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#### Interpretation - the aff may not claim offense from anything other than the instrumental implementation of a policy stating that The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

#### Reduce = diminish

Merriam Webster [Encyclopedia Britannica, “Reduce”] [DS]

to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number

reduce taxes

reduce the likelihood of war

#### IP protections cover patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets

SpencePC 4/4/16 [Legal Counsel, “Four Types of Intellectual Property for Business”] [DS]

If you are a business owner, you should familiarize yourself with the four types of intellectual property, otherwise known as IP. We speak with many entrepreneurs who don’t know where to begin when it comes to protecting their ideas and inventions. They need this information frequently so we decided to create a quick and easy guide to educate them. It was popular so we decided to post it to our blog. Let us know if you found this useful and if there are any other guides you would like us to make in the comment section below.

If you feel you need to speak with a lawyer directly, call Spence PC directly at 1-312-404-8882.

Four Types of IP

Copyrights

Patents

Trademarks

Trade Secrets

At Risk Businesses

When your business is young, it is at risk of having its ideas “borrowed” by competitors. Protect yourself, your business, and your ideas by following this guide.

Type 1 – Copyrights

What are Copyrights? According to Copyright.Gov ‘s Guide to copyrights, “Copyright is a form of protection provided by the laws of the United States (title 17, U.S.Code) to the authors of “original works of authorship,”” Copyrights protect writing, pictures, music, art, and other forms of intellectual works. What this means for you is that if you wrote something, or created a piece of work that you don’t want people to reuse without your permission, you have the right to copyright that work. Now, if people want to use, reuse, or re purpose your work, they must first contact you to use it, attribute you as the owner, and use it for purposes you deem appropriate. There is an exception to this rule, that is, Fair Use. If someone wants to use a portion of your work for educational, parody, commenting, or news purposes they can.

Take away : Make sure you copyright your work and your website while providing people a way to contact you so they can use your work with your permission. Click the link for Copyright.Gov’s frequently asked questions to learn how to copyright your work.

Type 2 – Patents

What are Patents? According to the United States Patent Office , “A patent for an invention is the grant of a property right to the inventor”. Generally this patent lasts for 20 years from when the inventor attempts to patent their invention by filing with the US Government. The list of things that can patented is fairly lengthy and open to interpretation but it covers anyone who “invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent,”.

For a business owner or an inventor this means that if you found a new way to make something or discovered a new product you’d like to take to market, you would want to first patent the idea so no one can take the idea and claim it as their own. For instance, if you have a revolutionary water bottle that you feel would benefit the masses, you should protect this intellectual property by filing with patent office that the idea is unique and your own. If the government agrees that the idea is your own, unique, and is useful you will be awarded a patent to protect your right to the concept. This then gives you the ability to produce the concept, sell it, or bring the concept to investors without worrying about them stealing your ideas.

However, a word of caution, if you share your patented ideas, there is a risk that others will reverse engineer your concept. Reverse engineering is when competitors take apart an object or idea to understand how it functions with the goal of enhancing or modifying the object in order to replicate it. Making enough variations to the original concept can result in a ‘unique’ idea that your competitors can then patent as their own idea. Companies can avoid compensating you for your patent idea and claim these ‘new’ versions of your idea as their own. This frequently happens in the technology industry between companies like Samsung and Apple.

Take away: Protect your ideas and inventions with patents before sharing them with the world.

Type 3 – Trademarks

What are Trademarks? According to the USPTO , a Trademark is a “word, phrase, symbol, or design, or a combination thereof, that

identifies and distinguishes the source of the goods of one party from those of others. ” For instance, if your company name, a logo, or your company tagline can me trademarked. The trademark serves as a brand identifier for your business or your products. Images, slogans, and colors can all be trademarked. For instance, Tiffany Blue is a trademarked color that is used by Tiffany & Co. in promotional materials as well as boxes, bags, and more.

Words, phrases, and pictures are generally the most common intellectual properties to be trademarked, however other distinguishing features can also be registered for your company. For example, Coca-Cola bottles’ have a trademarked shape, Dell and Ford have trademarked their family names, and even smells. These are known as non-conventional trademarks but are used in every industry to protect IP. It is important to protect these business assets, as trademarks give business owners the tools to prevent competitors from taking advantage of the goodwill that one’s brand has accumulated over the years.

If you feel that you have been the victim of copyright or trademark infringement, an unregistered trademark provides limited protection.

Take Away: It is best to register trademark s at your local and national government office responsible for trademark registration. Remember, a registered trademark must be renewed regularly to keep it “alive” and to protect your IP.

