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### Notes

\*Truth exists, reality is real, and capitalism is good.

\*There is so much gendered language in these cards - I tried to catch everything but if I didn’t mark it out yourself/read at your own risk.

\*This kritik is the best against affirmatives that make arguments about the indeterminacy or pluralistic nature of language or society, as it is an impact turn to that notion. It also is good against policy affirmatives that drastically increase the overreach of the government.

\*This kritik is TERRIBLE against antiblackness or other identity based affirmatives, because the thesis of Objectivism is that oppression would not exist if everyone just focused on their own self-interest. Rand was also racist, sexist, transphobic, etc. Making survival-of-the-fittest-esque arguments versus identity affirmatives is not the best route.

Objectivism is a philosophical framework developed by the Russian writier and philosopher Ayn Rand. It has several tenets that interact in different ways with debate arguments.

1. Reality exists independently of consciousness - Rand believes that objects exist and look/feel/sound the same for all people, although each person can have their own method of coming to that perception. The chair in front of you is definitively a chair and looks the same for all people. “A” is “A”, etc. etc.

2. Rational self-interest is the most ethical model of living - Rand believes that this allows for competition and efficiency and innovation, all of which lead to the betterment of society.

3. Laissez-faire capitalism is awesome - Rand believes that that role of government or other collective institutions is solely for the prevention of the use of force - any act of taxation or regulation is a form of thievery.

### Quotes

Put these in your 2NC and 2NR for extra spice

Ayn Rand wrote in *Atlas Shrugged*:

“If you don't know, the thing to do is not to get scared, but to learn.”

“I swear by my life and my love of it that I will never live for the sake of another man, nor ask another man to live for mine.”

“Contradictions do not exist. Whenever you think that you are facing a contradiction, check your premises. You will find that one of them is wrong.”

“Never think of pain or danger or enemies a moment longer than is necessary to fight them.”

“I think; therefore, I'll think.”

“Live and act within the limit of your knowledge and keep expanding it to the limit of your life.”

“There is no such thing as a lousy job - only lousy men who don't care to do it.”

“Money is only a tool. It will take you wherever you wish, but it will not replace you as the driver.”

“It is not death that we wish to avoid, but life that we wish to live.”

“Money will not purchase happiness for the man who has no concept of what he wants.”

"If it's worth doing, it's worth overdoing."

# Neg

## 1NCs

### 1NC vs Policy

#### Modern day education is plagued with teaching methods that miss the forest for the trees. In the attempt to take every factor into account, students actually learn nothing. The affirmative is another failed liberal attempt to make students whole subjects.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

I went to an eighth-grade class on Western European history in a highly regarded, non-Progressive school with a university affiliation. The subject that day was: Why does human history' constantly change? This is an excellent question, which really belongs to the philosophy of history. What factors, the teacher was asking, move history, and explain men's past actions? Here are the he listed on the board: competition among classes for land, money, power, or trade routes; disasters and catastrophes (such as wars and plagues); the personality of leaders; innovations, technology, new discoveries (potatoes and coffee are included here); and developments in the rest of the world, which interacts with a given region. At this point, time ran out. But think of what else could qualify as causes in this kind of approach. What about an era's press or media of communication? Is that a factor in history? What about people's psychology, including their sexual proclivities? What about their art or their geography? What about the weather? Do you see the hodgepodge the students are being given? History, they are told, is moved by power struggles and diseases and potatoes and wars and chance personalities. Who can make sense out of such a chaos? Here is a random multiplicity thrown at a youngster without any attempt to conceptualize it—to reduce it to an intelligible unity, to trace the operation of principles. This is perceptual-level history, history as nothing but a torrent of unrelated, disintegrated concretes. The American Revolution, to take a specific example, was once taught in the schools on the conceptual level. The Revolution's manifold aspects were identified, then united, and explained by a principle: the commitment of the colonists to individual rights and their consequent resolve to throw off the tyrant's yoke. This was a lesson students could understand and find relevant in today's world. But now the same event is ascribed to a whole list of alleged causes. The students are given ten (or fifty) causes of the Revolution, including the big landowners' desire to preserve their estates, the Southern planters' desire for a cancellation of their English debts, the Bostonians' opposition to tea taxes, the Western land speculators' need to expand past the Appalachians, and firth. No one can retain such a list longer than is required to pass the exam; it must be memorized, then regurgitated, then happily and thoroughly forgotten. is all one can do with unrelated concretes If the students were taught by avowed Marxists—if they were told that history reflects die clash between the factors of production and the modes of ownership—it would be dead wrong, but it would still be a principle, an integrating generalization, and it would be much less harmful to the students' ability to think; they might still be open to argument on the subject. But to teach them an unconceptualized hash is to imply that history is a tale told by an idiot, without wider meaning, or relevance to the present. This approach destroys the possibility of the students thinking or caring at all about the field. I cannot resist adding that the State Education Department of New York has found a way, believe it or not, to make the teaching of history still worse. You might think that, in history at least, the necessary order of presenting the material is self-evident. Since each era grows out of the preceding, the obvious way to teach events is as they happened, that is, chronologically. But not according to a new proposal. In order "to put greater emphasis on sociological, political, and economic issues," a New York State proposal recommends that historical material be organized for the students according to six master topics picked out of the blue from the pop ethos: "ecology, human needs, human rights, cultural interaction, the global system of economic interdependence, and the future." In this approach, an event from a later period can easily be taught (in connection with one master topic) first, long before the developments from an earlier period that actually led to it. As a more traditional professor from Columbia has noted: "The whole thing would be wildly out of chronological order. The (Russian) purge trials of the 1930s would be taught before the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. It is all fragmented and there is no way that this curriculum relates one part of a historical period to another, which is what you want kids to be able to do. But the modern educators don't seem to care about that. They want "fragments," that is, concretes, without context, logic, or any other demands of a conceptual progression. I do not know what to make of this New York proposal. The fact that it was announced to the press and discussed seriously is revealing enough. Given the way history is now being taught, it is not surprising that huge chunks of it promptly get forgotten by the students or simply are never taken in. The result is many adolescents' shocking ignorance of the most elementary historical, or current, facts. One man wrote a column recently in The Washington Post recounting his conversations with today's teenagers. He found high school graduates who did not know anything about World War Il, including what happened at pearl Harbor, or what country the United States was fighting in the Pacific. won?" one college student asked him. At one point, the writer and a girl who was a junior at the University of Southern California were watching television coverage of Poland after martial law had been imposed; the set showed political prisoners being put into a cage. The girl could not understand it '"Why don-t they just leave and come to L.A.?'" she asked. "l explained that they were not allowed to leave." "'They're not!” she said. '"Why not?"' 'I explained that in totalitarian states citizens usually could not emigrate." she said. "'Since when? Is that something Now let us make a big jump—from history to reading Let us look at the method of teaching reading that is used by most American schools in some form: the look-say method (as against phonics). The method of phonics, the old-fashioned approach, first teaches a child the sound of individual letters; then it teaches him to read words by combining these sounds. Each letter thus represents an abstraction subsuming countless instances. Once a child knows that p sounds "puh," for instance, that becomes a principle; he grasps that every p he meets sounds the same way. When he has learned a few dozen such abstractions, he has acquired the knowledge necessary to decipher virtually any new word he encounters. Thus, the gigantic multiplicity of the English vocabulary is reduced to a handful of symbols. This is the conceptual method of learning to read. Modern educators object to it. Phonics, they say (among many such is unreal. I quote from one such mentality: "There is little value in pronouncing the letter p in isolation, it is almost impossible to do this—a vowel inevitably follows the pronunciation of any consonant. This means: when you pronounce the sound of have to utter the vowel sound "uh"; so, you haven't isolated the pure consonant; so, phonics is artificial. But why can't you isolate in your mind, focusing only on the consonant sound, ignoring the accompanying vowel for of analysis—just as men focus on a red table's color but ignore its shape in order to reach the concept Why does this writer rule out selective attention and analysis, which are the very essence of human cognition? Because these involve an act of abstraction; they represent a conceptual process, precisely the that modern educators oppose. Their favored method, look-say, dispenses with abstractions. Look- say forces a child to learn the sounds of whole words without knowing the sounds of the individual letters or syllables. This makes every word a new concrete to be grasped only by perceptual means, such as trying to remember its distinctive shape on the page, or some special picture the teacher has associated with it. Which amounts to heaping on the student a vast multiplicity of concretes and saying: stare at these and memorize them. (You may not be surprised to discover that this method was invented, as far as I can tell, by an eighteenth-century German professor who was a follower of Rousseau, the passionate opponent of reason. There is a colossal Big Lie involved in the look-say propaganda. Its advocates crusade against the overuse of memory, they decry phonics because, they say, it requires a boring memorization of all the sounds of the alphabet. Their solution is to replace such brief, simple memorization with the task of memorizing the sound of every word in the language. In fact, if one wishes to save children from the drudgery of endless memorization, only the teaching of abstractions will do it—in any field. No one can learn to read by the look-say method. It is too anti-human. Our schools today, therefore, are busy teaching a new skill: guessing. They offer the children some memorized shapes and pictures to start, throw in a little phonics (thanks to immense parental pressure), count on the parents secretly teaching their children something at home about reading—and then, given this stew of haphazard clues, they concentrate their efforts on teaching the children about methods of guessing what a given word might be.

#### State action necessarily limits the individual freedoms that ought to be granted to every person - only pure competition can make society the best it can possibly be

Cox 13 - Stephen Cox, Ph.D. (UCLA), Professor of English Literature, Distinguished Professor, Faculty Fellow, Revelle College, July 2013 [“Rand, Paterson, and the Problem of Anarchism”, The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1 (July 2013), pp. 3-25, Penn State University Press] rpg

From the economist Henry George (1839–97) Nock had derived a belief that “government”—as opposed to the oppressive “state”—can be supported by a 100 percent tax on “unearned” increases in the values of land. Whether this is really “anarchism” can be disputed (Cox 1992, 42–44). Rand apparently never disputed it. It is possible that she did not clearly understand Nock’s position. Paterson, who was very well read on the subject, pronounced George’s Single Tax nothing but “socialism” (Cox 2004, 53, 71, 215). Rand’s conflict with individualist anarchism came at a later time. In Atlas Shrugged (1957), Rand proposed a moral and political theory significantly based on the idea that force should never be initiated, by individuals or by government; it should be used only in direct and personal retaliation: “It is only as retaliation that force may be used and only against the man who starts its use” (1024). This severely limited-government theory naturally attracted to Rand’s circle many radical opponents of the state, including the economist Murray Rothbard (1926–95). Rothbard attended Rand’s philosophical salons but made himself unwelcome by refusing to accept her intellectual authority. Soon after, he became the twentieth century’s most formidable proponent of libertarian anarchism (“anarcho-capitalism”). Largely because of his influence, the libertarian movement of the 1970s and 1980s included a very significant minority of anarchists; the movement still does, though their numbers may be declining. And many libertarians continue to combine anarchism with an unorthodox Objectivism. It was at least in part to counter the ideas of Rothbard and his followers that Rand developed the arguments contained in three essays originally published in The Objectivist Newsletter (1963 and 1964) and republished in The Virtue of Selfishness (1964b): “Man’s Rights,” “The Nature of Government,” and “Government Financing in a Free Society.” By the time she wrote these essays, Rand had developed a decided aversion to sharing the intellectual stage with anyone else. In refuting Rothbard’s ideas, she referred to their proponents anonymously, as “some of the younger advocates of freedom” (Rand 1964b, 112). But it is plainly Rothbard and company whom she had in mind. The fact that such people generally described themselves as libertarians is reflected in the vigorous opposition she later mounted to anything called “libertarianism.” The anarcho-capitalists suggested, and continue to suggest, that the state can be replaced with private, voluntary agencies—organizations that contract with individuals to provide protection (private police) and adjudication of conflicts (private justice). These agencies would compete with one another, much as companies now compete to provide the necessities of food and shelter. As competitors, they would be anxious to please their clients by offering the greatest possible security and the most satisfactory settlement of disputes. Costs would be controlled by the competitive principle that controls costs in other areas of life. Yet while competing, these agencies would be inclined to reach amicable understandings among themselves— a cheaper alternative than fighting one another. Contrast the current situation, in which no one is guaranteed either justice or safety (including safety from predatory police and courts), but everyone is guaranteed high taxes, intrusive laws, the surrender of the right to choose for oneself in important instances, and often the surrender of the right to self-defense. This, argue the anarcho-capitalists, is ever the course of monopolistic government. The state doesn’t simply appropriate the citizens’ right to repel force; it constantly initiates force, on the citizens themselves. This, I believe, is the argument on which libertarian anarchists substantially agree.1 Rand’s own ideas are so close to those of the anarcho-capitalists that when she attempts to counter their position, she does so very much in their own terms. The anarcho-capitalists identified invasions of rights with the initiation of force; as I have noted, Atlas Shrugged had already enshrined the non-initiation-of-force principle: So long as men desire to live together, no man may initiate—do you hear me? no man may start—the use of physical force against others. . . . Whoever, to whatever purpose or extent, initiates the use of force, is a killer acting on the premise of death in a manner wider than murder: the premise of destroying man’s capacity to live. (Rand 1957, 1023) The only proper purpose of a government is to protect man’s rights, which means: to protect him from physical violence. A proper government is only a policeman, acting as an agent of man’s selfdefense, and, as such, may resort to force only against those who start the use of force. (1062) “Man’s Rights” repeats the idea that “the government, acting as a policeman, may use force only in retaliation and only against those who initiate its use” The non-initiation principle or “‘non-aggression’ axiom”—the idea that no one has the right to initiate “the use or threat of physical violence against the person or property of someone else”—was congenial both to Rothbardian anarchists and to such limited-government theorists as Robert Nozick (Rothbard 1973, 8, here quoted; Nozick 1974, 32–35). I know of no libertarian anarchist who denies the principle. Rothbard himself went so far as to claim that “all libertarians agree on nonaggression as the central axiom of their doctrine” (Rothbard 1973, 8). Indeed, the non-initiation principle was influential enough to become the basis of Libertarian Party ideology. Despite vigorous and determined criticism, mounted by many people over many years, the party still requires potential members to sign a statement declaring, “I certify that I oppose the initiation of force to achieve political or social goals.”2

