle effect is described in the research of economists David Card and Alan Krueger (the current chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers) showing that, contrary to conventional economic orthodoxy, **increases in the minimum wage increase employment. In 60 percent of the states that raised the minimum wage during periods of high unemployment, job growth was faster than the national average**.¶ Some business people oppose an increase in the minimum wage as needless government interference in the workings of the market. In fact, **a big increase would substantially** reduce government intervention and dependency on public assistance **programs**.

## AT: Libertarianism NC

### Case Cross Apps

#### 1. The 1AC was an impact turn to libertarianism – allowing complete freedom of choice justifies neoliberal slavery of the working class that’s the neolib impact.

#### 2. Power relations need to be analyzed as a prerequisite – intentions justify ignoring the mass violence of neolib which is an independent voter because you allow us to be complicit.

Zizek and Daly 04- (Glyn [Senior Lecturer in Politics at University College in Northampton], Slajov [Slavoj Žižek is a Slovenian Marxist philosopher, psychoanalyst and cultural critic. He is a senior researcher at the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia] “Conversations with Zizek”, p. 14-16) GHS//GB

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world**. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology** attempts to **naturalize[s] capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human [humyn] cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

#### 3. Coercion inevitable – neolib threatens the entire planet and our existence which means try or die for the aff and non-unique’s your impacts.

### Critical Spread

#### 1. The assumption is that all contracts are just --- the 1AC is about how the fiduciary relationship between employer and employee is unjust --- that’s what justifies this exploitive neolib model – that’s Giroux.

#### 2. FW Justifies screwing over minorities—we allow the rich to keep their ill-gotten gains and exploits certain populations—empirics prove that’s unjust.

#### 3. I’ll defend that neolib is unjust which is the value imposed on people by the government—you need a specific reason my value is bad.

#### 4. Assumes all people are moral actors—corporate leaders who create systems of domination need the government to GET OUT because they need a system that lacks accountability, because if the people realized they were being exploited they would resist—they both destroy the public sphere and lock in status quo politics of violence.

Giroux ‘14Henry A. Giroux | State Terrorism and Racist Violence in the Age of Disposability: From Emmett Till to Eric Garner - Expanded Version¶ Friday, 05 December 2014 11:50By [Henry A. Giroux](http://www.truth-out.org/author/itemlist/user/47063), Truthout | Op-Ed, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27832-state-terrorism-and-racist-violence-in-the-age-of-disposability-from-emmett-till-to-eric-garner

