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#### The problem of the neoliberal status quo is not a lack of communication, but rather the fetishization of speech. Our society has never been more democratic, which is precisely what allows capitalism to operate. Radical politics requires a rejection of democratic institutions readily available – anything short kills class focus. Dean 14

Dean, Jodi. "13 After Post-Politics: Occupation and the Return of Communism." The post-political and its discontents: Spaces of depoliticization, spectres of radical politics (2014): 261.

The US Left has not been completely without vision. It uniformly asserts the primacy of democracy. In a rich discussion of the conver- gence of neoliberalism and neoconservatism, Wendy Brown high- lights de-democratisation as its central force and threat (2006). The details of Brown’s analysis are evocative, but her overall account is unpersuasive because it both presumes a prior democracy, a previous acceptance and practice of democracy that is now unravelling, and neglects the hegemony of democratic rhetoric today. Democracy was long a contested category in US politics, subordinated to individual and states’ rights, and valued less than elites’ property and privilege. Anxieties over the tyranny of the majority, the great unwashed, immigrants, Catholics, workers, women, blacks and the young infused the American system from its inception. The combination of civil rights, students and new social movements in the 1960s with rapid expansion in communications media enabling people to reg- ister their opinions, contact representatives and organise gatherings and protests has, contra Brown, realised democratic aspirations to a previously unimaginable degree. Far from de-democratised, the contemporary ideological formation of communicative capitalism fetishises speech, opinion and participation. Communicative capital- ism materialises and repurposes democratic ideals and aspirations in ways that strengthen and support globalised neoliberalism. In fact, the proliferation, distribution, acceleration and intensification of communicative access and opportunity produce a deadlocked democracy incapable of serving as a forum for progressive political and economic change.¶ The problem of the last decades is not de-democratisation. It has been the Left’s failure to defend a vision of economic equality and solidarity, in other words, its betrayal of communism. When democ- racy appears as both the condition of politics and the solution to the political condition, capitalism cannot appear as the violence it is. Rather than assuming the underlying class conflict, one assumes a field generally fair and equal enough for deliberation and voting to make sense, the basic assumption of post-politics.¶ In some settings, an emphasis on democracy is radical, like the French Revolution, the Haitian Revolution, the initial fight for politi- cal freedom that led to the Russian February Revolution, as well as in struggles against colonialism and imperialism, and even in opposi- tion to the authoritarianism of the party-state bureaucracies of the former East. To stand for democracy in these instances was to stand against an order constituted through the exclusion of democracy. In contemporary parliamentary democracies, however, for leftists to refer to their goals as a struggle for democracy is strange. It is a defence of the status quo, a call for more of the same. Democracy is our ambient milieu, the hegemonic form of contemporary politics. That democracy is widely accepted did not stop the 2011 protest movements from presenting themselves in its name. In fact, democ- racy was the other side of the ‘politics of no politics’ urged in Greece, Spain and Occupy Wall Street. The 2011 Spanish protest camps and street occupations opted explicitly for a politics of no politics. Opposing high unemployment and steep spending cuts, thousands of people from throughout Spanish society took to the streets in a massive mobilisation. Multiple voices, participants as well as com- mentators, emphasised that no common line, platform or orienta- tion united the protesters; they were not political. For many, the intense, festive atmosphere and break from the constraints of the usual politics incited a new confidence in social change. Discussion groups in the multiple assemblies approved a wide variety of motions that included raising taxes on the rich, eliminating the privileges of the political elite, controlling banks and providing for inexpensive and ecologically friendly public transportation. At the same time, the refusal of representation and reluctance to implement decision mechanisms hampered actual debate, enabling charismatic indi- vidual speakers to move the crowd and acquire quasi-leadership positions (no matter what position they took), and constraining pos- sibilities of working through political divergences toward a collective plan (prominent voices insisted that the movement was not politi- cal). The mobilisation of thousands, the experience of occupation and resistance, was a vital political step, a clear indication of mass opposition to a state serving the interests of capital (Schneider 2011). For a while, it broke with ‘the network of inert habits’ previously inhibiting and displacing oppositional struggle (Badiou 2011: 35). Yet insofar as the assemblies were deliberative rather than executive bodies (in an unfortunate inverse of the Paris Commune), the action they set in motion was foreshortened, ineffective.¶ The occupation of Athens’ Syntagma Square that began on 25 May 2011 similarly rejected representation, introducing a number of organisational innovations that prioritised the inclusion of indi- vidual voices over the inclusion of tendencies, groups and previ- ously developed political positions. The innovations included the formation of a set of working groups, thematic assemblies and a general assembly with the Right to make decisions and before which speakers were chosen by lot.2 These arrangements expanded oppor- tunities for political expression. They installed a gap in the everyday, allowing a glimpse into the possibility of another world. According to some commentators, though, the large general assembly also re-induced passivity as people started to equate action with voting and to refrain from engaging in direction action.3 The participa- tion without representation approach hindered the development of a specific plan, strategy or vision of an alternative to the austerity programme the Greek government ultimately acquiesced to under IMF pressure. The movement of the squares risked becoming an end in itself rather than an element of a larger political strategy aiming towards ending capitalism and developing equitable and common relations of production.¶ These same patterns reappeared in Occupy Wall Street. On the one hand, the openness of the movement, its rejection of party identification, made it initially inviting to a wide array of those dis- contented with continued unemployment, increasing inequality and political stagnation in the US. On the other, when combined with the consensus-based process characteristic of the General Assemblies (adopted from the Spanish and Greek occupations), this inclusivity had detrimental effects, hindering the movement’s ability to take a strong stand against capitalism and for collective control over common resources.¶ The ‘politics of no-politics’ meme seeking to trump class and eco- nomic struggle in the Spanish, Greece and US protests was not new. It was a reappropriation of the idea of post-politics. From post-politics’ initial appearance as a description of a technocratic state intent on managing populations in the service of capital, to its subsequent deployment in critical analyses of governance under neoliberalism, it manifested itself again in activists’ misunderstanding of their own oppositional movement. Avoiding the division and antagonism that comes with taking a political position, they displaced their energies onto procedural concerns with inclusion and participation, as if the content of the politics were either given – a matter of identity – or sec- ondary to the fact of inclusion, which makes the outcome of political struggle less significant than the process of deliberation. As Manuel Castells described the Spanish acampadas: ‘what is transformative is the process rather than the product’ (2011). Many in Spain, Greece and Occupy named their goal democracy, envisioning their struggles specifically as a struggle for democracy (rather than for the abolition of private property, collective ownership of the means of production, and economic equality within an already democratic setting). Some Occupy Wall Street activists, for example, tried to make money in politics the primary issue, as if inequality were primarily an effect of a broken political system rather than a constitutive attribute of capitalism.¶ If occupation is understood as a tactic, it becomes clear that these movements are not primarily democratic, and framing them as such is a symptom of the continued ideological suasion of post-politics. Occupation is not a democratic process; it is a militant, divisive tactic that expresses the fundamental division on which capitalism depends. Occupiers actively reject democratic institutions, break the law, disrupt public space, squander public resources, and attempt to assert the will of a minority of vocal protesters outside of and in contradiction to democratic procedures. This assertion is what made Occupy and the other movements so strong, so invigorating – they were divisive in a setting that attempted to reduce division to matters of personal opinion, taste or faith. Unfortunately, emphases on democracy led activists and commentators to underplay this com- ponent of the movement.¶ One of the clearest early statements of the democratic underpin- nings of the 2011 movements came from Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, who viewed them not only as calls for a ‘real democracy’ but also as experiments in a democracy liberated from the constraints of representation. Further developing their argument in the short book Declaration (2012), they emphasise direct and horizontal participa- tion in political decision-making, again viewing the movements as nascent and local forms of what is needed on a larger scale.¶ The problem with Hardt and Negri’s democratic depiction of the movements is not that it clashes with the self-understanding of par- ticipants, for many share their view. Nor is the problem their empha- sis on participation and decision-making rather than execution, itself another instance of the way enthusiasm for horizontality results in a Left disregard for what Marx noted as a key achievement of the Paris Commune, namely, the fact that it acted as an executive rather than a parliamentary body. The problem is that the language of democracy is post-political. It avoids the fundamental antagonism of class conflict and proceeds as if the only thing really missing were participation. This avoidance of antagonism leads to a disavowal of division within the movements – and thus effectively to the post-political move that seeks to individualise, displace and manage political division.¶ Consider, for example, one of the early challenges facing Occupy Wall Street: with what was it concerned? To what wrong or crime was the movement responding? Early reluctance to name capital- ism the crime and the wealthiest 1 per cent the enemy made it seem as if Ron Paul supporters, anti-Fed (the US Federal Reserve Bank) conspiracy theorists and anti-tax libertarians were as much a part of the movement as those demanding jobs for all, a guaranteed minimum income, campaign finance reform, and the restoration of the Glass-Steagall legislation separating commercial and investment banking. Because the movement was committed to a consensus-based approach to democratic decision-making, capitalism’s supporters could install themselves as permanent obstacles to the articulation of any goals or demands deemed unacceptable by virtue of being too pro-union, socialist or communist.¶ Or consider the debate over demands (Deseriis and Dean 2012). In Occupy Wall Street, the debate over whether Occupy should issue demands obscured the fact that the people coming together in the name of the 99 per cent were an assemblage of politically and economically divergent subjectivities, not an actual social bloc. The refusal to be represented by demands was actually the refusal or ina- bility to make an honest assessment of the social composition of the movement so as to develop a politics in which different forces and perspectives do not simply neutralise each other in the search for a position with which everyone could agree. Such inability was further obfuscated by emphases on democratic processes and participation. In order to avoid conflicts and pursue the myth of consensus, the movement produced within itself autonomously operating groups, committees and caucuses. These groups were brought together through structures of mediation such as the General Assembly and the Spokes Council, which struggled to find a common ground amidst the groups’ members’ divergent political and economic posi- tions. Positions were so divergent and the likelihood of achieving even modified consensus so small that even before the eviction of Zuccotti Park, activists realised that getting anything done required working in smaller, separate or local groups rather than seeking the approval of the GA. In short, the democratic emphasis on consensus and refusal of demands that incited the movement became a serious blindspot with regard to real divergences, a blindspot that had high costs in terms of political efficacy as serious proposals got watered down in order to secure agreement from those who rejected their basic premises.¶

#### Free speech is an illusion propagated by corporatists – their model of rights assumes an equal playing field analogous to free market economists view of capital. The promotion of free speech perpetuates the idea that speech is a commodity, which strengthens neoliberalism’s hold on the academy. Brown 15

Brown, Wendy. Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. MIT Press, 2015.

At times, kennedy raises the pitch in Citizens United to depict limits on corporate funding of PAC ads as “an outright ban on speech”;19 at other times, he casts them merely as inappropriate government inter- vention and bureaucratic weightiness.20 But beneath all the hyperbole about government’s chilling of corporate speech is a crucial rhetorical move: the figuring of speech as analogous to capital in “the political marketplace.” on the one hand, government intervention is featured throughout the opinion as harmful to the marketplace of ideas that speech generates.21 Government restrictions damage freedom of speech just as they damage all freedoms. on the other hand, the unfettered accumulation and circulation of speech is cast as an unqual- ified good, essential to “the right of citizens to inquire...hear... speak...and use information to reach consensus [itself] a precondi- tion to enlightened self-government and a necessary means to protect it.”22 not merely corporate rights, then, but democracy as a whole is at stake in the move to deregulate speech. Importantly, however, democ- racy is here conceived as a marketplace whose goods—ideas, opinions, and ultimately, votes—are generated by speech, just as the economic market features goods generated by capital. In other words, at the very moment that Justice kennedy deems disproportionate wealth irrele- vant to the equal rights exercised in this marketplace and the utili- tarian maximization these rights generate, speech itself acquires the status of capital, and a premium is placed on its unrestricted sources and unimpeded flow.¶ What is significant about rendering speech as capital? economiza- tion of the political occurs not through the mere application of market principles to nonmarket fields, but through the conversion of political processes, subjects, categories, and principles to economic ones. This is the conversion that occurs on every page of the kennedy opinion. If everything in the world is a market, and neoliberal markets con- sist only of competing capitals large and small, and speech is the capital of the electoral market, then speech will necessarily share cap- ital’s attributes: it appreciates through calculated investment, and it advances the position of its bearer or owner. Put the other way around, once speech is rendered as the capital of the electoral marketplace, it is appropriately unrestricted and unregulated, fungible across actors and venues, and existing solely for the advancement or enhancement of its bearer’s interests. The classic associations of political speech with freedom, conscience, deliberation, and persuasion are nowhere in sight.¶ How, precisely, is speech capital in the kennedy opinion? How does it come to be figured in economic terms where its regulation or restriction appears as bad for its particular marketplace and where its monopolization by corporations appears as that which is good for all? The transmogrification of speech into capital occurs on a number of levels in kennedy’s account. First, speech is like capital in its tendency to proliferate and circu- late, to push past barriers, to circumvent laws and other restrictions, indeed, to spite efforts at intervention or suppression.23 speech is thus rendered as a force both natural and good, one that can be wrongly impeded and encumbered, but never quashed.¶ second, persons are not merely producers, but consumers of speech, and government interference is a menace—wrong in prin- ciple and harmful in effect—at both ends. The marketplace of ideas, kennedy repeats tirelessly, is what decides the value of speech claims. every citizen must judge the content of speech for himself or herself; it cannot be a matter for government determination, just as govern- ment should not usurp other consumer choices.24 In this discussion, kennedy makes no mention of shared deliberation or judgment in politics or of voices that are unfunded and relatively powerless. He is focused on the wrong of government “command[ing] where a per- son may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, [using] censorship to control thought.”25 If speech generates goods consumed according to individual choice, govern- ment distorts this market by “banning the political speech of millions of associations of citizens” (that is, corporations) and by paternal- istically limiting what consumers may know or consider. Again, if speech is the capital of the political marketplace, then we are polit- ically free when it circulates freely. And it circulates freely only when corporations are not restricted in what speech they may fund or promulgate.¶ Third, kennedy casts speech not as a medium for expression or dialogue, but rather as innovative and productive, just as capital is. There is “a creative dynamic inherent in the concept of free expres- sion” that intersects in a lively way with “rapid changes in technol- ogy” to generate the public good.26 This aspect of speech, kennedy argues, specifically “counsel[s] against upholding a law that restricts political speech in certain media or by certain speakers.”27 Again, the dynamism, innovativeness, and generativity of speech, like that of all capital, is dampened by government intervention.¶ Fourth, and perhaps most important in establishing speech as the capital of the electoral marketplace, kennedy sets the power of speech and the power of government in direct and zero-sum-game opposition to one another. Repeatedly across the lengthy opinion for the majority, he identifies speech with freedom and government with control, cen- sorship, paternalism, and repression.28 When free speech and govern- ment meet, it is to contest one another: the right of speech enshrined in the First Amendment, he argues, is “premised on mistrust of gov- ernmental power” and is “an essential mechanism of democracy [because] it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people.”29 Here are other variations on this theme in the opinion:¶ The First Amendment was certainly not understood [by the framers] to condone the suppression of political speech in society’s most salient media. It was understood as a response to the repression of speech.30¶ When Government seeks to use its full power, including criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought.... The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves.31 This reading of the First Amendment and of the purpose of political speech positions government and speech as warring forces parallel to those of government and capital in a neoliberal economy.