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

Productiveness is your acceptance of morality, your recognition of the fact that you choose to live--that productive work is the process by which man's consciousness controls his existence, a constant process of acquiring knowledge and shaping matter to fit one's purpose, of translating an idea into physical form, of remaking the earth in the image of one's values--that all work is creative work if done by a thinking mind, and no work is creative if done by a blank who repeats in uncritical stupor a routine he has learned from others--that your work is yours to choose, and the choice is as wide as your mind, that nothing more is possible to you and nothing less is human--that to cheat your way into a job bigger than your mind can handle is to become a fear-corroded ape on borrowed motions and borrowed time, and to settle down into a job that requires less than your mind's full capacity is to cut your motor and sentence yourself to another kind of motion: decay--that your work is the process of achieving your values, and to lose your ambition for values is to lose your ambition to live--that your body is a machine, but your mind is its driver, and you must drive as far as your mind will take you, with achievement as the goal of your road--that the man who has no purpose is a machine that coasts downhill at the mercy of any boulder to crash in the first chance ditch, that the man who stifles his mind is a stalled machine slowly going to rust, that the man who lets a leader prescribe his course is a wreck being towed to the scrap heap, and the man who makes another man his goal is a hitchhiker no driver should ever pick up--that your work is the purpose of your life, and you must speed past any killer who assumes the right to stop you, that any value you might find outside your work, any other loyalty or love, can be only travelers you choose to share your journey and must be travelers going on their own power in the same direction.

#### Our alternative is a return to objectivism - accepting the notion that reality is not constructed subjectively and exists outside of one’s consciousness is a necessary prerequisite to effective education.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

Rand begins by explicitly naming the base of her philosophy: the axioms of existence (what is, is; existence exists), consciousness (one is aware that something exists, consciousness is conscious) and identity (that which exists has a specific nature, A is A). Causality is a corollary of the axiom of identity: if every thing has a specific nature, then it can act only in accordance with that nature. A philosophical axiom is a fundamental, undeniable truth on which all subsequent knowledge rests. It is self-evident – i.e. implicit in any instance of perception – and cannot be coherently denied: any ‘denial’ must accept the axiom in the very act of trying to deny it. Whatever the degree of your knowledge, these two – existence and consciousness – are axioms you cannot escape, these two are the irreducible primaries implied in any action you undertake, in any part of your knowledge and in its sum, from the first ray of light you perceive at the start of your life to the widest erudition you might achieve at its end. Whether you know the shape of a pebble or the structure of the solar system, the axioms remain the same: that it exists and that you know it. To exist is to be something, as distinguished from the nothing of nonexistence; it is to be an entity of a specific nature made of specific attributes [this is the third axiom]. Centuries ago, the man who was – no matter what his errors – the greatest of your philosophers [Aristotle], has stated the formula defining the concept of existence and the rule of all knowledge: A is A. A thing is itself (Rand, 1961, p. 125). Together these three axioms add up to a corollary principle, which Rand calls the primacy of existence. The primacy of existence states that existence comes first: what exists, exists and is what it is independent of any consciousness. Consciousness, by contrast, is a metaphysical dependent: in order for it to be conscious of something, it requires that something first exist. In order for you to be conscious of the book on the table, for instance, the book (and table) must first exist. “If nothing exists, there can be no consciousness: a consciousness with nothing to be conscious of is a contradiction in terms... . If that which you claim to perceive does not exist, then what you possess is not consciousness” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Metaphysically, therefore, consciousness is passive (although epistemologically, it is active – see below): its function is to grasp that something exists and to grasp the nature, the identity, of that which exists. Consciousness has no power to create or alter that which exists (which is not to deny that man has the power to re-arrange what exists – see below). The opposite of the primacy of existence is what Rand calls the primacy of consciousness. On this view, consciousness comes first: its task is not to perceive existence but to create it. Ever since Kant (though the stage was set by Descartes), the primacy of consciousness has been dominant in philosophy. Whether it is Kant’s internal forms of sensibility and conceptual categories creating space, time, existence, and causality, Hegel’s cosmic mind developing itself through progressive contradictions, the Pragmatists’ feelings and actions molding the world, or the Postmodernists’ social construction of reality, the common root is the idea that the function of consciousness is not to identify but to create and alter reality. But to accept the primacy of consciousness is to reject the axioms of existence, consciousness and identity, and so to lapse into self-contradiction. A consciousness cannot be the creator of existence because it first requires that existence exist: a “consciousness conscious of nothing but itself is a contradiction in terms” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Nor can the primacy of consciousness be saved by claiming, as so many have tried, that existence exists but consciousness determines its identity. This is to claim that there exists a thing, which is no thing in particular – i.e. there exists something, which is nothing. Note that Objectivism recognizes that there are man-made facts as distinguished from metaphysically given facts (Rand, 1982, pp. 23–34). Metaphysically given facts flow from the inexorable nature – the identity – of reality: they are, and they had to be. Man-made facts flow (in part) from man’s volition: they are, but they did not have to be (i.e. a different choice was possible). The existence of the sun, for instance, is a metaphysically given fact; the existence of the Empire State Building and the existence of the Constitution of the United States are man-made facts. The creative power that man’s faculty of volition gives him, however, is strictly limited: the existence and identity of the elements of reality are outside his power to affect. Man’s only creative power is the ability to rearrange the elements of reality in accordance with their identities. To do so successfully (i.e. in a manner that will further his existence) requires knowledge. Man can attempt, for instance, to build a skyscraper by piling up dirt and leaves, but it will crash to the ground. He can also, however, study the principles of physics, learn how to make steel and concrete, and then erect soaring towers. Man can attempt to organize a society by following “divine revelation” – and then see his society collapse into the chaos of the Dark Ages. But he can also study man’s nature, the nature and functions of government, and actual past governments, and then write a viable Constitution. Epistemology All knowledge (including knowledge of the axioms) begins with the evidence of the senses. To claim that the senses are invalid is a contradiction. On what basis could one claim the senses were invalid except on the basis of sensory evidence? The senses give us automatic knowledge of reality. So-called perceptual “errors,” such as illusions, are simply the way in which the brain integrates the whole perceptual field, e.g. the railroad tracks look like they meet off in the distance because the eyes respond to input regarding distance. We can see that the tracks do not really meet by walking down the tracks. As noted in the previous chapter, Kant’s fundamental error was the premise that having a specific means of consciousness (i.e. sensory systems and a rational faculty) automatically disqualifies one from knowing reality. But the truth is the reverse. One can know reality only through a specific means of awareness, which determines the specific way in which one is aware of reality. At the perceptual level, this means one must distinguish between the object and form of perception. We become aware of the wavelength of light, for example, through the experience of color (hue). There is no such thing as awareness of reality by no means (e.g. absent a brain and sense receptors). Having a means of awareness does not undermine the validity of our knowledge, as Kant implied. Nor does it imply that we perceive reality “as it appears to us.” We do not perceive appearances; we perceive reality by specific means. Man’s distinctive form of awareness, however, is not perceptual. He shares that level with the lower animals. Man has the power of reason. Reason functions by means of concepts. The question on which the validity of reason depends is: Do concepts give us knowledge of reality? Ever since Kant (although Plato made the same error), the dominant view in philosophy has been that they do not: concepts have no connection to reality, they are subjective products of the human mind whose inescapable distortions create a “reality” of their own. Kant’s view has dominated philosophy because no one until Ayn Rand had been able to identify the connection of concepts to sensory perception (and so to reality). No one had been able to identify how we are able validly to form a mental unit that integrates things which, though similar, are also different from each other in every observable, measurable aspect (e.g. every table is of a different width, length, height, weight, etc.). Rand’s crucial discovery in this regard is that of measurement omission (see Rand, 1990 for details). One observes, for instance, that certain man-made objects consisting of a flat, level surface with supports and that support other, small objects (tables) are similar to each other and different from related objects (e.g. chairs). One integrates the different tables into a single mental unit by omitting the particular measurements of each table on the implicit principle that a table may be of any width, length, height, weight (within certain ranges) so long as it is of some specific width, length, etc. (within those ranges). One then retains the concept by a sensoryperceptual symbol, a word. Words, therefore, are not detached from reality but stand for concepts that are themselves based in the facts of reality. The concept table stands for an unlimited potential number of actual tables, including tables not yet made. Valid higher-level concepts are formed through integrating lower-level concepts using the same principle of measurement omission. For example, tables, chairs, sofas, desks and lamps can be integrated into a more abstract concept, furniture, by integrating the facts that these are all movable articles in a home that make it fit for living and working, but omitting the measurements of the various types of moving articles. Definitions are the final step in concept formation. They have two functions: to tie the concept to its referents in reality and to differentiate the concept from other concepts. A definition, which must be formed in accordance with objective principles in order to be valid, is not synonymous with the concept. A definition simply identifies the fundamental attributes of the concretes subsumed by the concept (e.g. “man is the rational animal” is a valid definition of man because reason is man’s fundamental attribute). The definition of man ties the concept to its proper referents while connecting it to but keeping it distinct from one’s other related knowledge. Thus the two parts of a valid definition, genus and differentia. The genus “animal” connects the concept of man with the rest of our vast knowledge about the animal kingdom. The differentia “rational” distinguishes the referents of the concept of man in a fundamental way from all the other members of the animal kingdom. The enormous cognitive benefit of concepts is that of economy: an unlimited number of entities (actions, relationships, etc.) can be held in mind and dealt with by means of a single mental unit, thereby drastically increasing the range and power of man’s mind beyond that attainable at the perceptual level. Observe that for Objectivism concepts are not “out there,” intrinsic properties of objects or of reality, to be discovered by some mysterious process of intuition. Nor are they subjective constructs arbitrarily invented inside one’s head. They are mental integrations of what is out there. They are the form in which a conceptual consciousness grasps reality. They are, if formed by the correct method, objective. Contrary to the claims of some Postmodernists, for example, the concepts of male and female are not arbitrary but objective. Those who doubt this should start by looking at pictures of males and females – or in the mirror. The mind attains objectivity by connecting every concept to perceptual data and therefore to the facts of reality. The method by which it does this is logic. Logic, for Objectivism, is not primarily deductive but inductive: deriving all of one’s conclusions ultimately from sensory-perception and integrating this knowledge into a non-contradictory whole. Thus Objectivism rejects two dominant modern approaches to philosophy: rationalism (reason, especially deduction, divorced from sensory-perceptual observation) and empiricism (sensory-perceptual observation divorced from reason, i.e. from conceptual processing and integration). For Objectivism knowledge results from logic applied to experience. Postmodernism stresses the fact that different individuals and groups have different “contexts,” i.e. different ideas. For the Postsmodernist this immediately disqualifies the conclusions of any individual from being objective. There are two reasons for this. First, according to postmodernism any context is necessarily arbitrary, i.e. divorced from reality, since concepts are necessarily arbitrary. Objectivism, by contrast, shows that concepts, if formed by the correct method, are based in reality. Furthermore, Objectivism shows that context-holding – which means requiring that everything one knows be integrated without contradiction with everything else one knows – is a crucial part of logic and so of expanding knowledge; it is not the disqualifier of knowledge. Second, for postmodernism an individual’s cultural context, whether true or false, good or bad, determines his ideas; that is, the individual is helpless to avoid cultural determinism. Objectivism, by contrast, holds that the conceptual level of awareness is volitional. “[T]o think is an act of choice ... . Reason does not work automatically; thinking is not a mechanical process; the connections of logic are not made by instinct. The function of your stomach, lungs or heart is automatic; the function of your mind is not. In any hour and issue of your life, you are free to think or to evade that effort” (Rand, 1961, p. 120). Man has the sovereign power to choose the ideas that move him. Volition is a corollary of the axiom of (human) consciousness. The “perceptual self-evidency” here is that of introspection. One can observe directly that one has the power to focus one’s mind at the conceptual level (e.g. aim for understanding, integration) or to let it drift at or drop to the sensory-perceptual level. A good illustration of volition (and one that works very well with students) is reading a book: one can just look at the marks on the page or try to focus one’s mind so as to understand what the words mean. No matter what one’s culture or environment (assuming a normal brain state and freedom from physical coercion), one has the power to choose to think or to evade the effort (and then, if one chooses to think, the power to make secondary choices based on that primary choice; see Peikoff, 1991, pp. 55–72). Note that volition does not violate the law of causality; rather it is a form of that law – one applicable to a conceptual consciousness. The cause of the choice to think in each given case is: the individual man. It is a causal primary not necessitated by prior events. Nor does volition undermine science. In actuality, it is a precondition of all science and of all knowledge. If men were not free to focus on the facts, evaluate them and reach conclusions based on logic and evidence, then all claims of knowledge would reduce to nonsense (as they do in postmodernism), viz. “I was forced by my genes and conditioning to emit the follows word sounds...” Volition does not mean omniscience. All knowledge has to be acquired and men can err in reaching conclusions. It is precisely because human consciousness is volitional and conceptual – and therefore fallible – that man needs the science of epistemology, the science that identifies the fundamental means of acquiring and validating knowledge.