Type 4 – Trade Secrets

What are Trade Secrets? Generally, any piece of confidential corporate information which gives any business a competitive advantage can be considered a trade secret. For instance, Coca-Cola’s secret formula could be considered a trade secret. Now, if I created a soda company and produced identical soda to coca-cola, this would be an infringement of Coke’s trade secret. This is a general example but trade secrets can even defined as distribution methods (Walmart), Sales methods, consumer information, ad campaigns and strategies, list of vendors, list of clients, and production processes. Generally, trade secrets are leaked through corporate (industrial) espionage, breach of contract, or something as simple as leaving your prototype iPhone at a bar.

A trade secret must be designated as such before it is leaked. One cannot simply say “I have a secret”. Use Nondisclosure agreements and designate information as trade secrets in contracts when dealing with partner companies and employees. There are other ways to designate information as a trade secret, to learn more, you should contact Spence-PC.

Take Away: Protect your trade secrets. Keep employees on a need to know basis. If you’re letting an employee go, make sure they don’t have access to your client files after they have been terminated. To learn more about protecting your company and your trade secrets from corporate espionage check out this article from Inc.

The post Four Types of Intellectual Property for Businesses appeared first on SpencePC.

**Medicine is for the alleviation of disease**

Sara **Constantakis** 20**16** [World of Forensic Science, Gale In Context: Science. “Medicine”] [DS]

Medicine is one of the branches of the health sciences. It deals with restoring and maintaining health, but is also used in determining cause of death. It is a practical science that applies knowledge from biology, chemistry, and physics to treat diseases. Biological knowledge is derived from anatomy, biochemistry, physiology, histology, epidemiology, microbiology, genetics, toxicology, pathology, and many other disciplines. Biology forms the basis for understanding how the human body works and interacts with its environment.

An understanding of chemistry is required to determine the interactions between different drugs, to detect chemicals in the body, and design drugs for treatment. Physics has an impact on understanding how the body works and on understanding how the various instruments and equipment are used in diagnosis and treatment. The need to understand interactions between all of these areas makes medicine one of the most complex scientific disciplines.

#### Violation: they do not defend the hypothetical enactment of the plan and gain offense off of the undercommons

Topical version of the aff: **the member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to end the use of intellectual property protections by non-Indigenous groups for medicines derived from indigenous knowledge.**

#### Disads to the TVA just prove there is neg ground and that it’s a contestable stasis

Switch side debate – critiques of liberalism and permformance can be read on the neg – solves dogmatism by testing different viewpoints

**Vote Neg – The resolution is the only common stasis point that anchors negative preparation. Allowing any aff deviation from the resolution is a moral hazard which justifies an infinite number of unpredictable arguments with thin ties to the resolution. Because debate is a competitive game, their interpretation incentivizes affirmatives to run further towards fringes and revert to truisms which are exceedingly difficult to negate—this asymmetry is compounded by their monopoly on preparation**

#### That outweighs – The competitive incentive from debate creates pressures for research and focused clash which generates important skills and makes debate a training ground for future work. The impact Successful movement organizing is analogous to mainstream politics – it requires skilled organization, negotiating relationships, strategic leadership, and proto-institutionalism – sacrificing debate as training ensures we never translate opinion into political power, but requiring the aff defend contestable positions linearly increases debate’s capacity for movement advocacy as they get more predictable

Han and Barnett-Loro 18 [Hahrie Han, Department of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara. Carina Barnett-Loro, Climate Advocacy Lab, San Francisco. To Support a Stronger Climate Movement, Focus Research on Building Collective Power. December 19, 2018. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2018.00055/full]

Building public will to address the climate crisis requires more than shifting climate change opinion or engaging more people in activism (Raile et al., 2014). By many measures, the climate movement today is stronger than ever: more people taking actions, more financial resources, and deeper concern. Nonetheless, despite increasingly widespread popular demand for sensible climate solutions (Leiserowitz et al., 2017; Hestres and Nisbet, 2018) and broad organizational infrastructure to support climate activism across most Westernized democracies (Brulle, 2014), public will that translates into the political power needed to effect meaningful change has been elusive (McAdam, 2017). Even the 2014 and 2017 People's Climate Marches that drew hundreds of thousands to the streets, demonstrations in support of the Paris Climate Accords, and large-scale acts of civil disobedience in opposition to the Keystone XL and Dakota Access pipelines have resulted in only short-lived campaign victories. Nearly 10 years after the failure to pass comprehensive climate and clean energy legislation at the federal level, experts largely agree there is “little hope” existing policies are sufficient to address the scale of the crisis (Keohane and Victor, 2011).

How can research help bridge the gap not only between opinion and action, but also between action and power? Many articles in this special edition examine the question of the conditions that make it more likely individuals will take action around climate issues. Indeed, the gap between opinion and action is well-known (Kahan and Carpenter, 2017), and burgeoning research in many fields of social science seeks to bridge it (Rickard et al., 2016; Doherty and Webler, 2016; Feldman and Hart, 2018). One of us works for the Climate Advocacy Lab, which supports field experimentation through direct funding and in-kind research assistance to build our collective understanding of the most effective strategies for moving people into action.