The larger reasons behind Eric Garner's execution seem to be missed by most commentators. The issue is not simply police misconduct, or racist acts of police brutality, however deadly, but the growing use of systemic terror of the sort we associate with Hannah Arendt's notion of totalitarianism that needs to be explored. When fear and terror become the organizing principles of a society in which the tyranny of the state has been replaced by the despotism of an unaccountable market, violence becomes the only valid form of control. The system has not failed. As Jeffrey St. Clair has pointed out, it is doing exactly what it is supposed to do, which is to punish those it considers dangerous or disposable - which increasingly includes more and more individuals and groups. Hannah Arendt was right in arguing that, "If lawfulness is the essence of non-tyrannical government and lawlessness is the essence of tyranny, then terror is the essence of totalitarian domination." [(1)](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27832-state-terrorism-and-racist-violence-in-the-age-of-disposability-from-emmett-till-to-eric-garner#a1) In an age when the delete button and an utterly commodified and privatized culture erase all vestiges of memory and commitment, it is easy for a society to remove itself from those sordid memories that reveal the systemic injustices that belie the presence of state violence and terrorism. Not only do the dangerous memories of bodies being lynched, beaten, tortured and murdered disappear in the fog of celebrity culture and the 24/7 entertainment/news cycle, but the historical flashpoints that once revealed the horrors of unaccountable power and acts of systemic barbarism are both disconnected from any broader understanding of domination and vanish into a past that no longer has any connection to the present. [(2)](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27832-state-terrorism-and-racist-violence-in-the-age-of-disposability-from-emmett-till-to-eric-garner#a2) The murder of Emmett Till, the killing of the four young black girls, Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson and Denise McNair, in the 1963 church bombing in Birmingham, Alabama, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., the killing by four officers of Amadou Diallo, and the recent killings of countless young black children and men and women, coupled with the ongoing and egregious incarceration of black men, in this country are not isolated expressions of marginalized failures of a system. They are the system, a system of authoritarianism that has intensified without apology. Rather than being viewed or forgotten as isolated, but unfortunate expressions of extremism, these incidents are part of a growing systemic pattern of violence and terror that has unapologetically emerged at a time when the politics and logic of disposability, terror and expulsion has been normalized in US society and violence has become the default position for solving all social problems, especially as they pertain to poor minorities of class and color. If police brutality is one highly visible expression of the politics of disposability, mass incarceration is its invisible underside. How else to explain that "the United States incarcerates a higher proportion of blacks than apartheid South Africa did [and that in] America, the black-white wealth gap today is greater than it was in South Africa in 1970 at the peak of apartheid." [(3)](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27832-state-terrorism-and-racist-violence-in-the-age-of-disposability-from-emmett-till-to-eric-garner#a3) Or that 77 percent of all inmates out of a population of 2.3 million are people of color. When ethics and any vestige of social responsibility and the public good are trampled beneath the hooves of the finance state, there is no space for democratic values or justice. We live in an age of disposability - an historical period of increasing barbarism ruled by financial monsters, who offer no political concessions and are driven by a death-drive. Under assault are those individuals and populations considered excess such as poor youth of color and immigrants but also those public spheres such as public and higher education that offer a space for critical ideas, thoughtfulness, informed exchange and the development of modes of democratic solidarity. Democratic values, commitments, integrity and struggles are under siege in the age of neoliberal misery and disposability. The aim of the terrorist state, as Arendt argues, is not only to instill fear, but to destroy the very capacity for convictions. Under such conditions, power is not only unaccountable, but it is free from any sense of moral and political conviction. Hence, the rise of the punishing state as a way to govern all of social life. In this context, life becomes disposable for most, but especially for poor minorities of class and color. I think bell hooks is right when she states that "the point of lynching historically was not to kill individuals but to let everybody know: 'This could happen to you.' " This is how a terrorist state controls people. It individualizes fear and insecurity and undercuts the formation of collective struggle. Fear of punishment, of being killed, tortured, or reduced to the mere level of survival has become the government's weapon of choice. The terrorist state manufactures ignorance and relies on induced isolation and privatization to depoliticize the population. Beliefs are reduced to the realm of the private allowing the public realm to sink into the dark night of barbarism, terror and lawlessness. Without the ability to translate private troubles into public issues, Americans face a crisis of individual and collective agency as well as a historical crisis. As an endless expression of brutality and the ongoing elimination of any vestige of equality and democratic values, the killing of innocent black children and adults by the police makes clear that Americans now inhabit a state of absolute lawlessness and extreme violence, one that both fills the Hollywood screens with prurient entertainment and a culture of cruelty and, unfortunately, provides testimony to the ravaging violence that marks everyday life as well. Of course, this is not simply a domestic issue or one limited to the United States. As Arif Dirlik points out, "Life in general is being devalued for entire sections of populations across the globe. Let's not forget the callousness with which people are being murdered by drones, US troops, Israel, Han Chinese (Tibetans, Uighurs). The assassination of blacks by the police across the US gives the impression of a vulnerable population being used as guinea pigs, to warn the rest of what to expect if we get out of line." [(4)](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/27832-state-terrorism-and-racist-violence-in-the-age-of-disposability-from-emmett-till-to-eric-garner#a4) Totalitarianism is on the rise across the globe just as a growing number of populations that are vulnerable are becoming more disposable due to modes of governance wedded to militarism, unchecked market forces, corporate sovereignty and updated forms of disorder.

### Framework: Coordination

#### Coordination is key to fulfill individual moral obligations, which mandates state intervention.

Robert E. Goodin 95 [professor of government at the University of Essex, and professor of philosophy and social and political theory at Australian National University], “Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Public Policy, May 1995, BE

The same general principle gives rise to much stronger implications at the level of the group as a whole, however. When no one in par- ticular bears responsibility for performing some morally desirable actions, everyone collectively has a strong, perfect duty to see to it that those things are done, within the limits of the capacities of the group as a whole to do so without undue sacrifice.“ The argument for strong collective responsibility in such cases proceeds by two steps. First, notice that the problems posed here for individual action in the circumstances envisaged are all, in essence, coordination problems? Where two or more people try to do the same good deed, their efforts might prove counterproductive; or one's good deed might render the other’s superfluous. Either way, there is a need for coordination. Similarly, the danger of bottomless pits arises principally because, in the absence of coordinating mechanisms, the conscientious rightly dread that the unconscientious will shirk their duties, leaving the former with much more than their share of the moral chores to do. Running through all the rationales for the “not my job” excuse, then, is this one common feature - they all point to coordination problems, of one sort or another. The second step in this argument is to show that the solution to such coordination problems is, of necessity, a responsibility peculiar to the group as a whole. To some extent, this follows from the very nature of coordination. By its very nature, coordination is not some- thing that can be performed by one actor in isolation. By its nature, “coordination” refers to the relations between things: between muscles, in a graceful dancer’s body; between departments, in a smoothly functioning state; or, in the case of social coordination, between your actions and others’. Coordination simply cannot be an attribute of your action alone, or of others’ actions alone. Rather, it can only be an attribute of yours together with theirs. And that, in turn, is the essence of a "group action."8

### Framework: Moral Duties

#### Failure to enforce collective moral duties undermines moral agency.

Robert E. Goodin 95 [professor of government at the University of Essex, and professor of philosophy and social and political theory at Australian National University], “Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Public Policy, May 1995, BE

The rather more grand way of phrasing the point here might be couched in terms of undermining moral agency. Failure to discharge isolated, individual responsibilities may well result in other people’s being harmed. That is wrong. But it is, at least in principle, a reme- diable wrong. People can, at least in principle, always be compensated for harms to their interests (or so the libertarian would claim, any- way). Failure to discharge shared, collective responsibilities has more grievous consequences, undermining in certain crucial respects other people's moral agency itself. For that, compensation is in principle impossible. There must be a moral agent to be compensated, and it is that very moral agency that is being undermined."