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause to go unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### The alternative is to abandon the affirmative’s hope for more discourse in favor of militant class struggle – rather than looking for new ways to dissent, a radical leftist project must begin with reimagining political formations outside of capitalism. The real lesson of the 60’s is that activism centered on rights is a failed project that the affirmative tries to reinvent, which will lead to the same result. Hickel 12

Hickel, Jason [London School of Economics and Political Science], and Arsalan Khan [University of Virginia]. "The culture of capitalism and the crisis of critique." Anthropological Quarterly 85.1 (2012): 203-227.

We began this essay with the observation that, at the very moment when¶ neoliberal ideologues are zealously advancing the “free market” by invoking¶ the grand moral principles of liberty and freedom, American progressives¶ are content to speak in a utilitarian and technocratic language that aims¶ for “balanced” solutions through rational consensus. This reflects how the¶ Left in America no longer sees its historical role as one of ensuring socioeconomic¶ justice in the face of exploitation by a clearly defined adversary¶ like “the Right” or “the elite.” Instead, progressives seem preoccupied¶ with another, more diffuse constellation of threats: political polarization,¶ the decline of civility in public discourse, and increasing ideological rigidity¶ and zeal. This is why some representatives of the American liberal-left, like¶ Jon Stewart, have been so adamant about blaming “extremists” on both¶ sides of the political aisle, and why the Obama campaign succeeded on a¶ relatively vague platform of cooperation, compromise, “hope,” and “unity.”¶ That this appears to so many as a better kind of politics makes sense within¶ a cultural framework that sees ideological conflict as illusory rather than¶ substantive, as a result of misunderstanding and misrepresentation rather¶ than a product of incommensurable interests or structural inequities. In¶ such a world, conflict can be redressed through a shared commitment to¶ civility, consensus building, openness, and diversity.¶ It bears pointing out briefly that this trend has been paralleled to some¶ extent by discourses about globalization in culture studies, post-colonial¶ studies, and, indeed, some strands of anthropology. Jonathan Friedman¶ (2002) has famously criticized Bhabha (1994), Appadurai (1993), and Malkki¶ (1992) for celebrating hybridity and cosmopolitanism as the antidote¶ to the chauvinism of nationalist and other essentialist identities, which¶ they see as inherently violent because they are preoccupied with defending¶ cultural boundaries against the threatening Other. Friedman rightly¶ argues that the celebration of hybridity and cosmopolitanism obscures¶ the violent exclusions that face the vast majority of people who cannot¶ partake of globalization’s “cut ‘n’ mix culture” (2002:33). Like the forms¶ of progressive politics that we have discussed above, this literature thoroughly¶ depoliticizes globalization and rationalizes neoliberal capitalism.¶ Fortunately, this has not been the last word on the matter: in the past¶ decade, a number of anthropologists have gone to great lengths to theorize¶ the violent contradictions of neoliberalism. Kalb, following Polanyi,¶ insists on seeing globalization as “a political project of globally imposed marketization…sponsored by transnational class segments within the¶ core northern states and its comprador allies in dependent economies”¶ (2005:177). Friedman (2003) stresses how class polarization has created¶ cosmopolitan elites who are self-consciously global and hybrid, while at¶ the same time generating intense forms of cultural closure and chauvinism¶ among those most adversely affected by neoliberal policy. Carrier¶ and Heyman take a similar approach to the study of consumption, arguing¶ for a radical departure from prevailing “psycho-cultural” analyses that¶ tend to “ignore or simplify inequalities and conflict” (1997:355).¶ To quote Žižek (2009a) once again, “The aim of progressive politics¶ should be to reconstruct society in such a way that poverty will be impossible.”¶ But the altruistic virtues of cultural capitalism and development¶ hobble this project by obscuring the exploitative relations of production¶ that generate poverty and inequality in the first place, and by appropriating¶ the critical capacities of the Left. These new trends appear to sanitize¶ capitalism, to obviate its contradictions. They make capitalism seem¶ palatable and benevolent. Instead of imagining real alternatives to global¶ capitalism, many progressives today content themselves with promoting¶ TOMS Shoes, Ethos water, and Alternative Spring Break with evangelical¶ zeal. This is the extent of capitalism’s hegemony, that it has colonized¶ our capacity to imagine alternatives, and has transformed our potential¶ for meaningful political critique and activism into a profoundly depoliticized,¶ consumerist passivity. As a result, progressives in America have¶ largely abandoned the task of confronting the antagonisms intrinsic to¶ market capitalism. This is not to say that progressives do not care about¶ growing inequality and mounting human suffering in America and abroad.¶ They do. However, in many cases, their energies have been channeled¶ into the spirit of rebellious and virtuous consumption and the moral project¶ of development, which may mitigate the effects of capitalist production¶ (although this too is questionable) but will never address the ultimate¶ causes of our contemporary economic crises.¶ This is partly the unfortunate, and unintended, legacy of some strands¶ of thinking located within the New Left of the 1960s, and even within the¶ much-lauded Frankfurt School. To be sure, the overriding concern with¶ individual autonomy and authentic self-expression that permeated the¶ intellectual and political milieu of the 1960s helped secure important¶ legal and political rights, and made possible the notion of a more inclusive¶ and multicultural nation. Broadly speaking, these legal and politi-cal rights have created opportunities for select members of racial and¶ ethnic minorities and women to enter into an elite world from which they¶ had previously been barred. Although their place within this elite remains¶ suspect and conditional, often predicated on their ability and willingness¶ to participate in cultural activities that are themselves marked¶ by race and gender bias, these new rights have not significantly altered¶ the actual distribution of powers either within America or within global¶ capitalist society more broadly. Indeed, as we have shown, capitalism¶ largely appropriated the idea of individual rights and liberties and the¶ anti-society ethos of the times to facilitate neoliberal forms of consumption¶ and production. Moreover, given that corporations also have the¶ legal status of individuals, they have taken advantage of the very same¶ laws that were designed to protect individual rights and freedoms, and¶ this has facilitated an unprecedented consolidation of corporate power.¶ What this period furnished in place of a substantial redistribution of¶ wealth and power is the appearance of freedom and choice. Consumers—at¶ least those with sufficient resources—now have the freedom¶ to fashion our identities as mainstream or alternative and to choose¶ between regular, rebellious, and virtuous commodities; but we cannot¶ opt out of the system, and we are not free to reconsider the fundamental¶ violence at the heart of our capitalist society.¶ Progressives in America today remain largely circumscribed within¶ the neoliberal paradigm. This fact becomes particularly clear in debates¶ about military policy. For instance, Democrats have fought hard to repeal¶ “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” so that homosexuals can have the freedom to¶ serve in the military, but they have left the military-industrial complex itself¶ mostly unscrutinized. Discussions about the War on Terror tend to fall¶ along similar lines. While certain progressive circles have advanced radical¶ critiques, the dominant concern remains that “national security” has¶ come at the expense of liberty and freedom for citizens at home. Generally¶ speaking, this approach fails to recognize that liberty in America has¶ always been a privilege primarily reserved for white, middle-class males,¶ and that its extension or denial to others is largely contingent on the historical¶ needs of capitalism. Furthermore, the notion of liberty that functions¶ domestically as a critique of state overreach is deployed at the same¶ time to rationalize the belligerent use of military force around the world,¶ and to underwrite the imperial project of violently restructuring foreign¶ governments and economies in accordance with neoliberal principles. In the Muslim world, this is the very process that—because of the humiliation,¶ poverty, and conspicuous inequalities that it generates—bloats the¶ ranks of militant movements. In light of this, any thorough critique of the¶ War on Terror will require that scholars and activists examine the links between¶ American imperial interests in the Muslim world and the systemic¶ needs of capitalist accumulation.

#### The role of the judge is to be a critical analyst testing whether the underlying assumptions of the AFF are valid. This is a question of the whether the AFF scholarship is good – not the passage of the plan.

#### First, neoliberalism operates through a narrow vision of politics that sustains itself through the illusion of pragmatism. We should refuse their demand for a plan. Blalock, JD, 2015

(Corinne, “NEOLIBERALISM AND THE CRISIS OF LEGAL THEORY”, Duke University, LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS Vol. 77:71) MG from file