There is less attention, however, to the question of how those actions might translate into political influence. The challenge is this: in most cases, the null assumption is that activism becomes power at scale: that collective action is merely the sum of its parts, and the more people who take action, the more likely a movement is to achieve its goals. All things being equal, it is true that more is better (Madestam et al., 2013). Additional research, however, shows that for our stickiest social problems (like climate change), simply having more activists, money, or other resources is not sufficient to create and sustain the kind of large-scale change needed (Baumgartner et al., 2009; Canes-Wrone, 2015). Instead, we need a social movement that translates our actions into power. Social movements are a set of “actors and organizations seeking to alter power deficits and to effect transformations through the state by mobilizing regular citizens for sustained political action” (Amenta et al., 2010). Instead of focusing only on resources, movements focus on power. Instead of focusing only on individual action, they focus on collective action. To become a source of power, collective action must be transformative.

How, then, do we build the kind of movements that generate the collective action necessary to shift existing power dynamics? For scholars, what research can help advocates understand how to translate individual actions into the powerful, and transformative collective action necessary to create change? To examine this question, we co-hosted a conference that brought social scientists together with climate advocates in the United States. At this convening, movement leaders argued that to better support building a robust climate movement, research should move beyond traditional public opinion, communications, messaging, and activism studies toward a greater focus on the strategic leadership and collective contexts that translate opinion and action into political power. This paper thus offers a framework, described in Table 1, for synthesizing existing research on movement-building and highlighting the places where additional research is needed. We hope this framework can help focus more future research on the collective, relational contexts and strategic leadership choices necessary to generate collective action that translates into power. In describing the framework, we draw on Slater and Gleason's (2012) typology to show what we know and do not know about supporting movement actors seeking to make more impactful choices.

Assessing the State of Research on Climate Movement Building

How do movement leaders translate supportive public opinion and grassroots activism into political influence? Answering this question rests on first understanding a few key points about social movements. First, movements operate in an environment of uncertainty. For the climate movement, everything from oil spills to hurricanes, domestic elections to international treaties, legal decisions, and market forces can affect the terrain they must navigate. Movement leaders cannot directly control many of these things. Second, policy change is not power. A given policy change will not automatically effect change in the world consistent with movement interests (Hacker, 2004). Moreover, policies can be easily overturned, as exemplified by the transition from Obama to Trump, and immediate rollback of key policies including the Clean Power Plan, restrictions on drilling and mining on public lands, and coal ash protections. To create lasting power, movements need broad constituencies that persist through the ups and downs and whims of different administrations. Third, there is no direct line from activism to power, because power is a dynamic relationship between movements and their targets. To wield power, movements use their resources to act on the interests of political decision-makers (Hansen, 1991). In fact, some research suggests the advocacy group resources most predictive of large-scale policy change are relationships with decision-makers—more so than lobbying money, campaign contributions, or the number of grassroots members (Baumgartner et al., 2009). Some argue that the climate movement's failure to build and sustain the kind of constituency that would pressure decision-makers contributed to the failure of cap-and-trade legislation in 2010 (Skocpol, 2013).

Given these three factors—persistent uncertainty, the need to focus on power not policy, and the complex interests of movement targets—what are the questions movement leaders need to answer to build a more effective climate movement? We argue that most research has focused either on documenting trends in the political environment in which movements work or on questions of how the movement can focus on building more of its resources (such as more supportive public opinion or more activists). Those questions are important. Particularly in today's uncertain, dynamic political environment, however, we also need research on strategy: how do movements create the leadership capacities and organizational (or “meso-level”) conditions needed to navigate uncertain political situations and shifting relationships, and thus translate resources to power?

Organizations that have successfully wielded power in other issue areas can be instructive in showing why understanding strategic leadership and meso-level, collective contexts matters. Consider the gun debate in the United States. Polls show strong public support for stricter regulation of guns, advocates like Michael Bloomberg have poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the fight, and protests have brought millions of people into the streets for gun control. Nonetheless, the National Rifle Association (NRA) has been more effective in translating its activists and resources into political power. Why? First, leaders within the NRA undertook an intentional campaign to build an ardent constituency of gun owners that was willing to stand together, again and again, through ups and downs of any political fight, to support gun rights. As recently as the early 1970s, the NRA supported sensible gun regulations. Beginning in the 1970s, however, a group of hardline conservatives took control of leadership of the organization (Melzer, 2009). To build constituency, they used three key tactics: widespread benefits provided to gun owners from the national organization, strong appeals to identity, and a complex latticework of interpersonal relationships sustained at the local level (LaCombe, forthcoming). Second, leaders strategically leveraged this constituency to negotiate relationships with the Republican Party. The recurrent ability of leaders to deliver support from this constituency for policymakers became the basis through which the NRA built high-level relationships with elected officials and the Republican Party, thus cementing its hold over gun policy in the United States. By linking base-building with elite politics, the NRA transformed the political dynamics around gun rights.