### Turn: Intervention

#### LW decreases government intervention

Nick Hanauer 13 [founder of Second Avenue Partners, a venture capital company in Seattle specializing in early-stage startups and emerging technology. He has founded or financed dozens of companies, including aQuantive Inc. and Amazon.com, and is the co-author of two books, “The True Patriot” and “The Gardens of Democracy”], “The Capitalist’s Case for a $15 Minimum Wage”, Bloomberg View, 19 Jun 2013, BE

**Raising the minimum wage** to $15 an hour **would inject about $450 billion into the economy each year. That would give more purchasing power to millions of poor and lower-middle-class Americans, and would stimulate buying, production and hiring**.¶ Studies by the Economic Policy Institute show that a $15 minimum wage would directly affect 51 million workers and indirectly benefit an additional 30 million. That’s 81 million people, or about **64 percent of the workforce**, and their families who **would be more able to buy cars, clothing and food from our nation’s businesses**.¶ This virtuous cycle effect is described in the research of economists David Card and Alan Krueger (the current chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers) showing that, contrary to conventional economic orthodoxy, **increases in the minimum wage increase employment. In 60 percent of the states that raised the minimum wage during periods of high unemployment, job growth was faster than the national average**.¶ Some business people oppose an increase in the minimum wage as needless government interference in the workings of the market. In fact, **a big increase would substantially** reduce government intervention and dependency on public assistance **programs**.

### Turn: Independence

#### Autonomy depends on economic control for the poor – that outweighs non-coercion concerns

Levin-Waldman 3 (Oren M, pf public affairs and administration @ Metropolitan College of New York, formerly pf @ Bard, “The Living Wage: Realizing the Republican Ideal” Public Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 171-196.)//ghs=VA

Timothy Gaffaney (2000) maintains that a democratic polity operates on the premise that individuals will be politically autonomous - that they indeed will be citizens. A goal of democracy does not necessarily have to entail economic equality. But a democratic polity does not merely respect and ensure noninterference and non-coercion. It must also ensure that conditions for participation in that democracy are available to all individuals, for by doing so it guarantees a universal application of citizenship. In fact, the state must guarantee conditions for full citizenship. Autonomy, then, depends on access to and control over economic resources. For Gaffaney, this ideally would mean that government pro- vide the poor with the practical training and skills necessary for conducting democratic government. It might mean providing them the basis upon which they can achieve economic independence.

### Turn: Dignity

#### Living wage respects the dignity and autonomy of workers

Levin-Waldman 3 (Oren M, pf public affairs and administration @ Metropolitan College of New York, formerly pf @ Bard, “The Living Wage: Realizing the Republican Ideal” Public Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 171-196.)//ghs-VA

At the heart of republicanism, of course, is the very meaning of citizenship. The living wage movement of the past assumed that one could not rightfully make claims to citizenship - or at least be viewed in those terms by others - unless one had dignity in one's work, which itself could not happen unless one was paid a livable wage. In part, this was, as Shklar suggests, a matter of public respect. What the contemporary living wage, in the form of the campaign, does is give workers voice in very much the same way it did in the past. As a measure that raises low- wage workers' wages and affords them greater dignity in their work, a living wage should then be viewed as a measure aimed at preserving the framework that allows individuals to function as autonomous citizens. Does a higher wage in and of itself not have the effect of giving work- ers greater voice, which in and of itself becomes a basis for empowerment? It does not give greater voice in that it increases the bargaining power among low-skilled workers in the way that unions do. But it does give them greater voice in that higher wages improve their morale and thereby enable them to have greater dignity in their work.

### Case Precludes

#### Economic independence is a prerequisite to political independence

Levin-Waldman 3 (Oren M, pf public affairs and administration @ Metropolitan College of New York, formerly pf @ Bard, “The Living Wage: Realizing the Republican Ideal” Public Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 171-196.)//ghs-VA

Classical republicanism assumed that a citizen achieved his greatest moral fulfillment from participating in a self-governing republic. When citizens were virtuous, which meant that they were willing to sacrifice their private interests for the sake of the general community, they also achieved liberty. This was certainly a view expressed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1968) when he talked about the general will and how service to it could liberate individuals from their enslavement to their passions. Sacrifice also meant a willingness to serve in public office, for the sake of working for the common good. But as Wood explains, there were clearly economic implications to this. "This virtue could be found only in a republic of equal, active, and independent citizens. To be completely virtuous citizens, men - never women, because it was assumed they were never independent - had to be free from dependence and from the petty interests of the marketplace. Any loss of independence and virtue was corruption" (p. 104). What this meant, then, was that one could not be an autonomous individual if one was economically dependent on others, which included being paid by masters. Therefore, since liberty and independence were the bases for virtue, one who was not independent would not qualify as a citizen. Although this would preclude those who worked for wages in the employ of others on the grounds that they lacked independence and were totally absorbed in their narrow occupations, it could also include those engaged in the liberal professions if they too were too dependent on their work for their incomes. They would be no more qualified for positions of virtuous leadership than mechanics and other manual laborers (Wood 1991, pp. 106-107). The overall point was that economic independence would in turn enable one to be politically independent. The ideal worker achieved independence through the ownership of property. By owning and working his own property, he would not be dependent on others. The idea that work was respectable and a basis for full-fledged citizenship certainly had its roots in republican political thought. But it was also a gospel of the Protestant bourgeoisie that held that work made men useful in a world in which there was also economic scarcity. The notion that individuals were free to work also meant that they were also empowered to live lives of independence, and this independence included the potential to acquire their own wealth. In the republican social outlook, the key figure was the small independent entrepreneur (Foner 1995, pp. 11-31).