RECOVERING LEGAL THEORY’S RELEVANCE? The lens of neoliberalism not only allows one to see how these narratives fit together to reveal a larger rationality but also to understand why the solutions they propose fail to challenge or even escape that rationality. I address the three most prominent prescriptions being offered by critical legal scholars today: (1) a pragmatic turn to politics, (2) a return to more explicit normative and moral claims, and (3) acceptance in recognition that the decline is merely an ebb in the regular cycles of theory. A. Prescription: More Politics The most common prescription for recovering legal theory’s vibrancy is a greater participation in politics—scholars should eschew descriptive projects**,** especially those that might be used to bolster the conservative argument on an issue or in a case, as well as those critiques that appear purely academic, in favor of projects intended to influence the courts in progressive ways.134 One can certainly understand why this is a tempting prescription in light of the success of explicitly conservative legal theory and methods135 and concern that left-leaning legal academics have not taken up this charge.136 However, this demand for political engagement has unintended consequences: It legitimizes the current frameworks. As the Roberts Court further embraces neoliberal principles, persuading the Court means functioning within neoliberal logic and is therefore counterproductive for the revitalization of critical legal theory. Moreover, this political prescription tends to produce a reified notion of what counts as politics, limiting the political as well as intellectual potential of theoretical projects. For example, in the wake of the of the Court’s incremental move toward recognition of same-sex marriage in United States v. Windsor, 137 many progressive legal scholars have written on the subject hoping to nudge the Court toward full recognition. But in light of Nancy Fraser’s work, one should ask just what kind of recognition that would be—whether it would displace materialist claims or reify forms of identity.138 Full recognition of same-sex marriage is a destination toward which the Court is already heading and an area where the public discourse has largely already arrived. Emphasizing this area also participates in the ideology of erasure, leading many to believe that the current Court is making progressive interventions because it is progressive on identity and cultural issues, even though Windsor was handed down in a term in which the Court retrenched on significant materialist issues and embodied a number of blatantly neoliberal positions.139 Even if not writing for the Court, a legal scholar’s attempt to be useful to those in the profession who share her political goals risks constraining the legal profession and its own professional and disciplinary norms.140 In this way, the focus on concrete political effects helps foster legal thought’s “considerable capacity for resisting self-reflection and analysis,”141 which has only become more pronounced in the face of the neoliberalization of the academy as instrumental knowledge is increasingly privileged. When attempting to counter hegemony, what one needs to do is disrupt the legible—to expand the contours of what is considered political—not to accept the narrowly circumscribed zone of politics neoliberalism demarcates. Therefore, it is crucial not to judge critical legal scholarship according to whether its political impact is immediate or even known, and thus a turn to politics is not the remedy for legal theory’s marginalization. B. Prescription: More Normativity Some scholars recognize the danger of embracing a reified notion of politics that unwittingly reaffirms the status quo, and instead champion assertions of substantive morality to counteract the cold logics of pragmatism and efficiency.142 This proposed solution advocates a return to more substantive ideals of justice and equality. Although it may be true that change will ultimately require wresting these liberal and democratic ideals from neoliberalism and refilling their hollowed-out forms, this approach entails a number of pitfalls. The first is simply the inevitable question regarding moral claims: Whose morality is to be asserted? This question has created crisis on the left before, even producing some of the schisms among the crits recounted above. Neoliberalism does not have to contend with this issue—it foregrounds its formal nature and holds itself out as not needing to create a universal morality or set of values. More importantly, it claims to provide a structure in which one can keep one’s own substantive morals. Therefore, neoliberalism’s logic cannot be countered by moral claims without first disrupting its illusion of amorality. The ineffectiveness of the progressive critique of law and economics, based in claims of distributive justice and moral imperative, provides a clear example of how the neoliberal discourse can capture normative claims. The work of Martha McCluskey, one of the few legal scholars writing about neoliberalism in the domestic context over the last ten years, highlights the extent to which the “distributive justice” critique, which argues against the privileging of efficiency over equality and redistribution, fails to challenge the underlying logic.143 McCluskey illustrates how critics of law and economics who critique the approach’s inattention to redistribution have already ceded the central point, by arguing within the conventional views that “efficiency is about expanding the societal pie [and] redistribution [is] about dividing it.”144 “Neoliberalism’s disadvantage is not, as most critics worry, its inattention to redistribution, but to the contrary, its very obsession with redistribution as a distinctly seductive yet treacherous policy separate from efficiency.”145 In order to challenge this rationality, she explains, one cannot “misconstrue neoliberalism as a project to promote individual freedom and value-neutral economics at the expense of social responsibility and community morality.”146 One must instead recognize that neoliberalism has redefined social responsibility and community morality. Therefore, one must refuse the false dichotomy between the economic and cultural spheres (a division that allows the neoliberal discourse to displace cultural concerns to a moment after the economic concerns have been dealt with). Merely asserting the falsity of this separation is not sufficient**.** Neoliberalism has real effects in the world that strengthen its ideological claims.147 Therefore, it is not a struggle that can take place solely on the terrain of discourse or ideology. Like neoliberalism generally, law and economics does not hold itself out as infallible or as an embodiment of social ideals, but instead as the best society can do. It functions precisely on the logic that there is no alternative. Like Hayek’s theory, “[l]aw and [e]conomics is full of stories about how liberal rights and regulation designed to advance equality victimize the all-powerful market, undermining its promised rewards.”148 In light of this, it is a mistake to see neoliberalism as disavowing moral principles in favor of economic ones; it instead folds them into one another: “[T]he Law and Economics movement is rooted in the moral ideal of the market as the social realization of individual liberty and popular democracy.”149 Neoliberalism’s approach presents itself not only as efficient, but also as just. Legal scholars need to recognize neoliberalism’s focus on the market is not only a form of morality, but also a powerful one. They cannot assume that in a battle of moralities the substantive communitarian ideal will win.150 Furthermore, the neoliberal framework, through its reconfiguration of the subject as an entrepreneur, justifies material inequalities—in contrast to liberalism’s mere blindness to them. Consequently, merely asserting the existence of material inequalities does not immediately undermine neoliberalism’s claims. Far from the engaged citizen who actively produces the polis in liberal theory, the neoliberal subject is a rational, calculating, and independent entity “whose moral autonomy is measured by [her] capacity for ‘self-care’—the ability to provide for [her] own needs and service [her] own ambitions.”151 The subject’s morality is not in relation to principles or ideals, but is “a matter of rational deliberation about costs, benefits, and consequences.”152 If efficiency is the morality of our time, the poor are cast not only as “undeserving” but also as morally bankrupt. Therefore, efficiency replaces not only political morality, but also all other forms of value. Therefore, critics are right that other forms of value have been crowded out; but the logic is deeper than they seem to realize. It goes beyond the scope of what is being done in the legal academy. It is a logic that organizes our time and therefore must be countered differently. More normativity is not the answer to legal theory’s marginalization because neoliberalism’s logic can accommodate even radically contradictory moralities under its claims of moral pluralism. Ethical claims of justice and community may need to be made, but one must first recognize that countering hegemony is harder than merely articulating an alternative; hegemony must be disrupted first. Disrupting neoliberalism’s logic thus entails not only recognizing that neoliberalism has a morality, but also taking that morality seriously. C. Prescription: Acceptance The final response of legal theorists to their field’s marginalization is to dismiss it as merely the regular ebb and flow of theory’s prominence.153 Putting it in terms of Thomas Kuhn’s theory of paradigm shifts, the contemporary moment is just the “normal science” of the paradigm brought about by the crits’ revolutionary moment in the 1970s and 1980s.154 The vitality, this narrative contends, will return when a competing paradigm emerges. There are several problems with this perspective on the decline. First, it entails an error in logic insofar as it takes an external perspective. Legal theory does not inevitably rise and fall but only according to the work being produced; or, to put it another way, this descriptive account of theory’s ebb can be a selffulfilling prophecy insofar as it decreases scholars’ motivation to pursue and receptivity toward theoretical projects. Second, legal scholars cannot be content with normal science when it has the kinds of consequences for democracy and economic inequality that neoliberal hegemony does. The Court is currently entrenching these principles at an unprecedented rate in areas of free speech, equal protection, and antitrust to name a few.155 At first, such acceptance appears to be what Janet Halley is advocating in “taking a break from feminism,”156 but upon closer inspection it is not. Halley is cautioning against the left’s nostalgia—concluding that operating under the banner of feminism and a preoccupation with “reviving” feminism looks backward instead of forward.157 Critical legal scholarship instead needs to be “self-critical” and to recognize that “how we make and apply legal theory arises out of the circumstances in which we recognize problems and articulate solutions.”158 Theory must arise from engagement with the current circumstances. Acceptance cannot be the solution; legal theory must produce the momentum to move forward. VII CONCLUSION: WHERE WE GO FROM HERE The way forward cannot entail a return to reified notions of theory any more than by a return to reified notions of politics. Critical legal scholars should not attempt to revitalize previous critical movements but, instead, reinvigorate the practice of critique within the legal academy. A. Why Critique Naming neoliberalism is necessary in order to counteract it. Without explicit identification, there can be no truly oppositional position. It also makes legible connections that would otherwise go unseen, as was the case with scholars writing about the decline. But there must also be a step beyond naming: critique. Critique means taking neoliberal rationality seriously. The approach must not be dismissive, merely pointing out neoliberalism’s inconsistencies, but instead must recognize that neoliberal rationality is inherently appealing. One cannot merely indict efficiency as contrary to more substantive values, but one also must recognize that efficiency is inextricably tied to beliefs about liberty, dignity, and individual choice, as well as corresponding beliefs about the capacities and limits of the state to effectuate change. No one is arguing that neoliberalism is the best of all possible worlds; in fact, its power comes precisely from abandoning such a claim. In recognizing its hegemonic status, legal scholars can understand the critical task as being more than just demystification. Neoliberal does not paper over inequalities after all; it justifies them. Ultimately, critique should function as a means of opening the conversation in ways that go beyond the picture of law painted by the Roberts Court—to refuse to allow the legal academy to be merely mimetic of a Court that is clearly embracing a neoliberal vision. Critique provides a means of thinking about law as not limited by what the markets can tolerate; it is the means through which one can discover a form of resistance that goes beyond nostalgia for the liberal welfare state. And finally, critique is simply a means of asserting that things can be different than they are in a world that constantly insists that there is no alternative.

#### Second, the knowledge claims of the AC are the jumping off point for the debate – our framework provides a more reasonable neg burden. When a student turns in an F paper, no teacher has an obligation to write an entirely new paper to show it was bad – pointing out major academic deficiencies would justify failing the paper – the ballot asks who did the better debating, so if their analysis is wrong, they haven’t.

#### Third, neoliberalism is a conceptual framework that has to be challenged at the level of scholarship. Godrej 14

Farah Godrej [Department of Political Science¶ University of California-Riverside ]“neoliberalism, Militarization, and the Price of dissent¶ Policing Protest at the University of California¶ “Edited by Chatterjee, Piya, and Sunaina Maira. The Imperial University. University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

I have offered here a particular window into the ways in which the interests, mechanisms, and operations of both the university system and the neoliberal state are aligned with those of private capital. Of course, that the academy is made to strategically ally with capital as a key piece of neoliberal consolida- tion should not surprise us. Rather, what is worth noting, I have argued here, is the necessity of the linkages between disinvestment in public education, militarization, and the criminalization of dissent. These necessary link- ages demonstrate this volume’s premise that the university is an institution embedded in the hierarchies and inequalities of U.S. racial, gender, and class politics and shed light on the confluence of military and industrial interests as they appear within the U.S. university. I have sought also to emphasize the systematicity and multilayered complexity of this phenomenon. That is, the various pieces of this picture necessarily go together, as rhetoric, law, bureaucracy, and the force of arms all combine effectively to produce the desired end.¶ The neoliberal logic entailed in the privatization of the University of Cal- ifornia is, I have argued, necessarily interlinked with the logic of militari- zation and the criminalization of dissent, because it employs a militarized enforcement strategy, coupled with a political rhetoric that criminalizes the specific behaviors involved in protest and dissent against these strate- gies. The militarization of the university campus is thus not simply a reflec- tion of the increasing militarization of American law enforcement based on the logic of ongoing threats to public safety encoded in years of the War on Drugs and the War on Terror.25 Rather, such militarization is one prong of a necessary enforcement strategy designed to convey that dissent against privatization is meant to be costly in inflicting various forms of legitimized violence upon those who dissent. The second prong of the enforcement strategy also conveys that dissenters will pay a high price by being criminal- ized, either through rhetoric that paints them as violent and therefore mar- ginal, unworthy, and undesirable in the public imagination or through legal machinations that force them to expend tremendous financial resources on extricating themselves from prosecution.¶ The language of cost and price here, of course, reminds us of the ongo- ing hegemony—and perhaps victory—of the conceptual frameworks of neoliberalism and its theoretical accompaniments, such as rational choice theory, predominantly featured in neoclassical economics. These strategies of criminalization and militarization rest on sending signals to adversaries, encoded precisely in these languages, wherein value and worth are measured in terms of indicators such as price or cost, and rational actors are assumed to be guided by a universally comprehensible incentive structure. Thus the strategies of criminalization and militarization rest on de-incentivizing dis- sent, so to speak, assuming that dissenters will measure the costs inherent in their actions and choose rationally to cease from engaging in such dissent. The continued insistence on dissent is therefore resistance to the logic of neoliberal privatization on multiple levels: it not only calls out the complic- ity of the university with the neoliberal state and the forces of private capital but also continues to dissent despite the “incentives” offered in exchange for desisting from dissent. And in so doing, it should be signaling its rejection not simply of privatization but of the entire conceptual baggage of neolib- eralism, including its logics of rational choice, cost, price, and incentive, as well as its logic of structural violence. In other words, the ongoing struggle against the logic of neoliberal privatization requires that dissent continue, despite its high “price.”¶

## NR

The 1AC largly misses the point – issues on college campuses are not caused by speech codes or other policies but rather the way that neolib and funding are able to dictate what gets written about and studied. As schools have become increasingly privatized departments like ethic studies are cut off since there seen as pointless in the eyes of cap – which means ideas and speech are always limited in the context of university. The aff tries to address one symptom of the issue with free speech while allowing the root cause to go unquestioned – we will isolate 3 specific links each function as disads to the perm:

First is **Misdiagnosis** – Society has never been more democratic people are able to protest and speak out about whatever they want which is what allows capitalism to strengthen its grasp on the academy. When we all appeal to individual expression like speech it creates a sort of me politics which destroys any collective action and masks cap since people think the democratic system will change for them if they just speak out loud enough which proves a trade off with the alt since ppl are more focused on getting rights then actually challenging instituions. – that’s dean

Second is the **commodification of speech** - Their conception of speech treats it like a commodity where analogues to the free market if we take out any regulations we can be rewarded for what we say and have the best ideas win out this ignores the economic conditions that influence ideas in the first place

There are 2 impacts to this

1) FS doesn’t solve and reifies economic exploitation by perpetuating the myth of an equal playing field, which lets money operate.

2) It proves their scholarship/assumptions about politics are incompatible with and kill alt solvency b/c they treat speech like a commodity to be traded, which assumes a neoliberal view of the market and sustains cap by teaching us to think of everything through the same economic lense.

Third is **Palliative –** Universities will inevitably control who gets to talk so free speech creates an allusion of freedom and will only allow students to speak out to the point that they don’t pose a threat. Inevitably they will use economic conditions to undermine whoever is too radical for them.

The alt is an epistemological shift – we ideologically reject the aff’s stale tactics. We need militant, unrelenting forms of rejection that actively destroy cap. This doesn’t foreclose the possibility of actions like fighting tuition increases, creating prison to school pipelines or divesting fossil fuels, rather it is the epistemological frame that makes the actions efficient in the first place. Absent the alt, no physical action will create lasting change. By engaging in this class-based critique and reunderstanding the way neolib has situated people within the university, the alt allows movements which take down cap

## Links

### Generic (Brown)

#### Free speech is an illusion propagated by corporatists – their model of rights assumes an equal playing field analogous to free market economists view of capital. The promotion of free speech perpetuates the idea that speech is a commodity, which strengthens neoliberalism’s hold on the academy. Brown 15

Brown, Wendy. Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. MIT Press, 2015.