#### Interrogating the methods in which knowledge is imparted to students is necessary - it’s a prior question to any of their solvency claims.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

With that brief orientation, I do need to say a word to motivate you to read this book. (Chapter 2 will make clear why I think it is important to do so.) The primary beneficiaries of a book on the philosophy of education are parents and teachers, those concerned directly with children. If you are a teacher, it should be obvious why this book is of value to you. This is your life work, training children in something. It is assumed that you want to know in what and for what purpose. If a teacher is anything other than the lowest hack, it is essential that he or she have this knowledge. If you are a parent, this material is crucial because parents are the ones responsible for their child's maturation. You cannot just accept what the teacher says, particularly today. You have to know: Are they equipping my child properly or are they harming him? Are they giving him the essentials he needs to develop properly? What are the essentials? If he is having trouble in school, is that his problem or is that the fault of the school? What are the schools doing, and is that what they should be doing? A philosophy of education, in short, is essential to being a proper parent; otherwise, you are merely turning your child over to blind chance. Even if you happen to have good teachers, you have to supplement their work at home in order to enhance your child's ability to succeed. There are two other groups that I think can benefit. First, any- body who wants to communicate, teach, or persuade others of specific things—a husband and a wife, an employer and an employee, a speech- maker, a politician—will find the proper methods of teaching applicable. This book is partly theory, but largely practical tips and advice on communication and teaching. From that point Of view, anyone other than a hermit could benefit. Finally, I think you can benefit even if you are not in any of these categories. This information can provide you with a standard of self-evaluation. If you know a proper philosophy of education, you can look at yourself and say, "How was I educated? Did my parents and teachers give me what I needed for mature life? If not, can I supply the lack, myself, now?" If you know the standard that one ~~man~~ requires by his nature, you can begin to judge your own case and remedy any deficiency you might observe. In that sense, a philosophy of education is like a checklist for your own readiness to face the tasks of life. The pure philosophy—metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, poli- is standard Objectivism but the application to education is my tics— own. (I had very little discussion through the years with Ayn Rand on this particular subject. Clearly, I do not believe I have made any false applications, but I do not want Miss Rand saddled with the responsibility.) If education is instruction in the powers necessary for life, what are those powers and for what kind of life? I have to give specific Objectivist content; otherwise, the topic is simply too broad to guide us in any meaningful direction. A proper theory of education, like a proper theory of ethics, must tell you specifically how to function on earth. It cannot be just ambiguous, floating abstractions. At the very least, it has to tell you two things: how to instruct (method) and what to instruct (content). If a theory doesn't tell you that much, it is just worthless verbiage.

### 1NC vs Kritik

#### The affirmative buys into the anti-intellectual school system of letting students learn about the world themselves - this is a recipe for subjectivist and relativist forms of thought.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

Today's education, I have said, reduces children to the status of animals, without the ability to know or predict the future. Animals, how- ever, can rely on brute instinct to guide them. Children cannot; brought up this way, they soon begin to feel helpless—to feel that everything is changing and that they can count on nothing. The above is not merely my polemic. The science teachers are working deliberately to create the US State of mind. The teachers are openly skeptical themselves, having been given a similar upbringing, and they insist to their students that everything is changing, that factual information is continually becoming outdated, and that there are things much more important in class—in science class—than truth. 11 is hard to believe how brazen people have become. "When preparing performance objectives," the Creative Sciencing book says, "you may wish to consider the fact that we don't demand accuracy in art or creative writing, but we have permitted ourselves to require accuracy in science. We may be paying a high price in lost interest, enthusiasm, vitality, and creativity in science because Of this requirement of accuracy."16 Our students should not have to be concerned about factual accuracy. They need have no idea whether gases expand or contract under pressure, or whether typhus germs cause or cure disease—but this will leave them free to be "vital" and 'iterative." But, you may ask, what if a student comes out in class with a wrong answer to a factual question? You are old-fashioned. There is no such answer, and besides it would be bad for the student's psychology if there were: "How many times will a student try to respond to a question if continually told that his or her answers are wrong? Wrong answers should be reserved for quiz shows on television."" What then is the point in having a teacher at there are no wrong answers, and since adults must not "authoritarian," am! since, as John Dewey has proclaimed, students do not learn by listening or by reading, but only by "doing." This brings me to an extremely important issue, one that is much wider than science teaching. My overriding impression of today's schools, derived from every class I visited, is that teachers no longer teach. They no longer deliver prepared material while the students listen attentively and take Instead, what one encounters everywhere is group-talking, that is, class participation and class discussion. Most Of the teachers I saw Mere enthusiastic professionals, excellent at what they do. But they conceive their role primarily as bull-session moderators. Some of the teachers obviously had a concealed lesson in mind, which they were bootlegging to the students—in the guise of asking leading questions or making brief, purposeful side comments. But the point is that the lesson had to legged. The official purpose of the class was for the pupils to speak more or less continually—at any rate, well over half the time. I asked group of high school students if their teachers ever delivered lectures in class. 'Oh no!" they cried incredulously, as though I had come from another planet or a barbaric past "No one that anymore." All the arguments offered to defend this anti-teaching approach are senseless. "Students," I have heard it said, "should develop initiative; they should discover knowledge on their own, not be spoon-fed by the teachers." Then why should they go to school at all? Schooling is a process in which an expert is paid to impart his superior knowledge to ignorant beginners. How can this involve shelving the expert and leaving the ignorant to shift for themselves? What would you think of a doctor who told a patient to cure himself because the doctor opposed spoon-feeding? "Students," I have heard, "should creative, not merely passive and receptive." How can they be creative before they know anything? Creativity does not arise in a void; it can develop only after one has mastered the current cognitive context. A creative ignoramus is a contradiction in terms. "We teach the method of thought," I have heard, "rather than the content" This is the most senseless claim of all. Let us leave aside the obvious fact that method cannot exist apart from some content. The more important point here is that though/ is precisely what cannot be taught by the discussion approach. If you want to teach thought, you must first put up a sign at the front of the class: 'Children should he seen and heard." To be exact: they may be heard as an adjunct of the lesson, if the teacher wishes to probe their knowledge, or answer a question of clarification, or assess their motivation to learn, or entertain a brief comment. But the dominant presence and voice must be that of the teacher, the cognitive expert, who should be feeding the material to the class in a higher purposeful fashion. carefully balancing concretes and abstractions, pre- paring for and then drawing and then interrelating generalizations, identifying the evidence at each point, and so forth. These are the processes that must first be absorbed year after year by the student in relation to a whole series of different contents. In the end, such training will jell in his mind into a knowledge of how to think—which he can then apply on his own, without any teacher. But he can never even begin to grasp these processes in the chaotic hullabaloo of a perpetual class discussion with equally ignorant peers. Have you seen the [1984] television debates among the Democrats seeking to be president? Do you regard these spectacles of arbitrary assertion, constant subject-switching absurd concrete-mindedness, and brazen ad hominem as examples of thinking? This is exactly the pattern that is being inculcated as thinking today by the class-discussion method. An educator with any inkling of the requirements of a conceptual consciousness would never dream of running a school this way. But an educator contemptuous of concepts, and of knowledge, would see no objection to it. In the Class discussions, I saw, the students regularly asked to state their own opinion. They 'Vere asked it in regard to issues about why they had no idea how to have an opinion, since they had no knowledge of the relevant facts or principles, and no knowledge of the methods of logical argument. Most of the time the students were honest; they had no opinion, in the sense of a sincere, even if mistaken, conviction on the question at hand. But they knew that they were expected to "express them. selves." Time and again, therefore, I heard the following: "1 like (or dislike) "Why?" "Because I do. That's my opinion." Whereupon the teacher would nod and say "very interesting" or "good point" Everybody’s point, it seemed, was good, as good as everybody else's and reasons "ere sim- ply irrelevant. The conclusion being fostered in the minds of the class was: "It's all arbitrary; anything and no one really knows" The result is only the spread of subjectivism, but of a self-righteous subjectivism, which cannot even imagine objectivity would consist of. Project a dozen years of this daily processing. One study of American students notes that they "generally offered superficial comments ... and consultants observed that they seemed 'genuinely puzzled at requests to explain or defend their points of view, "'IS What else could anyone expect? NOW let me quote from a New York Times news story. "l like (Senator Gary Han's] ideas," said Darla Doyle, a Tampa homemaker. "He's a man. His ideas are fresher than Mondale's are. I like the way he comes across." A reviewer asked Mrs. Doyle to identify the ideas that appealed to her "That's an unfair question," she said, asking for a moment to consider her answer. Then she replied, "He wants to talk with Russia." The headline of this story is: "Hart's Fans Can’t Say Why They Ate"19 According to John Dewey, students are bored by lectures, but motivated to learn by collective "doing." Not the ones I saw. Virtually every class was in continuous turmoil, created by students waving their hands to speak, dropping books, giggling, calling out remarks, whispering asides, yawning, fidgeting, shifting, shuffling. The dominant emotion was a painful boredom, which is the sign of minds being mercilessly starved and stunted. Perhaps this explains the magic influence of the instant it rang, everywhere I went. the room was empty, as though helpless victims were running for their lives from a dread plague. And so, in a sense they were. Our schools are failing in every subject and on a fundamental level. They are failing methodically, as a matter of philosophic principle. The anti-conceptual epistemology that grips them comes from John Dewey and from all his fellow irrationalists, who dominate twentieth-century American culture, such as linguistic analysts, psychoanalysts, and neo-Existentialists. And behind all these, as I argued in Ominous Parallels, stands a century of German philosophy inaugurated by history's greatest villain: Immanuel Kant, the first man to dedicate his life and his system to the destruction of reason. Epistemological corruption is not the only cause of today's educational fiasco. There are many other contributing factors, such as the teacher’s unions. and the senseless requirements of the teacher’s colleges, and the government bureaucracies (local and but epistemology is the basic cause, without reference to which none of the others can be intelligently analyzed or remedied. Now let me recount for you two last experiences, which are on the political implications of today's educational trend, one occurred at the most prestigious teacher-training institution in the country, Teachers College of Columbia University, In my first class, there, chosen at random, the professor made the following pronouncement to a group of sixty future teachers: "The evil of the West is not primarily its economic exploitation of the Third World, but its ideological exploitation. The crime of the West was to upon the communal culture of Africa the concept of the individual." I thought 1 had heard everything, but this shocked me. I looked around. The future teachers were dutifully taking it down; there were no objections. Despite their talk about "self-expression," today's educators have to inculcate collectivism. Man's organ of individuality is his mind; deprived of it, he is nothing, and can do nothing but huddle in a group as his only hope of survival. The second experience occurred in a class of juniors and seniors at a high for the academically gifted. The students had just returned from a visit to the United Nations, where they had met with an official of the Russian delegation, and they were eager to discuss their reactions. The class obviously disliked the Russian, feeling that his answers to their questions about life in Russia had been evasions or lies. But soon some- one remarked that we Americans are accustomed to believing what our government says, while the Russians naturally believe theirs "So how do I know?" he concluded. "Maybe everything is a lie" "What is truth?" asked one boy, quite sincere; the class laughed, as though this obviously unanswerable. "Neither side is good," said another student. "Both countries lie all the time. But the issue is the percentage. What we need to know is how much they lie—is it 99 percent for one, for example, 82 percent the other?' After a lot, more of this, including some pretty Beak arguments in favor of America by a small patriotic faction, one boy summed up the emerging consensus. "We can never know who is lying or telling the truth," he said. "The only thing we can know is bare fact. For example, we can know that a Korean airplane was shot down by the Russians [in 1983]. But as to the Russians' Story Of the cause vs. story, that is mere opinion." To which one girl replied in all seriousness: "But we can't even know that—none of us saw the plane shot down." This class discussion was the climax of my tour. I felt as though I "ere witnessing the condensed essence of a perceptual-level schooling. "Thought," these students were saying, "is helpless, principles are non- existent, truth is unknowable, and there is, therefore, no way to choose between the United States of America and the bloodiest dictatorship in history, not unless we have seen the blood with our own eyes." These youngsters represent the future of country. They are the children of the best and the brightest, who will become the businessmen, the artists, and the political leaders of tomorrow Does this kind of generation have the strength—the intellectual strength, the strength of con- victim—necessary to uphold the American heritage in an era dominated by incipient Big Brothers at home and missile-rattling enemies abroad? It is not the students' fault, and they do not fully believe the awful things they say, not yet. The ones I saw, at ever-y school except for Columbia—and here I want to register some positive impressions— "ere extremely likable. For the most part, they struck me as clean-cut, well-mannered, exuberant, intelligent, innocent. They were not like the typical college student one meets, who is already hardening into a brash cynic or skeptic. These youngsters, despite all their doubts and scars, still seemed eager to discover some answers, albeit sporadically. They were still clinging to vestiges of idea that man's mind can understand reality and make sense of the world. They are still open to reason—if someone would teach it to them. Nor is it basically the teachers' fault. The ones I saw '\*ere not like the college professors I know, reek of stale malice and delight in wrecking their students' minds. The teachers seemed to take their jobs seriously; they genuinely liked their classes and wanted to educate them. But given the direction of their own training, they were unable to do it. There is a whole generation of children Who still want to learn, and a profession much of which wants to help them, to say nothing of a country that devoutly wishes both groups tell. Everything anyone would need to save the world is there, it is waiting, and all that is required to activate it is what?