# 2AC – T Frontlines

## Impact Turns

### Impact Turn Overview

#### 1. If we’re in the direction of the topic that puts sufficient mitigation on fairness for education to outweigh.

#### 2. Limits are impossible- dialogue is always monological, the aff link turns that by rupturing a space for discussions.

#### 3. No such thing as predictability – PVP is always going to have advantages you haven’t prepped which means education comes first because skew inevitable.

#### 4. Education comes first –

#### A. Cross apply Delgado – the status quo is fixated around a hegemonic interpretation of fairness that justifies neolib cross apply the impact that turns T.

#### B. Education trumps it’s the only value we get from debate and they train us to not recognize power relations in real life, fairness only matters in round.

#### 5. Cross apply the Role of the Judge – this evidence is fantastic – utilizing fairness as a factor in decision making prioritizes self-interest over the educational value of the public sphere which coopts and destroys debate making neoliberal ideology replicate itself causes the same violent norms. We’ve mechanized debate where we’re stuck in the same repetitious cycle.

#### 6. The question posed is one that is a product of neoliberal mantras – the entire existence of civil society is at risk until we’ve answered the 1AC’s question instead.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Across the globe, the forces of casino capitalism are on the march. With the return of the Gilded Age and its dream worlds of consumption, privatization and deregulation, not only are democratic values and social protections at risk, but the civic and formative cultures that make such values and protections crucial to democratic life are in danger of disappearing altogether. As public spheres, once enlivened by broad engagements with common concerns, are being transformed into "spectacular spaces of consumption," the flight from mutual obligations and social responsibilities intensifies and has resulted in what Tony Judt identifies as a "loss of faith in the culture of open democracy."4 This loss of faith in the power of public dialogue and dissent is not unrelated to the diminished belief in higher education as central to producing critical citizens and a crucial democratic public sphere in its own right. At stake here is not only the meaning and purpose of higher education, but also civil society, politics and the fate of democracy itself. Thomas Frank is on target when he argues that "Over the course of the past few decades, the power of concentrated money has subverted professions, destroyed small investors, wrecked the regulatory state, corrupted legislators en masse and repeatedly put the economy through the wringer. Now it has come for our democracy itself."5 And, yet, the only questions being asked about knowledge production, the purpose of education, the nature of politics, and our understanding of the future are determined largely by market forces. The mantras of neoliberalism are now well known: Government is the problem; Society is a fiction; Sovereignty is market-driven; Deregulation and commodification are vehicles for freedom; and Higher education should serve corporate interests rather than the public good. In addition, the yardstick of profit has become the only viable measure of the good life, while civic engagement and public spheres devoted to the common good are viewed by many politicians and their publics as either a hindrance to the goals of a market-driven society or alibis for government inefficiency and waste.

### Education Overview

#### 1. We’ll win the education debate – neolib contains and shapes anything and everything we think as academia is being coopted by the right. The only good education is one that starts at the position of the university. Makes T an independent voting issue.

Zizek and Daly 04- (Glyn [Senior Lecturer in Politics at University College in Northampton], Slajov [Slavoj Žižek is a Slovenian Marxist philosopher, psychoanalyst and cultural critic. He is a senior researcher at the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia] “Conversations with Zizek”, p. 14-16) GHS//GB

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world**. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology** attempts to **naturalize[s] capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human [humyn] cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

### Fairness Overview

#### 1. Demands for fairness and private interests ignores the grand scheme of things and locks in the violent politics of the squo and destroys debate.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."6 One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems."6 Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility. Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."8 Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice. Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.9 Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt.

#### 2. Concession of the Delueze evidence means it’s over – creating limits locks in violence as you force us to be the politician, we instead embrace the position of the poet, who speaks in the name of a creative power, capable of overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes eternal return, which fundamentally shatters the concept of limits to break us free of the hegemonic status quo.