At times, kennedy raises the pitch in Citizens United to depict limits on corporate funding of PAC ads as “an outright ban on speech”;19 at other times, he casts them merely as inappropriate government inter- vention and bureaucratic weightiness.20 But beneath all the hyperbole about government’s chilling of corporate speech is a crucial rhetorical move: the figuring of speech as analogous to capital in “the political marketplace.” on the one hand, government intervention is featured throughout the opinion as harmful to the marketplace of ideas that speech generates.21 Government restrictions damage freedom of speech just as they damage all freedoms. on the other hand, the unfettered accumulation and circulation of speech is cast as an unqual- ified good, essential to “the right of citizens to inquire...hear... speak...and use information to reach consensus [itself] a precondi- tion to enlightened self-government and a necessary means to protect it.”22 not merely corporate rights, then, but democracy as a whole is at stake in the move to deregulate speech. Importantly, however, democ- racy is here conceived as a marketplace whose goods—ideas, opinions, and ultimately, votes—are generated by speech, just as the economic market features goods generated by capital. In other words, at the very moment that Justice kennedy deems disproportionate wealth irrele- vant to the equal rights exercised in this marketplace and the utili- tarian maximization these rights generate, speech itself acquires the status of capital, and a premium is placed on its unrestricted sources and unimpeded flow.¶ What is significant about rendering speech as capital? economiza- tion of the political occurs not through the mere application of market principles to nonmarket fields, but through the conversion of political processes, subjects, categories, and principles to economic ones. This is the conversion that occurs on every page of the kennedy opinion. If everything in the world is a market, and neoliberal markets con- sist only of competing capitals large and small, and speech is the capital of the electoral market, then speech will necessarily share cap- ital’s attributes: it appreciates through calculated investment, and it advances the position of its bearer or owner. Put the other way around, once speech is rendered as the capital of the electoral marketplace, it is appropriately unrestricted and unregulated, fungible across actors and venues, and existing solely for the advancement or enhancement of its bearer’s interests. The classic associations of political speech with freedom, conscience, deliberation, and persuasion are nowhere in sight.¶ How, precisely, is speech capital in the kennedy opinion? How does it come to be figured in economic terms where its regulation or restriction appears as bad for its particular marketplace and where its monopolization by corporations appears as that which is good for all? The transmogrification of speech into capital occurs on a number of levels in kennedy’s account. First, speech is like capital in its tendency to proliferate and circu- late, to push past barriers, to circumvent laws and other restrictions, indeed, to spite efforts at intervention or suppression.23 speech is thus rendered as a force both natural and good, one that can be wrongly impeded and encumbered, but never quashed.¶ second, persons are not merely producers, but consumers of speech, and government interference is a menace—wrong in prin- ciple and harmful in effect—at both ends. The marketplace of ideas, kennedy repeats tirelessly, is what decides the value of speech claims. every citizen must judge the content of speech for himself or herself; it cannot be a matter for government determination, just as govern- ment should not usurp other consumer choices.24 In this discussion, kennedy makes no mention of shared deliberation or judgment in politics or of voices that are unfunded and relatively powerless. He is focused on the wrong of government “command[ing] where a per- son may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, [using] censorship to control thought.”25 If speech generates goods consumed according to individual choice, govern- ment distorts this market by “banning the political speech of millions of associations of citizens” (that is, corporations) and by paternal- istically limiting what consumers may know or consider. Again, if speech is the capital of the political marketplace, then we are polit- ically free when it circulates freely. And it circulates freely only when corporations are not restricted in what speech they may fund or promulgate.¶ Third, kennedy casts speech not as a medium for expression or dialogue, but rather as innovative and productive, just as capital is. There is “a creative dynamic inherent in the concept of free expres- sion” that intersects in a lively way with “rapid changes in technol- ogy” to generate the public good.26 This aspect of speech, kennedy argues, specifically “counsel[s] against upholding a law that restricts political speech in certain media or by certain speakers.”27 Again, the dynamism, innovativeness, and generativity of speech, like that of all capital, is dampened by government intervention.¶ Fourth, and perhaps most important in establishing speech as the capital of the electoral marketplace, kennedy sets the power of speech and the power of government in direct and zero-sum-game opposition to one another. Repeatedly across the lengthy opinion for the majority, he identifies speech with freedom and government with control, cen- sorship, paternalism, and repression.28 When free speech and govern- ment meet, it is to contest one another: the right of speech enshrined in the First Amendment, he argues, is “premised on mistrust of gov- ernmental power” and is “an essential mechanism of democracy [because] it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people.”29 Here are other variations on this theme in the opinion:¶ The First Amendment was certainly not understood [by the framers] to condone the suppression of political speech in society’s most salient media. It was understood as a response to the repression of speech.30¶ When Government seeks to use its full power, including criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought.... The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves.31 This reading of the First Amendment and of the purpose of political speech positions government and speech as warring forces parallel to those of government and capital in a neoliberal economy.

### Generic (Liberalism)

### Generic (sleeper)

### Free speech impossible

### Palliative

### Speech = Abstraction

### Protests

### Newspapers

### Tolerance/More speech

### “Politically correct”

### Deliberative Democracy/Commuitarianism

### BDS (extra)

### Online/Communication Media

### Surveillance

### Identity Focus

### Black Violence/History

### Black Essentialism

### Affect (General)

### Fem Rage

### Agonism/Radical Democracy

### Trans and Queer\* Links

### Agamben

### Kant

### Supreme Court Links

### Democracy

### Econ Collapse

### Giroux

### Constitution

### Hegemony

### Soft Power

### Philosophy

### Pluralism

### Property Rights

## Impacts

### I: Marketplace of ideas

### I: Turns case

#### Free speech is impossible in a capitalist environment—the right to free speech hinders on social relations and economic status; all means of expression assume socioeconomic means that the aff glosses over. Morley 15

Our Cherished Freedom of Speech Myth Written by Daniel MorleyFriday, 20 February 2015 http://www.marxist.com/our-cherished-freedom-of-speech-myth.htm

