**I offer the following definitions:**

**Just is defined as “guided by truth, reason, justice, and fairness” (Dictionary.com)**

**Strikes are unique to capitalism Friedman:**

**The strike is unique to capitalism because [of] the capitalist labor exchange,** where workers sell their labor time to capitalists for wages, is necessarily incomplete. In other markets, the conditions of exchange are fully specified. Both consumers and store owners, for example, know the price, size, and characteristics of a can of soup for sale on the store shelves, and consumers who refuse the offered price leave with no claim on the soup. By contrast, **labor is a “variable” element of production because the exact conditions of employment, including notably the amount of labor to be performed in any time period, are not fully specified. Instead, capitalists hire workers for a period of time in hopes of driving them to produce enough to cover their wage and allow for a profit. The incomplete nature of capitalist-labor contracts makes the labor process a contested terrain where conflicts extend to all areas that influence workers’ productivity, including the authority of supervisors**, management’s right to hire and to fire workers, and workers’ speech at work. **Capitalists use their control over access to the means of production to enforce their version of the labor contract by threatening to discharge individuals who work too slowly or lack labor discipline. Control over access to the means of production and the weight of a powerful and wealthy capitalist against an individual worker give employers leverage against workers. Strikers challenge the capitalist labor contract** in two ways: by rejecting the capitalist’s control over access to productive property and by rejecting the individualist premise of the labor exchange. There are always disputes between individual buyers and sellers where one side walks away from the exchange. However, strikes are fundamentally different because strikers insist on their right to bargain collectively with their employer, balancing their numbers against the employer’s wealth and power, and because strikers insist on their right to control access to the means of production, what capitalists consider their private property. **So all strikes are incipient rebellions against the capitalist system itself, because capitalism rests on the authority of the capitalist over the workers, authority that comes from the capitalist’s control over access to productive property and the leverage the capitalist has over individual workers.** No dispute over the price of soup can raise such fundamental issues

[***https://libcom.org/files/%5BAaron\_Brenner,\_Benjamin\_Day,\_Immanuel\_Ness%5D\_The\_E(b-ok.org).pdf***](https://libcom.org/files/%5BAaron_Brenner,_Benjamin_Day,_Immanuel_Ness%5D_The_E(b-ok.org).pdf)

**A socialist mode of production solves the causes of strikes. Keat**

While socialist ideas may retrospectively be identified in many earlier forms of protest and rebellion against economic injustice and political oppression, socialism both as a relatively coherent theoretical doctrine and as an organized political movement had its origins in early nineteenth-century Europe, especially in Britain, France and Germany. It was, above all, a critical response to early industrial capitalism, to an unregulated market economy in which **the means of production were privately owned and property-less workers were forced to sell their labour-power to capitalists for often meagre wages.** The ills of this system seemed manifest to its socialist critics. **Not only was the relationship between workers and capitalists inherently exploitative, and the commodification of labour an affront to human dignity, but it generated widespread poverty and recurrent unemployment, massive and unjust inequalities of wealth and economic power, degrading and soul-destroying work, and an increasingly atomized and individualistic society**. Socialists were not alone in criticizing some of these features of industrial capitalism and its accompanying ideology of economic liberalism. In particular, antipathy towards individualism was also a characteristic of conservative thought. But whereas conservatives found their inspiration in the hierarchically structured organic communities of the past, and were deeply hostile to the political radicalism of the French Revolution, socialists looked forward to new forms of community consistent with the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. For them, **the evils of capitalism could be overcome only by replacing private with public or common ownership of the means of production, abolishing wage-labour and creating a classless society where production geared to capitalist profits gave way to socially organized production for the satisfaction of human needs. In such a society, the human potential for a genuinely ‘social’ mode of existence would be realized, with mutual concern for others’ wellbeing rather than unbridled pursuit of self-interest, with cooperation for common ends rather than competition for individual ones, and with generosity and sharing rather than greed and acquisitiveness – a truly human community,**

*Keat, Russell, and John O'neill°. SOCIALISM \*.*

[*http://www.russellkeat.net/admin/papers/57.pdf*](http://www.russellkeat.net/admin/papers/57.pdf)

