## 1ac Our Version

### “They’re really fun”

### As someone who has lived in Vegas for 18 years, I expect this phrase to be applied to a lot of things. Drones isn’t one of them.

### Yet, even if this phrase was used when describing drones, I expected a non-debate friend to say it, not a journalist reporting on the creation of a drone program at my own university. Even amidst education cuts, force furloughs for professors, whole departments closing, and a terrible freshmen retention rate, our legislature and even those attending our university barely recognize any of these things.

### Here is the true, unrecognized story of what is going on at UNLV

This is from Reporter Yesenia Amaro of the Las Vegas Review-Journal wrote on July 7th, 2013- [“UNLV targets creation of drones technology minor,” <http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/education/unlv-targets-creation-drones-technology-minor>, ALB] \*edited for gendered language

Creech Air Force Base drone crews operate unmanned (SIC) aircraft in war zones from their Indian Springs location.¶ The U.S. Geological Survey plans to use less sophisticated drones to spy on Southern Nevada’s mule deer and bighorn sheep later this year.¶ The expanding use of ~~unmanned~~ \*unstaffed\* aerial vehicles in both military and civilian life has UNLV considering the creation of a drones minor program for students, said Thomas Piechota, the university’s interim vice president for research and dean of the graduate college.¶ The minor program focusing on the science behind drones and their uses would complement degrees in fields such as mechanical, electrical and aerospace engineering. In looking at whether to offer the drones minor, University of Nevada, Las Vegas officials now are gathering information on industry needs.¶ “That’s what we are trying to evaluate,” Piechota said last week. “We have faculty and students doing work with unmanned (SIC) aerial vehicles already.”¶ The program would bolster statewide efforts to bring government, industry and education together. The Nevada Governor’s Office of Economic Development in May submitted the last part of an application to the Federal Aviation Administration seeking to become one of six states designated as testing and training sites for unmanned (SIC) aerial vehicles.¶ “Nevada is well positioned,” Piechota said.¶ The state is competitive for various reasons, including a strong military presence, clear and open testing ranges, the climate and education programs that are already in place to support the industry, Piechota said.¶ The education programs exist at the K-12, community college and four-year university levels. For example, Piechota said, Rancho High School offers an Academy of Aviation magnet program.¶ “If the state gets designated, I think there’s certainly going to be a demand,” he said.¶ Doug van Aman, regional director with the Nevada Governor’s Office of Economic Development, said Nevada has a high chance of getting selected as one of the six sites because of its long history with unmanned (SIC) aerial vehicles.¶ “We were one of the first states, if not the first, to have UAVs in a test scenario,” he said. “We have a history of it and it’s kind of in our DNA now.”**¶** If the FAA selects Nevada, it would help build a new industry in the state. It would help expand existing companies and would help attract new ones into the state, Aman said. “It’s an opportunity to be the Silicon Valley of the UAV industry.”¶ The state should get a response from the FAA by the end of this year.¶ Last week, UNLV officials met with various industry leaders.¶ ¶ “We wanted to hear from them, what are their workforce needs,” he said.¶ ¶ University officials are still also trying to see how they can incorporate a specialty minor program into the existing programs. Also, not many students are going into science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields, often referred to as STEM, but a minor centered on drones could help attract students who might not otherwise be interested in those fields, Piechota said.¶ ¶ Bill Culbreth, associate professor of mechanical engineering at UNLV, has done research on unmanned aerial vehicles, including testing on a heavy fuel diesel engine. Many graduate students have worked with him on the research.¶ ¶ “They are really fun. They really attract the students,” he said of such research projects. “A minor would be a way to attract undergraduate students. I think there would be plenty of students who would be interested in going into that minor.”¶ ¶ But industry support would be critical in developing the program.¶ ¶ “We need to work closely with the industry to make this happen,” Piechota said.¶ ¶ Budget limitations are also something university officials have to keep in mind. A minor program wouldn’t be costly, but it would require additional financial support, Piechota said. The exact cost has yet to be determined.¶ ¶ “We would want to hire new faculty that would be able to support a program like this and grow a program like this,” he said.¶ ¶ Culbreth said UNLV already offers related courses that could support the drones minor, such as classes offered by the College of Engineering.¶ ¶ “There’s quite a few courses that could be used for that minor,” he said.¶ ¶ If the program is ultimately created, students who pursue the drones minor might have an easier time landing a job after graduating, a good paying job.¶ ¶ During the first quarter of this year, there were more than 13,500 filled aerospace and defense jobs statewide, Aman said. The average annual salary for those jobs is in the range of $80,000.¶ ¶ “We do have a good solid foundation for building a workforce,” he said.