#### Postmodern skepticism is a silly attempt by French snowflakes to avoid the materiality and existence of social problems - things really do happen!!!

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

We do not accept the claim of some Postmodernists that the philosophy is so diverse and variegated that it cannot be defined (a very Postmodern claim in itself). If the term postmodernism has no coherent, intelligible definition, then the term is meaningless and should not be used at all. If postmodernism is not something particular, then it is nothing. We hold that postmodernism has a specific meaning, despite differences among various factions. We are concerned here only with its essential tenets. Fundamentally, as we shall see, postmodernism is the explicit, philosophical rejection of reality, reason and objectivity. According to postmodernism, the concept of an objective reality – the idea that reality exists and is what it is independent from any human mind – is invalid. Some Postmodernists allow that an objective reality may exist, but dismiss it as unimportant: “Some, including myself, do not deny the possible existence of something worth the label ‘objective reality,’ but are more inclined to emphasize that social reality is not external to human consciousness and language use” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 459). A closely related Postmodern viewpoint is that, although an objective reality may exist, by our very nature it is impossible for us to know it. Other Postmodernists dismiss objective reality outright: “Feminist analysis [a branch of postmodernism] begins with the principle that objective reality is a myth” (Ann Scales quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 23). Philosophically, the above differences are irrelevant. If reality exists but cannot be known, then for all practical purposes, objective reality can be dispensed with entirely. Do not make the mistake of thinking, as some do, that not all facts fall under the scope of postmodernism’s attack, that it wishes simply to criticize existing social or economic relations. Even scientifically established facts and science itself are under attack. “Rules for science that claim to show the ultimate or superior way to objectivity and rationality,” writes Alvesson, “has [sic] so far not proven to be uncontested or reliable in the long run ... . Data are never pure, free from theory, language and an interpretive bias, they are always constructed in terms of a particular framework, prestructured personal and cultural understanding, vocabulary and perspective” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 460). Other Postmodernists reject science even more blatantly: “our critique of the objective standpoint as male is a critique of science as a specifically male approach to knowledge. With it, we reject male criteria for verification” (Catharine MacKinnon quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 26). If objective reality and objective facts are a myth that must be abandoned, what is to replace them? According to postmodernism, “reality” is a human, subjective construction. Typically postmodernism does not endorse individual subjectivism (although such would not be logically inconsistent with its tenets given that each individual grows up in a different sub-culture). It claims that “facts” are social creations that change as society changes. “Reality” is a collective creation, a group product. Here is this view applied to leadership studies: “It is important to realize that leaders, subordinates as well as measurements of various qualities, feelings and outcomes are subjective and social constructions and not simple reflections of objective reality” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 464). Since “reality” is socially constructed and varies as different groups attempt to create their own “realities,” postmodernism embraces multiple, often contradictory and unintelligible, “realities.” “[T]he Postmodern is a view of the world where individuals are inundated with multiple voices that create a cacophony of sound and an inability to make complete sense of reality. The discovery of ultimate Truths is abandoned as impossible and mistaken” (Tierney, 1996, p. 373). “From a Postmodern perspective ... the idea ... that reality is understandable is rejected in favor of a multivocality where disintegration and instability is the norm” (Tierney, 1996, p. 374). On the Postmodernist approach, then, identity – the idea that existents in reality have an independent, definite, firm, knowable nature – is an illusion and causality is discarded, often as a male or white or arbitrary Western prejudice. In attacking objective reality and extolling the group as the creator of “reality,” postmodernism denigrates the importance of the individual. According to postmodernism, man is not an autonomous agent who possesses free will – i.e. a reasoning mind capable of reaching truth by adhering to reality. “The idea of the autonomous human being that is capable of independent thought and action is replaced by the portrait of an individual hemmed in by social and cultural constraints.” (Tierney, 1996, p. 375) Man is a mere fragment of a – usually physiological – collective. His ideas, values, interests and actions – all are determined not by his rational thought and his own choices but by his relationship to and membership in a collective: by the fact that he happens to be white or black, male or female, heterosexual or homosexual, born in North America or born in Africa. “[W]hen Postmodern arguments are extended we find it possible to replace an individualistic worldview – in which individual minds are critical to human functioning – with a relational reality” (Kenneth Gergen quoted in Tierney, 1996, p. 375). Postmodernism, in other words, embraces collective (group) determinism. By what means does a group socially construct “reality”? According to postmodernism, the usual means is: language. The group that is able to control language – to impose its meaning and definitions on the concepts we use – creates reality. “As Deetz (forthcoming, p. x) puts it, ‘conceptions are always contests for meaning. Language does not name objects in the world; it is core to the process of constituting objects... .’ ” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 470) Language and concepts, on this view, have no referents in reality (there is, after all, no independent reality for concepts to refer to), no firm meanings, no objective rules or logic in their proper use and misuse. Concepts mean simply whatever a group decides they mean. Gergen (2001, p. 805) sums it up this way, “there is no ultimate means of justifying one form of rationality, description, or explanation over another. If such justification were to be offered, they would also prove to be exercises in linguistic convention.” Because concepts and logic, according to postmodernism, are not our means of discovering and identifying the nature of reality but rather our means of creating “reality,” the individual’s faculty of reason is impotent. “From this perspective, the pursuit of truth becomes deeply problematic as a goal of social science because what counts as truth is not fixed, but derives in part from social conventions that can differ among contexts and language games” (Kilduff & Mehra, 1997, p. 463). “Postmodernists eschew the search for clarity or persuasion through rational logic because absolutes no longer exist” (Tierney, 1996, p. 374). Reason, to the extent that postmodernism retains the term, does not name some objective, specific cognitive faculty of man, his means of knowledge and discoverer of truth. “Reason” is simply a social construct used to dominate others and which changes as the dominant group changes. According to postmodernism, historically the group that was able to impose its interpretation of “reason” on others thereby came to hold tremendous power over them, capable of dismissing any dissenters as “irrational.” As one Postmodernist puts it, “like ‘fairness,’ ‘merit,’ and ‘free speech,’ Reason is a political entity” (Stanley Fish quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 25). Writes a commentator on postmodernism: “The characteristics associated with the knower – objectivity, reason, universality, intellect – are associated with men.” (Susan H. Williams quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 28). Writes still another scholar: “what Michael Foucault devastatingly labeled ‘the monologue of reason’ has been, for many contemporary intellectuals, displaced by an emphasis on the socially contingent and power-driven nature of conceptions of reality and the ubiquity of often incommensurable perspectives. No longer can those with even radically different views be facilely denounced as irrational” (Sanford Levinson quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 29). “Reality,” then, is socially constructed by those who are able to shape and define the meaning of concepts and language. The Postmodernist view of the world is, in essence, that of group warfare. This, plus its implicit Marxist premises, explains postmodernism’s obsession with power. For it, every issue is one of cultural and political power: a struggle to see which group can impose its whims (its “social creation of reality”) on others. In any difference or dispute between two groups, there is no resort to what the facts are or to what is true, since what count as “facts” and “truth” for one group may not count as “facts” and “truth” for the other group. There is only a power struggle to see which group can control our concepts and language. Thus some Postmodernists claim that what counts as “reality,” “reason,” “objectivity,” “knowledge,” etc., has been created by males to subjugate females. Others claim that what has been called “reality,” “reason,” “objectivity,” “knowledge,” etc., has been created by the West to subjugate the non-Western world. In such an approach, there is no distinction between reason and force. (Observe the perverse rewriting of history implicit in the Postmodern approach; in fact, true subjugation – through brute force – occurs only when men abandon reason as the means of settling disputes.) Because in metaphysics and epistemology postmodernism rejects reality and reason, it necessarily rejects all objective standards, including all objective moral standards. An objective standard states that, by the inexorable nature of reality, as discovered by the faculty of reason, X is required for Y. For instance, if an entrepreneur is trying to build a bridge for his railway, the standard is that the bridge be constructed so that it is capable of sustaining the loads it is meant to carry without collapsing. A bridge that meets the standard is good or valuable; one that does not is bad or without value. The standard fundamentally is set by reality: if one wants trains to be able to cross the river, the bridge cannot be built from leaves or water but must be build from suitable materials, such as wood or steel, properly arranged. But the standard is also set by man’s reason: one must discover a whole host of knowledge, including the facts that materials and methods of construction differ, that some can withstand enormous loads while others cannot, etc., in order to know what is required to build the bridge. Because the standard is based in reality and reason, it is objective. And note that the penalty for not adopting an objective standard when building the bridge is also set fundamentally by reality: the bridge will collapse on the first run, sending the train plummeting into the river and bankrupting the entrepreneur’s business. Similarly, if the entrepreneur when building his bridge hires only the most knowledgeable construction engineers (vs., say, hiring one white engineer, one black, one female, one disabled, etc.), his action is an expression of an objective standard. By the nature of reality, it takes actual knowledge and skills – not various skin colors or gender – to erect a bridge; the entrepreneur has grasped this fact by his reason, and so chooses to hire only the most knowledgeable and skilled engineers he can find, regardless of their membership in various demographic categories. If he hires incompetent engineers, by the nature of reality disaster again will ensue. Objective standards, in other words, rest on the fundamental fact that reality is what it is and does not accommodate itself to anyone’s thoughts, desires, whims – that in order to act successfully man must obey reality, discovering by a process of reason what reality’s nature and requirements are. Postmodernism, however, rejects all this. Reality, for it, is not a firm place with a definite nature. Reality is not something we must adapt to – it is something that adapts to us. We create “reality,” constructing it out of our language games. Reason, as we have seen, is absent in such a world; “reason” is only the attempt by one group to impose its linguistic whims on others. If reason and reality are out, anything goes – and must go. The hostility that Postmodernists project toward objective standards – be they employment or grammatical or economic or moral standards – stems from the fact that any objective standard must be based on reality and reason, both of which postmodernism wishes to annihilate. “Standards” are acceptable only so long as they make no claim to be reality-based. As Gergen (2001, p. 807) puts the point in regard to moral standards, “The advantage of postmodern constructionism is that it does not seek to lodge these commitments [to values] in some form of foundation [i.e. in reality], a secure base from which others may be viewed as transcendentally wrong or evil.” This is the actual meaning behind postmodernism’s championing of “diversity.” When Postmodernists campaign in the name of diversity that grade school students should read not just Shakespeare but also stories that contain sentences like “She sweetest, goodest safe,” they do not do so because they think the latter is in reality as good as Shakespeare. When they campaign in the name of diversity to have people hired not on merit and ability but because they are “disabled,” they do not do so because they think the disabled person will in reality be as good at his job. When they campaign in the name of diversity to have Indian mysticism taught alongside Western science, they do not do so because they think the former will enable us to build better computers and send rockets into outer space. Their goal in all these cases, rather, is to smash the objective standards themselves. Postmodernism adheres to an unwavering egalitarianism. All standards, moral or otherwise, must be discarded; everything is the “equal” of everything else. In the normative realm – the realm of determining what is better and worse, be it in terms of engineering or economics or morality – anything goes. Making everything “equally valuable,” of course, in the end destroys the very concept of value. In essence, therefore, postmodernism amounts to nihilism. Postmodernists bicker among themselves about whether their philosophy is a new paradigm or just a method for attacking old paradigms (i.e. reason). But the distinction is irrelevant. Either way, it is not a positive philosophical theory but the destruction of philosophy – and so of man’s life. In rejecting reality, reason and all objective standards postmodernism deliberately rejects the essence of the Enlightenment. The “modern” in postmodernism refers to the Enlightenment and all the glories that it brought the world: reason, science, technology, freedom, capitalism, wealth.

