Neo-liberal ideology makes extinction inevitable. The unthinking drive for competitiveness sidelines concerns of ecological sustainability and leads to war.

**Bristow 10** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

In recent years, regional development strategies have been subjugated to the hegemonic discourse of competitiveness, such that the ultimate objective for all regional development policy-makers and practitioners has become the creation of economic advantage through superior productivity performance, or the attraction of new ﬁrms and labour (Bristow, 2005). A major consequence is the developing ‘ubiquitiﬁcation’ of regional development strategies (Bristow, 2005; Maskell and Malmberg, 1999). This reﬂects the status of competitiveness as a key discursive construct (Jessop, 2008) that has acquired hugely signiﬁcant rhetorical power for certain interests intent on reinforcing capitalist relations (Bristow, 2005; Fougner, 2006). Indeed, **the competitiveness hegemony is such that many policies** previously **considered only indirectly relevant to unfettered economic growth tend to be hijacked in support of competitiveness agendas** (for example Raco, 2008; also Dannestam, 2008). This paper will argue, however, that a particularly narrow **discourse of ‘competitiveness’ has** been constructed that has **a number of negative connotations for the** ‘resilience’ of regions. Resilience is deﬁned as the region’s ability to experience **positive economic success that is socially inclusive, works within environmental limits and** which **can ride global economic punches** (Ashby et al., 2009). As such, resilience clearly resonates with literatures on sustainability, localisation and diversiﬁcation, and the developing understanding of regions as intrinsically diverse entities with evolutionary and context-speciﬁc development trajectories (Hayter, 2004). In contrast, the **dominant discourse of competitiveness is ‘placeless’ and increasingly associated with globalised, growth-ﬁrst and environmentally malign agendas** (Hudson, 2005). However, this paper will argue that the relationships between competitiveness and resilience are more complex than might at ﬁrst appear. Using insights from the Cultural Political Economy (CPE) approach, which focuses on understanding the construction, development and spread of hegemonic policy discourses, the paper will argue that the dominant discourse of competitiveness used in regional development policy is narrowly constructed and is thus insensitive to contingencies of place and the more nuanced role of competition within economies. This leads to problems of resilience that can be partly overcome with the development of a more contextualised approach to competitiveness. The paper is now structured as follows. It begins by examining the developing understanding of resilience in the theorising and policy discourse around regional development. It then describes the CPE approach and utilises its framework to explain both how a narrow conception of competitiveness has come to dominate regional development policy and how resilience inter-plays in subtle and complex ways with competitiveness and its emerging critique. The paper then proceeds to illustrate what resilience means for regional development ﬁrstly, with reference to the Transition Towns concept, and then by developing a typology of regional strategies to show the different characteristics of policy approaches based on competitiveness and resilience. Regional resilience Resilience is rapidly emerging as an idea whose time has come in policy discourses around localities and regions, where it is developing widespread appeal owing to the peculiarly powerful combination of transformative pressures from below, and various catalytic, crisis-induced imperatives for change from above. It features strongly in policy discourses around environmental management and sustainable development (see Hudson, 2008a), but has also more recently emerged in relation to emergency and disaster planning with, for example ‘Regional Resilience Teams’ established in the English regions to support and co-ordinate civil protection activities around various emergency situations such as the threat of a swine ﬂu pandemic. The discourse of resilience is also taking hold in discussions around desirable local and regional development activities and strategies. The recent global ‘credit crunch’ and the accompanying in-crease in livelihood insecurity has highlighted the advantages of those local and regional economies that have greater ‘resilience’ by virtue of being less dependent upon globally footloose activities, hav-ing greater economic diversity, and/or having a de-termination to prioritise and effect more signiﬁcant structural change (Ashby et al, 2009; Larkin and Cooper, 2009). Indeed, **resilience features particular strongly** in the ‘grey’ literature spawned by thinktanks, consul-tancies and environmental interest groups **around the consequences of the global recession, catastrophic climate change and the arrival of** the era of **peak oil** for localities and regions with all its implications for the longevity of carbon-fuelled economies, cheap, long-distance transport and global trade. **This popularly labelled ‘triple crunch’** (New Economics Foundation, 2008) **has powerfully illuminated the potentially disastrous material consequences of the** voracious **growth imperative at the heart of** neoliberalism and **competitiveness, both in the form of resource constraints (especially food security) and** in **the inability** of the current system **to manage global ﬁnancial and ecological sustainability.** In so doing, it appears to be galvinising previously disparate, fractured debates about the merits of the current system, and challenging public and political opinion to develop a new, global concern with frugality, egalitarianism and localism (see, for example Jackson, 2009; New Economics Foundation, 2008).