There seem to be 3 reactions to this information.
The first two are apathy and ignorance. Many simply shrug their shoulders and say “Okay, whatever.” Many fail to understand how this affects them or simply don’t care about the possible implications. Others simply take a “Oh that’s cute!” approach saying things like “Oh wow! Drones are pretty cool!” There is no objection, no conversation, and worst of all, no public debate surrounding drones.

While doing research about Vegas drone policy, I discovered zero articles discussing its ethical implications. All articles were ultimately intertwined with the economic and militaristic benefits that drones could bring, veiling any further discussion about the disadvantages to more drones.

Where we expected to be a university – wide discussion, we simply found half a paragraph buried on UNLV’s website about the introduction of a drone minor.

Here is just one of the many articles that exemplify the problem
From a Las Vegas Review-Journal editorial board note posted on July 10th, 2013 [http://www.reviewjournal.com/opinion/editorials/drone-minor-major-step, ALB]

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is getting better and better about partnering with private industry to improve students’ employment prospects

. The latest example of the school’s responsiveness is its consideration of a minor in drone technology.¶ As reported by the Las Vegas Review-Journal’s Yesenia Amaro on Sunday, the program would focus on the science behind unmanned (SIC) aerial vehicles, as well as drone usage, and would complement degrees in fields such as mechanical, electrical and aerospace engineering. The university is gathering information on industry needs, which would guide the program’s structure.¶ Ms. Amaro reported that in the first quarter of 2013, there were 13,500 aerospace and defense jobs held statewide, at an average annual salary of $80,000. Drone operators certainly helped bolster those employment figures — Creech Air Force Base alone has 250 drone pilots and crew members, working in shifts 24 hours a day — and the field is sure to expand as more ways to use drones are explored. The commercial application of drones has huge economic possibilities, with a recent Medill News Service report pegging the current national annual impact at $14 billion. That figure has the potential to rise to more than $80 billion by 2025, depending on how the Federal Aviation Administration opts to regulate the integration of commercial drones into urban airspace — a decision expected to come in 2015. About 10,000 new drones will be in the air within a few years after the commercial ban is lifted, according to agency projections.¶ UNLV is ideally situated to offer drone studies, from a military standpoint and for a variety of other reasons outlined by Ms. Amaro’s report. The university should be commended for examining the need for such a program. Higher education needs more programs that give students practical knowledge in growing high-tech industries that pay well — particularly those that are right here in Nevada. A college education isn’t getting any cheaper, and especially in this slowly recovering economy, students can’t afford to put themselves tens of thousands of dollars in debt for degrees that offer limited job prospects.

### Liam and I started research on this aff the only way we could – through our local university setting. What we found was a complete lack of understanding, or worse, a complete disregard for the real human cost of drone policy. Many didn’t even know that Creech Air force Base, a military site where military drones are piloted for use in Afghanistan or Pakistan, was only a few miles from UNLV. Many simply shrugged their shoulders.

### This isn’t just a problem with our university, it is a problem with the way college education is structured. As Giroux rights in 2013

**Henry A** Giroux, 10-29-**13** **(Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977. He then became professor of education at Boston University from 1977 to 1983. In 1983 he became professor of education and renowned scholar in residence at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies. He moved to Penn State Univeristy where he took up the Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University from 1992 to May 2004. He also served as the Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies “Henry A. Giroux | Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University”,** [**http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university**](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)**)**