#### Refusal to make a determination on an issue creates the situation for every war and atrocity.

Daraweesh et al 15 - Fuad Al‐Daraweesh, PhD at the University of Toledo, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, and Dr. Dale T. Snauwaert, Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education, Department Interim Director, CNDE Director, In Factis Pax Founding Editor, 2015 [“Human Rights Education Beyond Universalism and Relativism”, Palgrave McMillian] rpg

The core problem with cultural relativism is that it presupposes the positional confinement of cultures. It suggests that individuals can never escape their cultural perspective and thus are confined within the position of that culture. Individuals tend to share a fixed position within their culture with other cultural members; as Amartya Sen points out, this fixed position leads to positional objectivity and, in turn, to the possibility of objective illusion and false consciousness. If the individuals within a group share the same, invariant position and attain agreement on the validity of their beliefs, perceptions, etc. then they have achieved positional objectivity—from within their shared position they have achieved intersubjective warrantability. However, the shared belief may be false, even though it is positionally shared (Sen, 2009). Examples include the historical beliefs that the earth is flat, the sun revolves around the earth, and slavery is morally justifiable, among many others. These beliefs constitute objective illusions; an objective illusion is “a positionally objective belief that is, in fact, mistaken in terms of transpositional scrutiny. The concept of an objective illusion involves both the idea of positionally objective belief, and the transpositional diagnosis that this belief is, in fact, mistaken” (p. 163). Objective illusions are, in turn, the basis of false consciousness, the collective beliefs that are false but passionately held to be true. An entire population may suffer from false consciousness grounded in their positional confinement (Sen, 2009). Positional confinement, in turn, blocks the possibility of a shared ethical agreement across cultures; this confinement is then the basis of violence, for there are neither fair terms of cooperation nor the possibility of the nonviolent resolution of the inevitable conflicts that arise between nations and peoples (Sen, 2006, 2009). Positional confinement renders, therefore, cultural relativism dangerously silent on ethical relations between cultural groups. From this perspective, there does not exist recognition of any ethical–political obligation between cultural groups, for each is a positionally confined social construction with its own moral norms. The relations between cultural groups thus tend to be a matter of power rather than ethics. This conception of the relations between nations and peoples has tended to take at least two theoretical forms: international political realism and the “clash of civilizations” thesis. Moral relativism and positional confinement logically lead to international political realism. If moral consideration is confined to the boundaries of one’s own community, if moral understanding is impossible across cultural boundaries, and if the moral systems of various cultures are incommensurable, then there exists a state of moral, legal, and political anarchy between societies. International, intersocietal, and intercultural relations, then, can only be conducted in terms of rational self-interest pursued through the exercise of power. Relations between nation-states and peoples can only be based in powerpolitics, in the sense that they exclusively concern rational self-interest and power, not what is right per se (Brown, 1992; Cady, 1989; Doyle, 1997; Smith, 1986). This is a Hobbesian state of nature. If cultural relativism is assumed, then anarchy follows as the context of international relations. Under these anarchical conditions, the international system exists in a perpetual state of war. These conditions lead to the phenomenon referred to as the “security dilemma.” Given the rationality of the actors, coupled with uncertain knowledge of others’ intentions, preparing to defend one’s community increases the probability of conflict; the rational pursuit of security leads to insecurity (Jervis, 1991). Thus, the assumption of anarchy generates a perpetual a state of insecurity. The only way under these conditions to maintain a modus vivendi, a state of cold war, is through a balance of power, which serves as a deterrent, giving no party advantage over the other (Doyle, 1997; Nye, 1977; Smith, 1986). A negative peace can only be achieved through deterrence. However, each culture is imminently susceptible to invasion. From this perspective, there does not exist an obligation to give others external to one’s culture moral consideration. Based upon the positional confinement of cultural relativism, international political realism entails the denial of moral consideration to others. This positional moral confinement leads to a state of perpetual conflict and violence. This inherent problem with cultural relativism was exposed at the Nuremberg Tribunal after World War II and gave rise to the human rights movement (Snauwaert, 1995).

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

Productiveness is your acceptance of morality, your recognition of the fact that you choose to live--that productive work is the process by which man's consciousness controls his existence, a constant process of acquiring knowledge and shaping matter to fit one's purpose, of translating an idea into physical form, of remaking the earth in the image of one's values--that all work is creative work if done by a thinking mind, and no work is creative if done by a blank who repeats in uncritical stupor a routine he has learned from others--that your work is yours to choose, and the choice is as wide as your mind, that nothing more is possible to you and nothing less is human--that to cheat your way into a job bigger than your mind can handle is to become a fear-corroded ape on borrowed motions and borrowed time, and to settle down into a job that requires less than your mind's full capacity is to cut your motor and sentence yourself to another kind of motion: decay--that your work is the process of achieving your values, and to lose your ambition for values is to lose your ambition to live--that your body is a machine, but your mind is its driver, and you must drive as far as your mind will take you, with achievement as the goal of your road--that the man who has no purpose is a machine that coasts downhill at the mercy of any boulder to crash in the first chance ditch, that the man who stifles his mind is a stalled machine slowly going to rust, that the man who lets a leader prescribe his course is a wreck being towed to the scrap heap, and the man who makes another man his goal is a hitchhiker no driver should ever pick up--that your work is the purpose of your life, and you must speed past any killer who assumes the right to stop you, that any value you might find outside your work, any other loyalty or love, can be only travelers you choose to share your journey and must be travelers going on their own power in the same direction.

#### Our alternative is a return to objectivism - accepting the notion that reality is not constructed subjectively and exists outside of one’s consciousness is a necessary prerequisite to effective education.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

Rand begins by explicitly naming the base of her philosophy: the axioms of existence (what is, is; existence exists), consciousness (one is aware that something exists, consciousness is conscious) and identity (that which exists has a specific nature, A is A). Causality is a corollary of the axiom of identity: if every thing has a specific nature, then it can act only in accordance with that nature. A philosophical axiom is a fundamental, undeniable truth on which all subsequent knowledge rests. It is self-evident – i.e. implicit in any instance of perception – and cannot be coherently denied: any ‘denial’ must accept the axiom in the very act of trying to deny it. Whatever the degree of your knowledge, these two – existence and consciousness – are axioms you cannot escape, these two are the irreducible primaries implied in any action you undertake, in any part of your knowledge and in its sum, from the first ray of light you perceive at the start of your life to the widest erudition you might achieve at its end. Whether you know the shape of a pebble or the structure of the solar system, the axioms remain the same: that it exists and that you know it. To exist is to be something, as distinguished from the nothing of nonexistence; it is to be an entity of a specific nature made of specific attributes [this is the third axiom]. Centuries ago, the man who was – no matter what his errors – the greatest of your philosophers [Aristotle], has stated the formula defining the concept of existence and the rule of all knowledge: A is A. A thing is itself (Rand, 1961, p. 125). Together these three axioms add up to a corollary principle, which Rand calls the primacy of existence. The primacy of existence states that existence comes first: what exists, exists and is what it is independent of any consciousness. Consciousness, by contrast, is a metaphysical dependent: in order for it to be conscious of something, it requires that something first exist. In order for you to be conscious of the book on the table, for instance, the book (and table) must first exist. “If nothing exists, there can be no consciousness: a consciousness with nothing to be conscious of is a contradiction in terms... . If that which you claim to perceive does not exist, then what you possess is not consciousness” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Metaphysically, therefore, consciousness is passive (although epistemologically, it is active – see below): its function is to grasp that something exists and to grasp the nature, the identity, of that which exists. Consciousness has no power to create or alter that which exists (which is not to deny that man has the power to re-arrange what exists – see below). The opposite of the primacy of existence is what Rand calls the primacy of consciousness. On this view, consciousness comes first: its task is not to perceive existence but to create it. Ever since Kant (though the stage was set by Descartes), the primacy of consciousness has been dominant in philosophy. Whether it is Kant’s internal forms of sensibility and conceptual categories creating space, time, existence, and causality, Hegel’s cosmic mind developing itself through progressive contradictions, the Pragmatists’ feelings and actions molding the world, or the Postmodernists’ social construction of reality, the common root is the idea that the function of consciousness is not to identify but to create and alter reality. But to accept the primacy of consciousness is to reject the axioms of existence, consciousness and identity, and so to lapse into self-contradiction. A consciousness cannot be the creator of existence because it first requires that existence exist: a “consciousness conscious of nothing but itself is a contradiction in terms” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Nor can the primacy of consciousness be saved by claiming, as so many have tried, that existence exists but consciousness determines its identity. This is to claim that there exists a thing, which is no thing in particular – i.e. there exists something, which is nothing. Note that Objectivism recognizes that there are man-made facts as distinguished from metaphysically given facts (Rand, 1982, pp. 23–34). Metaphysically given facts flow from the inexorable nature – the identity – of reality: they are, and they had to be. Man-made facts flow (in part) from man’s volition: they are, but they did not have to be (i.e. a different choice was possible). The existence of the sun, for instance, is a metaphysically given fact; the existence of the Empire State Building and the existence of the Constitution of the United States are man-made facts. The creative power that man’s faculty of volition gives him, however, is strictly limited: the existence and identity of the elements of reality are outside his power to affect. Man’s only creative power is the ability to rearrange the elements of reality in accordance with their identities. To do so successfully (i.e. in a manner that will further his existence) requires knowledge. Man can attempt, for instance, to build a skyscraper by piling up dirt and leaves, but it will crash to the ground. He can also, however, study the principles of physics, learn how to make steel and concrete, and then erect soaring towers. Man can attempt to organize a society by following “divine revelation” – and then see his society collapse into the chaos of the Dark Ages. But he can also study man’s nature, the nature and functions of government, and actual past governments, and then write a viable Constitution. Epistemology All knowledge (including knowledge of the axioms) begins with the evidence of the senses. To claim that the senses are invalid is a contradiction. On what basis could one claim the senses were invalid except on the basis of sensory evidence? The senses give us automatic knowledge of reality. So-called perceptual “errors,” such as illusions, are simply the way in which the brain integrates the whole perceptual field, e.g. the railroad tracks look like they meet off in the distance because the eyes respond to input regarding distance. We can see that the tracks do not really meet by walking down the tracks. As noted in the previous chapter, Kant’s fundamental error was the premise that having a specific means of consciousness (i.e. sensory systems and a rational faculty) automatically disqualifies one from knowing reality. But the truth is the reverse. One can know reality only through a specific means of awareness, which determines the specific way in which one is aware of reality. At the perceptual level, this means one must distinguish between the object and form of perception. We become aware of the wavelength of light, for example, through the experience of color (hue). There is no such thing as awareness of reality by no means (e.g. absent a brain and sense receptors). Having a means of awareness does not undermine the validity of our knowledge, as Kant implied. Nor does it imply that we perceive reality “as it appears to us.” We do not perceive appearances; we perceive reality by specific means. Man’s distinctive form of awareness, however, is not perceptual. He shares that level with the lower animals. Man has the power of reason. Reason functions by means of concepts. The question on which the validity of reason depends is: Do concepts give us knowledge of reality? Ever since Kant (although Plato made the same error), the dominant view in philosophy has been that they do not: concepts have no connection to reality, they are subjective products of the human mind whose inescapable distortions create a “reality” of their own. Kant’s view has dominated philosophy because no one until Ayn Rand had been able to identify the connection of concepts to sensory perception (and so to reality). No one had been able to identify how we are able validly to form a mental unit that integrates things which, though similar, are also different from each other in every observable, measurable aspect (e.g. every table is of a different width, length, height, weight, etc.). Rand’s crucial discovery in this regard is that of measurement omission (see Rand, 1990 for details). One observes, for instance, that certain man-made objects consisting of a flat, level surface with supports and that support other, small objects (tables) are similar to each other and different from related objects (e.g. chairs). One integrates the different tables into a single mental unit by omitting the particular measurements of each table on the implicit principle that a table may be of any width, length, height, weight (within certain ranges) so long as it is of some specific width, length, etc. (within those ranges). One then retains the concept by a sensoryperceptual symbol, a word. Words, therefore, are not detached from reality but stand for concepts that are themselves based in the facts of reality. The concept table stands for an unlimited potential number of actual tables, including tables not yet made. Valid higher-level concepts are formed through integrating lower-level concepts using the same principle of measurement omission. For example, tables, chairs, sofas, desks and lamps can be integrated into a more abstract concept, furniture, by integrating the facts that these are all movable articles in a home that make it fit for living and working, but omitting the measurements of the various types of moving articles. Definitions are the final step in concept formation. They have two functions: to tie the concept to its referents in reality and to differentiate the concept from other concepts. A definition, which must be formed in accordance with objective principles in order to be valid, is not synonymous with the concept. A definition simply identifies the fundamental attributes of the concretes subsumed by the concept (e.g. “man is the rational animal” is a valid definition of man because reason is man’s fundamental attribute). The definition of man ties the concept to its proper referents while connecting it to but keeping it distinct from one’s other related knowledge. Thus the two parts of a valid definition, genus and differentia. The genus “animal” connects the concept of man with the rest of our vast knowledge about the animal kingdom. The differentia “rational” distinguishes the referents of the concept of man in a fundamental way from all the other members of the animal kingdom. The enormous cognitive benefit of concepts is that of economy: an unlimited number of entities (actions, relationships, etc.) can be held in mind and dealt with by means of a single mental unit, thereby drastically increasing the range and power of man’s mind beyond that attainable at the perceptual level. Observe that for Objectivism concepts are not “out there,” intrinsic properties of objects or of reality, to be discovered by some mysterious process of intuition. Nor are they subjective constructs arbitrarily invented inside one’s head. They are mental integrations of what is out there. They are the form in which a conceptual consciousness grasps reality. They are, if formed by the correct method, objective. Contrary to the claims of some Postmodernists, for example, the concepts of male and female are not arbitrary but objective. Those who doubt this should start by looking at pictures of males and females – or in the mirror. The mind attains objectivity by connecting every concept to perceptual data and therefore to the facts of reality. The method by which it does this is logic. Logic, for Objectivism, is not primarily deductive but inductive: deriving all of one’s conclusions ultimately from sensory-perception and integrating this knowledge into a non-contradictory whole. Thus Objectivism rejects two dominant modern approaches to philosophy: rationalism (reason, especially deduction, divorced from sensory-perceptual observation) and empiricism (sensory-perceptual observation divorced from reason, i.e. from conceptual processing and integration). For Objectivism knowledge results from logic applied to experience. Postmodernism stresses the fact that different individuals and groups have different “contexts,” i.e. different ideas. For the Postsmodernist this immediately disqualifies the conclusions of any individual from being objective. There are two reasons for this. First, according to postmodernism any context is necessarily arbitrary, i.e. divorced from reality, since concepts are necessarily arbitrary. Objectivism, by contrast, shows that concepts, if formed by the correct method, are based in reality. Furthermore, Objectivism shows that context-holding – which means requiring that everything one knows be integrated without contradiction with everything else one knows – is a crucial part of logic and so of expanding knowledge; it is not the disqualifier of knowledge. Second, for postmodernism an individual’s cultural context, whether true or false, good or bad, determines his ideas; that is, the individual is helpless to avoid cultural determinism. Objectivism, by contrast, holds that the conceptual level of awareness is volitional. “[T]o think is an act of choice ... . Reason does not work automatically; thinking is not a mechanical process; the connections of logic are not made by instinct. The function of your stomach, lungs or heart is automatic; the function of your mind is not. In any hour and issue of your life, you are free to think or to evade that effort” (Rand, 1961, p. 120). Man has the sovereign power to choose the ideas that move him. Volition is a corollary of the axiom of (human) consciousness. The “perceptual self-evidency” here is that of introspection. One can observe directly that one has the power to focus one’s mind at the conceptual level (e.g. aim for understanding, integration) or to let it drift at or drop to the sensory-perceptual level. A good illustration of volition (and one that works very well with students) is reading a book: one can just look at the marks on the page or try to focus one’s mind so as to understand what the words mean. No matter what one’s culture or environment (assuming a normal brain state and freedom from physical coercion), one has the power to choose to think or to evade the effort (and then, if one chooses to think, the power to make secondary choices based on that primary choice; see Peikoff, 1991, pp. 55–72). Note that volition does not violate the law of causality; rather it is a form of that law – one applicable to a conceptual consciousness. The cause of the choice to think in each given case is: the individual man. It is a causal primary not necessitated by prior events. Nor does volition undermine science. In actuality, it is a precondition of all science and of all knowledge. If men were not free to focus on the facts, evaluate them and reach conclusions based on logic and evidence, then all claims of knowledge would reduce to nonsense (as they do in postmodernism), viz. “I was forced by my genes and conditioning to emit the follows word sounds...” Volition does not mean omniscience. All knowledge has to be acquired and men can err in reaching conclusions. It is precisely because human consciousness is volitional and conceptual – and therefore fallible – that man needs the science of epistemology, the science that identifies the fundamental means of acquiring and validating knowledge.