As Lenin succinctly summed up, “Freedom in capitalist society always remains just about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners. The modern wage slaves, owing to the conditions of capitalist exploitation, are so much crushed by want and poverty that "democracy is nothing to them," "politics is nothing to them"; that, in the ordinary peaceful course of events, the majority of the population is debarred from participating in social and political life.” In addition to the general conditions of class society i.e. the masses’ poverty of time and income, “in practice the capitalists, the exploiters, the landowners and the profiteers own nine-tenths of the best meeting halls, and nine-tenths of the newsprint, printing presses”. To that we may add that at least nine-tenths of the film and television production facilities and distribution channels are similarly privately owned by vast monopolies. Private property is not just a right to something, but at the same time a denial of the right to that something for all others. The subordination of everything in our society to commodity production, to the buying and selling of goods and ideas, leads to the cumulative concentration of this private wealth in fewer and fewer hands, and thus the exclusion of the vast majority from the benefits of the ‘inalienable’ right to private property. Because bourgeois legality leaves aside all concrete matters of wealth and time, and moreover enshrines their inequitable distribution by defending the right to accumulate vast wealth, the freedoms to speech and association that it enshrines for all are in practice denied and mutilated for the vast majority. Technically, we all have the right to express ourselves (leaving aside things such as publishing violent pornography etc), but in practice we find we do not have the economic resources to do so, and we are too bogged down in our hand-to-mouth existence to have the energy to do so anyway. Even being in, say, a band, involves a struggle for survival too burdensome for most to endure, and modern society is like a vast graveyard of artists starved of the necessary oxygen to ply their trade. In this way the market represents a far more efficient and subtle form of censorship and control than any clumsy state ever was. Both Sony Pictures and their film The Interview are very useful case studies for freedom of speech in capitalist society today. Of course, the overwhelming majority of society has no actual freedom to produce a film and have it distributed; if we wish to do so, we must go to those with the resources. But, you will say, the market and its freedom give us choice, and thus we can ‘shop around’ for a studio who will make our film. But when we look closer, we find that the market in the film industry is not so free after all: the top 7 film studios have captured 88.3% of the market, the top 12, 96.4%. Sony was the fourth highest grossing studio of 2014, taking in $1.2bn, or 12.2% of the market. These studios do not represent different artistic institutions constantly experimenting with various up-and-coming talents, but are vast capitalist enterprises unconcerned with originality or giving a voice to the voiceless. Those more willing to experiment, occupy niches or express the real lives of the masses are starved of capital and constantly teeter on the brink of bankruptcy or irrelevence - positions 162 to 29 on the ‘Studio Market Share’ league table all capture 0.0% of the market (http://www.boxofficemojo.com/studio/). The reality is that the behemoths such as Sony are not independent, private individuals whose free speech rights are at risk. In reality, these monopolies are the biggest enemies of free speech. Their dominant position, which they owe not to their outstanding contribution to culture but to the science of profiteering, allows them to exclude, drown out, rob and fleece the ‘speech’ of countless thousands of artists and journalists who don’t ‘toe the line’. How many decent scriptwriters have been rejected, or had their ideas stolen, how many promising bands have been denied airtime, record deals and performance spaces, and how many journalists ignored, by the big shareholders and their bureaucrats? Furthermore, the scale of these film studio monopolies and the costs of their blockbusters have certain implications. Far from needing their freedom of expression to be protected, these monopolies are directly involved in the very centre of power and its propaganda in the West. One less reported outcome of the hack into Sony was a series of emails between its executives, in which it was revealed that a CIA agent had not only looked over the script of The Interview, but that, possibly under CIA pressure, and certainly with its approval, the script was altered not by the film’s artistic leaders but by Sony executives! This was the all-important change of the film’s assassinated antagonist to being North Korea’s head of state Kim Jong Un! Previously the plan had been to use a pseudonym for obvious reasons, but as the Daily Beast reports, Marisa Liston, Sony’s senior vice president of national theatrical publicity, wrote in a leaked email that the film’s directors Seth Rogen and Evan Goldberg “mentioned that it was a sony [sic] executive that told them to not use a fictitious name, but to go with kim jon-un [sic]” after “a former cia agent and someone who used to work for Hilary [sic] Clinton looked at the script”. The Daily Beast also reports other leaked “emails that show that a senior U.S. State Dept. official consulted with [CEO of Sony Pictures] Lynton on the content of the movie, and Ambassador Robert King, U.S. Special Envoy for North Korean Human Rights, provided advice on the film”. Z Magazine adds that in other leaked emails “Michael Lynton reveals that he checked with “someone very senior in State,” who confidentially, gave him the go-ahead for the filmic representation of the assassination of a living head of state—the first in U.S. film history.” The very scale, expense and certainly the subject matter favoured by major Hollywood studios requires high level collaboration with the state itself. Action film formulas are, as we all know, a favourite for these studios because they present easy-to-swallow, immediate excitement and offer an illusory escape to individual heroism for a population forced to live passive lifestyles. But such films are highly costly and tend to feature military hardware. Consequently, they require the equipment and ‘help’ of the US military to get made, and so “Blockbuster films made at major studios are required to pass the censors before they receive military support...The Pentagon and every branch of the Armed Services now help major studios shape, alter, influence ,and censor films for U.S. audiences. They have no hope of getting such government largess unless they first submit their scripts to Strub [head of US Department of Defence Entertainment Liaison Office], who openly admits that, “sometimes they require script changes as a condition of providing support. “Strub also explains the real goals of military/media collaborations: “any film that portrays the military as negative is not realistic to us.” In fact, “The Marine Corps’ film office in Los Angeles contains a floor-to-ceiling shelf of files on films that asked for assistance but were never made, “most too expensive to produce without military assistance.” In addition to vetting scripts before supplying the hardware, Strub’s office carefully monitors the “creative” process once the film is in production. No on-set deviations from the content stipulations are allowed, a process that circumscribes independent improvisation or creative input that might emerge in the collaborative process that is film production.” (Karen Andersen, Z Magazine 28.1.15) Thus when people describe US action films as like propaganda for US imperialism, they are more correct than they know. It is not just a question of a general, amorphous ruling class ideology penetrating the heads of filmmakers (though it is that too). Clearly the CIA and the Pentagon are directly involved in censoring and writing films to project the ideology they want. Their efforts at doing so are facilitated by the monopolisation of the film industry such that they can establish cosy relations with the few men who control Hollywood. Josh Levin, the owner of a chain of cinemas in the US, joined the media industry’s self-congratulatory chorus about freedom of expression when defending his chain’s decision to screen the film, “It isn’t very often, frankly, in this country that such a high profile potential abridgment of people’s free expression is in the zeitgeist [that presents] an opportunity for us to all, as a country and as a people, stand up and say we will not tolerate people being bullied out of free expression.” The reality, as we can see, is directly contrary to this - giant media monopolies such as Sony have monopolised the airwaves and function as outlets for subtle state propaganda served as entertainment. The hue-and-cry about freedom of speech plays a role not unlike the name Ministry of Truth when given to the propaganda ministry in Orwell’s 1984. All those liberals who see the debate purely in terms of what ‘limits’ should be placed on free expression for the sake of security do little more than distract attention from the real point - that the free expression of Sony Pictures et al is only the free expression of its major shareholders and the US state at the expense of everybody else’s free speech. The collusion of the state with the heads of giant monopolies is of course nothing peculiar to the film-industry, but is a natural and inevitable product of monopoly capitalism. This collusion and censorship is applied much more directly in our so-called ‘free press’ than in the entertainment industries for the obvious reason that it is here that ‘free speech’ can be most effectively curtailed. There is a multitude of ways in which the British government censors the press - in particularly by classifying information as a national security issue. It is common knowledge that the state has lost no time in exploiting the so-called ‘War on Terror’ to arrogate to itself more and more draconian powers to keep secrets and censor the press. However the aim of this article is not to deal so much with the state’s direct and explicit censorship of the press, which is the only restriction on free speech that liberals understand. Instead, this article is devoted the showing how the capitalist control of society and its means of communication prohibit real free expression for the masses and that this is achieved precisely through the greatest liberal freedoms of expression, association and private property. Suffice it to say that as Marxists we entirely reject the state’s attack on civil liberties. A far more subtle and pervasive form of censorship is exercised by the state not against the press but in collaboration with it. The Defence, Press and Broadcasting Advisory Committee is “composed of representatives of the Ministry of Defence, the Home Office, and the Foreign Office, and of the newspapers, periodicals, and broadcasting news organisations. The chairman is a civil servant, the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Defence. The press and broadcasting members select one of their number as chairman of their side of the committee. He acts as their spokesman at meetings of the committee and provides a point of day to day contact for the permanent secretary of the committee (the D Notice secretary), who is normally a retired senior officer from the armed forces.” (See source here) This permanent committee is an example of the subtle shaping of reporting and journalistic opinion through gentlemanly intimacy - and as such requires the monopolisation of the media into the hands of a few powerful press barons who can easily be met with and leaned upon. The D Notices this committee releases are not legally binding on the editors, yet the latter choose to obey them in almost all circumstances. The interests of the major media owners and the rest of the ruling class coincide in all important respects. Thus in most cases direct censorship is unnecessary, clumsy and looks bad, far better instead to rely on shared interests, outlooks and ‘friendship’. This strategy was cynically summed up in a 2014 Parliamentary debate on the future of the BBC’s World Service, in which the decision to hand over control of this radio station to the BBC from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) was defended. Up till now, this radio station was directly controlled by the British state’s foreign office in order to ensure it was used ‘correctly’ to promote the interests of the British ruling class; in defending the loss of this direct control, the parliamentary report was obliged to admit that the FCO is only relinquishing control in order to make the promotion of British ruling class interests more subtle, “The FCO's reluctance to be seen to influence the World Service is understandable, but we believe that it would not be in the interests of the UK for the BBC to lose sight of the priorities of the FCO, which relies upon the World Service as an instrument of 'soft power'. The Chairman of the BBC Trust will meet the Foreign Secretary annually to discuss the performance of the World Service. We asked the Foreign Secretary whether he would "hold the BBC's feet to the fire" in protecting the interests of the World Service, and he replied: "I will always do that". We also note that, although there is no express provision under the new Agreement between the BBC and the Government for quarterly meetings between the FCO and the BBC World Service at Director level, Lord Williams was confident that meetings in future would "probably be as regular as they have been in the past"...We will continue to speak up for the BBC World Service and its role in projecting the values and interests of the UK across the world. We urge the Foreign Secretary to do the same. We are encouraged to hear that frequent contact between the BBC and the FCO is likely to continue. We were pleased to hear the Foreign Secretary say that he would always "hold the BBC's feet to the fire" in protecting the interests of the World Service. We urge him and his successors to honour that commitment.” A general world outlook is forged in the shadowy world in which the powerful move. A very good example is the opaque Bilderberg Group, in which “120–150 political leaders and experts from industry, finance, academia and the media” meet annually and decide what matters in the world. “Most editors of the "establishment" Press in Britain, Europe, and the United States have attended Bilderberg Conferences. Some are even members of the international steering committee which governs Bilderberg. “Included among them are William Rees-Mogg, [former] editor of "The Times", Frank Giles, [former] foreign editor of the "Sunday Times", and Andrew Knight, editor of "The Economist". The biggest newspapers in Europe are represented: Germany - "Die Zeit" (Theo Sommer); France - "La Monde" (Michel Tatu); Italy - "La Stampa" (Carlo Sartori); Denmark - "Berlingske Tidende" (Niels Norlund). “From the United States, Hedley Donovan, Henry Grunwald, and Ralph Davidson of "Time" have attended Bilderberg Conferences. So have Osborn Eliot, former editor of "Newsweek", and Arthur Sulzberger of the "New York Times". Joseph Kraft, James Reston, Joseph Harsch, George Will, and Flora Lewis, prominent political columnists of sound reputation, have all at one time or another participated in the conferences.” We are often given the impression that the press is in constant struggle with the government, always exposing embarrassing scandals and harassing its representatives. But this is an illusion, most of these conflicts are based not on substance but in manufactured superficialities, and the general line of interest of the ruling class is not diverted from nor questioned. An example would be over the current crises in Ukraine and Iraq - government ministers will be ‘harangued’ by BBC or Sky News as to why they’re not intervening more forcefully. Somewhere in the echelons of power, out of all the debates between the movers and shakers of the ruling class, it is decided that the only debate that matters on this issue is whether the UK is intervening with sufficient force. Thus the TV news stations and newspapers focus any government criticism in this way and this way only. In truth “newspapers like The Times or Le Temps speak the truth on all unimportant and inconsequential occasions, so that they can deceive the public with all the requisite authority when necessary” (Leon Trotsky, My Life). Recent British history has furnished no shortage of examples of this, most notably in the conscious manipulation of footage of the Battle of Orgreave in the miners strike, where the BBC reversed the video to give the impression that miners had attacked police officers, the exact opposite of the truth. Where scandals do emerge and secrets are revealed, as is increasingly the case in Britain, this is either a result of unavoidable accident, or is an outcome of the splits and struggles amongst different sections of the ruling class. Veteran American journalist Max Frankel gives a very good account of the cynical and calculated way in which layers of the state manufacture and use secrets in their ongoing struggles for influence, “practically everything that our government does, plans, thinks, hears and even contemplates in the realms of foreign policy is stamped as secret and treated as secret. And then it’s unraveled by that same government, by the Congress and by the press in one continuing round of professional and social contacts and cooperative and competitive exchanges of information. “The governmental, political and personal interests of the participants are inseparable in this process. Presidents make secret decisions, only to reveal them for the purposes of frightening an adversary nation, wooing a friendly electorate, protecting their own reputations. “The military services conduct secret research in weaponry or to reveal it for the purpose of enhancing their budgets. “Appearing superior or inferior to a foreign army. Gaining the vote of a Congressman or the favor of a contractor. “The Navy uses secret information to run down the weaponry of the Air Force. The Army passes on secret information to prove its superiority to the Marine Corps. “High officials of government reveal secrets in the search for support of their policies or to sabotage the plans and policies of a rival department. “Middle range officials of government reveal secrets so as to attract the attention of their superiors or to lobby against the orders of those superiors. “Though not the only vehicle for this traffic in secrets, Congress is always eager to provide a forum, the press is probably the most important. “And in the field of foreign affairs, only rarely does our government give full information to the press for the purpose of simply informing the people. For the most part, the press obtains significant information bearing on foreign policy only because it has managed to make itself a party to confidential materials … transmitting these materials from government to other branches of government as well as to the public at large. “And that’s why the press has been wisely and correctly called the Fourth Branch of Government.” (http://www.thirteen.org/). In a bourgeois society, news and information are traded as commodities, and like all other commodities, the rich and powerful command far greater purchasing power than others. What does and doesn’t emerge as a story or scandal will frequently be a result not of free journalism and investigation but an outcome of cynical horse-trading amongst the powerful. The picture of the truth that we get is in this way distorted and delayed by the competing interests of the powerful. It is interesting to consider how it is decided which news stories are ‘hot’ and from what angle they are to be spun. It cannot escape the notice of a close follower of the news that certain stories tend to dominate the headlines out of proportion with their actual importance, obvious examples being the enormous importance attached to the deaths of westerners over others and the obsession with essentially non-political one-off accidents such as the garbage truck which lost control in Glasgow recently. But not only this. As already mentioned, a clear line or framing of the debate exists across news outlets on all important issues, and serves to circumscribe in advance how the various crises of the capitalist world are thought of. Given the bourgeois press is not one state controlled monopoly but a complex of competing enterprises and journalists, how is this general ‘line’ this arrived at? The starting point for any answer must be the private ownership of the of the media by a few individuals at the centre of capitalism’s power sources, hence their presence on the Bilderberg Group, which in reality is just the best known of many similar secretive clubs. In these clubs and in conversations between leading bourgeois figures a sort of narrative and set of shared goals are worked out. We have to bear in mind that this state of affairs has not suddenly emerged, that there is always an established history and context of certain prejudices, interests and general outlook amongst the ruling class which has developed over the centuries. All bourgeois individuals have grown up in a society already dominated by these tried-and-tested ideas, and they find them to be more-or-less useful in expressing their interests. Those new ideas which help express any new needs and interests of the ruling class will be voiced by this class’ more prescient thinkers, and will stick precisely because they are useful. Evidently the vast majority of articles and news items are however neither written nor edited directly by the likes of Rupert Murdoch. The transmission belt for bourgeois ideology into society is the struggle for careers and influence amongst the middle-class, especially its upper layers. Taking capitalism for granted, middle-class careerists seeking to climb the media’s greasy pole cannot afford to question, at least not openly, the terms under which this struggle for influence is conducted - i.e. the ownership and domination of the media by the big bourgeoisie. Self-interest is an extremely sensitive instrument, and the ambitious journalist can quite easily pick up on the prejudices, egos and interests that he or she needs to massage in order to get along, or at the very least, the issues and points of view that must be avoided. To pick just one example, in 2001 Sam Kiley resigned as The Times’ Middle East correspondent, after which he reported to the Guardian that “Rupert Murdoch's influence over editorial policy at his most prestigious British title, the Times, is so great that journalists are censored by executives frightened of offending their proprietor … “Mr Murdoch's friendship with Ariel Sharon, Israel's prime minister, and Mr Murdoch's extensive Israeli investments led executives to extensively rewrite copy. "Middle managers flew into a hysterical terror every time a pro-Israeli lobbying group wrote in with a quibble or complaint, and then usually took their side against their own correspondent," he wrote. Mr Kiley wrote that he was asked not to describe the killing of Israel's opponents as "assassination", and was directed to use less emotive phrases such as "targeted killing" instead.” All journalists and editors are constantly and acutely aware that their freedom to write and to edit depends entirely on the all-pervasive power of the owner to relieve them of their duties as and when they wish, and as a result self-censorship is routine and unquantifiable. Of course in all this nobody’s freedom of expression has in any way been violated, and the surface appearance gives the impression of a ‘free society’. But behind the scenes real power is exerted through the subtle and hidden threat of joblessness hanging over all journalists should they express themselves a little too freely. Additionally, an even more subtle control on what is said is derived from the class background and outlook of most journalists. Even when writing ‘freely’, the middle or even upper class background of leading journalists colours their worldview and causes them to prioritise certain stories and interpret others in certain ways. Under the control of media moguls, the press is subordinated to the dual needs of profit making and ideological indoctrination. Advertisers want papers to be sensationalist, superficial and eye-catching, and insofar as the owner uses the press to further their political agenda, superficial sensationalism is directed to support this agenda. Sometimes, these dual imperatives conflict, and the media is obliged to report on existing stories that may to some extent harm the interests of the owners, however a suitable spin on and limit to such stories is quickly found. But often these dual imperatives of profit making and agenda pushing coincide, which is not coincidental - dissenting views usually require more explanation, more factual proof and more thought and as such anything which ‘goes against the stream’ tends to be a harder sell as well. An unusually clear proof of the screening out of ‘difficult’ stories has come to light in the last 24 hours. Peter Oborne, the highly respected journalist known for breaking the MPs’ expenses scandal, resigned from his post as chief political commentator for the Daily Telegraph this month in protest at the newspaper’s systematic suppression of any news which may harm the interests of its powerful advertisers, in other words it ‘voluntarily’ censored itself and did violence to ‘free speech’ in a subtle manner that is surely routine throughout the British press. His resignation letter is worth quoting at length, “Late last year I set to work on a story about the international banking giant HSBC. Well-known British Muslims had received letters out of the blue from HSBC informing them that their accounts had been closed. No reason was given, and it was made plain that there was no possibility of appeal. "It’s like having your water cut off," one victim told me. “When I submitted it for publication on the Telegraph website, I was at first told there would be no problem. When it was not published I made enquiries. I was fobbed off with excuses, then told there was a legal problem. When I asked the legal department, the lawyers were unaware of any difficulty. When I pushed the point, an executive took me aside and said that "there is a bit of an issue" with HSBC. “I researched the newspaper’s coverage of HSBC. I learnt that Harry Wilson, the admirable banking correspondent of the Telegraph, had published an online story about HSBC based on a report from a Hong Kong analyst who had claimed there was a ‘black hole’ in the HSBC accounts. This story was swiftly removed from the Telegraph website, even though there were no legal problems. “Then, on 4 November 2014, a number of papers reported a blow to HSBC profits as the bank set aside more than £1 billion for customer compensation and an investigation into the rigging of currency markets. This story was the city splash in the Times, Guardian and Mail, making a page lead in the Independent. I inspected the Telegraph coverage. It generated five paragraphs in total on page 5 of the business section. “The reporting of HSBC is part of a wider problem. On 10 May last year the Telegraph ran a long feature on Cunard’s Queen Mary II liner on the news review page. This episode looked to many like a plug for an advertiser on a page normally dedicated to serious news analysis. I again checked and certainly Telegraph competitors did not view Cunard’s liner as a major news story. Cunard is an important Telegraph advertiser. “The Tesco false accounting story on 23 September was covered only in the business section. By contrast it was the splash, inside spread and leader in the Mail. Not that the Telegraph is short of Tesco coverage. Tesco pledging £10m to fight cancer, an inside peak at Tesco’s £35m jet and ‘Meet the cat that has lived in Tesco for 4 years’ were all deemed newsworthy. “From the start of 2013 onwards stories critical of HSBC were discouraged. HSBC suspended its advertising with the Telegraph. Its account, I have been told by an extremely well informed insider, was extremely valuable. HSBC, as one former Telegraph executive told me, is “the advertiser you literally cannot afford to offend”. “Executives say that Murdoch MacLennan [chief executive of the Telegraph] was determined not to allow any criticism of the international bank. “He would express concern about headlines even on minor stories,” says one former Telegraph journalist. “Anything that mentioned money-laundering was just banned, even though the bank was on a final warning from the US authorities. This interference was happening on an industrial scale. “The Telegraph’s recent coverage of HSBC amounts to a form of fraud on its readers. It has been placing what it perceives to be the interests of a major international bank above its duty to bring the news to Telegraph readers. “A free press is essential to a healthy democracy. There is a purpose to journalism, and it is not just to entertain. It is not to pander to political power, big corporations and rich men. Newspapers have what amounts in the end to a constitutional duty to tell their readers the truth. “It is not only the Telegraph that is at fault here. The past few years have seen the rise of shadowy executives who determine what truths can and what truths can’t be conveyed across the mainstream media. The criminality of News International newspapers during the phone hacking years was a particularly grotesque example of this wholly malign phenomenon." Murdoch McLennan’s apparent anxiety and complete intolerance even for negative coverage of HSBC in minor articles reminds us more of a state-censor in a totalitarian regime, examining reports with a microscope should any hint of the truth have sneaked through. True, this censorship is not total, but just in one newspaper, and Peter Oborne has been free to expose this scandal elsewhere - at the cost of his job. But it reveals the subtle, hidden and constant way in which the powerful manipulate the news all without the formal restriction to anybody’s ‘free speech’ rights. Peter Oborne can say these things (on a relatively obscure website) thanks to his relative prestige as a journalist. Thousands of other journalists lack that luxury. Stories such as this should not be confused as examples of our freedom of speech, but rather of the bourgeoisie's inability to control its own failing system. Nevertheless we must not draw pessimistic and cynical conclusions about the propagandistic power of the press. It is both to the credit of the working class, and a proof of the unfree, distorted character of the media, that in spite of the systematic suppression of such beliefs in the media, big majorities in Britain support the renationalisation of the railways, utilities and banking system and believe that our society is far too unequal and dominated by big business. In the US, for decades a huge proportion of society, at times even a majority, has favoured what is called a ‘single payer healthcare system’ - in other words, a nationalised healthcare system free at the point of use. All this despite it finding no echo or promotion whatsoever in the media. In Europe the popular conception of the US population regarding its healthcare is that the American masses do not know what is good for them and foolishly oppose free healthcare, but this is completely false. But the fact that the US media utterly fails to reflect this, that in no mass media outlet does this popular opinion on a crucial issue get expressed, reveals just how unfree the press is under capitalism. Examples of these distortions can be multiplied at will. As I write these lines three muslims have been murdered in America for racist reasons (no doubt fostered by the media’s obsession with fear-mongering regarding Islam), and yet this is described in the media as a simple murder - one only has to ask how the murder of three white christians by a muslim would be presented in the media to know the answer and see the injustice. Actually, only a tiny minority of terrorist attacks and murders in the West are carried out by muslims, and yet the media systematically gives the impression that ‘all terrorists are muslims’. There is a level of bias in the media that is so huge and systematic as to be equivalent to conscious propaganda. In Britain clear majorities have opposed, for decades, privatisation of the utilities, the railways and Royal Mail, and want to see much higher taxes on the rich to fund social programmes to alleviate inequality, and yet at no point in the past twenty years have any of these mass opinions been expressed by either the media or any mainstream party. This reveals that we do not live in a free or democratic society, but one dominated and controlled by the tiny minority of super rich. The effects of this process are to narrow and to trivialise our culture. The more unequal our society gets, the harder it is for young people to afford rent and find venues and spaces in which to express themselves, the more commercialised and controlled our cultural output has become. There is a process taking place across the Western world of gentrification which is constantly being remarked upon. It is widely known that this is pricing out working class youth from the cities in which they grew up and is narrowing our cities’ culture. It is common to hear frustrated complaints about endless fancy coffee bars and cupcake bakers catering to the moneyed minority. An important part of this process is the systematic closing down of independent music venues. "The frequency with which smaller venues are closing is scary," said Krissi Murison, editor of the music magazine NME to The Guardian. To pick a few examples in London from just the past few months - Madame Jo Jos, the famous indie club in Soho, has been shut down because its bouncers were involved in a fight - but really so that Westminster Council can get expensive flats built on the site. The Joiners Arms, one of the most popular and important gay clubs in London, has just closed, again for upmarket flat developments. The Horse Hospital, an independent set of studios for artists and a venue for screening films, is about to be closed because property prices and rent are too high. The Horse Hospital has released the following statement which says infinitely more about the reality of ‘free expression’ in our society than all the saccharine celebrations of it we read in the pages of the mainstream press, “London is devolving rapidly into a culturally bereft corporate wasteland. It is being systematically cleansed of its cultural vitality, diversity and energy. ... “People, institutions and future potentials are being priced out of this city which soon will only have a homogenous, thin layer of sanctioned and carefully monitored culture as its defining engine, this spells disaster for everyone. Transformation of all kinds relies on the possibility for the most coherent and powerful radical ideas to become tradition, without room for those ideas to even have a chance to be played out, what hope is there? “We will continue our fight to stay here, we believe in this, however symbolic it may be.” With each passing year the music industry narrows further and further. There are now only 3 major record labels in existence, and two recent studies have demonstrated that mainstream music has become blander and more predictable than ever before - scientists at the University of Bristol have developed software capable of predicting a given song’s success with 60% accuracy. Not only did their algorithm manage to prove that pop music has been getting louder and louder (probably to compensation for its contrived character), but also that, since the early 2000s, pop music has become more and more conservative and predictable, such that the software was able to more accurately predict the success of songs from this period. The Spanish National Research Council found the same phenomenon with different software. Its analysis of the chords, melodies and types of sound revealed "evidence of a progressive homogenization of the musical discourse...In particular, we obtained numerical indicators that the diversity of transitions between note combinations - roughly speaking chords plus melodies - has consistently diminished in the last 50 years" (Reuters). Major music labels have been exploiting the creative talents of musicians for generations. The history of pop music can be seen as a graveyard for artists ripped off by the bureaucrats of the major labels. Garry Shider,s the legendary guitarist of Parliament-Funkadelic, whose songs sold millions upon millions, was entered into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1997. And yet, despite writing this hugely successful music, he could not afford his medical bills and so a special fund had to be created to pay the bills, but he died before sufficient money had been raised. Sly Stone is another hugely successful and internationally famous funk musician. His manager took advantage of his vulnerability from drug abuse to convince him to sign over all his royalties to a company he chose, which amounted to stealing his fortune. As a result, Sly has been reduced to having to live in a van! These two examples are from highly successful musicians; the position is far worse for the countless thousands of struggling underground musicians. The rise of internet streaming as a medium for music has significantly worsened the hand of small musicians, because internet giants like Pandora, Spotify and Google Music can lean upon their extraordinarily back catalogue of decades of popular music to crush new musicians. The internet makes all music immediately available, and in the face of that, any one artist’s output is insignificant, so why pay them fairly? Pandora thus feels confident enough to propose The Internet Radio Fairness Act, or IRFA, which would “cut musicians’ pay by 85 percent—reducing Pandora’s royalty costs from 50 per cent to 10 per cent.” “According to the Huffington Post: “In the third quarter of last year, Blake Morgan’s songs were played on Pandora some 27,900 times. But the New York-based recording artist and label owner said he made only $1.62 from the popular internet radio service.”” (quoted from Joel Ang) Vast media monopolies use their power, and the respective desperation of musicians and other artists, to buy up the copyrights to all kinds of acts of creation - novels, screenplays, albums etc. They can do this because the independent artists do not feel they can make it in the global market on their own - just using your copyright to prevent your work being stolen or plagiarised costs a huge amount in legal fees, thus they feel the need to sign up with those with the influence and financial muscle to do so. But once these rights are signed away, the owners can do what they want with them. They essentially pirate - legally - from the actual artists. Again, no one’s democratic rights are formally violated in this process, but in practice, millions of artists are bullied out of their own copyrights and have their own labour’s of love transformed into someone else’s property. This is another reason why monopolies such as Sony, far from needing our support in the fight for free speech, are the enemies of free speech, for they have hoarded millions of copyrights to control, inhibit and manipulate our society’s artistic output. If anyone doubts the ferocity with which copyright laws, which exclude society from the use and exchange of its own intellectual products, are enforced, they need look no further than the tragic case of Aaron Swartz, a ‘hacktivist’ so appalled at the way in which universities and academic publishers profit from hoarding knowledge against those who create it, he simply hacked into JSTOR and downloaded its vast database of academic papers. Instead of using this to make a personal profit, he simply took advantage of the internet’s incredible potential for socialising all human knowledge for the benefit of humanity by making this database free to download. Rather than incur a fine or a banning from academia, Aaron was hounded by the very highest level, the federal prosecutor, and was most likely to face a $1m and 35 years in jail! Confronted with this appalling situation, Aaron took his own life in 2013. He is rightly regarded as a hero and progressive in the ‘hacker’ community, not interested in stealing for personal gain but for humanity’s. The truth is that Aaron Swartz was a fighter for real free speech and was persecuted to the point of suicide for being just that. In our society, there is no true freedom of speech, for it is a freedom only for those who command massive resources. Freedom in the lives of the majority is fleeting, illusory and a cruel irony - the freedom to consume what media the capitalists have deemed important or profitable, and the freedom to be exploited, whether as industrial workers, journalists or struggling musicians. A lucky few break through the tiny cracks in the system and these are held up as ‘proof’ of the freedom of the majority. It follows that the only way to create a truly free society, one in which the majority have equal access to the facilities of the media and in which culture is produced for the sake of genuine human expression, whatever form that may take, is to treat all these facilities - newspapers, TV stations, websites, music venues and the education system - as social goods freely available to all and under the democratic control of the masses. But not only that. The enormous power of the ruling class stems primarily not from its ownership of the airwaves, but its control over production in general. The long working hours, the general condition of relying on the capitalists for employment so that we may live, and all the social insecurity this creates, inhibits our creativity and confidence, it impoverishes us literally and spiritually. In these conditions, there can be no talk of real freedom of expression. The expropriation of the media empires under democratic workers control as part of a general plan of production to meet social need - that is the demand of those who fight for real freedom of expression!
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#### Rejecting commodification of knowledge creates a democratic university system. This also answers this perm - Protests misfocused and allowed for the infiltration of neolib Aronowitz and Giroux 2000