Higher Education and the Crisis of Legitimacy¶ In the United States and increasingly in Canada, many of the problems in higher education can be linked to diminished funding, the domination of universities by market mechanisms, the rise of for-profit colleges, the intrusion of the national security state, and the diminished role of faculty in governing the university, all of which both contradict the culture and democratic value of higher education and makes a mockery of the very meaning and mission of the university as a democratic public sphere. Decreased financial support for higher education stands in sharp contrast to increased support for tax benefits for the rich, big banks, the military and mega corporations. Rather than enlarge the moral imagination and critical capacities of students, too many universities are now encouraged to produce would-be hedge fund managers, depoliticized students, and modes of education that promote a "technically trained docility."14 Increasingly pedagogy is reduced to learning reified methods, a hollow mechanistic enterprise divorced from understanding teaching as a moral and intellectual practice central to the creation of critical and engaged citizens. This reductionist notion of pedagogy works well with a funding crisis that is now used by conservatives as an ideological weapon to defund certain disciplines such as history, English, sociology, anthropology, minority studies, gender studies and language programs. While there has never been a golden age when higher education was truly liberal and democratic, the current attack on higher education by religious fundamentalists, corporate power and the apostles of neoliberal capitalism appears unprecedented in terms of both its scope and intensity.15¶ Universities are losing their sense of public mission, just as leadership in higher education is being stripped of any viable democratic vision. In the United States, college presidents are now called CEOs and move without apology between interlocking corporate and academic boards. With few exceptions, they are praised as fundraisers but rarely acknowledged for the quality of their ideas. It gets worse. As Adam Bessie points out, "the discourse of higher education now resembles what you might hear at a board meeting at a No. 2 pencil-factory, [with its emphasis on]: productivity, efficiency, metrics, data-driven value, [all of] which places utter, near-religious faith in this highly technical, market-based view of education [which] like all human enterprises, can (and must) be quantified and evaluated numerically, to identify the "one best way," which can then be "scaled up," or mass-produced across the nation, be it No. 2 pencils, appendectomies, or military drones."16¶ In this new Gilded Age of money and profit, academic subjects gain stature almost exclusively through their exchange value on the market. Pharmaceutical companies determine what is researched in labs and determine whether research critical of their products should be published. Corporate gifts flood into universities making more and more demands regarding what should be taught. Boards of Trustees now hire business leaders to reform universities in the image of the marketplace. For-profit universities offer up a future image of the new model of higher education, characterized by huge salaries for management while a mere "17.4 per cent of their annual revenue spent on teaching, while 20 per cent was distributed as profit (the proportion spent on marketing [is] even higher."17 Offering subprime degrees devoid of any sense of civic purpose, large numbers of students from many of these for-profit institutions never finish their degree programs and are saddled with enormous debts. As Stefan Collini observes, at the University of Phoenix, owned by the Apollo Group, "60 percent . . . of their students dropped out within two years, while of those who completed their courses, 21 per cent defaulted on paying back their loans within three years of finishing. [Moreover], 89 percent of Apollo's revenue comes from federal student loans and [Apollo] spends twice as much on marketing as on teaching."18¶ What happens to education when it is treated like a corporation? What are we to make of the integrity of a university when it accepts a monetary gift from powerful corporate interests or rich patrons demanding as part of the agreement the power to specify what is to be taught in a course or how a curriculum should be shaped? Some corporations and universities now believe that what is taught in a course is not an academic decision but a market consideration. In addition, many disciplines are now valued almost exclusively with how closely they align with what might be euphemistically called a business culture. One egregious example of this neoliberal approach to higher education is on full display in Florida, where Gov. Rick Scott's task force on education is attempting to implement a policy that would lower tuition for degrees friendly to corporate interests in order to "steer students toward majors that are in demand in the job market."19 Scott's utterly instrumental and anti-intellectual message is clear: "Give us engineers, scientists, health-care specialists and technology experts. Do not worry so much about historians, philosophers, anthropologists and English majors."20¶ Not only does neoliberalism undermine both civic education and public values and confuse education with training, it also wages a war on what might be called the radical imagination. For instance, thousands of students in both the United States and Canada are now saddled with debts that will profoundly impact their lives and their futures, likely forcing them away from public service jobs because the pay is too low to pay off their educational loans. Students find themselves in a world in which heightened expectations have been replaced by dashed hopes and a world of onerous debt.21 Struggling to merely survive, the debt crisis represents a massive assault on the imagination by leaving little or no room to think otherwise in order to act otherwise. David Graeber is right in insisting that the student loan crisis is part of a war on the imagination. He writes:

### It seems that a total focus on the market has gripped UNLV. When we decided to cut education programs, we do so from the standpoint what makes the least amount of money. Educational focus is based off a supply and demand focus that forces out those that are deemed economically inefficient. When asked about why many choose or switch majors, or even why they went to college to begin with, the sole focus is on economics. Answers like “I want to make more money” or “I want to find a job that pays more” were common place. If a teacher offered their students an A and told them they never had to show up to class if they didn’t want to, every student would take this offer. College is not seen as an institution for learning or becoming a better advocate or citizen, it is seen as an obstacle that saps them of money they could otherwise have. This is why it should come as no surprise that the drones minor was created in the first place. Nevada, as one article puts it, can become “the test bed” for new drone technology, and UNLV can be at the center of this new market. Never mind the human casualties that result from military decisions made practically next door, never mind the military tests of dangerous weapons that happen, sometimes literally, in the backyard of Nevadan citizens, and never mind the implications of being able to spy or practically anyone. The only focus that we have is on profit and margins.

### We are confronted with the very necessity to be an activist.

#### As Moyers and Giroux writes in 11-22-13 (Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977. He then became professor of education at Boston University from 1977 to 1983. In 1983 he became professor of education and renowned scholar in residence at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies. He moved to Penn State Univeristy where he took up the Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University from 1992 to May 2004. He also served as the Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies. “We Live in an Era of Zombie Politics: Bill Moyers Interviews Henry Giroux”, <http://www.alternet.org/economy/do-we-live-era-zombie-politics?page=0%2C4&paging=off&current_page=1#bookmark>)