#### Debate doesn’t have any effect on the political and the individual arguments we read have no effect on our subjectivity, even if they spur immediate reflection, those insights aren’t integrated into deep-stored memory—this means you can vote negative on presumption. Encouraging focused, nuanced research and clash is the only chance to change attitudes long term—which means they can’t solve their impact turns but our model can.

#### filter their impacts through predictable testability ---debate inherently judges relative truth value by whether or not it gets answered---a combination of a less predictable case neg, the burden of rejoinder, and them starting a speech ahead will always inflate the value of their impacts, which makes non-arbitrarily weighing whether they should have read the 1ac in the first place impossible within the structure of a debate round so even if we lose framework, vote neg on presumption. They also create a moral hazard that leads to affs only about individual self-care so even if you think this aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not, so assume the worst possible affirmative when weighing our impacts.

#### State bad isn’t offense against topicality bc they don’t have to defend it AND you can criticize the state bc you defend a change from the squo

#### Drop the debater – the round shouldn’t have happened in the first place

No RVIs – this includes impact turns and independent voting issues –

1 – exclusions are inevitable – we only have 45 minutes to discuss things – doesn’t prove harmful intent

2 – T is an aff burden – doesn’t justify them winning

3 – forces unreasonable standard of epistemic perception – bad arguments should be rejected, but that doesn’t implicate the team

# Case

1. All of their cards are power tagged – none of their cards are about medicine – command f “medicine” or “medical” and you wont find anything in any of their cards
2. They have no explanation for how the ballot is able to solve for all racial capitalism – means that you can vote neg on presumption

#### Gillespie’s call for an undercommon communication is an intellectual mirage – it imagines that symbolic and representational disruptions in benign academic spaces implicate material violence and buys off material tactics for resistance

Webb, 18—Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Sheffield (Darren, “Bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system: On forms of academic resistance (or, can the university be a site of utopian possibility?),” Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 40:2, 96-118, dml)

It is easy to be seduced by the language of the undercommons. Embodying and enacting it, however, is difficult indeed. Being within and against the university, refusing the call to order through insolent obstructive unprofessionalism, is almost impossible to sustain. Halberstam (2009, 45) describes the undercommons as “a marooned community of outcast thinkers who refuse, resist, and renege on the demands of rigor, excellence, and productivity.” A romantic and appealing notion for sure but refusing and reneging on “the university of excellence” will cost you your job. When Moten describes subversion as a “series of immanent upheavals” expressed through “vast repertoires of high-frequency complaints, imperceptible frowns, withering turns, silent sidesteps, and ever-vigilant attempts not to see and hear” (2008, 1743), one is reminded instantly of Thomas Docherty, disciplined and suspended for his negative vibes.7

Being with and for the maroon community is difficult too. First of all, “Where and how can we find/see the Undercommons at work?” (Ĉiĉigoj, Apostolou-Hölscher, and Rusham 2015, 265). Where and how can one find those liminal spaces of sabotage and subversion, and how does one occupy them in a spirit of hapticality, study, and militant arrhythmia that brings the utopic underground to the surface of the fierce and urgent now? Beautiful language, but how does one live it? Networks do, of course, exist—the Undercommoning Collective, the Edu-Factory Collective, the International Network for Alternative Academia, to name but a few. These are promising spaces for bringing together and harboring the maroons and the fugitives. But networks are typically short-lived, and—as Harney and Moten warned—there is a danger of institutionalization, of taking institutional practices with you into alternative spaces “because we’ve been inside so much” (Harney and Moten 2013, 148). And so, predictably, meetings of the fugitives come with structure, order, an official agenda, and circulated minutes. The outcasts convene in conventional academic conferences, with parallel sessions, panels of papers, lunch breaks, wine and nibbles (e.g., Edu-Factory 2012). These spaces offer time out, welcome respite, a breathing space, a trip abroad, and then one returns to work.

If hapticality, the touch of the undercommons, is “a visceral register of experience … the feel that what is to come is here” (Bradley 2014, 129–130), then this seems elusive. It is hard to detect a sense of the utopic undercommons rising to the surface of the corporate-imperial university. Moten describes the call to disorder and to study as a way to “excavate new aesthetic, political, and economic dispositions” (Moten 2008, 1745). But this notion of excavating is highly problematic. It is common within the discourse of “everyday utopianism”—finding utopia in the everyday, recovering lost or repressed transcendence in “everydayness” (Gardiner 2006)—to describe the process of utopian recovery in terms of excavating: excavating repressed desires, submerged longings, suppressed histories, untapped possibilities. But the fundamental questions of where to dig and how to identify a utopian “find” are never adequately addressed (see Webb 2017). Gardiner defines utopia as “a series of forces, tendencies and possibilities that are immanent in the here and now, in the pragmatic activities of everyday life” (2006, 2). But how are these forces, tendencies and possibilities to be identified and recovered? For Harney and Moten, it is through study, hapticality and militant arrhythmia. These are slippy concepts, however, evading concrete material referents.