Aronowitz, Stanley, and Henry A. Giroux. "The corporate university and the politics of education." The Educational Forum. Vol. 64. No. 4. Taylor & Francis Group, 2000.

Neither the discourse nor the practices¶ of critical learning are abroad in public¶ higher education, except as the rear-guard¶ protests of an exhausted faculty and a fragment¶ of the largely demobilized student¶ body. Furthermore, as recent changes at the¶ University of Chicago attest, leading private¶ schools are under pressure to dilute¶ their offerings.Blind sided by the rebellions¶ of the 1960s, many educators went along¶ with student demands for ending requirements¶ and ended up with the marketplace¶ in which demand-driven criteria' determined¶ curricular choices . In other words,¶ neoliberalism entered the academ y through¶ the back door of student protest. For progressive¶ educators, however, the task remains¶ unchanged. Rather than accept the¶ flaccid "breadth" requirements of many¶ universities that claim to offer a core, these¶ ed u cators must demand a rigorous and¶ coherent core curriculum in which the history¶ and di versity of Western and Eastern¶ know ledge are critically examined. This¶ demand is not a call to revive the Great¶ Book s for the top 20 universities, as suggested¶ by conservative Alan Bloom (1987),¶ but to propose that all students, especially¶ in th eir first two years, study science, literature,¶ and philosophy in global historical¶ contexts regardless of their institution's¶ position in the hierarchy. As a requisite of¶ any postsecondary credential, this demand¶ is today a radical act. Profit making does¶ not de fine the meaning of democracy, nor¶ should the laws of the market define the¶ essence of higher education. For higher¶ education to capitulate to the "market"-¶ which arguably wants something else because¶ it is in a panic about an uncertain¶ future-means that training replaces education¶ and that surrendering the idea of¶ higher education as a public good is a necessity.¶ A democratic-as opposed to a¶ commodified--education would acknowledge¶ that public institutions, largely paid¶ for by working- and middle-class people,¶ should promote critical thinking, explore¶ the current meaning of citizenship, and relentlessly¶ pursue democratic appropriation¶ of both Western and Subaltern (marginal)¶ tr aditions with bold skepticism.¶ Perhaps it is too early to propose that¶ public hi gher education be thoroughly¶ decommodified, that all costs be paid by a¶ tax system that must be made progressive¶ again. Perhaps the battle cry that, at least¶ in the first two years, only science, math,¶ philosophy, literature, and history (understood¶ in the context of social th eory) be¶ taught and learned, confining academic¶ and vocational specializations to the last¶ two years, is too controversial, even among¶ critics of current trends.If higher education¶ is truly to become a public good in the¶ double meaning of the term-as a¶ decommodified resource for the people and¶ as an ethically legitimate institution that¶ does not submi t to the business im perative-then¶ we must move beyond mere¶ acce ss. We must promote a national debate¶ about what is to be taught and learned if¶ citizenship and critical thought are to remain,¶ even at the level of intention, at the¶ heart of higher learning.
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#### The alternative is a relentless class-based politics that works against the university’s economic underpinnings – only engaging in a critique that focuses on the economic forces at play in public universities can we resolve capitalism. Oparah 14

Oparah, Julia. [Professor and Chair of Ethnic Studies at Mills College and a founding member of Black Women Birthing Justice] "Challenging Complicity: The Neoliberal University and the Prison–Industrial Complex." The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent (2014).