How do you shut down public schools and say that charter schools and private schools are better because education is really not a right, it's an entitlement? How do you get a discourse governing the country that seems to suggest that anything public, public health, public transportation, public values, you know, public engagement is a pathology?¶ BILL MOYERS: Let me answer that from the other side. They would say to you that we cut Medicaid or food stamps because they create dependency. We closed public schools because they aren't working, they aren't teaching. People are coming out not ready for life.¶ HENRY GIROUX: No, no, that's the answer that they give. I mean, and it's a mark of their insanity. I mean, that's precisely an answer that in my mind embodies a kind of psychosis that is so divorced— is in such denial about power and how it works and is in such denial about their attempt at what I call individualize the social, in other words—¶ BILL MOYERS: Individualize?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Individualize the social, which means that all problems, if they exist, rest on the shoulders of individuals.¶ BILL MOYERS: You are responsible.¶ HENRY GIROUX: You are responsible.¶ BILL MOYERS: If you're poor, you're responsible if you're ignorant, you're responsible if—¶ HENRY GIROUX: Exactly.¶ BILL MOYERS: —you're sick?¶ HENRY GIROUX: That's right, that the government— the larger social order, the society has no responsibility whatsoever so that— you often hear this, I mean, if there—I mean, if you have an economic crisis caused by the hedge fund crooks, you know and millions of people are put out of work and they're all lining up for unemployment, what do we hear in the national media? We hear that maybe they don't know how to fill out unemployment forms, maybe it's about character. You know, maybe they're just simply lazy.¶ BILL MOYERS: This line struck me: "The ideology of hardness and cruelty runs through American culture like an electric current..."¶ HENRY GIROUX: Yeah, it sure does. I mean, to see poor people, their benefits being cut, to see pensions of Americans who have worked like my father, all their lives, and taken away, to see the rich just accumulating more and more wealth.¶ I mean, it seems to me that there has to be a point where you have to say, "No, this has to stop." We can't allow ourselves to be driven by those lies anymore. We can't allow those who are rich, who are privileged, who are entitled, who accumulate wealth to simply engage in a flight from social and moral and political responsibility by blaming the people who are victimized by those policies as the source of those problems.¶ BILL MOYERS: There's a new reality you write emerging in America in no small part because of the media, one that enshrines a politics of disposability in which growing numbers of people are considered dispensable and a drain on the body politic and the economy, not to mention you say an affront on the sensibilities of the rich and the powerful.¶ HENRY GIROUX: If somebody had to say to me, "What exactly is new that we haven't seen before?" And I think that what we haven't seen before is an attack on the social contract, Bill, that is so overwhelming, so dangerous in the way in which its being deconstructed and being disassembled that you now have as a classic example, you have a whole generation of young people who are now seen as disposable.¶ They're in debt, they're unemployed. My friend, Zygmunt Bauman, calls them the zero generation: zero jobs, zero hope, zero possibilities, zero employment. And it seems to me when a country turns its back on its young people because they figure in investments not long term investments, they can't be treated as simply commodities that are going to in some way provide an instant payback and extend the bottom line, they represent something more noble than that. They represent an indication of how the future is not going to mimic the present and what obligations people might have, social, political, moral and otherwise to allow that to happen, and we've defaulted on that possibility.¶ BILL MOYERS: You actually call it— there's the title of the book, “America's Education Deficit and the War on Youth.”¶ HENRY GIROUX: Oh, this is a war. It's a war that endlessly commercializes kids, both as commodities and as commodifiable.¶ BILL MOYERS: Example?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Example being that the young people can't turn anywhere without in some way being told that the only obligation of citizenship is to shop, is to be a consumer. You can't walk on a college campus today and walk into the student union and not see everybody represented there from the local banks to Disneyland to local shops, all selling things.¶ I mean, it's like the school has become a mall. It imitates the mall. And if you walk into schools as one example, I mean, you look at the buses, there are advertisements on the buses. You walk into the bathroom, there are advertisements above the stalls. I mean, and the curriculum is written by General Electric.¶ BILL MOYERS: We're all branded—¶ HENRY GIROUX: They're branded, they're branded.¶ BILL MOYERS: —everything is branded?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Where are the public spaces for young people other learn a discourse that's not commodified, to be able to think about non-commodifiable values like trust, justice, honesty, integrity, caring for others, compassion. Those things, they're just simply absent, they're not part of those public spheres because those spheres have been commodified.¶ What does it mean to go to school all day and just be taking tests and learning how to teach for the test? Their minds are numb. I mean—the expression I get from them, they call school dead time, these kids. Say it's dead time. I call it their dis-imagination zones.¶ BILL MOYERS: Dis-imagination?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Yeah, yeah, they rob— it's a form of learning that robs the mind of any possibility of being imaginative. The arts are cut out, right, so the questions are not being raised about what it means to be creative.¶ All of those things that speak to educating the imagination, to stretching it, the giving kids the knowledge, a sense of the traditions, the archives to take risks, to learn about the world, they're disappearing.¶ BILL MOYERS: I heard you respond to someone who asked you at a public session the other evening: "What would you do about what you've just described?" And your first response was start debating societies in high schools all across the country.¶ HENRY GIROUX: That's right. One of the things that I learned quickly as a result of the Internet is I started getting a ton of letters from students who basically were involved in these debate societies. And they're saying like things, "We use your work. We love this work.”¶ And I actually got involved with one that was working with— out of Brown University's working with a high school in the inner cities, and I got involved with some of the students. But then I began to learn as a result of that involvement that these were the most radical kids in the country.¶ I mean, these were kids who embodied what a critical public sphere meant. They were going all over the country, different high schools, working class kids no less, debating major issues and getting so excited about in many ways winning these debates but doing it on the side of— something they could believe in.¶ And I thought to myself, "Wow, here's a space." Here's a space where you're going to have a whole generation of kids who could be actually engaging in debate and dialogue. Every working class urban school in this country should put its resources as much as possible into a debate team.