**Capitalism is a system that is fundamentally bad for the progress of society and needs to be abolished. Magdoff:**

It is, of course, doubtful whether the concept of a “human nature” means anything at all because the consciousness, behavior, habits, and values of humans can be so variable and are influenced by the history and culture that develops in a given society. Not only has so-called human nature changed, but the ideology surrounding the components of human nature has also changed dramatically. **The glorification of making money, the sanctioning of all the actions necessary to do so, and the promotion of the needed human traits**—“unnatural” and repugnant to Aristotle—**is** now **the norm of capitalist societies.** During capitalist development, including the recent past, what many have considered obvious characteristics of human nature have been shown to be nonsense. For example, it was once considered a part of human nature that women were not able to perform certain tasks competently. It was extremely unusual for women to be physicians, partially because of the belief that they were not capable of learning and using the needed skills. Now women doctors are common, and women are frequently more than half of the students in medical school. The recent harebrained remarks by Harvard University’s president that perhaps it is part of human nature that women can’t do quality work in math and science indicates that a strong ideological view of human nature still exists. This sentiment is now supposedly made more scientific by presumed genetic differences, even in areas where none have been demonstrated. It is clear what many consider human nature is actually a set of viewpoints and prejudices that flow out of the culture of a particular society. **Capitalism has existed for about 500 years**—mercantile (or merchant) capitalism for about 250 followed by industrial capitalism for the last 250—less than 0.4 percent of the entire period of human existence. (In large parts of the world, capitalism arrived later as the system expanded and has held sway for an even smaller portion of time.) **During this** small **slice of human history the cooperative, caring, and sharing nature within the human character has been downplayed while aggressive competitiveness has been brought to prominence for the purpose of fostering, and surviving within, a system based on the accumulation of capital. A culture has developed along with capitalism—epitomized by greed, individualism** (everyone for themselves), **exploitation of men and women by others, and competition.** The competition occurs among departments in companies and, of course, among companies and countries, and workers seeking jobs, and it permeates people’s thinking. Another aspect of the culture of capitalism is the development of consumerism—the compulsion to purchase more and more, unrelated to basic human needs or happiness. As Joseph Schumpeter described it decades ago “…the great majority of changes in commodities consumed has been forced by producers on consumers who, more often than not, have resisted the change and have had to be educated by elaborate psychotechnics of advertising” (Business Cycles, vol. 2 [McGraw-Hill, 1936], 73).

*Magdoff, Harry. “Approaching Socialism.” Monthly Review, July 2005, monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism/. Accessed 27 Oct. 2021.*

*‌*

**Thus the alt is to embrace a socialist government and society, one with collective ownership over the means of production and the removal of the capitalist mode of production, because capitalism is an unjust system, a just government would solve the issue of it, thus removing the need for strikes.**

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the best method to resist capitalism. Prefer:**

**Performativity: Solving neoliberalism controls the internal link to all in-round argumentation. Neoliberalism has become the basis of reason and logic. Martel, James. "Resisting the Neoliberal University with a General Strike." *Whiteness, Power, and Resisting Change in US Higher Education*.**