The housing crisis of 2008 proves that neoliberalism is unsustainable.

**Sachikonye 10**[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The financial crisis of** 2007 to 20**08** **highlighted the fact that neolib**eralism **is facing** a major **crisis.** In essence, the financial crisis was caused by the **excessiveness of neo-lib**eral economic policy **through** the **unregulated dominance of ‘the market’**. Harvey explains: ―Neoliberalisation **has an astonishing record** these last thirty years or so **of breaking down innumerable barriers worldwide to** the **absorption of capital surpluses**. It has also invented all manner of new forms of speculation in asset values that similarly suck in massive quantities of capital surplus, though at considerable risk. What is 9 | P a g e equally astonishing is its capacity to organize and orchestrate gigantic devaluations of capital worldwide without, up until now, crashing the whole system [my emphasis]‖ (2006: xxvi). Harvey writing in 2006 was able to predict the subsequent crisis that occurred between 2007 and 2008, that currently affects the world. It is important to look at the factors that led to the crisis. Paul Krugman, noted American economist and Nobel laureate, stated that **the immediate cause** of the crisis **was** the ‘housing bubble’ in the US which in turn led to ‗widespread‘ mortgage overdrafts and subsequently to large losses at ―many financial institutions‖ (Krugman, 2008a) 9 . George Soros 10 the well known investor writes: ―The proximate cause is to be found in the housing bubble or more exactly in the excesses of **the subprime mortgage market**. The longer a double-digit rise in house prices lasted, the more lax the lending practices became. In the end, people could borrow 100 percent of inflated house prices with no money down. **Insiders referred to subprime loans as ninja loans—no income, no job, no questions asked**‖ (2008). First and foremost, large amounts of money were being lent out on credit to allow the American consumer to acquire housing or purchase particular assets, without the necessary precautions or regulations to check if they could then repay back the amount(s) they had borrowed. Krugman 11 notes that the ‗initial shock‘ of the widespread mortgage defaults was: ―compounded by secondary effects, as lack of capital forced banks to pull back, leading to further declines in the prices of assets, leading to more losses, and so on — a vicious circle of ‗deleveraging‘. 12 Pervasive loss of trust in banks, including on the part of other banks, reinforced the vicious circle‖ (2008a). As a result, money markets which are a ―[n]etwork of banks, discount houses, institutional investors, and **money dealers** who borrow and lend among themselves for the short-term (typically 90 days)‖ (BusinessDictionary.com) 13 **became ineffective and the network ceased to operate** efficiently, if at all. Krugman notes that consequently the money markets ‗effectively shut down‘ (2008a) 14 . This in turn led to the financial crisis. Even though its origins were in America **the crisis affected the whole globe.** Krugman states: ―[w]hy do we need international cooperation? Because we have a globalized financial system in which a crisis that began with a bubble in Florida condos and California McMansions has caused monetary catastrophe in Iceland. We‘re all in this together, and need a shared solution‖ (2008a) 15 . Thus, the globalized financial system‘ that neo-liberalism established in the 1980‘s is facing an unprecedented crisis. Having discussed the immediate reasons leading up to the crisis, it is now important to discuss the deeper causes of the crisis of neo-liberalism.

Neoliberalism precludes ethics by reducing decision-making to economic self-interest.

**Sachikonye 10**[[3]](#footnote-3)

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

Thus the **Plan**: The USFG ought to provide Pell Grants to eligible inmates in the United States criminal justice system. I reserve the right to clarify, so no theory violations until he checks in CX. No legal violations link because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

**Aff gets RVIs** on I meets and counter-interps because

(a) 1AR timeskew means I can’t cover theory and still have a fair shot on substance.

(b) no risk theory would give neg a free source of no risk offense which allows him to moot the AC.