What is it to inhabit the undercommons? Those who have written of their experiences refer to “small acts of marronage” such as poaching resources and redeploying them in ways at odds with the university’s designs and demands (Reddy 2016, 7), or exploiting funding streams “to form cracks in the institution that enable the Others to invade the university” (Smith, Dyke, and Hermes 2013, 150). For Adusei-Poku (2015), the undercommons is a space of refuge which is all about survival (2015, 4–5). We who feel homeless in the university are forced into refuge. We gather together to survive. We may gain satisfaction from small acts of marronage, but this is less about bringing the utopic common underground to the surface as it is a form of “radical escapism” (Adusei-Poku 2015, 4). Benveniste (2015, v) tells us that: “The undercommons has no set location and no return address. There is no map for entering and no guide for staying. The only condition is a living appetite. Listen to its hunger for difference.” We need more than poetry, however. And we need more than a series of minor acts of resistance. As Srnicek and Williams rightly emphasize, resistance is a defensive, reactive gesture, resisting against. Resistance is not a utopian endeavour: “We do not resist a new world into being” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 47). The undercommons, when one can find it, is a bolt hole, a place of refuge, a breathing space in the system. We need something more.

The occupation Can the occupied building operate as a site of utopian possibility within the corporate-imperial university? Reflections on, and theorizations of, two recent waves of occupation—“Occupied California” 2009–2010 and the UK Occupations 2010–2011—have answered this question affirmatively. The “occupation” should not be understood here as solely or necessarily “student occupation.” It goes without saying—though sadly so often does need saying —that “faculty also have a responsibility to fight with and for students” (Smeltzer and Hearn 2015, 356). Though led by a new historical subject, “the graduate without a future” (Schwarz-WeinStein 2015, 11), the importance of faculty support for the occupations was emphasized on both sides of the Atlantic (Research and Destroy 2010, 11; Dawson 2011, 112; Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 14; Ismail 2011, 128; Newfield and EduFactory 2011, 26). Long before Occupy took shape in Zuccotti Park, “occupation” was being heralded as the harbinger of a new society and a new way of being. If we return to the notion of creating utopian spaces, the key aim for some of the occupiers was to create communes within the university walls—to communize space (Inoperative Committee 2011, 6).8 Communization here is understood as a form of insurrectionary anarchism that refuses to talk of a transition to communism, insisting instead upon the immediate formation of zones of activity removed from exchange, money, compulsory labor, and the impersonal domination of the commodity form (Anon 2010a, 5). As one pamphlet declared: We will take whatever measures are necessary both to destroy this world as quickly as possible and to create, here and now, the world we want: a world without wages, without bosses, without borders, without states. (Anon 2010d, 34) This is a revolutionary anarchism that takes the university campus as the site for a practice—communization—that not only prefigures but also realizes the vision of a free society. Heavily influenced by The Coming Insurrection (Invisible Committee 2009), but tapping into a long tradition of anarchist theory and practice from Hakim Bey’s Temporary Autonomous Zones (Bey 1985) to David Graeber’s Direct Action (Graeber 2009), occupation becomes “the creation of a momentary opening in capitalist time and space, a rearrangement that sketches the contours of a new society” (Research and Destroy 2010, 11). It is “an attempt to imagine a new kind of everyday life” (Hatherley 2011, 123). Firth (2012) refers to these momentary openings as critical, experimental utopias: Such utopias are … simultaneously immanent and prefigurative. They are immanent insofar as they allow space for the immediate expression of desires, satisfaction of needs and also the articulation of difference or dissent. They are prefigurative to the extent that they allow one to practice and exemplify what one would like to see at a more proliferative range in the future (26) The ultimate aim is for the practice to spread beyond the campus through a dual process of provocative rupture—the idea that insurrectionary moments can unleash the collective imagination and stimulate an outpouring of creativity that blows apart common sense and offers glimpses of a future world (Gibson-Graham 2006, 51; Shukaitis and Graeber 2007, 37)—and “contaminationism,” that is, spreading by means of example (Graeber 2009, 211). It may well have been the case that communism was realized on the campuses of Berkeley and UCL, that a momentary opening in capitalist space/time appeared through which another world could be glimpsed. The occupation, however—whether California, London, or anywhere else—is likely always to remain a localized temporary disruptive practice. A practice with utopian potency, for sure, in terms of suspending normalized forms of discipline and opening new egalitarian discursive spaces (Rheingans and Hollands 2013; Nişancioğlu and Pal 2016). In terms of wider systemic change, however, “small interventions consisting of relatively non-scalable actions are highly unlikely to ever be able to reorganise our socioeconomic system” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 29). What “the occupation” demonstrates more than anything is the reality of the corporate-imperial university, as the institutional hierarchy, backed by the carceral power of the police