**If one thing is clear about the struggle with neoliberalism in the currentday university, it is that neoliberalism cannot be beaten at its own game. So much academic time and labor has been spent trying to justify, forexample, why we should continue to have courses in the humanities atall or why faculty should retain control over their own intellectual prop-erty, all to no avail. To argue with neoliberalism on its own terms is to engage in a language of rubrics and data, to pore over excel spread-sheets and student learning outcomes, seeking to use information as a way to convince administrators and other neoliberal overlords why they shouldn’t do what they are doing. None of this is going to save academia. The game is rigged; the rubrics and data dumps are decoys. The dirtysecret of neoliberalism (a fairly open secret these days) is it is not a rational metrics oriented matter of dollars and cents, or whatever other currency is in question. Instead neoliberalism—at least from the perspec-tive of the neoliberal administrator—is about demonstrating one’s own subservience to the market.1 Often or even usually (maybe always?) this must be demonstrated in ways that actually go against one’s own academic institution’s financial and other interests (otherwise how could you prove you were devoted to the market at all costs?). Faculty who want to go into administration must demonstrate they are willing to destroy every-thing that is autonomous and undominated about academia. Even “wellmeaning” administrators cannot avoid implementing and reproducing neoliberal doctrines. One oddity of neoliberalism is that virtually no one who enforces itschaotic mechanisms will admit they are neoliberal; indeed many a neolib-eral decree has been preceded by someone saying “I’m probably the mostanti neoliberal person there is...” before bringing down the neoliberalhammer on whatever obstacle is deemed as such.But the point is that neoliberalism doesn’t need any consciousenforcers, nor a smoky back room where neoliberals plot their domina-tion of the world. Those rooms and plots used to exist at the Universityof Chicago and other places but they are beside the point now. Neolib-eralism has spilled beyond the boundaries of a specific ideology per se to become ontological. That is to say, it has become what passes for reality in the world; it amounts to what Foucault calls a “grid of intelligibil-ity” wherein everything is screened through its logics and its apparatusof power.2 Even leftists who oppose neoliberalism are to some extent caught up in this logic system simply because it is so pervasive, not only as a system of control but also (and more importantly) as a system of thought, a way of knowing. In this way, neoliberalism is, in some sense,the only game in town. Everything has to be justified using neoliberal language; it has become the sole basis for reason and logic in our time(for example, recently in California an attempt to end the death penalty was done exclusively based on the cost of maintaining prisoners on death row year after year). Accordingly, appealing to reason and logic to argue against neoliberalism is a total waste of time; it amounts to using the language of a former—liberal—ontology in this new neoliberal context.The same words that made one kind of sense then (and even then they served very dark purposes) make a different kind of “sense” now.3For this reason, in this chapter I will argue the only way to contest neoliberalism is through a complete refusal of its fundamental bases.Anything less will not work (and has already been tried). Academicsorganizing against neoliberalization must not engage in negotiations, orcajoling, or begging. None of this will be effective because the very terrainof language has been coopted and usurped by neoliberal logics. No matterhow destructive or foolish a particular act might be it will most likelybe done anyway because what neoliberal administrators say they wantand what they actually want (or, more accurately still, what neoliber-alism wants through them) are two different things. No matter how muchmoney is out there, neoliberalism will always cry poverty because precarityis the only way it knows to continue its path of reckless domination (it wasrecently revealed the California State University system was sitting on a1.5 billion—yes billion—dollar slush fund after insisting it was absolutelybroke for years. This in a state that is itself the fifth largest economy inthe world in a period—at the time—of massive growth). No matter howmany charts and graphs are enlisted to make dollar and cents based argu-ments about saving the humanities (or more likely, because we all haveto use neoliberal talk to get anything, why the humanities are a far betterinvestment than STEM) they will be ignored because neoliberalism hasalready decided it can monetize the sciences in a way it can’t do with thehumanities (and anyway, as previously noted, making money is never thepoint anyway; actuallylosingmoney is the point).**

**This precludes all argumentation. A prerequisite to engaging in debate is using argument and reasoning, but that has been co-opted by capitalism.**

**Critical pedagogy: Challenging capitalism is key in educational spaces to combat the corporate university and empower students. Giroux**

**Giroux, Henry A., and Henry A Giroux. “Henry A. Giroux: Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory.” Truthout, Truthout, 3 Mar. 2015, truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/. || Brentwood School HO || Recut by Iowa City West Coach (Kyle Kopf)**

**These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism’s culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education. And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the “hyper-educated poor”** [**(18)**](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/) **joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. Memory is no longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. While the post-9/11 attacks have taken an even more dangerous turn, higher education is still a site of intense struggle, but it is fair to say the right wing is winning. The success of the financial elite in waging this war can be measured not only by the rise in the stranglehold**