The federal ban on Pell Grants for prisoners’ education was engrained in neoliberal logic of economic competitiveness that privileged vocational training over liberal arts education. **Yates 9**[[4]](#footnote-4)

In 1971, Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger spoke at the first National Conference on Corrections, “We know that today the programs of (prisoner) education range from nonexistent to inadequate, with all too few exceptions. However we do it, the illiterate and the unskilled who are sentenced for substantial terms must be given the opportunity, the means, and the motivation to learn his way to freedom” (Burger, 1985 p. 193). Prison-based programs have dated back to the 1800s as reformers sought to extend basic and vocational education, as well as moral education to those who had been convicted of crimes (Welch, 1996). Gehring and Wright (2003) propose that many of these early reformers were not just interested in improving the virtues of the inmates, but also had a sophisticated understanding of the anti-democratic nature of penal systems. They had the progressive notion that prisoners were capable of being agents in their own reformation by taking responsibility for education. Gehring and Wright call the presence of these early radical prison educators, “the hidden heritage of correctional education” (p. 52 5). They suggest this thread of progressiveness extended up through World War II after which Cold War pragmatism resulted in a return to basic education (Gehring & Wright 2003). Much of the **programs of the** 19**60s and** 19**70s** followed a functionalist approach that **equated an inmate’s** future **success** as a law-abiding citizen **with** the knowledge required to obtain lawful employment and negotiate legal society. These skill sets focused primarily on obtaining **vocational skills** and basic literacy. Howard Davidson describes this theory: “it propounds that crime results from individuals making poor (i.e. criminal) decisions when faced with life‟s many problems. **Out of neoliberalism comes the market metaphor, in which individuals make rational decisions based on calculating benefits against costs**” (Davidson, 1995, p.4). How did the modern functionalist approach to prisoner education take root? Much of the impetus seems to have arisen from human capital theory. **One** of the **primary feature**s **of neoliberal thought** and practice **is the reliance upon** human capital theory to explain the purpose of education. Human capital theory has been described by Robert Hart and Thomas Moutos (1995) as an investment of **skills training in workers that seeks to balance the costs of training with the return on** the **investment.** Even the proponents of human capital theory describe it as reductionist, mechanical and based upon “homogenized factors.” During the reign of neoliberalism, human capital theory slithered from its manufacturing origins into the corridors of education. Perhaps the most succinct description of the human capital theory of education is provided (without apparent irony) by Joop Hartog and Hessel Oosterbeek (2007): “The basic human capital model of schooling envisages two options (1) go to school for s years and earn an income Ys every year after leaving school, or (2) go to work right away and earn 53 annual income Yo” (p. 7). This reductionist view of the role of schooling does not take into account exogenous factors that can affect income level such as discrimination and availability of jobs in the market (Livingstone, 1997). The role of human capital theory in education reached a high level of urgency among neoliberals as concern arose regarding the United States competiveness in global markets. Chief among the proponents were Presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton through the Goals 2000 project which set the priority for education to create the workers who could increase the U.S. efficacy in international capitalism (Briscoe, 2000). A center-piece of the thrust toward implementation of human capital theory in education was the No Child Left Behind legislation which narrowed the focus of educational curricula toward those basic skills required for technical society such as math, reading and science at the expense of those for an active, well-rounded life such as social studies, art, music and physical education. According to Pauline Lipman (2007) No Child Left Behind is “explicitly designed to meet the needs and technical rationality of business… symbolically, as well as practically, national testing constitutes a system of quality control, verifying that those who survive the gauntlet of tests and graduate have the literacies and dispositions business requires” (Lipman, 2007, p. 46). Lipman sees the legislation as a disciplinary process with the end product being docile workers, the ultimate in human capital. Prisoner job training programs fulfilled this need. In the 1970s and 1980s, **in part due to** the availability of **the Pell Grant,** a **liberal arts** curriculum **became a major component of** many **prison education** programs in a way that it never had before**.