#### 3. Fairness is shaped by neolib – they make you complicit.

Delgado 92 (Richard Delgado [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May)

**We have** cleverly **built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time.** Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about administrability, fairness, stability, and ease of determination points us away from what**  [\*821]  **really counts: the way** in which **stronger parties have managed to inscribe their** views and **interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

### T: Radical Imagination

#### Attempting to foreclose the conversation destroys the radical imagination necessary to rupture neoliberalism.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Not only does neoliberalism undermine both civic education and public values and confuse education with training, it also wages a war on what might be called the radical imagination. For instance, thousands of students in both the United States and Canada are now saddled with debts that will profoundly impact their lives and their futures, likely forcing them away from public service jobs because the pay is too low to pay off their educational loans. Students find themselves in a world in which heightened expectations have been replaced by dashed hopes and a world of onerous debt.21 Struggling to merely survive, the debt crisis represents a massive assault on the imagination by leaving little or no room to think otherwise in order to act otherwise. David Graeber is right in insisting that the student loan crisis is part of a war on the imagination. He writes: Student loans are destroying the imagination of youth. If there's a way of a society committing mass suicide, what better way than to take all the youngest, most energetic, creative, joyous people in your society and saddle them with, $50,000 of debt so they have to be slaves? There goes your music. There goes your culture. . . . And in a way, this is what's happened to our society. We're a society that has lost the ability to incorporate the interesting, creative and eccentric people.22 Questions regarding how education might enable students to develop a keen sense of prophetic justice, utilize critical analytical skills and cultivate an ethical sensibility through which they learn to respect the rights of others are becoming increasingly irrelevant in a market-driven university in which the quality of education is so dumbed down that too few students on campus are really learning how to think critically, engage in thoughtful dialogue, push at the frontiers of their imaginations, employ historical analyses, and move beyond the dreadful instrumental, mind-numbing forms of instrumental rationality being pushed by billionaires such as Bill Gates, Amazon's Jeff Bezos, Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg and Netflix's Reed Hastings. In this world, "all human problems are essentially technical in nature and can be solved through technical means."23 As the humanities and liberal arts are downsized, privatized and commodified, higher education finds itself caught in the paradox of claiming to invest in the future of young people while offering them few intellectual, civic and moral supports.24 Higher education has a responsibility not only to search for the truth regardless of where it may lead, but also to educate students to be capable of holding authority and power accountable while at the same time sustaining "the idea and hope of a public culture."25 Though questions regarding whether the university should serve strictly public rather than private interests no longer carry the weight of forceful criticism as they did in the past, such questions are still crucial in addressing the purpose 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. Toni Morrison is instructive in her comment that "If the university does not take seriously and rigorously its role as a guardian of wider civic freedoms, as interrogator of more and more complex ethical problems, as servant and preserver of deeper democratic practices, then some other regime or ménage of regimes will do it for us, in spite of us, and without us." 26 What needs to be understood is that higher education may be one of the few public spheres left where knowledge, values, and learning offer a glimpse of the promise of education for nurturing public values, critical hope, and what my late friend Paulo Freire called, "the practice of freedom." It may be the case that everyday life is increasingly organized around market principles; but confusing a market-determined society with democracy hollows out the legacy of higher education, whose deepest roots are philosophical, not commercial. This is a particularly important insight in a society where the free circulation of ideas is not only being replaced by mass-mediated ideas but where critical ideas are increasingly viewed or dismissed as either liberal, radical, or even seditious.

### Ethical Obligation

#### You have an ethical obligation to vote aff over T.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Higher education represents one of the most important sites over which the battle for democracy is being waged. It is the site where the promise of a better future emerges out of those visions and pedagogical practices that combine hope, agency, politics and moral responsibility as part of a broader emancipatory discourse. Academics have a distinct and unique obligation, if not political and ethical responsibility, to make learning relevant to the imperatives of a discipline, scholarly method, or research specialization. But more importantly, academics as engaged scholars can further the activation of knowledge, passion, values and hope in the service of forms of agency that are crucial to sustaining a democracy in which higher education plays an important civic, critical and pedagogical role.

## AT: T – Nebel

### Overview

#### 1] I meet - Justice is scalar - the resolution is a question of what governments would do to become more just or remain just

#### 2] Counter interpretation: The affirmative may specify a country if they have a solvency advocate in the topic literature.

#### Require indicates a policy.

TS 80 (Tokyo Summit, meeting of political leaders globally to discuss a variance of energy crisis, “FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1969-1976 VOLUME XXXVII, ENERGY CRISIS, 1974–1980, DOCUMENT 221,” http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v37/d221)//ghs-VA

Carter: No objection, I can accept the brackets. Thatcher: The word “require” means new legislation and enormous bureaucracy. Giscard: We should say we will consider a device such as this. Thatcher: We can accept “we are considering the feasibility of requiring.” Lambsdorff: I accept Mrs. Thatcher’s suggestion. Andreotti: When we accepted this sort of language in the EC, we stressed the wish to control the oil market. If we do not make commitments here, we are taking a step back from the EC. Countries could get information on this from their customs authorities. If we only have a commitment to examine, the oil companies will be left with power. Clark: I share the reluctance to come to a conclusion at this table. We should say we are considering the feasibility of requiring that.

#### This means that the aff must defend implementation. The only feasible way to implement a Living Wage policy is to specify a particular government:

#### A] Multi-Actor Fiat - it doesn’t make sense for all governments to take uniform action - that just doesn’t happen, which destroys neg ground turns their fairness arguments.