¶ BILL MOYERS: My favorite of your many books is this one, “Zombie Politics and Culture in the Age of Casino Capitalism.” Why that metaphor, zombie politics?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Because it's a politics that's informed by the machinery of social and civil death.¶ BILL MOYERS: Death?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Death. It's a death machine. It's a death machine because in my estimation it does everything it can to kill any vestige of a robust democracy. It turns people into zombies, people who basically are so caught up with surviving that they have no— they become like the walking dead, you know, they lose their sense of agency— I mean they lose their homes, they lose their jobs.¶ And so this zombie metaphor actually operated at two levels. I mean, at one level it spoke to people who have no visions, who exercise a form of political leadership that extends the politics of what I call war and the machineries of death, whether those machineries are at home or abroad, whether they're about the death of civil liberties or they're about making up horrendous lies to actually invade a country like Iraq.¶ So this— the zombie metaphor is a way to sort of suggest that democracy is losing its oxygen, you know, it's losing its vitality, that we have a politics that really is about the organization of the production of violence.¶ It's losing its soul. It's losing its spirit. It's losing its ability to speak to itself in ways that would span the human spirit and the human possibility for justice and equality.¶ BILL MOYERS: Because we don't think of zombies as having souls?¶ HENRY GIROUX: They don't have souls.¶ BILL MOYERS: Right. You—¶ HENRY GIROUX: They're driven by lust.¶ BILL MOYERS: By lust?¶ HENRY GIROUX: The lust for money, the lust for power.¶ BILL MOYERS: Well, that's, I guess, why you mix your metaphors. Because you talk about casino capitalists, zombie politics, which you say in the book shapes every aspect—¶ HENRY GIROUX: Every aspect.¶ BILL MOYERS: —of society.¶ HENRY GIROUX: Yeah, at the current moment. This is what—¶ BILL MOYERS: How so?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Well, first, let's begin with an assumption. This casino capitalism as we talk about it, right, one of the things that it does that hasn't been done before, it doesn't just believe it can control the economy. It believes that it can govern all of social life. That's different.¶ That means it has to have its tentacles into every aspect of everyday life. Everything from the way schools are run to the way prisons are outsourced to the way the financial services are run to the way in which people have access to health care, it's an all-encompassing, it seems to me, political, cultural, educational apparatus.¶ And it basically has nothing to do with expanding the meaning and the substance of democracy itself. What it has to do is expanding— what it means to get—a quick return, what it means to take advantage of a kind of casino logic in which the only thing that drives you is to go to that slot machine and somehow get more, just pump the machine, put as much money in as you can into it and walk out a rich man. That's what it's about.¶ BILL MOYERS: You say that casino capitalist, zombie politics views competition as a form of social combat, celebrates war as an extension of politics and legitimates a ruthless social Darwinism.¶ HENRY GIROUX: Oh, I mean, it is truly ruthless. I mean, imagine yourself on a reality TV program called “The Survivor," you and I, we're all that's left. The ideology that drives that program is only one of us is going to win. I don't have any respect for you. I mean, all I'm trying to do is beat you. I just want to be the one that's left. I want to win the big prize.¶ And it seems to me that what's unfortunate is that reality now mimics reality TV. It is reality TV in terms of the consensus that drives it, that the shared fears are more important than shared responsibilities, that the social contract is the pathology because it basically suggests helping people is a strength rather than a weakness.¶ It believes that social bonds not driven by market values are basically bonds that we should find despicable. But even worse, in this ethic, the market has colonized pleasure in such a way that violence in many ways seems to be the only way left that people can actually experience pleasure whether it's in the popular medium, whether it's in the way in which we militarize local police to become SWAT teams that actually will break up poker games now in full gear or give away surplus material, equipment to a place like Ohio State University, who got an armored tank.¶ I mean, I guess— I'm wondering what does it mean when you're on a campus and you see an armored tank, you know, by the university police? I mean, this is— everything is a war zone. You know, Senator Graham—when Lindsey Graham, he said— in talking about the terrorist laws, you know these horrible laws that are being put into place in which Americans can be captured, they can be killed and, you know—the kill list all of this, he basically says, "Everybody's a potential terrorist."¶ I mean, so that what happens here is that this notion of fear and this fear around the notion of security that is simply about protecting yourself, not about social security, not about protecting the commons, not about protecting the environment, turns everybody into a potential enemy. I mean, we cannot mediate our relationships it seems any longer in this culture in ways in which we would suggest and adhere to the notion that justice is a matter of caring for the other, that compassion matters.¶ BILL MOYERS: So this is why you write that America’s no longer recognizable as a democracy?¶ HENRY GIROUX: No. Look, as the social state is crippled, as the social state is in some way robbed, hollowed out and robbed of its potential and its capacities, what takes its place? The punishing state takes its place.¶ You get this notion of incarceration, this, what we call the governing through crime complex where governance now has been ceded to corporations who largely are basically about benefiting the rich, the ultra-rich, the big corporations and allowing the state to exercise its power in enormously destructive and limited ways.¶ And those ways are about militarizing the culture, criminalizing a wide swathe of social behavior and keeping people in check. What does it mean when you turn on the television in the United States and you see young kids, peaceful protestors, lying down with their hands locked and you got a guy with, you know, spraying them with pepper spray as if there's something normal about that, as if that's all it takes, that's how we solve problems? I mean, I guess the question here is what is it in a culture that would allow the public to believe that with almost any problem that arises, force is the first way to address it.¶ I mean, one has to recognize that in that kind of logic, something has happened in which the state is no longer in the service of democracy.¶ BILL MOYERS: Well, George Monbiot, who writes for theGuardian, wrote just the other day, "It's business that really rules us." And he says, "So I don't blame people for giving up on politics … When a state-corporate nexus of power has bypassed democracy and made a mockery of the voting process, when an unreformed political funding system ensures that parties can be bought and sold, when politicians of the main … parties stand and watch as public services are divvied up by a grubby cabal of privateers, what is left of the system that inspires us to participate?"¶ HENRY GIROUX: I mean, the real question is why aren't we more outraged?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Why aren't we in the streets?