¶ In my earlier work on the academic-prison-industrial complex, I suggested that activist scholars were producing and disseminating countercarceral knowledge by bringing academic research into alignment with the needs of social movements and interrogating and reorganizing relationships between prisoners and researchers in the free world.50 Given the history of epistemic and physical violence and exploitation of research subjects by the academy, such a reorganizing of relationships and accountabilities is clearly urgently needed. Yet no matter how radical and participatory our scholarship is, we ultimately fail to dismantle the academic-military-prison-industrial com- plex (academic-MPIC) if we address it only through the production of more knowledge. Since knowledge is a commodity, marketed through books, arti- cles, and conferences as well as patents and government contracts, the pro- duction of “better,” more progressive or countercarceral knowledge can also be co-opted and put to work by the academic-MPIC.¶ An abolitionist lens provides a helpful framework here. Antiprison schol- ars and activists have embraced the concept of abolition in order to draw attention to the unfinished liberation legislated by the Thirteenth Amend- ment, which abolished slavery “except as a punishment for a crime.”51 Aboli- tionists do not seek primarily to reform prisons or to improve conditions for prisoners; instead they argue that only by abolishing imprisonment will we free up the resources and imagine the possibility of more effective and less violent strategies to deal with the social problems signaled by harmful acts. While early abolitionists referred to themselves as prison abolitionists, more recently there has been a shift to prison-industrial complex abolitionism to expand the analysis of the movement to incorporate other carceral spaces— from immigrant detention centers to psychiatric hospitals—and to empha- size the role of other actors, including the police and courts, politicians, corporations, the media, and the military, in sustaining mass incarceration.52¶ How does an abolitionist lens assist us in assessing responses to the academic-MPIC? First, it draws our attention to the economic basis of the academic-MPIC and pushes us to attack the materiality of the militari- zation and prisonization of academia rather than limiting our interventions to the realm of ideas. This means that we must challenge the corporatization of our universities and colleges and question what influences and account- abilities are being introduced by our increasing collaboration with neoliberal global capital. It also means that we must dismantle those complicities and liberate the academy from its role as handmaiden to neoliberal globaliza- tion, militarism, and empire. In practice, this means interrogating our uni- versities’ and colleges’ investment decisions, demanding they divest from the military, security, and prison industries; distance themselves from military occupations in Southwest Asia and the Middle East; and invest instead in community-led sustainable economic development. It means facing allega- tions of disloyalty to our employers or alma maters as we blow the whistle on unethical investments and the creeping encroachment of corporate fund- ing, practices, and priorities. It means standing up for a vision of the liberal arts that neither slavishly serves the interests of the new global order nor returns to its elitist origins but instead is deeply embedded in progressive movements and richly informed by collaborations with insurgent and activ- ist spaces. And it means facing the challenges that arise when our divest- ment from empire has real impact on the bottom line of our university and college budgets.

### Scholarship -> Material effects

### Cost Benefit Analysis Flawed

### Theory Offense

### Discourse First

### K prior (ontology and epist.)

political of his career.16
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### A2 Alt Right Backlash

#### Neolib is the root cause – the Alt right has capitalized on neoliberalism’s systematic inequality. Only a leftist movement that targets economic injustice can solve. Norton 16

Ben Norton is a politics reporter and staff writer at Salon http://www.salon.com/2016/07/01/how\_neoliberalism\_fuels\_the\_racist\_xenophobia\_behind\_brexit\_and\_donald\_trump/FRIDAY, JUL 1, 2016

“If you’ve got money, you vote in,” a Brexit supporter told The Guardian’s John Harris. “If you haven’t got money, you vote out.”¶ Harris traveled through economically depressed rural areas of the U.K., interviewing working-class voters, many of whom formerly voted Labour, but were turned off by its embrace of pro-corporate neoliberal policies under former Prime Minister Tony Blair, and now vote UKIP.¶ “This is about so much more than the European Union. It is about class, and inequality, and a politics now so professionalised that it has left most people staring at the rituals of Westminster [the site of the U.K. Parliament] with a mixture of anger and bafflement,” he explained.¶ Person after person told Harris the same thing: They were voting out, and not just because of immigration, but because of outsourcing, a diminishing standard of living, unemployment, dwindling social services and more.¶ The Guardian created incredibly insightful short documentaries featuring interviews with working-class supporters of Brexit and Trump: “Most of all,” Harris wrote, “Brexit is the consequence of the economic bargain struck in the early 1980s, whereby we waved goodbye to the security and certainties of the postwar settlement, and were given instead an economic model that has just about served the most populous parts of the country, while leaving too much of the rest to anxiously decline.”¶ That economic bargain struck in the 1980s was neoliberalism. The Cold War was coming to an end, the Soviet Union was on the verge of implosion and Deng Xiaoping had put China on the path toward capitalist restoration.¶ During the Cold War, Western capitalist societies had to provide some degree of social services for their populations, in order to compete against socialist alternatives. With capitalism’s victory, this was no longer necessary.¶ British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, the mother of neoliberalism, famously declared, “There is no alternative.” American President Ronald Reagan, its father, soon followed. The welfare state was whittled back and neoliberalism took hold. After Reagan, the “New Democrat” followed: President Bill Clinton wholeheartedly embraced privatization, eagerly gutting welfare and signing NAFTA, leading us to where we are today.¶ Leftist critiques¶ The strategy being pursued by figures like Brexit advocates and Trump is by no means new. It is a fascistic approach, a far-right (or what some today call “alt-right“) response to leftist critiques like those raised by figures like Bernie Sanders.¶ Sanders, a self-declared democratic socialist, recognizes that immigration is not the cause of the nation’s — and world’s — economic problems. Rather, the real problem is the capitalist system, which inevitably, by virtue of how it is constructed, benefits what Sanders calls the billionaire class — the 1 percent, the corporate elite, the bourgeoisie — at the expense of workers, who are exploited and do not benefit from the product of their labor.¶ By embracing this capitalist system in its purest form — that is, neoliberalism — mainstream left-wing parties in Europe, the U.S. and throughout the world have effectively told voters that Thatcher was correct: There is no alternative. Seeing its chance, the far-right has jumped in and posed its own alternative — a fascistic one.¶ There are signs that average citizens are pushing back against this bipartisan neoliberal consensus and demanding a socialist alternative in lieu of the far-right one. In the U.K., Jeremy Corbyn, a longtime, principled socialist, was elected leader of the Labour Party. In the U.S., Sanders ran an enormous grassroots campaign that took the country by storm.¶ But Sanders was defeated by his Wall Street-backed opponent, Hillary Clinton. And the neoliberal Blairite wing of the Labour Party is trying desperately to oust Corbyn from power, just as the neoliberal, Clinton-dominated Democratic Party has aggressively fought Sanders and his supporters.¶ Sanders himself understands exactly what is going on. He warned the Democratic Party in an op-ed in The New York Times mere days after the Brexit vote that, unless it changes its ways and abandons its neoliberal policies, it will face the same far-right defeat seen in the U.K. “Surprise, surprise. Workers in Britain, many of whom have seen a decline in their standard of living while the very rich in their country have become much richer, have turned their backs on the European Union and a globalized economy that is failing them and their children,” Sanders wrote passionately.¶ “Millions of American voters, like the Leave supporters, are understandably angry and frustrated by the economic forces that are destroying the middle class,” he added. To avert this threat, Sanders said, “We must create national and global economies that work for all, not just a handful of billionaires.”¶ Socialists like Corbyn and Sanders recognize that, while the British and American governments continue to implement austerity policies and cut spending on social services, right-wing politicians and pundits can distract from their own actions and instead tell voters to worry about migrants.¶ Liberal politicians, journalists and pundits, meanwhile, appear largely unable to grasp what is happening.¶ Missing the point¶ Vox’s Zack Beauchamp asserted boldly, “Brexit was fueled by irrational xenophobia, not real economic grievances,” completely dismissing economic explanations for the vote.¶ In his piece, Beauchamp makes a misleading elision. He argues, and adeptly at that, that the supposedly adverse economic effects of immigration on the British economy were exaggerated by the pro-Leave campaign — which they certainly were. But then Beauchamp makes an ideological leap and concludes that this proves the vote had nothing to do with economics.¶ Vox points to numerous studies and charts to explain why British voters are being “irrational.” If only working-class people who are struggling to make ends meet would peruse scientific journals, then they would understand!¶ This perspective utterly and completely misses the point. It is not that average Britons don’t have real economic grievances. On the contrary, far-right political forces have scapegoated immigrants for those real economic grievances. Of course, this scapegoating of immigrants is irrational, but it is a demagogic political tactic — it is not supposed to be rational; it is only supposed to be effective.¶ Beauchamp later acknowledges that “British hostility to immigrants long proceeds the recent spate of mass immigration.” Compared to other countries, particularly Germany, Britain has not taken many refugees and migrants. If Brexit is solely about racism and the U.K. has been racist for centuries (which it certainly has been), then why didn’t Britain leave before?¶ Because the economic crisis in the U.K. continues.¶ Child poverty in the U.K. has risen by 200,000 children over the past year. A staggering 29 percent of British children live in poverty. And experts warn that child poverty continues to grow.¶ At the same moment, instead of trying to tackle the growing poverty rate, the British government passed legislation that scraps its target to reduce child poverty.¶ Moreover, nearly 4 million British children are in families that are struggling to make ends meet, and two-thirds of these families have at least one adult in work. That is to say, poverty is a serious problem among people who are employed, not just the unemployed.¶ Today, at least 10 million people in the U.K. live in poverty — an increase of half a million since the previous year. Matthew Reed, head of Children’s Society, called the figures “truly dreadful.”¶ “The Government was repeatedly warned of the likely consequences of reducing support for the poorest people in the country and now we can see the results,” Reed added.¶ In the absence of a leftist alternative, all of this only fuels far-right politics.¶ The neo-fascist threat¶ Liberals smugly blaming the Brexit vote on stupidity, making fun of working-class Leave supporters for (falsely) googling E.U. after the fact and actively downplaying the serious economic concerns behind the vote only further plays into right-wing hatred of elites.¶ It also conveniently absolves establishment liberals of responsibility for supporting policies that fueled the rise of the far-right.¶ We live in an incredibly dangerous moment. It is not hyperbolic to say Europe is going through political changes similar to those of the post-Depression 1930s, when fascism was on the rise for the first time.¶ Brexit is a big victory for neo-fascist forces throughout the West — actual neo-fascist parties and politicians. And there is no sign that the far-right will decline anytime soon.¶ Demagogues like Trump in the U.S., or Marine Le Pen in France, or Geert Wilders in the Netherlands, may lose the upcoming election, but there will be many more elections after that, and the far-right will only continue to gain strength — unless it faces a real challenge.¶ A leftist resistance must assert itself in opposition to these growing forces of reaction. The enormous popularity of Corbyn, Sanders and others shows how millions of average people recognize that the system is not working for them, and they want a socialist alternative.¶ Yet a critical obstacle is in place: Mainstream, centrist parties like the Labour Party in the U.K. or the Democratic Party in the U.S. are actively cannibalizing themselves, viciously attacking any leftists who criticize their neoliberal leadership.¶ In the process, they are only pouring more fuel onto the fascist fire — a fire that will burn all of us, and the world.

#### Not reverse causal – reversing speech codes won’t affect the alt right. Johnson 11/22

Adam Johnson[contributing analyst for FAIR.org.] November 22, 2016 https://qz.com/842675/donald-trump-did-not-beat-hillary-clinton-because-of-identity-politics/

There’s only one problem: There isn’t really any evidence provided. No studies proffered, no exit poll dissecting, no empirical basis for this conclusion at all. It’s just a vague feeling, something that seems true. There’s a supposed problem—an excess of political correctness and identity politics—but it’s not connected to the topic at hand: the election of Donald J. Trump.¶ But let’s be generous. Even if, for the sake of argument, one accepts the premise that “political correctness” fueled Trump’s success, what’s missing from the conversation is that few people—the above pundits not excepted—derive their ideas of political correctness from first-hand experiences.¶ Often the perception of “political correctness” is heavily filtered through Fox News and right-wing radio’s cartoon version of it. Day in and day out, center and center-right outlets highlight and distort the most obscure excesses, typically on college campuses, to feed a narrative to its audience that white men are under siege by conspiratorial liberal forces. But the majority of Trump’s supporters haven’t been to college in decades, nor are they interfacing first-hand with these academic enclaves; rather, they’re presented with anecdotes on television and a bustling market of anti-liberal films that stoke a vision of a dystopian PC police state.¶ To this extent, liberals couldn’t really dial down the “identity politics” in an effort to assuage white conservatives even if they wanted to; the Murdochian echo chamber will just move the goalposts and cherry-pick new outrages. Centrists and liberals accepting the premise of out-of-control political correctness as something that can be dialed down have done all of the heavy-lifting for the right wing—and, increasingly, white supremacist forces—without critically analyzing whether the average voter’s perception of “safe spaces” and “thought-policing” is at all connected to objective reality.¶ Same with immigration, terrorism, and a whole host of right-wing soft spots: They are serious issues, to an extent, but they are racialized and then magnified a thousandfold by a partisan media machine that feeds off and profits greatly from white grievance.¶ A lack of sufficient economic populism on Clinton’s part is a reasonable critique, and one some of these pundits are perhaps hinting at. But absence of populism isn’t evidence that “identity politics” is to blame; it’s evidence that Clinton’s economic outlook is centrist, and would be regardless of whether she said “black lives matter” or targeted messages to the LGBTQ community.¶ Every one of the above pundits who is blaming identity politics and political correctness for Trump, it can’t be stressed enough, hated identity politics to begin with, and would have regardless of who won. They’re jamming a long-held dislike into a topical and convenient narrative—an act that could be dismissed as cynical self-flattery if it wasn’t, in the face of an upsurge of reactionary politics, also helping provide ideological cover for racists and demagogues.