#### B] Policymaking - Saying all governments can implement the same policy is a bastardization of policymaking, there different mechanics and normal means for each policy so it’d be impossible for anyone to get ground.

Banks et al 5 (Nina Banks, Bucknell University, Geoffrey Schneider, Bucknell University, Paul Susman, Bucknell University “Paying the Bills Is Not Just Theory: Service Learning about a Living Wage,” University of Nebraska Omaha, Summer 2005)//ghs-VA

For political economists, one of the most valuable aspects of service learning is that it gives students a broader, more critical understanding of the theories and models presented in mainstream economics courses. Students move beyond neoclassical theory with its simplifying assumptions and omissions regarding the role of power relations, historical events, and human agency. The living wage project, in particular, promotes an alternative, ethically based vision of the world that deviates from the neoclassical acceptance of wages that are insufficient to meet human needs. In addition, as students examine the data on the actual effects of raising the wages of the lowest paid workers, they may develop a clearer understanding of political economic forces shaping the labor market that go far beyond neoclassical externalities and inefficiencies. Issues of power and class, for example, help students understand why employers and government officials so frequently oppose living wage proposals. Of course, the near hegemony of neoclassical, or at least "market," perspectives is not vanquished all at once, if ever. Many students continue to reiterate such assumptions, even in the face of their own work. But for some, the combination of course material and service learning creates an eye-opening experience. And by requiring students to work within local communities, students' interest and involvement in the world beyond the academy (and beyond neoclassical economics) are encouraged. Indeed, for some students, this experience proves to be a catalyst to pursue civic engagement beyond the end of the semester. Although service learning requires additional attention from the instructor, we have found the experience so intensely rewarding and necessary for what we hope to inspire in our students that we encourage other readers of this journal to embrace it.

**2AR:** Topic lit controls the internal link to textuality: a] the only impact to textuality is predictability—they don’t have an intrinsic good to the text of the resolution, b] we can’t reasonably predict something that’s not grounded in the topic literature.

### AT Grammar

#### Grammar is not a voting issue:

#### 1] There is no such thing as correct grammar – your interp doesn’t exist!!!

Michael Rosen 12 [ writer and broadcaster who has produced many books for children and a few for adults], "Sorry, there's no such thing as 'correct grammar'" The Guardian, March 2, 2012, GHS//MM

One of the interesting things about the word "grammar" is that many of its users think that it is self-evident that it refers to one thing: "the grammar" of the language. If only the matter were that simple. Whereas linguists are agreed that language has grammar, what they can't agree on is how to describe it. So, while there is a minimum agreement that language is a system with parts that function in relation to each other, there is no universal agreement on how the parts and the functions should be analysed and described, nor indeed if they should be described as some kind of self-sealed system or whether they should always be described in terms of the users, ie those who "utter" the language, and those who "receive" it (speakers and listeners, writers and readers etc).¶ For some, this is just academic nit-picking. There is just "the grammar" and one of the great failings of education today is that neither teachers or pupils know it. In fact, we would neither be able to speak nor understand if we didn't know it. A three-year-old who says "I bringed it" is expressing the grammar through the structure she has learned which indicates past happenings. It just so happens that the "ed" ending isn't the customary way of doing it with that verb. So she knows "grammar" but not the grammar of that particular word in that particular context.¶ This immediately raises the question of whether we get to know grammar in order to be "correct", or in order to describe what people say and write. So, one of the customary ways of talking in London is to say "I ain't done it" or "I ain't going anywhere" or some such. Some would have this as "wrong" or even as "ungrammatical". Others would say that if "grammar" is about analysing and describing then "ain't" is as valid a subject of study as anything else. I doubt if that's what is being taught – or indeed what many people want to hear – at the Selfridges class.¶ Many people yearn for correctness and this is expressed in the phrase "standard English". The honourable side to this is that it offers a common means of exchange. However, this leads many people to imagine that because it is called standard, it is run by rules and that these rules are fixed. I've always understood rules to be regulations that are drawn up in some agreed list. They are fixed (until such time as they are amended) and they are enforceable. In fact, there is no agreed list, a good deal of what we say and write keeps changing and nothing is enforceable. Instead, language is owned and controlled by everybody and what we do with it seems to be governed by various kinds of consent, operating through the social groups of our lives. Social groups in society don't swim about in some kind of harmonious melting pot. We rub against each other from very different and opposing positions, so why we should agree about language use and the means of describing it is beyond me.