#### Objectivism provides the best ethical framework for maximizing the utility for every involved party.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

The existence of a volitional, living organism is a precondition of the science of ethics. Telling an individual what he should do is pointless if he has no choice of how to act. But Ayn Rand does not take the need for a science of ethics for granted (for Objectivism’s ethics see Peikoff, 1991; Rand, 1964). She begins by asking the fundamental question: why does man need a code of ethics? The answer, she holds, rests precisely in the fact that man is a certain kind of living organism. A living organism’s life is conditional: its continued existence depends upon it reaching certain goals that are set by its specific nature (a gazelle, for instance, must obtain grass to live, a lion must obtain gazelles or the like to live). The organism’s life, in other words, is the standard that determines what goals it must reach and what it must avoid, what is a value and disvalue to it: the grass (as food) is a value to the gazelle, but not to the lion. “It is only the concept of ‘Life,’ ” Rand states in a crucial identification, “that makes the concept of ‘Value’ possible” (Rand, 1964, p. 17). For animals other than man, the standard of value is built-in to their actions: within the range of their power, they act automatically to pursue the goals needed to further their lives. The same is not true for man. He can act as his own destroyer. He must choose to hold his life as his standard of value. And even if he makes this choice, he must discover how – which values, goals and actions are necessary – to sustain his life.¶ By the nature of reality and man’s nature as a living organism, ethics is needed to teach man how to live successfully. The only objective standard of value, Rand shows, is man’s life, which means each individual’s life. Thus does Rand refute Hume’s view that you cannot get an “ought” from an “is.” Man’s nature, what he is, determines what he ought to do – if he chooses to live. Life is the ultimate standard in ethics. If a man chooses not to live (ignoring here people with painful incurable illnesses who might rationally want to end the suffering), then he has rejected reality (including his nature) and there is nothing more to say (Rand, 1982, pp. 95–101).¶ Since the purpose of morality is to teach a man how to live, the individual is the proper beneficiary of his moral action. Thus Rand advocates egoism as against altruism. Altruism mean’s “other-ism,” the sacrifice of oneself to other men. A moral code that tells an individual to sacrifice himself to others tells him to disregard his life, to renounce his own values, to value his own destruction – which is a contradiction in terms. (An egoist might properly risk his life for someone or something he values if his life would have no meaning to him without that value; see Rand, 1964, pp. 43–49.)¶ Because reason is man’s method of forming and validating concepts, that is, his means of gaining knowledge, and because knowledge enables man to achieve the values necessary to live, reason is man’s basic means of survival. Thus Objectivism advocates rational egoism.¶ The standard of value of the Objectivist ethics – the standard by which one judges what is good or evil – is man’s life, or: that which is required for man’s survival qua man. Since reason is man’s basic means of survival, that which is proper to the life of a rational being is the good; that which negates, opposes or destroys it is the evil (Rand, 1964, p. 23). The cardinal virtue in Objectivism – the fundamental method by which man obtains his values and lives – is rationality. “The virtue of Rationality means the recognition and acceptance of reason as one’s only source of knowledge, one’s only judge of values and one’s only guide to actions” (Rand, 1964, p. 25).¶ Other virtues, all of which are implicit in the virtue of rationality, are: honesty (the refusal to fake reality), integrity (loyalty to one’s rational judgment in action; see also Becker, 1998), independence (taking responsibility for one’s own thinking and for sustaining one’s existence), productiveness (creating the material objects required to fulfill one’s needs), justice (rationality applied to judgments of and actions toward other men), and pride (moral ambitiousness). All the virtues pertain to the proper relationship between consciousness and existence, mind and reality. Note that in Objectivism, the individual is the unit of moral value. This stems most fundamentally from the Objectivist metaphysics. Only the individual exists as a real, independent entity. This is validated through sense perception. A group or collective is not an entity but an abstraction, a collection of individuals. Thus there can be no moral principles that pertain to a group separate from moral principles that apply to each individual member.¶ Objectivism also totally rejects the “morality” of hedonism, the mindless indulgence of one’s whims or emotions. Since emotions stem from one’s implicit value judgments (Peikoff, 1991), the doctrine of hedonism tells people, in effect: value whatever you already happen to value. This is an empty doctrine, because it does not tell people what to value. And man cannot sustain his life long-range if he engages in mindless action. For similar reasons, Objectivism rejects pragmatism: do whatever seems to “work” in the short run. There is no standard in pragmatism by which to define what “works” other than emotions. For Objectivism morality is not doing whatever one happens to feel like doing, it is identifying and then doing what is actually in one’s long-range interest as a human being. Adhering to the dictates of reason is in one’s self-interest; rejecting reason is not. The anti-rational is the anti-life.¶ Objectivism also rejects utilitarianism: the greatest good for the greatest number. “Utilitarianism is a union of hedonism and Christianity. The first teaches man to love pleasure; the second, to love his neighbor. The union consists of teaching man to love his neighbor’s pleasure” (Peikoff, 1982, p. 122). This doctrine is clearly based on altruism and collectivism; the minority must be sacrificed to the whims of the majority. But a majority does not gain moral stature by dint of its numbers. Utilitarianism is a recipe for amorality and cannibalism, not for the survival and well being of the individual.¶ Finally, in Objectivism there is no dichotomy between the (truly) practical and the moral. The purpose of morality is not to sacrifice your life in order to serve God or society, but to live successfully and happily, long range, on earth. Consider, by way of example, one of the virtues inherent in rationality. Honesty means the refusal to fake reality. The justification of honesty is not that it benefits society but that it benefits the individual. The first consequence of trying to fake reality is to sabotage one’s own mind. Instead of using one’s rational faculty to perceive that which exists, the dishonest person uses it to deny or evade that which exists. This will make him, in principle, unable to deal with existence. The second consequence is that dishonesty will lead him to take actions in defiance of reality. The third consequence is that the results of his actions, in the end, will undermine his life and well being. Consider something as simple as a person who is planning on spending money. If he refuses to consider the amount of money he actually has to spend – focusing only on what he wants to buy – he will buy things he cannot afford and end up deeply in debt or bankrupt. If he pays with a bad check, he could even end up in jail. Honesty – regardless of his feelings – is in an individual’s rational self-interest (Locke & Woiceshyn, 1995). Objectivists are practical but they are not pragmatists. They believe in moral absolutes – because reality itself is absolute. It is what it is and cannot be changed by one’s whims – or one’s words.

## Link

### Generic

#### Modern day education is plagued with teaching methods that miss the forest for the trees. In the attempt to take every factor into account, students actually learn nothing. The affirmative is another failed liberal attempt to make students whole subjects.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

I went to an eighth-grade class on Western European history in a highly regarded, non-Progressive school with a university affiliation. The subject that day was: Why does human history' constantly change? This is an excellent question, which really belongs to the philosophy of history. What factors, the teacher was asking, move history, and explain men's past actions? Here are the he listed on the board: competition among classes for land, money, power, or trade routes; disasters and catastrophes (such as wars and plagues); the personality of leaders; innovations, technology, new discoveries (potatoes and coffee are included here); and developments in the rest of the world, which interacts with a given region. At this point, time ran out. But think of what else could qualify as causes in this kind of approach. What about an era's press or media of communication? Is that a factor in history? What about people's psychology, including their sexual proclivities? What about their art or their geography? What about the weather? Do you see the hodgepodge the students are being given? History, they are told, is moved by power struggles and diseases and potatoes and wars and chance personalities. Who can make sense out of such a chaos? Here is a random multiplicity thrown at a youngster without any attempt to conceptualize it—to reduce it to an intelligible unity, to trace the operation of principles. This is perceptual-level history, history as nothing but a torrent of unrelated, disintegrated concretes. The American Revolution, to take a specific example, was once taught in the schools on the conceptual level. The Revolution's manifold aspects were identified, then united, and explained by a principle: the commitment of the colonists to individual rights and their consequent resolve to throw off the tyrant's yoke. This was a lesson students could understand and find relevant in today's world. But now the same event is ascribed to a whole list of alleged causes. The students are given ten (or fifty) causes of the Revolution, including the big landowners' desire to preserve their estates, the Southern planters' desire for a cancellation of their English debts, the Bostonians' opposition to tea taxes, the Western land speculators' need to expand past the Appalachians, and firth. No one can retain such a list longer than is required to pass the exam; it must be memorized, then regurgitated, then happily and thoroughly forgotten. is all one can do with unrelated concretes If the students were taught by avowed Marxists—if they were told that history reflects die clash between the factors of production and the modes of ownership—it would be dead wrong, but it would still be a principle, an integrating generalization, and it would be much less harmful to the students' ability to think; they might still be open to argument on the subject. But to teach them an unconceptualized hash is to imply that history is a tale told by an idiot, without wider meaning, or relevance to the present. This approach destroys the possibility of the students thinking or caring at all about the field. I cannot resist adding that the State Education Department of New York has found a way, believe it or not, to make the teaching of history still worse. You might think that, in history at least, the necessary order of presenting the material is self-evident. Since each era grows out of the preceding, the obvious way to teach events is as they happened, that is, chronologically. But not according to a new proposal. In order "to put greater emphasis on sociological, political, and economic issues," a New York State proposal recommends that historical material be organized for the students according to six master topics picked out of the blue from the pop ethos: "ecology, human needs, human rights, cultural interaction, the global system of economic interdependence, and the future." In this approach, an event from a later period can easily be taught (in connection with one master topic) first, long before the developments from an earlier period that actually led to it. As a more traditional professor from Columbia has noted: "The whole thing would be wildly out of chronological order. The (Russian) purge trials of the 1930s would be taught before the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. It is all fragmented and there is no way that this curriculum relates one part of a historical period to another, which is what you want kids to be able to do. But the modern educators don't seem to care about that. They want "fragments," that is, concretes, without context, logic, or any other demands of a conceptual progression. I do not know what to make of this New York proposal. The fact that it was announced to the press and discussed seriously is revealing enough. Given the way history is now being taught, it is not surprising that huge chunks of it promptly get forgotten by the students or simply are never taken in. The result is many adolescents' shocking ignorance of the most elementary historical, or current, facts. One man wrote a column recently in The Washington Post recounting his conversations with today's teenagers. He found high school graduates who did not know anything about World War Il, including what happened at pearl Harbor, or what country the United States was fighting in the Pacific. won?" one college student asked him. At one point, the writer and a girl who was a junior at the University of Southern California were watching television coverage of Poland after martial law had been imposed; the set showed political prisoners being put into a cage. The girl could not understand it '"Why don-t they just leave and come to L.A.?'" she asked. "l explained that they were not allowed to leave." "'They're not!” she said. '"Why not?"' 'I explained that in totalitarian states citizens usually could not emigrate." she said. "'Since when? Is that something Now let us make a big jump—from history to reading Let us look at the method of teaching reading that is used by most American schools in some form: the look-say method (as against phonics). The method of phonics, the old-fashioned approach, first teaches a child the sound of individual letters; then it teaches him to read words by combining these sounds. Each letter thus represents an abstraction subsuming countless instances. Once a child knows that p sounds "puh," for instance, that becomes a principle; he grasps that every p he meets sounds the same way. When he has learned a few dozen such abstractions, he has acquired the knowledge necessary to decipher virtually any new word he encounters. Thus, the gigantic multiplicity of the English vocabulary is reduced to a handful of symbols. This is the conceptual method of learning to read. Modern educators object to it. Phonics, they say (among many such is unreal. I quote from one such mentality: "There is little value in pronouncing the letter p in isolation, it is almost impossible to do this—a vowel inevitably follows the pronunciation of any consonant. This means: when you pronounce the sound of have to utter the vowel sound "uh"; so, you haven't isolated the pure consonant; so, phonics is artificial. But why can't you isolate in your mind, focusing only on the consonant sound, ignoring the accompanying vowel for of analysis—just as men focus on a red table's color but ignore its shape in order to reach the concept Why does this writer rule out selective attention and analysis, which are the very essence of human cognition? Because these involve an act of abstraction; they represent a conceptual process, precisely the that modern educators oppose. Their favored method, look-say, dispenses with abstractions. Look- say forces a child to learn the sounds of whole words without knowing the sounds of the individual letters or syllables. This makes every word a new concrete to be grasped only by perceptual means, such as trying to remember its distinctive shape on the page, or some special picture the teacher has associated with it. Which amounts to heaping on the student a vast multiplicity of concretes and saying: stare at these and memorize them. (You may not be surprised to discover that this method was invented, as far as I can tell, by an eighteenth-century German professor who was a follower of Rousseau, the passionate opponent of reason. There is a colossal Big Lie involved in the look-say propaganda. Its advocates crusade against the overuse of memory, they decry phonics because, they say, it requires a boring memorization of all the sounds of the alphabet. Their solution is to replace such brief, simple memorization with the task of memorizing the sound of every word in the language. In fact, if one wishes to save children from the drudgery of endless memorization, only the teaching of abstractions will do it—in any field. No one can learn to read by the look-say method. It is too anti-human. Our schools today, therefore, are busy teaching a new skill: guessing. They offer the children some memorized shapes and pictures to start, throw in a little phonics (thanks to immense parental pressure), count on the parents secretly teaching their children something at home about reading—and then, given this stew of haphazard clues, they concentrate their efforts on teaching the children about methods of guessing what a given word might be.