and criminal justice system, inevitably disperses the occupiers—often using militarized force—and repossesses the occupied space in a strong assertion of its ownership rights not only to university buildings but also to what constitutes legitimate thought and behavior within them (on this see Docherty 2015, 90). The significance, and utopian potential, one attaches to campus occupations depends in part upon the significance one attaches to the university as a site of struggle. For the Edu-Factory Collective: As was the factory, so now is the university. Where once the factory was a paradigmatic site of struggle between workers and capitalists, so now the university is a key space of conflict, where the ownership of knowledge, the reproduction of the labour force, and the creation of social and cultural stratifications are all at stake. This is to say the university is not just another institution subject to sovereign and governmental controls, but a crucial site in which wider social struggles are won and lost. (Caffentzis and Federici 2011, 26) Clearly, if this is true, then the form the struggle takes, and the example it sets, is of immense significance. Srnicek and Williams describe as “wishful thinking” the idea that the occupation might spread beyond the campus by means of rupture or contamination (2016, 35). However, if the university really is a key site of class struggle (Seybold 2008, 120; Haiven and Khasnabish 2014, 38), a site through which wider struggles are refracted and won or lost, then the transformative potential of the occupation needs to be attended to seriously. The analysis of the university offered by the Edu-Factory Collective is, however, outdated. Sounding like Daniel Bell writing in 1973 about how universities had become the “axial structures” of post-industrial society (Bell 1973, 12), the analysis does not hold water today. Moten overdoes it when he tells us that “the university is a kind of corpse. It is dead. It’s a dead institutional body” (Moten 2015, 78). What is clear, however, is that “focusing on the university as a site of radical transformation is a mistake” (Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 13). As has been widely noted, there is very little distinguishing universities from other for-profit corporations (Readings 1996; Lustig 2005; Washburn 2005; Shear 2008, Tuchman 2009). What does separate them is their inefficiency, due in large part to the fact that universities operate also as medieval guilds, with faculties “ruled by masters who lord over journeymen and apprentices in an artisanal system of production” (Jemielniak and Greenwood 2015, 77). If the university is a sinister hybrid monstrosity—part medieval guild, part criminal corporation—which has no role other than reproducing its own privilege, then no special status can be attributed to campus protests. In this case, “A free university in the midst of a capitalist society is like a reading room in a prison” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). A reading room in a prison. Another apposite metaphor. The occupation is a safe space, offering temporary respite, a place to hide, a refuge, a bolt-hole, a breathing space. As with the utopian classroom and the undercommons, what the occupation suggests is that “defending small bunkers of autonomy against the onslaught of capitalism is the best that can be hoped for” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 48). Conclusion Zaslove was right to characterize utopian pedagogy within the corporateimperial university as the search for bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system. He himself suggests that, “All university classes should become dialogic-experiential models that educate by expanding the zones of contact with wider communities” (2007, 102). Like so many others, Zaslove sees dialogic-experiential models of education beginning in the classroom then expanding outward. The literature is full of references to “exceeding the limits of the university classroom” (Coté, Day, and de Peuter 2007a, 325), “extend [ing] beyond the boundaries of the campus” (Ruben 2000, 211), and “breeching the walls of the university compounds and spilling into the streets” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). This all brings to mind Giroux’s notion of academics as border crossers (Giroux 1992), but it also paints a picture of academics taking as their starting point the university and from there crossing the border into the community and the street.

The University can be the site for fleeting, transitory, small-scale experiences of utopian possibility—in the classroom, the undercommons, the occupation. It cannot be the site for transformative utopian politics. It cannot even be the starting point for this. Given the corporatization and militarization of the university, academics are increasingly becoming “functionaries of elite interests” inhabiting a culture which serves to reproduce these interests (Shear 2008, 56). Within the university, “radical” initiatives or movements will soon be co-opted, recuperated, commodified, and neutralized (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxvi; Seybold 2008, 123; Neary 2012b, 249; Rolfe 2013, 21). Institutional habitus weights so heavily that projects born in the university will be scarred from the outset by a certain colonizing “imaginary of education” (Burdick and Sandlin 2010, 117). And we have long known that the university is but one space of learning, and perhaps not a very important one at that. Identifying the academy as the starting point for a utopian pedagogy privileges this arcane space over sites of public pedagogy such as film, television, literature, sport, advertising, architecture, media in its various forms, political organizations, religious institutions, and the workplace (Todd 1997).