#### 2] We don’t do debate to learn about grammar - we debate because we will become policymakers in the future to create real change

#### 3] Begs the question: words can have multiple meanings, so there’s no way to resolve grammar independent of voters

#### 4] The only reason we care about semantics is because those interps allow for the best limits to facilitate good debates, so my impacts outweigh

#### 5] Grammar only functions as an internal link not as an impact so if I win the fairness debate this doesn’t matter.

### AT Bare Plurals

#### 1] No justification for why just governments are bare plurals as opposed to existential bare plurals

#### 2] Governments are not plural – they can be singular

Michel Kefer 92 and Johan Van Der Auwera [Department Member at the Universitat zu Koln in Philosophy, Education, and Political Science], "Meaning and Grammar: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives," Walter de Gruyter, January 1, 1992, GHS//MM

**Words such as** family**, government**, etc., **which can occur in sentences as** either **"singular" or "plural"**: the family/government is/are coming today**, can be explained in the same way. The nature of** "families" and "**governments**" **is such that they may be alternatively viewed as discrete individuals** (perceived in discontinuous space) or as forming a larger unit composed of these individual members (perceived in continuous space). Therefore, **the choice of the "singular" or "plural" forms with regard to verb agreement will directly depend upon the speaker's perception** of these entities in space in accordance to the particular message being conveyed.

#### 3] If the resolution said just government singular, I would be able to specify one government. I meet T-plural - so if I meet T-plural, I meet T-specifying just governments.

### AT Ordinary Speakers [Nebel]

#### 1] NO IMPACT to ORDINARY SPEAKERS: Policymakers around the world can’t agree to one policy – it differs based on government. Being consistent with policymaking o/w being consistent with ordinary speakers since policymakers are the ones who create change.

#### 2] TURN – you force me to defend the resolution in the abstract – that detaches the 1AC from tangible impacts on real people who are suffering – your abstractions link to Curry, which is a voting issue since it re-entrenches racism.

#### 3] No way to determine what ordinary speakers think – there are many conflicting ideas that emerge when you tell a group of people a statement.

#### 4] TURN – C/I is more consistent with what ordinary speakers think because no one knows what a just government is – only how to make a government more justice. Justice is scalar.

#### 5] TURN – ordinary speakers will think of specific places where a living wage ought to be implemented – like where they are from

### AT My interp allows spec

#### Your interpretation doesn’t allow for specification – don’t try to get out of it.

Nebel 14 (Jake, BPhil candidate in Philosophy at the University of Oxford, specializing in ethics and epistemology. I received my AB in Philosophy from Princeton University in 2013, “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments”,” Dec 19th, 2014, http://vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/)//ghs-VA

Some speakers might balk at the generic reading of the resolution. How, they might think, could anyone assent to **such a sweeping claim** about what just governments ought to do? It **seems** to depend **heavily on the details of each country**. I can easily get into this frame of mind. But, **equipped with this frame of mind, it’s not as if I would assent to, “Just governments ought to require that employers pay a living wage**,” and expect my audience to pick up on the existential reading. I would instead either deny the resolution or suspend judgment about it. This means that **the anti-generalization view is not evidence of an eligible existential interpretation**; rather, it’s a reason not to affirm the resolution. One more argument for affirmatives to answer! Consider an analogy. **Suppose I say, “Dogs are ugly.” You might think it’s silly to say of dogs in general that they are ugly: how could one support such a generalization about the aesthetics of dogs? So you’ll reject my statement. You won’t reinterpret it to mean that some dogs are ugly and agree with it**.

## AT: T – Government Contract

### C/I

#### C/I: Dictionary.com defines Living Wage as:

Dictionary.com, “Living Wage,” GHS//MM

**a wage on which it is possible for a wage earner** or an individual **and his or her family to live at least according to minimum** customary **standards**.

#### Prefer

**A] predictability** – dictionary.com is the most predictable dictionary website – key to discovering what’s in the topic lit – which is k2 clash since we can debate about what the topic is about

**B] ground** – this interp increases your ground b/c you get disads to both mw and increasing the mw to a living wage – ground key to test the aff on different fronts.

**Link turns fairness:** c/I is the most fair given that there is NO ONE DEFINITION of living wage or how to calculate it – it just means people should survive.

### Interp Outdated

#### Your interp is outdated – squo gives it to private contractors.

Macpherson 4 (David, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, “Living wage laws and the case for a targeted wage subsidy,” 2004)//ghs-VA

The coverage of the ordinances tends to vary. Initially, the laws were narrowly drawn to cover only employees of local governments and their service contractor. For example, contractor ordinances were enacted in Baltimore, Maryland (1994), Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1995), Portland, Oregon (1996), and Miami-Dade County, Florida (1999). However, as the number of jurisdictions adopting such laws grew, the living wage proponents drafted the legislation to cover a greater number of private employers. Today, a typical living wage proposal covers not only contractors, but also private employers receiving financial assistance, such as tax abatements or subsidies, from the local government. Examples of localities adopting ordinances covering private sector employers who receive government financial assistance include Los Angeles, California (1997), St. Paul, Minnesota (1997), Hartford, Connecticut (1999), San Francisco, California (2000), and Suffolk County, New York (2001).

### AT Farris

#### This article is all about living wages in terms of businesses – that is what the article is called – this definition is INCLUSIVE, not EXCLUSIVE – there is nothing about why living wages SHOULDN’T be given to prisoners if they are employees.

### AT Bernstein

#### 1] This is an argument about existing living wages – the aff isn’t limited by only one form of wages, but expanding the living wage so that I don’t defend the squo

## AT: T – Employers

### I – Meet

#### 1. I – Meet – all the Giroux evidence cites these individuals as being employees of the university. Prefer my evidence on specificity and there’s no carded violation.