The role of the ballot is who best engages in activism for changes in drone authority in their community. The Debate space should be used to compare political activism strategies.

Liam and I BELIEVE that solidarity and coalition building is the answer. Already UNLV is forming an alliance with drone activists. A line from an email with one such activist says it best: “hope to hear from you soon new friend."

While we do not oppose government action, we think the best way to confront drone authority is from a local perspective. Any political movement starts with local political movements that coalesce around a singular goal. Even though drone activists around the US and at UNLV might have different political views and different identities, there is still a goal that we can rally around.

It would be silly to claim that our activism ends with debate round, or that opposing drone policy is the only answer that we can give. Activism and political engagement is nothing if it is not changing and adaptive – we are always open to new ideas and strategies. That’s why we are here. Debate is at its best when portable skills translate to better democratic conversations, not just market potential. Debate is unique in that it offers up the exchange of new ideas, new strategies, and new ways of doing what we do. We want to use the ballot to both engage in coalition building with a diversity of ideas and to give us ideas about how we might be better activists.

This doesn’t just end with drones. There are a myriad of things that are wrong with UNLV. Even now, my partner is in an ongoing Title 9 investigation with his dorm floor to prevent sexual assaults and racial violence from happening in his residential complex. This is includes talking with students, housing and university officials, and those who experience racial and sexual assaults.

We think our identity is important. We identify as members with a university community, both inside and outside of debate and believe that the best way of discussing these things is through a local perspective. As a half Filipino and half Puerto Rican, I know firsthand the racism that I confront, and as a Korean, my partner knows that we are at an inherent disadvantage simply because we were born a different race. Despite this, we think that this offers the best strategy for dealing with those issues.

As Giroux writes
**Henry A** Giroux, 10-29-**13** **(Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977. He then became professor of education at Boston University from 1977 to 1983. In 1983 he became professor of education and renowned scholar in residence at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies. He moved to Penn State Univeristy where he took up the Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University from 1992 to May 2004. He also served as the Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies “Henry A. Giroux | Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University”,** [**http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university**](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)**)**