**of neoliberal policies over higher education, the increasing corporatization of the university, the evisceration of full-time, tenured jobs for faculty, the dumbing down of the curriculum, the view of students as customers, and the growing influence of the military-industrial-academic complex in the service of the financial elite, but also in the erasing of public memory. Memory is no longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. On the contrary, it is either being cleansed or erased by the new apologists for the status quo who urge people to love the United States, which means giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle. The current call to cleanse history in the name of a false patriotism that celebrates a new illiteracy as a way of loving the United States is a discourse of anti-memory, a willful attempt at forgetting the past in the manufactured fog of historical amnesia. This is particularly true when it comes to erasing the work of a number of critical intellectuals who have written about higher education as the practice of freedom, including John Dewey, George S. Counts, W.E.B. Du Bois, the Social Reconstructionists, and others, all of whom viewed higher education as integral to the development of both engaged critical citizens and the university as a democratic public sphere.** [**(19)**](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/) **Under the reign of neoliberalism, with few exceptions, higher education appears to be increasingly decoupling itself from its historical legacy as a crucial public sphere, responsible for both educating students for the workplace and providing them with the modes of critical discourse, interpretation, judgment, imagination, and experiences that deepen and expand democracy. As universities adopt the ideology of the transnational corporation and become subordinated to the needs of capital, the war industries and the Pentagon, they are less concerned about how they might educate students about the ideology and civic practices of democratic governance and the necessity of using knowledge to address the challenges of public life.** [**(20)**](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/) **Instead, as part of the post-9/11 military-industrial-academic complex, higher education increasingly conjoins military interests and market values, identities and social relations while the role of the university as a public good, a site of critical dialogue and a place that calls students to think, question, learn how to take risks, and act with compassion and conviction is dismissed as impractical or subversive.** [**(21)**](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/) **The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States. The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States, extending from Thomas Jefferson to John Dewey to Maxine Greene, who held that freedom flourishes in the worldly space of the public realm only through the work of educated, critical citizens. Within this democratic tradition, education was not confused with training; instead, its critical function was propelled by the need to provide students with the knowledge and skills that enable a “politically interested and mobilized citizenry, one that has certain solidarities, is capable of acting on its own behalf, and anticipates a future of ever greater social equality across lines of race, gender, and class.”** [**(22)**](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/) **Other prominent educators and theorists such as Hannah Arendt, James B. Conant and Cornelius Castoriadis have long believed and rightly argued that we should not allow education to be modeled after the business world. Dewey, in particular, warned about the growing influence of the “corporate mentality” and the threat that the business model posed to public spaces, higher education and democracy.**

**This outweighs other role of the ballots on proximity. The impacts of capitalism affect us in the round. They have a direct impact on us so we need to address them now.**

**Controls the internal link to all consequentialist impacts: Capitalism is unsustainable– produces resource wars, climate damage, and structural violence. Milne, Executive Director of Communications, 15 (Seumus Milne, Guardian columnist and associate editor, executive director of strategy and communications, “The Davos oligarchs are right to fear the world they’ve made,” 22 January 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jan/22/davos-oligarchs-fear-inequality-global-elite-resist)**