** According to Mary Wright (2001) the correction education liberal arts programs remained in favor well into the 1990s even as it was de-emphasized in the 54 larger academic world. She gives several reasons, including the slow pace of change in prisons, the lack of flexibility and increased cost of obtaining equipment for technical job training programs. However, **in the** 19**90s, liberal arts** in a correctional setting **fell into disfavor, and** adult basic education and **vocational education programs reasserted their primacy** in the penal system (Wright, 2001). Vocational programs in prison included plumbing, carpentry, electrical wiring, painting, heating and air conditioning as well as computer literacy. In addition, the emphasis on job training spilled over into the **language arts and math** programs as they **were retooled to focus on technical** and applied **reading and writing** (Steuer, 2001). Between 1995 and 2000, **the percentage of state prisons offering college courses decreased** from 31% to 26% **while** those offering basic adult education increased from 76% to 80%. State prisons offering **vocational education increased** from 54% to 55% and in private prisons it increased from 25% to 44% in the same time period (Harlow, 2003). Several reasons are given for this change in addition to the dissolution of prisoner Pell Grants. One is the perceived threat liberal arts curricula pose to the penal institution. Wright (2001) states that “a **liberal arts** curriculum, **which** often **emphasizes critical thinking,** intellectual and **moral reasoning and development of an inmate’s sense of self may pose a challenge to the established order of a correctional facility**” (p. 13). In addition, **with Pell Grants gone, prison**er **education** programs **became** more **dependent** up**on outcome-based funding.** Performance-based management of these programs, like the parallel evolution in public schools, led to “school report cards” that evaluated the effectiveness of the programs in turning out their product (Linton, 2005). Curricula that can lend to empirical studies, such as testing in basic adult education, were given priority 55 over liberal arts, which seemingly has more nebulous outcomes. According to John Linton (2005) of the U.S. Department of Education‟s Correction Education division: “The current climate [requires] that expenditure of public funds be restricted to „scientifically proven‟ effective interventions” (p. 91). **Job training fits well to this regime because** the **results of the program could be measured empirically through** the **numbers** of the test group who are **able to obtain work.** In addition, recidivism rates could be obtained. Numerous studies have pointed to the inverse relationship between vocational technical programs and recidivism (Hall & Bannatyne, 2000; Mattuci & Johnson, 2003; Young & Mattuci, 2006, Gordon & Weldon, 2003). Empirical studies focusing strictly on recidivism as a measurement of achievement have not been without their faults. In his examination of the more recent works, Charles Ubah (2002) has found a tendency for the inmates to self-select into the programs. These participants were probably more motivated, as a whole, to succeed upon their release, than those who did not participate (Ubah, 2002). Ubah‟s findings bring up another important question: What about those who slip through the cracks in the empirical studies? An example may be found in Robert Mattuci‟s (2003) description of the vocational program that he set up in a New York state prison. It consisted of an eight session program to teach the students basic plumbing skills in order to increase their employment prospects upon release. Mattuci, who had a bachelor‟s degree in education and twenty years experience as a plumber, appeared to incorporate a well-thought out system of pedagogy. He relates that “many inmates have never known a positive schooling experience so they lack the needed confidence to succeed at learning something new. A key to the program is therefore validating their differences as 56 individuals and accommodating their multiple learning styles” (p. 16). Mattuci had them work in groups for all hands-on activities and encouraged group brainstorming and problem solving. Yet, despite the care in which the teacher took in order to facilitate a sense of community on the shop floor, there were a significant number of inmates who did not take to the class. “Especially for the younger inmates, gang activity is very evident. The dropout rate of the male youth in three of the groups was 90%. For those influenced by gangs, there is a total lack of respect for the process of setting goals and working toward them” (Mattuci & Johnson, 2003, p. 17). A conventional vocational program may not reach this group of inmates who, as dropouts of the program are more likely to return to prison. While recidivism is an important issue, it must be understood within context of the many variables that exist both within the inmates and, just as importantly, the conditions that exist once they are released. Barriers to post-release employment include lack of current job skills in a rapidly changing market, lack of available jobs in a tight market, the large hole in the employment history created by incarceration, and perhaps most significantly, the criminal record. With the rise of the information society, even jobs considered “menial,” require criminal background checks. The perceived and actual impediments to employment can decrease the seeker‟s motivation and self image (Pavis, 2002). Combined with conditions that facilitated a life of crime in the first place: poverty, discrimination, substance abuse, the deck is stacked against the average inmate. Conventional job training in itself is clearly not going to arm these people against the challenges of life on the outside. The attributes previously described that led some 57 prisons to reject liberal arts education; the “critical thinking, intellectual and moral reasoning” leading to a “sense of self,” must be cultivated (p. 1). **Friere** (2004), Giroux (2006) **and others have called for** a **pedagogy** that is **freed from** the bonds of **the “bottom-line**.**”** Mike Cole (2005) puts it succinctly, **calling for schools to become sites where “teachers,** other school workers **and** pupils/**students** not only **agitate for changes** within the classroom and within the institutional context of the school, but also support a transformation in the objective conditions in which students and their parents labor” (p. 16). In this vision, there is no room for docile workers. Schools would be transformed into emancipatory institutions where workers would not only be provided basic literacy, vocational skills and liberal arts, but would also learn to advocate for a better world. I explore this possibility further in Chapter 5.