#### The opposite is true – anti-PC is a free pass to say whatever you want which enables Trump’s victory and shuts down debate. Weigel 11/30

Moira Weigel [a writer and academic. Her book Labor of Love: The Invention of Dating is published on 17 May.] <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/30/political-correctness-how-the-right-invented-phantom-enemy-donald-trump> Wednesday 30 November 2016

This willingness to be more outrageous than any previous candidate ensured non-stop media coverage, which in turn helped Trump attract supporters who agreed with what he was saying. We should not underestimate how many Trump supporters held views that were sexist, racist, xenophobic and Islamophobic, and were thrilled to feel that he had given them permission to say so. It’s an old trick: the powerful encourage the less powerful to vent their rage against those who might have been their allies, and to delude themselves into thinking that they have been liberated. It costs the powerful nothing; it pays frightful dividends.¶ Trump drew upon a classic element of anti-political-correctness by implying that while his opponents were operating according to a political agenda, he simply wanted to do what was sensible. He made numerous controversial policy proposals: deporting millions of undocumented immigrants, banning Muslims from entering the US, introducing stop-and-frisk policies that have been ruled unconstitutional. But by responding to critics with the accusation that they were simply being politically correct, Trump attempted to place these proposals beyond the realm of politics altogether. Something political is something that reasonable people might disagree about. By using the adjective as a put-down, Trump pretended that he was acting on truths so obvious that they lay beyond dispute. “That’s just common sense.”¶ The most alarming part of this approach is what it implies about Trump’s attitude to politics more broadly. His contempt for political correctness looks a lot like contempt for politics itself. He does not talk about diplomacy; he talks about “deals”. Debate and disagreement are central to politics, yet Trump has made clear that he has no time for these distractions. To play the anti-political-correctness card in response to a legitimate question about policy is to shut down discussion in much the same way that opponents of political correctness have long accused liberals and leftists of doing. It is a way of sidestepping debate by declaring that the topic is so trivial or so contrary to common sense that it is pointless to discuss it. The impulse is authoritarian. And by presenting himself as the champion of common sense, Trump gives himself permission to bypass politics altogether.¶ Now that he is president-elect, it is unclear whether Trump meant many of the things he said during his campaign. But, so far, he is fulfilling his pledge to fight political correctness. Last week, he told the New York Times that he was trying to build an administration filled with the “best people”, though “Not necessarily people that will be the most politically correct people, because that hasn’t been working.”¶ Trump has also continued to cry PC in response to criticism. When an interviewer from Politico asked a Trump transition team member why Trump was appointing so many lobbyists and political insiders, despite having pledged to “drain the swamp” of them, the source said that “one of the most refreshing parts of … the whole Trump style is that he does not care about political correctness.” Apparently it would have been politically correct to hold him to his campaign promises.¶ As Trump prepares to enter the White House, many pundits have concluded that “political correctness” fuelled the populist backlash sweeping Europe and the US. The leaders of that backlash may say so. But the truth is the opposite: those leaders understood the power that anti-political-correctness has to rally a class of voters, largely white, who are disaffected with the status quo and resentful of shifting cultural and social norms. They were not reacting to the tyranny of political correctness, nor were they returning America to a previous phase of its history. They were not taking anything back. They were wielding anti-political-correctness as a weapon, using it to forge a new political landscape and a frightening future.¶ The opponents of political correctness always said they were crusaders against authoritarianism. In fact, anti-PC has paved the way for the populist authoritarianism now spreading everywhere. Trump is anti-political correctness gone mad.¶

### A2 Speech Challenges Institutions

#### 1. The real battles won’t be won by liberal civility – when it counts the admin will crack down no matter what. Clover 15

Joshua Clover [professor at the University of California, Davis, where he writes about poetry and economic crisis.] <https://www.thenation.com/article/speechbros-concern-trolls-and-the-free-speech-fraud/> DECEMBER 17, 2015

That work is already being done, not in theory but in practice. The events on campus this fall have cascaded from Missouri to Yale, and then across the country. Each incident has its own particulars, but the repetition testifies that this is something structural—something beyond a callous president here, some supposedly coddled students there. The political trajectory was launched by the murders of Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown and the riots that followed, increasingly branded as #BlackLivesMatter. The movement has landed on over 20 quads, with more to come—the anger over ceaseless racial threat entwining with the recognition of campus as one more zone of unfreedom. The contemporary university is increasingly a financial concern with some classrooms attached. Its austerity programs are enacted unevenly on different populations, requiring ever more aggressive enforcement, both physical and ideological. This has included defending something like the right to racism itself, under the aegis of “free speech.” The response has been a distributed and ongoing event we might call the campus race riot, the double riot simplified into one.¶ This outcome of complex and long-­developing events has been zealously misnamed the “free-speech wars.” It is nothing of the sort. It’s a struggle against a long-standing commitment to racial violence—a struggle in which shouting “Free speech!” is a move that one side likes. That side likes to pretend it is not a side, that it simply wants to maintain abstract principles assuring the fairness of all future fights. That side has cops.¶ It also has useful allies in the form of liberal “concern trolls.” I just want to help you, says the troll, and I am very worried that if you continue with your shortsighted ways and do not comply with the precepts of the social order, you will never be able to change the social order. The concern troll’s argument, more concretely, is that students or whoever will need those free-speech rights later for some more significant fight. They say further that everybody loves free speech in principle; if you forsake it, you forsake popular support. There are several holes in this argument. It ignores the historically volatile category of what counts as protected speech, rather than seeing these recent struggles as direct challenges to the current definition (after Citizens United, we might suggest that the current legalisms around speech are not worth preserving). It ignores that “winning people over” isn’t always the expedient political course but often a means of pacification, a demand for respectability politics above all. It ignores that people stand in historically unequal relation to speech itself. The reason it’s not hateful to dress up for Halloween as a white dude, with a stupid haircut and mayonnaise dripping from your maw and a T-shirt emblazoned with my parents went to yale and all i got was this lousy trust fund, has nothing to do with the speech embodied in those costuming choices. It has to do with the absence of a centuries-long history of hunting, enslaving, and killing white people.¶ But let us accept the speechbro’s basic proposition: that there will be a more significant fight later than the debate over Halloween costumes or cultural appropriation, and that one should keep a strategic eye on that moment. This is surely true. When the fight actually comes to get cops off campus, to abolish the administration, destroy all student-loan records (soon, please!), do we really believe these battles will be won with “civility” and lip-service liberalism when the current, lesser fights cannot? Contrarily, we can be assured that these fights will be even more rigged for “speech” to be ineffective, diversionary, and neutralizing. If it were obvious that free speech in principle was a limit to emancipation in reality—a formal equality corresponding to real exclusions—would we still treat it as gospel, unchallengeable? Or would we eventually recognize that it is just one means, though an important one, in a struggle whose ends are elsewhere—that beyond civility there’s a riot going on, one that’s not a mistake but a truth?

#### 2. This relies on the neoliberal myth that if you express your individual opinion the system will respond and change for you, since anyone can succeed in a capitalist society if they work hard enough. This ignores current social inequalities and assumes an equal playing field which makes cap inevitable – that’s Brown.

#### 3. Serial policy failure – even if speech challenges institutions in the short term, it does so in a neoliberal way by affirming speech as a commodity which is traded in the larger system of neolib, and long term ensures policies will recreate the underlying system

#### 4. The AFF’s free speech challenges institutions in a narrow way – the system makes it seem like there is only one available political option, to work inside the neoliberal status quo, which forecloses more radical effective solutions

#### 5. Our framework answers this – the role of the judge is to criticize the underlying assumptions of the AFF – even if their plan has the consequence of challenging institutions, if we win that their assumptions about how to challenge them are neoliberal, we still win.

#### 6. This is a neoliberal myth – oppressive institutions are overturned as a result of collective critique and action, not free speech through oppressive institutions. Tillett-Saks 13

Andrew Tillett-Saks (Labor organizer and critical activist author for Truth-Out and Counterpunch), Neoliberal Myths, Counterpunch, 11/7/13, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/11/07/neoliberal-myths/>. NS

In the wake of the Brown University shout-down of Ray Kelly, champion of the NYPD’s racist stop-and-frisk policy and racial profiling in general, the debate has resurfaced. Rather than talking past the anti-protestors’ arguments, they need to be addressed directly. The prototypical argument in denouncing the protestors is not a defense of Ray Kelly’s racism. It is twofold: First, that a free-flowing discourse on the matter will allow all viewpoints to be weighed and justice to inevitably emerge victorious on its merits. Second, that stopping a bigot from speaking in the name of freedom is self-defeating as it devolves our democratic society into tyranny. The twofold argument against the protestors stems from two central myths of neoliberalism. The argument for free discourse as the enlightened path to justice ignores that direct action protest is primarily responsible for most of the achievements we would consider ‘progress’ historically (think civil rights, workers’ rights, suffrage, etc.), not the free exchange of ideas. The claim that silencing speech in the name of freedom is self-defeating indulges in the myth of the pre-existence of a free society in which freedom of speech must be preciously safeguarded, while ignoring the woeful shortcomings of freedom of speech in our society which must be addressed before there is anything worth protecting. Critics of the protest repeatedly denounced direct action in favor of ideological debate as the path to social justice. “It would have been more effective to take part in a discussion rather than flat out refuse to have him speak,” declared one horrified student to the Brown Daily Herald. Similarly, Brown University President Christina Paxson labeled the protest a detrimental “affront to democratic civil society,” and instead advocated “intellectual rigor, careful analysis, and…respectful dialogue and discussion.” Yet the implication that masterful debate is the engine of social progress could not be more historically unfounded. Only in the fairy tale histories of those interested in discouraging social resistance does ‘respectful dialogue’ play a decisive role in struggles against injustice. The eight-hour workday is not a product of an incisive question-and-answer session with American robber barons. Rather, hundreds of thousands of workers conducted general strikes during the nineteenth century, marched in the face of military gunfire at Haymarket Square in 1886, and occupied scores of factories in the 1930’s before the eight-hour work day became American law. Jim Crow was not defeated with the moral suasion of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s speeches. Rather, hundreds of thousands marched on Washington, suffered through imprisonment by racist Southern law enforcement, and repeatedly staged disruptive protests to win basic civil rights. On a more international scale, Colonialism, that somehow-oft-forgotten tyranny that plagued most of the globe for centuries, did not cease thanks to open academic dialogue. Bloody resistance, from Algeria to Vietnam to Panama to Cuba to Egypt to the Philippines to Cameroon and to many other countries, was the necessary tool that unlocked colonial shackles. Different specific tactics have worked in different contexts, but one aspect remains constant: The free flow of ideas and dialogue, by itself, has rarely been enough to generate social progress. It is not that ideas entirely lack social power, but they have never been sufficient in winning concessions from those in power to the oppressed. Herein lies neoliberal myth number one—that a liberal free-market society will inexorably and inherently march towards greater freedom. To the contrary, direct action has always proved necessary.

#### 7. This assumes consequentialist solvency – cap is inherently evil because it turns people in commodities and destroys value to life – rejecting cap is a decision rule that must be applied in every instance – to accept some cap to challenge cap is contradictory – that’s Smith 14

### A2 UOL

#### 1. The university is key - higher education provides a site for critical awareness which is a pre requisite to solve all social problems. Giroux 15

Henry Giroux, “Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory,” 3/3/15, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory>. NS

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.

#### 2. This is uniqueness for us – more capitalist policies are coming during Trump’s term, so we need to start resistance now before they take full effect – the earlier, the better.

#### 3. The alt solves – the only reason we think we can’t challenge neolib broadly is that neoliberal elites tell us that every day – collective critique can generate effective solutions, but giving up because neolib exists in other areas makes change impossible

#### 4. The impact is linear – even if the alt can’t solve neolib everywhere, it can in universities which is the key internal link to all our impacts

#### 5. The alt can spur social criticism and political revolution – look how far Bernie got and how many supporters he had. A new generation of citizens want a dramatic reduction of capitalism, and the only thing holding that back are the constant neoliberal myths fed to us

#### 6. Our framework answers this – we don’t have to solve all of neolib to win, only show that our criticism provides the better chance for a solution – fiat is illusory and the plan doesn’t really pass, so even if challenging neolib seems hard now because it exists in other areas, we should still learn the skills to challenge it because that makes success more likely
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