### Anarchism/Communism

#### Pure anarchy justifies violence to achieve certain ends - prefer Randian objectivism as a method of resolving these conflicts while still placing faith in the innate ability of the individual.

Cox 13 - Stephen Cox, Ph.D. (UCLA), Professor of English Literature, Distinguished Professor, Faculty Fellow, Revelle College, July 2013 [“Rand, Paterson, and the Problem of Anarchism”, The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1 (July 2013), pp. 3-25, Penn State University Press] rpg

Rand’s challenge was to argue against anarchism without abandoning the nonintervention principle. In her essays of 1963–64, her argument takes both a moral and a practical form. The moral part of her argument emphasizes the need for “an objective code of rules” respecting “the retaliatory use of force.” The institutionalization of this code is of such importance to her theory that she can say, “This is the task of a government—of a proper government—its basic task, [its] only moral justification and the reason why men do need a government” (Rand 1964b, 109). She is certain that an anarchist society, with multiple justice agencies, cannot arrive at an objective code, with all the moral freight that carries. The practical part of her argument against anarchism emphasizes the impossibility, as she thinks, that anything other than monopolistic government will prevent initiations of force. Private and competing justice systems will lead only to a competition of force: “Remember that forcible restraint of men is the only service a government has to offer. Ask yourself what a competition in forcible restraint would have to mean” (113). Rand therefore requires the establishment of a government—a government limited by concern for rights and the delegitimizing effect of initiations of force, but a government nonetheless. Now the question is, how can government exist without the initiation of force that is involved, for example, in taxation? Rand answers that question by suggesting that the expenses of the minimal government she has in mind could be met in a variety of voluntary ways. Clearly, people who recognized the value of government could simply contribute money, but Rand is loath to develop that option; perhaps it would look too much like mere charity toward people who were protected by government but declined to pay their share of its expense. Such contributions might be regarded as a sacrifice of some individuals to others—an act that Rand abhors even more deeply than many of the specific ways in which states behave. “The word that has destroyed you,” her spokesman in Atlas Shrugged declaims, “is ‘sacrifice’” (Rand 1957, 1027–28).3 In The Virtue of Selfishness, Rand stipulates that even the employees of government must be paid; they must not work self-sacrificially. Government provides a service, and its employees deserve their pay. Collectivists may treat the benefits of government as gifts from some superior power, which can create wealth at will; but Rand will not. For her, government is “a servant of the citizens,” and it cannot be other than “a paid servant” (Rand 1964b, 119). She proposes two ways of linking services to payments. (1) Government could run a lottery, thus providing entertainment and possible gain in return for the money spent on it. (She apparently did not reflect on the fact that governments attract people to licensed gambling games by making the competition illegal, thereby initiating force against the would-be competitors.) (2) People who wanted their contracts enforced by government could pay a fee for this service. Consider the fact that every credit transaction is, in effect, a contract, and you will see that such fees could bring in a lot of money (116–17). Rand presents these ideas as speculations, and they are. Nevertheless, they indicate that she was willing to respond to the anarcho-capitalist utopia with a utopia of her own, in which the state continues to exist but is funded without the initiation of force and (which is saying almost the same thing, from her point of view) without the violation of anyone’s rights. In her speculations, individuals voluntarily pay for what they are voluntarily provided. But this connection of service with payment is far from complete. Her lottery and her contract-protection service are supposed to provide not only the pleasures of gambling and the advantages of contract insurance but the whole parade of national defense, police, and courts. These important benefits would be enjoyed by people who had no credit and never bought a lottery ticket. Concerned about such apparently gratuitous services, Rand constructs an argument meant to show that the addition of unpaying beneficiaries would not significantly increase costs to actual contributors or render their giving sacrificial (119–20). This argument, true or false, has been thoroughly examined and debated by able scholars (Franck 2000; Sechrest 1999, 2000; Ust 2000); it need not concern us here. In the current context, a more interesting thing is that Rand’s government would be voluntarily financed by less than the entire adult population, yet it would impose itself on everyone. Despite that fact, she presents her idea of monopolistic government as government by consent: “The source of the government’s authority is ‘the consent of the governed.’ This means that the government is not the ruler, but the servant or agent of the citizens” (Rand 1964b, 110).4 Rand’s emphasis on consent and delegated agency confirms the descent of her political individualism from the classical liberal tradition shaped by John Locke. Locke required that government be founded on consent and pictured consent as the effect of a contract in which individuals surrender to government some of their powers (in another formulation, some of their rights) in exchange for protection of their remaining rights or powers. Because virtually no one ever does that explicitly, Locke added the idea of tacit consent or implicit contract: everyone who enters or stays within the jurisdiction of a state—everyone who takes lodging for a week, or uses the roads—gives implied consent to its authority (Locke 1988, 348, para. 2.119). This is the position that David Hume mercilessly ridiculed in his essay “Of the Original Contract” (1748), sneering at the notion that just by staying in one’s native land, which most people can’t leave even if they want to, one consents to some all-inclusive political contract (Hume 1963, 38). And this is the position that anarcho-capitalists, following the lead of the nineteenth-century American radical Lysander Spooner (1808–87), ridicule in their own way, pointing to the fact that very few people ever explicitly agreed to the U.S. Constitution, and asking why the descendants of even those people should be bound by their ancestors’ agreement (Spooner 1867–70; Block 2002, 146–47; Sechrest 2000, 171–72).

### Authentic Learning

#### Educational programs that emphasize minimally guided instruction have empirically failed - direct instruction is necessary in almost every instance.

Kirschner et al 6 - Paul A. Kirschner, Educational Technology Expertise Center, Open University of the Netherlands Research Centre, Learning in Interaction Utrecht University, The Netherlands, John Sweller, School of Education University of New South Wales, Richard E. Clark, Rossier School of Education University of Southern California, 2006 [“Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching”, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc] rpg

None of the preceding arguments and theorizing would be important if there was a clear body of research using controlled experiments indicating that unguided or minimally guided instruction was more effective than guided instruction. In fact, precisely as one might expect from our knowledge of human cognition and the distinctions between learning and practicing a discipline, the reverse is true. Controlled experiments almost uniformly indicate that when dealing with novel information, learners should be explicitly shown what to do and how to do it. A number of reviews of empirical studies have established a solid research-based case against the use of instruction with minimal guidance. Although an extensive review of those studies is outside the scope of this article, Mayer (2004) recently reviewed evidence from studies conducted from 1950 to the late 1980s comparing pure discovery learning, defined as unguided, problem-based instruction, with guided forms of instruction. He suggested that in each decade since the mid-1950s, when empirical studies provided solid evidence that the then popular unguided approach did not work, a similar approach popped up under a different name with the cycle then repeating itself. Each new set of advocates for unguided approaches seemed either unaware of or uninterested in previous evidence that unguided approaches had not been validated. This pattern produced discovery learning, which gave way to experiential learning, which gave way to problem-based and inquiry learning, which now gives way to constructivist instructional techniques. Mayer (2004) concluded that the “debate about discovery has been replayed many times in education but each time, the evidence has favored a guided approach to learning” (p. 18). Current Research Supporting Direct Guidance Because students learn so little from a constructivist approach, most teachers who attempt to implement classroom-based constructivist instruction end up providing students with considerable guidance. This is a reasonable interpretation, for example, of qualitative case studies conducted by Aulls (2002), who observed a number of teachers as they implemented constructivist activities in their classrooms. He described the “scaffolding” that the most effective teachers introduced when students failed to make learning progress in a discovery setting. He reported that the teacher whose students achieved all of their learning goals spent a great deal of time in instructional interactions with students by simultaneously teaching content and scaffolding-relevant procedures … by (a) modeling procedures for identifying and self-checking important information … (b) showing students how to reduce that information to paraphrases … (c) having students use notes to construct collaborations and routines, and (d) promoting collaborative dialogue within problems. (p. 533) Stronger evidence from well-designed, controlled experimental studies also supports direct instructional guidance (e.g., see Moreno, 2004; Tuovinen & Sweller, 1999). Hardiman, Pollatsek, and Weil (1986) and Brown and Campione (1994) noted that when students learn science in classrooms with pure-discovery methods and minimal feedback, they often become lost and frustrated, and their confusion can lead to misconceptions. Others (e.g., Carlson, Lundy, & Schneider, 1992; Schauble, 1990) found that because false starts are common in such learning situations, unguided discovery is most often inefficient. Moreno (2004) concluded that there is a growing body of research showing that students learn more deeply from strongly guided learning than from discovery. Similar conclusions were reported by Chall (2000), McKeough, Lupart, and Marini (1995), Schauble (1990), and Singley and Anderson (1989). Klahr and Nigam (2004), in a very important study, not only tested whether science learners learned more via a discovery versus direct instruction route but also, once learning had occurred, whether the quality of learning differed. Specifically, they tested whether those who had learned through discovery were better able to transfer their learning to new contexts. The findings were unambiguous. Direct instruction involving considerable guidance, including examples, resulted in vastly more learning than discovery. Those relatively few students who learned via discovery showed no signs of superior quality of learning. Cognitive load. Sweller and others (Mayer, 2001; Paas, Renkl, & Sweller, 2003, 2004; Sweller, 1999, 2004; Winn, 2003) noted that despite the alleged advantages of unguided environments to help students to derive meaning from learning materials, cognitive load theory suggests that the free exploration of a highly complex environment may generate a heavy working memory load that is detrimental to learning. This suggestion is particularly important in the case of novice learners, who lack proper schemas to integrate the new information with their prior knowledge. Tuovinen and Sweller (1999) showed that exploration practice (a discovery technique) caused a much larger cognitive load and led to poorer learning than worked-examples practice. The more knowledgeable learners did not experience a negative effect and benefited equally from both types of treatments. Mayer (2001) described an extended series of experiments in multimedia instruction that he and his colleagues have designed drawing on Sweller’s (1988, 1999) cognitive load theory and other cognitively based theoretical sources. In all of the many studies he reported, guided instruction not only produced more immediate recall of facts than unguided approaches, but also longer term transfer and problem-solving skills.