Without Pell Grant funding, prison education programs are forced to rely on donations from the private sector. **Erisman and Contardo 05**[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Because of limitations on** both **public funding** and prisoner self-funding**, a number of prison systems have turned to private donors to help support postsecondary correctional education**al programs**. In Texas, for example, donors interested in helping prisoners gain access to higher education, including corporate donors and advocacy groups, have created scholarships** through some of the public colleges and universities that provide postsecondary instruction in the state’s prison system. Virginia has two private nonproﬁ t scholarship funds that cover the cost of tuition, fees, and textbooks for some inmates taking college courses. One program is sponsored by the estate of a physician who was Learning to Reduce Recidivism 31 incarcerated as a youth, and the other is funded by a foundation named for the ﬁ rst warden at the Virginia Correctional Center for Women. While most private funding sources are too limited to support the creation of new postsecondary correctional education programs, as opposed to simply funding additional students in already established programs, there may be potential in more active fundraising efforts. In Oregon, for example, a private foundation called New Directions funds 26 percent of the state’s incarcerated college students, using funds donated by individuals, businesses, and a local community college. Minnesota has also moved in this direction in recent years (Box 4).

Neolib relies upon privatization of public goods. **Hamann 09** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

One of the significant developments in contemporary life that might fall under the heading of ”**neolib**eralism” **can be recognized through the various ways that** the traditional **distinctions between the public and** the **private** on the one hand, **and the political and** the **personal on the other have been gradually blurred**, reversed, or re-moved altogether. The exposure of formerly private and personal realms of life has occurred not only through the more striking examples of growing government and corporate surveillance (think of the telecoms and the warrantless monitoring of elec-tronic communications paid for with taxpayer dollars or the growing use of human implantable radio-frequency identification [RFID] microchips), but, more subtly and significantly, the extent to which activities of production and consumption typically practiced in public spaces are increasingly taking place in the home, a space once exclusively reserved for leisure time and housework. It has become more and more common to find such activities as telecommuting, telemarketing, and shopping via the Internet or cable television taking place within the home. Nearly ubiquitous technologies such as the telephone, home computers with worldwide web access, pagers, mobile phones, GPS and other wireless devices have rendered private space and personal time accessible to the demands of business and, increasingly, the inter-ests of government. To put it simply, it is no longer true, as Marx once claimed, that the worker “is at home when he is not working, and when he is working he is not at home.”5Reality television, social networking sites, personal webcams and confes-sional blogging have all contributed toward exposing the private realm in ways un-foreseen by the well-known feminist adage from the 1960’s: ”the personal is politi-cal”. Within this formerly public realm we now find that private interests or pub-lic/private amalgams have gained greater control and influence. In major urban areas Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) have appropriated many traditional governing functions from financially strapped municipalities including taxation, sa-nitation, and policing. **For years the** U.S. **federal gov**ernment **has given away** traditional **public goods** such as parklands, water, and the airways **to** profit-making **businesses**, often **in exchange for** shallow and **unfulfilled promises to serve the public interest.** Many formerly public or government institutions such as hospitals, schools, and **prisons are now managed** privately **as for-profit corporations as** increasing numbers of people go without healthcare, education levels drop, and **prison populations increase.** An ongoing effort has been made to further privatize if not eliminate traditional social goods such as healthcare, welfare, and social security. In addition, problems once recognized as social ills have been shifted to the personal realm: **poverty, environmental degradation,** unemployment, **homelessness, racism, sexism, and heterosexism: all have been reinterpreted as** primarily **private matters to be dealt with through voluntary charity, the invisible hand of the market,** by **cultivating personal “sensitivity” towards others** or improving one’s own self-esteem. **Corporations, churches, universities and other institutions have made it** part of **their mission** to organize the mandatory training of employees in these and other areas of personal development and self-management. Just as illness and disease are more of-ten addressed in the mainstream media as a problem of revenue loss for business than as an effect of poor environmental or worker safety regulations, corporations have stepped up the practice of promoting full worker responsibility for their own health and welfare, offering incentives to employees for their participation in fitness training, lifestyle management and diet programs. We can also find a sustained ex-pansion of ”self-help” and ”personal power” technologies that range from the old “think and grow rich” school to new techniques promising greater control in the self-management of everything from time to anger.6These and many other examples demonstrate the extent to which **so much** that was **once understood as social and political has been re-positioned within the domain of self-governance**, often through techniques imposed by private institutions such as schools and businesses.