Perhaps the emphasis on creating radical experimental spaces within the academy needs to shift toward operating in existing spaces of resistance outside it. Haiven and Khasnabish argue that many social movements function already as “social laboratories for the generation of alternative relationships, subjectivities, institutions and practices” (2014, 62), providing “a space for experiments in knowledge production, radical imagination, subjectification, and concrete alternative-building” (Khasnabish 2012, 237). Why locate utopian pedagogy in the university when “critical utopian politics” can take place in “infrastructures of resistance” such as intentional communities, housing collectives, squats, art centers, community theatres, bars, book shops, health collectives, social centers, independent media and, increasingly of course, the digital sphere (Firth 2012; Shantz 2012; Amsler 2015; Dallyn, Marinetto, and Cederstrom 2015)? Moving beyond short-term, localized, temporary modes of resistance, utopian pedagogy would work across these sites to develop a long-term strategy and vision.

There is a role for the academic in utopian politics, but not in the university-as-such. The utopian pedagogue has a responsibility to exploit their own privilege and to work with students, communities and movements outside and divorced from the university. As Shear rightly notes, academics (and especially those working in the humanities and social sciences) “inhabit a privileged space in which critical inquiry concerning social hegemony and political-economic domination” is possible (Shear 2008, 56). Within the university, however, spaces for embodying and enacting this kind of inquiry have become constrained, compromised, monitored, surveilled, co-opted, and recuperated. As I have argued throughout this article, utopian pedagogy has become a search for bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system. Beyond the academy, however, there is a role to play. As Chomsky (2010) tells us, with privilege comes responsibility. And as Giroux frames it, this is an ethical and political responsibility to provide “theoretical resources and modes of analysis” to help forge “a utopian imaginary” (Giroux 2014a; 153; 2014b, 200). This means putting one’s knowledge and resources to use in the service of a collaborative process of memory- and story-making, pulling together disparate inchoate dreams and yearnings in order to generate a utopian vision that can help inform, guide, and mobilize long-term collective action for systemic change.

**Reform/Revolution is a false dichotomy- reforms open up space for more radical demands**

**Taylor, PhD, 16**

(Keenga-Yamahtta, AAS@Princeton, http://bostonreview.net/forum/black-study-black-struggle/keeanga-yamahtta-taylor-keeanga-yamahtta-taylor-response-robin)

This is the context within which Robin Kelley intervenes. He critiques what he sees as the student movement’s desire to make the campus more “hospitable” to black students. **Kelley** is not advocating that students of color simply leave the university, but he **argues for a need to be in the university rather than of it**. Here, **he is challenging** the list of **demands of** many **campus protests** intending to make the campus more inclusive to the needs of black and oppressed students—demands for greater faculty diversity, renaming campus buildings and monuments, and curriculum changes, among others. **I don’t disagree with Kelley’s basic claims** that **the university reflects** all of the **institutional racism** and biases that we see throughout American society. **The issue is whether the student protests should be dismissed as** only **putting lipstick on a pig**. **True, their demands will certainly not transform the fundamental character of American universities, but that does not mean these limited reforms are not worthwhile.** In fact, **there is a relationship between more modest demands on the university and the more insurgent posture** that Kelley advocates (and that I agree with). The **demands** made by black students across the country **have been derived in the heat of struggle and represent the politics, collaboration, and aspirations of the existing movement.** **They represent the efforts to transform the conditions of the campuses** they often live within **to reflect their principles of respect and dignity**. No black student should ever have to live in a residential space named after an avowed racist such as John C. Calhoun—which is currently the case at Yale University. Why should black students at Princeton University have to honor the legacy of President Woodrow Wilson, who fought hard to prevent black students from having a presence on the campus? **The demand for more black and women faculty is not an exercise in futility; neither is the desire for curricula that more accurately reflect the world we live in as opposed to the “great white men” narratives of so much coursework and history. These demands may not radically transform the university’**s “commitment to war and security,” **but they have the potential to crack open debates** about racial inequality on campus, thereby **creating a larger platform to address the history and contemporary practices of racism in these institutions. Small victories can empower one to fight larger battles.** Some **protesters** will be satisfied with improving life on campus, but others **will be inspired to struggle for demands of greater consequence**. **Campus radicals who have already come to these conclusions risk cutting themselves off from the newly initiated by dismissing out of hand what appear to be reforms rather than the revolution. But rarely has there been revolution without reform.**

**The University can and must be reformed – even critics agree.**

**Kelly, PhD, 16**

(Robin DG., PoliSci@UCLA, <http://bostonreview.net/forum/black-study-black-struggle/robin-d-g-kelley-robin-d-g-kelleys-final-response> 3-7)