**The scale of the crisis has been laid out for them by the charity Oxfam. Just 80 individuals now have the same net wealth as 3.5 billion people – half the entire global population. Last year, the best-off 1% owned 48% of the world’s wealth, up from 44% five years ago. On current trends, the richest 1% will have pocketed more than the other 99% put together next year. The 0.1% have been doing even better, quadrupling their share of US income since the 1980s.¶ This is a wealth grab on a grotesque scale. For 30 years, under the rule of what Mark Carney, the Bank of England governor, calls “market fundamentalism”, inequality in income and wealth has ballooned, both between and within the large majority of countries. In Africa, the absolute number living on less than $2 a day has doubled since 1981 as the rollcall of billionaires has swelled.¶ In most of the world, labour’s share of national income has fallen continuously and wages have stagnated under this regime of privatisation, deregulation and low taxes on the rich. At the same time finance has sucked wealth from the public realm into the hands of a small minority, even as it has laid waste the rest of the economy. Now the evidence has piled up that not only is such appropriation of wealth a moral and social outrage, but it is fuelling social and climate conflict, wars, mass migration and political corruption, stunting health and life chances, increasing poverty, and widening gender and ethnic divides.¶ Escalating inequality has also been a crucial factor in the economic crisis of the past seven years, squeezing demand and fuelling the credit boom. We don’t just know that from the research of the French economist Thomas Piketty or the British authors of the social study The Spirit Level. After years of promoting Washington orthodoxy, even the western-dominated OECD and IMF argue that the widening income and wealth gap has been key to the slow growth of the past two neoliberal decades. The British economy would have been almost 10% larger if inequality hadn’t mushroomed. Now the richest are using austerity to help themselves to an even larger share of the cake.¶ The big exception to the tide of inequality in recent years has been Latin America. Progressive governments across the region turned their back on a disastrous economic model, took back resources from corporate control and slashed inequality. The numbers living on less than $2 a day have fallen from 108 million to 53 million in little over a decade. China, which also rejected much of the neoliberal catechism, has seen sharply rising inequality at home but also lifted more people out of poverty than the rest of the world combined, offsetting the growing global income gap.¶ These two cases underline that increasing inequality and poverty are very far from inevitable. They’re the result of political and economic decisions. The thinking person’s Davos oligarch realises that allowing things to carry on as they are is dangerous. So some want a more “inclusive capitalism” – including more progressive taxes – to save the system from itself.¶ But it certainly won’t come about as a result of Swiss mountain musings or anxious Guildhall lunches. Whatever the feelings of some corporate barons, vested corporate and elite interests – including the organisations they run and the political structures they have colonised – have shown they will fight even modest reforms tooth and nail. To get the idea, you only have to listen to the squeals of protest, including from some in his own party, at Ed Miliband’s plans to tax homes worth over £2m to fund the health service, or the demand from the one-time reformist Fabian Society that the Labour leader be more pro-business (for which read pro-corporate), or the wall of congressional resistance to Barack Obama’s mild redistributive taxation proposals.¶ Perhaps a section of the worried elite might be prepared to pay a bit more tax. What they won’t accept is any change in the balance of social power – which is why, in one country after another, they resist any attempt to strengthen trade unions, even though weaker unions have been a crucial factor in the rise of inequality in the industrialised world.¶ It’s only through a challenge to the entrenched interests that have dined off a dysfunctional economic order that the tide of inequality will be reversed. The anti-austerity Syriza party, favourite to win the Greek elections this weekend, is attempting to do just that – as the Latin American left has succeeded in doing over the past decade and a half. Even to get to that point demands stronger social and political movements to break down or bypass the blockage in a colonised political mainstream. Crocodile tears about inequality are a symptom of a fearful elite. But change will only come from unrelenting social pressure and political challenge.**

Plan Bad Theory

A is the interpretation: The AFF must defend the resolution in general and not specify an advocacy.

B is the violation: The AFF is running a plan

C is the standards:

1. Research burdens. Plans explode research burdens because the aff can focus on prepping their advocacy while I have to split my time between every possible plan. Research is skewed in favor of teams that have coaches who do nothing but cut cards for them.  Debating the resolution in general equalizes research burdens because it ensures both sides know the advocacy before the round. Research burdens is key to fairness because debaters need the same structural abilities to prep for the round to have the capacity to win. Research burdens are key to education because how we prepare for the round determines what educational benefits we gain from it.

D is the voter:

1. Education is the core purpose of debate since (A) debate is sponsored and funded by schools whose primary purpose is education and (B) education is the only out-of-round impact that occurs in debate rounds. If the activity is counter-educational, it is literally a waste of time. Drop them on theory to deter future abuse.
2. Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a competition. Your burden as a judge is to vote for the better debater, which you cannot do if the debate is skewed. You would be voting for the better cheater, not the better debater

Drop the debater because that would deter future theory violations.

No RVIs because debaters do not win just because they were fair or education, they still need to win other arguments.

Use competing interpretation because reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention.

Util is ableist cause some people can’t feel pain, so we can be infinitely abusive to them. Medicineplus.gov:

Congenital insensitivity to pain with anhidrosis (**CIPA**) **has** two **characteristic features**: **the inability to feel pain** and temperature, and decreased or absent sweating (anhidrosis). This condition is also known as hereditary sensory and autonomic neuropathy type IV. The signs and symptoms of CIPA appear early, usually at birth or during infancy, but with careful medical attention, affected individuals can live into adulthood.

*“Congenital Insensitivity to Pain with Anhidrosis: MedlinePlus Genetics.” Medlineplus.gov, 2020, medlineplus.gov/genetics/condition/congenital-insensitivity-to-pain-with-anhidrosis/. Accessed 25 Oct. 2021.*

*‌*