The role of the ballot is to vote for the policy that best challenges neoliberalism. Engaging state policy is key. **Callinicos 6**[[7]](#footnote-7)

The implication is that **any sustainable alt**ernative **to neo-lib**eralism has to be based, not on the market, but on democratic planning. There are some models of how this could work. One is Albert's Parecon, or participatory economics. This involves an economy of workers' and consumers' councils in which individuals and enterprises submit proposals for their share of society's resources. Then a process of gradual adjustments (Albert calls them "iteration") takes place while technical experts come up with a plan that would give everyone as much as possible of what they want. The main weakness of this model is that it mimics a bit too closely the workings of a market economy, in which claims on resources are driven by individual demands. Albert is an anarchist, and his commitment to decentralisation here goes too far. The allocation of society's resources isn't a neutral technical issue. It's a political question that requires some sort of collective and democratic decision-making process to choose between what would often be competing views of the priorities of the society in question. From this perspective, the British left wing economist Pat Devine offers a superior model of what he calls negotiated coordination. Here the allocation of resources is largely the outcome of discussion between producers, consumers, and other affected groups, but within the framework of overall decisions about economic priorities made democratically at the national and international level. Plainly there is much more to be said � and, above all, to be done � about democratic planning. All the same, the importance of the kind of work being done by Albert, Devine, and others is that they begin to break down the prejudice against planning and to sketch out how an economy that rejected the market could manage to be both democratic and efficient. Fighting for power But any break with capitalism **couldn't take the form of an instantaneous leap into a fully planned economy.** Marx long ago argued in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* that **a new workers' state** would inherit a society deeply marked by capitalism. Initially, it **would have to make compromises with the old order, and gradually move towards a society governed by the communist principle "From each according to their ability, to each according to their needs!"** Similarly today a society breaking with capitalism would need to make a decisive shift towards an economy in which priorities were decided democratically rather than left to the anarchy of competition. This would critically involve taking control of the financial markets, nationalising under workers' control key sectors of the economy, and extending social provision on the basis of a progressive tax system that distributed wealth and income from rich to poor. These measures, radical though they are, would still leave in place many aspects of a market economy. Large sectors would remain in private hands. Continuous pressure and the introduction of new measures would be necessary to move the economy as a whole towards the principles of democratic planning. One key step would be to weaken the power of the capitalist labour market, which today rules our lives. In my view, the best way to do this would be to introduce universal direct income. In other words, every resident of the country would receive, as of right, an income that met their basic needs at a relatively low but nevertheless decent level. This would serve two goals. First, it would ensure a basic level of welfare for everyone much more efficiently than existing systems of social provision people with greater needs because they had children or were disabled or whatever would receive a higher basic income. Secondly, having a guaranteed basic income would greatly reduce the pressure on people to accept whatever job was on offer on the labour market. One of the main presuppositions of capitalism that workers have no acceptable alternative to wage labour would be removed. The balance of power between labour and capital would shift towards the workers, irrespective of the nature of their employer. More broadly, the question of power is crucial. One obvious challenge to the kind of vision of change I have just sketched out is how to ensure that the direction of **change would be towards a democratically planned economy rather than** back to **market capitalism** or maybe to the kind of state capitalism that ended up dominating the Soviet Union. The only guarantee that counts is that levers of political power are in the hands of the workers themselves. **As long as the state takes the form that it does today** a bureaucratically organised, hierarchical set of apparatuses whose managers' interests are bound up with those of capital **any improvement in society can only be temporary and fragile. This is wh**y the strategy of **ignoring the state** advocated by Holloway and others **is so foolish. If we are to move towards a democratically planned economy,** then **the existing state has to be confronted and broken.**

Ignore permissibility and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action.