#### 2. I – Meet – They’re a part of the faculty.

AAUP 15 (American Association of University Professors, Think Tank/Interest Group of scholars from all over the country interested in promoting the development of higher education, “Contingent Faculty Positions,” February 2015, http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency)//ghs-VA

Who are "contingent faculty"? Depending on the institution, they can be known as adjuncts, postdocs, TAs, non-tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-timers, lecturers, instructors, or nonsenate faculty. What they all have in common: they serve in insecure, unsupported positions with little job security and few protections for academic freedom. And they are the vast majority of US faculty today. Something needs to change.

#### 3. I meet – they’re just not permanent employees.

Borowski 8 (Craig, Indiana University, “Risks, Benefits of Using Contingent Workers,” September 26, 2008, http://www.hrhero.com/hl/articles/2008/09/26/risks-benefits-of-using-contingent-workers/)//ghs-VA

Many employers use contingent workers: independent contractors, leased employees, consultants, and temporary employees. While using an alternative workforce has benefits, it can create legal and practical risks as well. If you use or are considering using contingent workers, here are some benefits and risks to weigh.

# Extra Cards

## Definitions

### Contingent Faculty

#### Contingent faculty aren’t the tenured professors you’re thinking of.

AAUP 15 (American Association of University Professors, Think Tank/Interest Group of scholars from all over the country interested in promoting the development of higher education, “Contingent Faculty Positions,” February 2015, http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency)//ghs-VA

Who are "contingent faculty"? Depending on the institution, they can be known as adjuncts, postdocs, TAs, non-tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-timers, lecturers, instructors, or nonsenate faculty. What they all have in common: they serve in insecure, unsupported positions with little job security and few protections for academic freedom. And they are the vast majority of US faculty today. Something needs to change.

## Giroux Article

### TBO

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

The question of what kind of education is needed for students to be informed and active citizens in a world that increasingly ignores their needs, if not their future, is rarely asked.10 In the absence of a democratic vision of schooling, it is not surprising that some colleges and universities are increasingly opening their classrooms to corporate interests, standardizing the curriculum, instituting top-down governing structures, and generating courses that promote entrepreneurial values unfettered by social concerns or ethical consequences. For example, one university is offering a master's degree to students who, in order to fulfill their academic requirements, have to commit to starting a high-tech company. Another university allows career officers to teach capstone research seminars in the humanities. In one of these classes, the students were asked to "develop a 30-second commercial on their 'personal brand.' "11 This is not an argument against career counseling or research in humanities seminars, but the confusion in collapsing the two. Central to this neoliberal view of higher education in the United States and United Kingdom is a market-driven paradigm that seeks to eliminate tenure, turn the humanities into a job preparation service, and transform most faculty into an army of temporary subaltern labor For instance, in the United States out of 1.5 million faculty members, 1 million are "adjuncts who are earning, on average, $20,000 a year gross, with no benefits or healthcare, no unemployment insurance when they are out of work."12 The indentured service status of such faculty is put on full display as some colleges have resorted to using "temporary service agencies to do their formal hiring."13 There is little talk in this view of higher education about the history and value of shared governance between faculty and administrators, nor of educating students as critical citizens rather than potential employees of Walmart. There are few attempts to affirm faculty as scholars and public intellectuals who have both a measure of autonomy and power. Instead, faculty members are increasingly defined less as intellectuals than as technicians and grant writers. Students fare no better in this debased form of education and are treated as either clients or as restless children in need of high-energy entertainment - as was made clear in the 2012 Penn State scandal. Such modes of education do not foster a sense of organized responsibility fundamental to a democracy. Instead, they encourage what might be called a sense of organized irresponsibility - a practice that underlies the economic Darwinism and civic corruption at the heart of a debased politics.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Higher Education and the Crisis of Legitimacy In the United States and increasingly in Canada, many of the problems in higher education can be linked to diminished funding, the domination of universities by market mechanisms, the rise of for-profit colleges, the intrusion of the national security state, and the diminished role of faculty in governing the university, all of which both contradict the culture and democratic value of higher education and makes a mockery of the very meaning and mission of the university as a democratic public sphere. Decreased financial support for higher education stands in sharp contrast to increased support for tax benefits for the rich, big banks, the military and mega corporations. Rather than enlarge the moral imagination and critical capacities of students, too many universities are now encouraged to produce would-be hedge fund managers, depoliticized students, and modes of education that promote a "technically trained docility."14 Increasingly pedagogy is reduced to learning reified methods, a hollow mechanistic enterprise divorced from understanding teaching as a moral and intellectual practice central to the creation of critical and engaged citizens. This reductionist notion of pedagogy works well with a funding crisis that is now used by conservatives as an ideological weapon to defund certain disciplines such as history, English, sociology, anthropology, minority studies, gender studies and language programs. While there has never been a golden age when higher education was truly liberal and democratic, the current attack on higher education by religious fundamentalists, corporate power and the apostles of neoliberal capitalism appears unprecedented in terms of both its scope and intensity.15