For Said, being awake becomes a central metaphor for defining the role of academics as public intellectuals, defending the university as a crucial public sphere, engaging how culture deploys power, and taking seriously the idea of human interdependence while always living on the border - one foot in and one foot out, an exile and an insider for whom home was always a form of homelessness. As a relentless border crosser, Said embraced the idea of the "traveler" as an important metaphor for engaged intellectuals. As Stephen Howe, referencing Said, points out, "It was an image which depended not on power, but on motion, on daring to go into different worlds, use different languages, and 'understand a multiplicity of disguises, masks, and rhetorics. Travelers must suspend the claim of customary routine in order to live in new rhythms and rituals . . . the traveler crosses over, traverses territory and abandons fixed positions all the time."41 And as a border intellectual and traveler, Said embodied the notion of always "being quite not right," evident by his principled critique of all forms of certainties and dogmas and his refusal to be silent in the face of human suffering at home and abroad. ¶ Being awake meant refusing the now popular sport of academic bashing or embracing a crude call for action at the expense of rigorous intellectual and theoretical work. On the contrary, it meant combining rigor and clarity, on the one hand, and civic courage and political commitment, on the other. A pedagogy of wakefulness meant using theoretical archives as resources, recognizing the worldly space of criticism as the democratic underpinning of publicness, defining critical literacy not merely as a competency, but as an act of interpretation linked to the possibility of intervention in the world. It pointed to a kind of border literacy in the plural in which people learned to read and write from multiple positions of agency; it also was indebted to the recognition forcibly stated by Hannah Arendt that "Without a politically guaranteed public realm, freedom lacks the worldly space to make its appearance."42 ¶ I believe that Said was right in insisting that intellectuals have a responsibility to unsettle power, trouble consensus and challenge common sense. The very notion of being an engaged public intellectual is neither foreign to, nor a violation of, what it means to be an academic scholar, but central to its very definition. According to Said, academics have a duty to enter into the public sphere unafraid to take positions and generate controversy, functioning as moral witnesses, raising political awareness, making connections to those elements of power and politics often hidden from public view, and reminding "the audience of the moral questions that may be hidden in the clamor and din of the public debate."43 Said also criticized those academics who retreat into a new dogmatism of the disinterested specialist that separates them "not only from the public sphere but from other professionals who don't use the same jargon."44 This was especially unsettling to him at a time when complex language and critical thought remained under assault in the larger society by all manner of antidemocratic and anti-intellectual forces. But there is more at stake here than a retreat into discourses that turn theory into a mechanical act of academic referencing, there is also the retreat of intellectuals from being able to defend the public values and democratic mission of higher education. Or, as Irving Howe put it, "intellectuals have, by and large, shown a painful lack of militancy in defending the rights which are a precondition of their existence."45¶ The view of higher education as a democratic public sphere committed to producing young people capable and willing to expand and deepen their sense of themselves, to think of the "world" critically, "to imagine something other than their own well-being," to serve the public good, take risks and struggle for a substantive democracy has been in a state of acute crisis for the last 30 years.46 When faculty assume, in this context, their civic responsibility to educate students to think critically, act with conviction and connect what they learn in classrooms to important social issues in the larger society, they are hounded by those who demand "measurable student outcomes," as if deep learning breaks down into such discrete and quantifiable units. What do the liberal arts and humanities amount to if they do not teach the practice of freedom, especially at a time when training is substituted for education? Gayatri Spivak provides a context for this question with her comment: "Can one insist on the importance of training in [in higher education] in [a] time of legitimized violence?"47¶ In a society that remains troublingly resistant to or incapable of questioning itself, one that celebrates the consumer over the citizen and all too willingly endorses the narrow values and interests of corporate power, the importance of the university as a place of critical learning, dialogue and social justice advocacy becomes all the more imperative. Moreover, the distinctive role that faculty play in this ongoing pedagogical project of shaping the critical rationalities through which agency is defined and civic literacy and culture produced, along with support for the institutional conditions and relations of power that make them possible, must be defended as part of a broader discourse of excellence, equity, and democracy.¶ Higher education represents one of the most important sites over which the battle for democracy is being waged. It is the site where the promise of a better future emerges out of those visions and pedagogical practices that combine hope, agency, politics and moral responsibility as part of a broader emancipatory discourse. Academics have a distinct and unique obligation, if not political and ethical responsibility, to make learning relevant to the imperatives of a discipline, scholarly method, or research specialization. But more importantly, academics as engaged scholars can further the activation of knowledge, passion, values and hope in the service of forms of agency that are crucial to sustaining a democracy in which higher education plays an important civic, critical and pedagogical role.
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