Finally, **I take to heart** Keeanga-Yamahtta **Taylor’s and** Barbara **Ransby’s caution against dismissing student demands as reformist and leaping over reality to revolutionary utopia.** **Taylor is absolutely right to point out the immense value of symbolic changes** like killing monuments to slaveholders and racists (though no respondent was willing to defend cultural-competency training and highly paid administrators to oversee diversity). I think all of us would agree with **Ransby’s prescient call for “non-reformist” reforms, for sustaining the fight to transform universities, not as refuges but as social institutions embedded in the broad public life. She correctly cautions against romanticizing the search for radical alternatives in disengagement.** I could not agree more with her call for “a radical recalibration of what universities owe” to society as a whole, and that requires rejecting the myth of meritocracy, the false division between the university and the world, and the idea that intellectuals only reside in the university. Her response should stand as a manifesto for the undercommons rather than an alternative. Indeed, **Ransby—**along with Purnell, Taylor, Lebron, Redmond, and Carruthers—**offers a corrective to my own nagging pessimism that the university can’t be transformed, reminding me that it must be transformed since it comprises a critical part of the world we are trying to change. On this point, I fully concede.**

**debate is the opposite of a settler rhythm – its a unique site of argument testing that challenges different ideas through iterative testing.**

**Fugitivity is a flawed method of political engagement that makes neoliberal violence inevitable.**

**Love 15**—Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania [Heather, ““Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary,” *differences* Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 89-91]

Today, queer studies—prestigious but unevenly institutionalized—still signals absolute refusal or criticality—all anti- and no normativity. In their influential 2004 essay, “The University and the Undercommons” (and in the 2013 book that followed from it), Fred **Moten and** Stefano **Harney** rely on such an understanding of queer (as well as concepts borrowed from black studies, feminism, ethnic studies, and anticolonial thought). They **call for betrayal, refusal**, theft, **and marronage** as modes of resisting the iron grip of the academy, pointing to an uncharted, underground, and collective space they call the undercommons. “To enter this space,” they write, “is to inhabit the ruptural and enraptured disclosure of the commons that fugitive enlightenment enacts, the criminal, matricidal, queer, in the cistern, on the stroll of the stolen life, the life stolen by enlightenment and stolen back, where the commons give refuge, where the refuge gives commons” (103). Moten and Harney speculate whether the “thought of the outside” (105) is possible inside the university and suggest that if there is an outside, it is along the margins and at the bottom. **Yet their imagination of that outside is indebted to the inside**, in particular to the conception of deviance produced within sociology. **Their account of the undercommons reads like a rap sheet, a list of the traditional topics of deviance studies: theft, homosexuality, prostitution, incarceration.**

**Moten and Harney do not describe the undercommons, but rather ask their readers to join it**, to participate in active revolt against profes- sional and disciplinary protocols. To o er an objective account of the social position of radical academics would be to further business as usual in the academy; dwelling in the undercommons requires giving up on the usual protocols of description. Moten and Harney argue against the traditional role of the “critical academic” (105), which they see as just another turn of the professional screw, since work that opposes the academy does not challenge its basic structure or everyday operations. They argue that “to be a critical academic in the university is to be against the university, and to be against the university is always to recognize it and to be recognized by it, and to institute the negligence of the internal outside, that unassimilated underground, a negligence of it that is precisely, we must insist, the basis of the professions” (105). In contrast to the figure of the critical academic, they forward the image of the “subversive intellectual” who is “in but not of” the academy (101). Without dismissing the galvanizing effect of such a call to the undercommons, **it is important to consider the limits of the refusal of objectification as a strategy**. To be unlocatable, to be nowhere, to be in permanent revolt: Moten and Harney describe the path that queer inquiry laid out for itself. **Objectification**—**recognition, description, critique**—**can be a way to reinforce the status quo, but it is also a way of acknowledging one’s institutional position and the real differences between inside and outside**. Even the most subversive intellectuals in the academy are “on the stroll” in a metaphorical but not a material sense. The fate of those who came “under false pretenses, with bad documents, out of love” (101), if they survive, is to become “superordinates” in Becker’s sense.

Whose side are we on? Can we hold onto the critical and polemical energy of queer studies as well as its radical experiments in style and thought while acknowledging our implication in systems of power, management, and control? Will a more explicit avowal of disciplinary affiliations and methods snuff out the utopian energies of a field that sees itself as a radical outsider in the university? To date, **both the political and the methodological antinormativity** of queer studies **have made it difficult to address our implication in the violence of knowledge production, pedagogy, and social inequality.** **Such violence is inevitable, and critical histories of the disciplines**—and the production of knowledge about social deviance—**are essential.** **Undertaking such work**, **however**, **will not allow escape into a radically different relation to our objects because we are** (as Moten and Harney also argue) part of that history—we are **its contemporary instantiation**. To imagine a social world in which those relations are transformed—in what Moten and Harney refer to as the “**prophetic organization**” (102)—**may be crucial for** the achievement of **social justice, but to deny our own implication in existing structures is also a form of violence**.