Neg burden is to defend a competitive post-fiat United States policy. Offense-defense is key to fairness and real world education. This means ignore skepticism. **Nelson 08** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

And **the truth-statement model** of the resolution **imposes an absolute burden of proof on the aff**irmative: if the resolution is a truth-claim, and the afﬁrmative has the burden of proving that claim, in so far as intuitively we tend to disbelieve truthclaims until we are persuaded otherwise, the afﬁrmative has the burden to prove that statement absolutely true. Indeed, one of the most common theory arguments in LD is conditionality, which argues it is inappropriate for the afﬁrmative to claim only proving the truth of part of the resolution is sufﬁcient to earn the ballot. Such a model of the resolution also gives the negative access to a range of strategies that many students, coaches, and judges ﬁnd ridiculous or even irrelevant to evaluation of the resolution.

If the **neg**ative **need only** prevent the affirmative from proving the truth of the resolution, it is logically sufficient to negate to **deny our ability to make truth-statements or** to **prove** normative **morality does not exist** or to deny the reliability of human senses or reason. Yet, even though most coaches appear to endorse the truth-statement model of the resolution, they complain about the use of such negative strategies, even though they are a necessary consequence of that model. And, moreover, **such strategies** seem fundamentally unfair, as they **provide the neg**ative **with functionally inﬁnite ground**, as there are a nearly inﬁnite variety of such skeptical objections to normative claims, while continuing to bind the afﬁrmative to a much smaller range of options: advocacy of the resolution as a whole.

Instead, it seems much more reasonable to treat the resolution as a way to equitably divide ground: the affirmative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to the value judgment implied by the resolution and the negative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to a value judgment mutually exclusive to that implied by the resolution. By making the issue one of desirability of **[Under] competing world-views** rather than of truth, the affirmative gains access to increased flexibility regarding how he or she chooses to defend that world, while the **neg**ative **retains equal flexibility while being denied** access to those **skeptical arguments** indicted above. Our ability to make normative claims is irrelevant to a discussion of the desirability of making two such claims. Unless there is some significant harm in making such statements, some offensive reason to reject making them that can be avoided by an advocacy mutually exclusive with that of the affirmative such objections are not a reason the negative world is more desirable, and therefore not a reason to negate. Note this is precisely how things have been done in policy debate for some time: a team that runs a kritik is expected to offer some impact of the mindset they are indicting and some alternative that would solve for that impact. A team that simply argued some universal, unavoidable, problem was bad and therefore a reason to negate would not be very successful. It is about time LD started treating such arguments the same way.

**Such a model** of the resolution has additional benefits as well. First, it **forces both debaters to offer offensive reasons to prefer** their worldview, thereby further **enforcing a parallel burden structure.** This means debaters can no longer get away with arguing the resolution is by definition true of false. The “truth” of the particular vocabulary of the resolution is irrelevant to its desirability. **Second, it is intuitive. When people evaluate** the truth of **ethical claims, they consider their implications in the real world.** They ask themselves whether a world in which people live by that ethical rule is better than one in which they don’t. Such debates don’t happen solely in the abstract. We want to know how the various options affect us and the world we live in.

The neg must defend one unconditional advocacy. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. He’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC.

**Plan focus is good** for education because:

(a) Plans increase depth of education because we can focus on one specific issue each round instead of touching briefly on each aspect of the topic.

Depth is better than breadth. If we go in-depth on a *different* issue each round, then we’ll get a breadth of info any way, but if we spread ourselves thin discussing a breadth of issues each round, we’ll never have an in-depth discussion of the topic.

(b) Plans are key to incentivize continued research. If the same stock arguments are going to apply every round, there’s no incentive to do new work.

Err Aff on theory. Negs won 8% more prelims at Harvard two weeks ago. This also means presume aff if presumption matters.
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