#### Minimally guided instruction programs are failing but present in the status quo

Kirschner et al 6 - Paul A. Kirschner, Educational Technology Expertise Center, Open University of the Netherlands Research Centre, Learning in Interaction Utrecht University, The Netherlands, John Sweller, School of Education University of New South Wales, Richard E. Clark, Rossier School of Education University of Southern California, 2006 [“Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching”, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc] rpg

After a half-century of advocacy associated with instruction using minimal guidance, it appears that there is no body of research supporting the technique. In so far as there is any evidence from controlled studies, it almost uniformly supports direct, strong instructional guidance rather than constructivist-based minimal guidance during the instruction of novice to intermediate learners. Even for students with considerable prior knowledge, strong guidance while learning is most often found to be equally effective as unguided approaches. Not only is unguided instruction normally less effective; there is also evidence that it may have negative results when students acquire misconceptions or incomplete or disorganized knowledge. Although the reasons for the ongoing popularity of a failed approach are unclear, the origins of the support for instruction with minimal guidance in science education and medical education might be found in the post-Sputnik science curriculum reforms such as Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, Chemical Education Material Study, and Physical Science Study Committee. At that time, educators shifted away from teaching a discipline as a body of knowledge toward the assumption that knowledge can best or only be learned through experience that is based only on the procedures of the discipline. This point of view appears to have led to unguided practical or project work and the rejection of instruction based on the facts, laws, principles, and theories that make up a discipline’s content. The emphasis on the practical application of what is being learned seems very positive. However, it may be an error to assume that the pedagogic content of the learning experience is identical to the methods and processes (i.e., the epistemology) of the discipline being studied and a mistake to assume that instruction should exclusively focus on application. It is regrettable that current constructivist views have become ideological and often epistemologically opposed to the presentation and explanation of knowledge. As a result, it is easy to share the puzzlement of Handelsman et al. (2004), who, when discussing science education, asked: “Why do outstanding scientists who demand rigorous proof for scientific assertions in their research continue to use and, indeed defend on the bias of intuition alone, teaching methods that are not the most effective?” (p. 521). It is also easy to agree with Mayer’s (2004) recommendation that we “move educational reform efforts from the fuzzy and unproductive world of ideology—which sometimes hides under the various banners of constructivism—to the sharp and productive world of theory-based research on how people learn” (p. 18).

### Diversity/Perspectives

#### The aff’s attempt to include more perspectives is a classic subjectivist attempt that leaves students without decisionmaking skills.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

Our leading educators, however, see no relation between concepts and facts. The reason they present material from subjects such as history without conceptualizing it is precisely that they regard concepts as mental constructs without relation to reality. Concepts, they hold, are not a device of cognition, but a mere human convention, a ritual unrelated to knowledge or reality, to be performed according to arbitrary social fiat. It follows that grammar is a set of pointless rules, decreed by society for no objectively defensible reason. I quote from a book on linguistics written for English teachers by a modern professor: "Because we know that language is arbitrary and changing, a teacher's attitude toward nonstandard usage should be one of acceptance... One level of language is not 'better' than another, this is why the term nonstandard is preferable to substandard in describing such usage as 'He don't do it,' 'Was you there?' A person who uses terms such as these will probably be penalized in terms of social and educational advancement in our society, however, and it is for this reason that the teacher helps children work toward, and eventually achieve, standard usage, perhaps as a 'second' language'\* In short, there is no 'correct" or "incorrect" any more, not in any aspect of language; there is only the senseless prejudice of society. I saw the results of this approach in the classroom. I watched an excellent public-school teacher trying to explain the possessive forms of nouns. She gave a clear statement of the rules, with striking examples and frequent repetition; she was dynamic, she was colorful, she was teaching her heart out. But it was futile. This teacher was not a philosopher of language, and she could not combat the idea, implicit in the text- book and in all the years of the students' earlier schooling, that grammar is purposeless. The students seemed to be impervious to instruction and incapable of attention, even when the teacher would blow a shrieking police whistle to shock them momentarily into silence. TO them, the subject was nothing but senseless rules: the apostrophe goes here in this case, there in that one. Here was a whole science reduced to disintegrated concretes that had to be blindly memorized—just like the ten causes of the American Revolution, or the ten shapes of the last look-say session. You might wonder how one teaches composition—the methods of expressing one's thoughts clearly and eloquently in writing—given today's philosophy of grammar and of I will answer by reading excerpts from a recent manifesto. "We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style.... The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another." Also, why does anyone need English teachers? Who issued this manifesto? Was it some ignorant, hotheaded teen- agers drunk on the notion of student lower? No. It was the National Council of Teachers of English. 10 If you want a hint as to the basic philosophy operative here, I will mention that the editor of College English, one of the major journals of the profession, objects to "an industrial society [that] will continue to want from us—or someone else—composition, verbal manners, discipline in problem solving, and docile rationality. Note how explicit this is. The climax of his "enemies list" is "rationality," Despite today's subjectivism, some rules of composition are still being taught. Certain of these are valid enough, having been carried over from a better past. But some are horrifying. Here is an exercise in how to write topic sentences- The students are given two possible sentences with which to start a paragraph, then are asked to choose which would make a good opening and which a bad one. Here is one such pair: l. Cooking is my favorite hobby. 2. It really isn't hard to stir-fry Chinese vegetables. The correct answer? Number 1 is bad. [t is too abstract. (!) Students should not write about so enormous a subject as an entire hobby. They should focus only on one concrete under it, such as Chinese vegetables. Here is another pair: l. There is too much pollution in the world. 2. We have begun to fight pollution in our own neighborhood. Of course, number I is inadmissible. Students must not think about world problems—that is too vague—only about the dinky concretes in their own backyard. 22 This sort of exercise has been consciously designed to leach students to be concrete-bound. HOW are children with such an upbringing ever to deal with or think about problems that transcend Chinese vegetables and their own neighborhood? The implicit answer, absorbed by the students unavoidably, is: "You don't have to worry about things like that; society or the president will take care of you; all you have to do is adapt" Before leave English, I want to mention what has been happening to the teaching of literature in our schools as a consequence of the attitude toward concepts that we have been discussing. First, there has been the disappearance from the schools of the classics in favor of cheap current novels. The language and themes of the classics are too difficult for today's students to grasp; one does not teach Shakespeare to savages, or to civilized children being turned into savages. Then, there is the continuous decline even of today's debased standards. I quote from two English teachers: "Years ago, used to hear that Julius Caesar was too difficult for ninth-graders; now we are told that Lord of the Flies is too hard for the general run of tenth-graders." Then, there is the final result, now increasingly common: the disappearance of literature of any kind and Its replacement by what are called "media classes." These are classes, in one book's apt description, that "teach television, newspapers, café- pair magazines, and movies.' I will pass up all the obvious comments on this frightening descent. I have just one question about it: Why should these graduates of TV and car-repair magazines care if the great books of the past are burned by government edict—when they can't read them anyway? Turning to the teaching of science in our schools I want to mention an instructive book written by two professors at Purdue University; titled Creative Sciencing, it tells science teachers how to teach their subject properly. To learn science, the book declares, students must engage in "hands-on science activities." They must perform a series of concrete "experiments," as designing a bug catcher, collecting pictures of objects that begin with a c, going on field trips to the local factory, or finding polluters in the community. (These examples are taken from the book.) There is no necessary order to these activities. The children are encouraged to interact with the classroom materials "in their own way," as the mood strikes them, they are not to be inhibited by a teacher imposed structure or by the logic of the subject.’ You may wonder whether students taught in this manner will ever learn the abstract concepts and principles of science, the natural laws and explanatory theories that have been painstakingly discovered across the centuries—the knowledge that makes us civilized men rather than jungle primitives. The answer has been given by F. James Rutherford, chief education officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "We're too serious," he declared. "We insist on all the abstract stuff. We need to relax and let the children learn their own neighborhood." This statement was made at a meeting of experts brought together by a large foundation to discover what ails science teach1ng.15

#### The affirmative buys into the anti-intellectual school system of letting students learn about the world themselves - this is a recipe for subjectivist and relativist forms of thought.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

Today's education, I have said, reduces children to the status of animals, without the ability to know or predict the future. Animals, how- ever, can rely on brute instinct to guide them. Children cannot; brought up this way, they soon begin to feel helpless—to feel that everything is changing and that they can count on nothing. The above is not merely my polemic. The science teachers are working deliberately to create the US State of mind. The teachers are openly skeptical themselves, having been given a similar upbringing, and they insist to their students that everything is changing, that factual information is continually becoming outdated, and that there are things much more important in class—in science class—than truth. 11 is hard to believe how brazen people have become. "When preparing performance objectives," the Creative Sciencing book says, "you may wish to consider the fact that we don't demand accuracy in art or creative writing, but we have permitted ourselves to require accuracy in science. We may be paying a high price in lost interest, enthusiasm, vitality, and creativity in science because Of this requirement of accuracy."16 Our students should not have to be concerned about factual accuracy. They need have no idea whether gases expand or contract under pressure, or whether typhus germs cause or cure disease—but this will leave them free to be "vital" and 'iterative." But, you may ask, what if a student comes out in class with a wrong answer to a factual question? You are old-fashioned. There is no such answer, and besides it would be bad for the student's psychology if there were: "How many times will a student try to respond to a question if continually told that his or her answers are wrong? Wrong answers should be reserved for quiz shows on television."" What then is the point in having a teacher at there are no wrong answers, and since adults must not "authoritarian," am! since, as John Dewey has proclaimed, students do not learn by listening or by reading, but only by "doing." This brings me to an extremely important issue, one that is much wider than science teaching. My overriding impression of today's schools, derived from every class I visited, is that teachers no longer teach. They no longer deliver prepared material while the students listen attentively and take Instead, what one encounters everywhere is group-talking, that is, class participation and class discussion. Most Of the teachers I saw Mere enthusiastic professionals, excellent at what they do. But they conceive their role primarily as bull-session moderators. Some of the teachers obviously had a concealed lesson in mind, which they were bootlegging to the students—in the guise of asking leading questions or making brief, purposeful side comments. But the point is that the lesson had to legged. The official purpose of the class was for the pupils to speak more or less continually—at any rate, well over half the time. I asked group of high school students if their teachers ever delivered lectures in class. 'Oh no!" they cried incredulously, as though I had come from another planet or a barbaric past "No one that anymore." All the arguments offered to defend this anti-teaching approach are senseless. "Students," I have heard it said, "should develop initiative; they should discover knowledge on their own, not be spoon-fed by the teachers." Then why should they go to school at all? Schooling is a process in which an expert is paid to impart his superior knowledge to ignorant beginners. How can this involve shelving the expert and leaving the ignorant to shift for themselves? What would you think of a doctor who told a patient to cure himself because the doctor opposed spoon-feeding? "Students," I have heard, "should creative, not merely passive and receptive." How can they be creative before they know anything? Creativity does not arise in a void; it can develop only after one has mastered the current cognitive context. A creative ignoramus is a contradiction in terms. "We teach the method of thought," I have heard, "rather than the content" This is the most senseless claim of all. Let us leave aside the obvious fact that method cannot exist apart from some content. The more important point here is that though/ is precisely what cannot be taught by the discussion approach. If you want to teach thought, you must first put up a sign at the front of the class: 'Children should he seen and heard." To be exact: they may be heard as an adjunct of the lesson, if the teacher wishes to probe their knowledge, or answer a question of clarification, or assess their motivation to learn, or entertain a brief comment. But the dominant presence and voice must be that of the teacher, the cognitive expert, who should be feeding the material to the class in a higher purposeful fashion. carefully balancing concretes and abstractions, pre- paring for and then drawing and then interrelating generalizations, identifying the evidence at each point, and so forth. These are the processes that must first be absorbed year after year by the student in relation to a whole series of different contents. In the end, such training will jell in his mind into a knowledge of how to think—which he can then apply on his own, without any teacher. But he can never even begin to grasp these processes in the chaotic hullabaloo of a perpetual class discussion with equally ignorant peers. Have you seen the [1984] television debates among the Democrats seeking to be president? Do you regard these spectacles of arbitrary assertion, constant subject-switching absurd concrete-mindedness, and brazen ad hominem as examples of thinking? This is exactly the pattern that is being inculcated as thinking today by the class-discussion method. An educator with any inkling of the requirements of a conceptual consciousness would never dream of running a school this way. But an educator contemptuous of concepts, and of knowledge, would see no objection to it. In the Class discussions, I saw, the students regularly asked to state their own opinion. They 'Vere asked it in regard to issues about why they had no idea how to have an opinion, since they had no knowledge of the relevant facts or principles, and no knowledge of the methods of logical argument. Most of the time the students were honest; they had no opinion, in the sense of a sincere, even if mistaken, conviction on the question at hand. But they knew that they were expected to "express them. selves." Time and again, therefore, I heard the following: "1 like (or dislike) "Why?" "Because I do. That's my opinion." Whereupon the teacher would nod and say "very interesting" or "good point" Everybody’s point, it seemed, was good, as good as everybody else's and reasons "ere sim- ply irrelevant. The conclusion being fostered in the minds of the class was: "It's all arbitrary; anything and no one really knows" The result is only the spread of subjectivism, but of a self-righteous subjectivism, which cannot even imagine objectivity would consist of. Project a dozen years of this daily processing. One study of American students notes that they "generally offered superficial comments ... and consultants observed that they seemed 'genuinely puzzled at requests to explain or defend their points of view, "'IS What else could anyone expect? NOW let me quote from a New York Times news story. "l like (Senator Gary Han's] ideas," said Darla Doyle, a Tampa homemaker. "He's a man. His ideas are fresher than Mondale's are. I like the way he comes across." A reviewer asked Mrs. Doyle to identify the ideas that appealed to her "That's an unfair question," she said, asking for a moment to consider her answer. Then she replied, "He wants to talk with Russia." The headline of this story is: "Hart's Fans Can’t Say Why They Ate"19 According to John Dewey, students are bored by lectures, but motivated to learn by collective "doing." Not the ones I saw. Virtually every class was in continuous turmoil, created by students waving their hands to speak, dropping books, giggling, calling out remarks, whispering asides, yawning, fidgeting, shifting, shuffling. The dominant emotion was a painful boredom, which is the sign of minds being mercilessly starved and stunted. Perhaps this explains the magic influence of the instant it rang, everywhere I went. the room was empty, as though helpless victims were running for their lives from a dread plague. And so, in a sense they were. Our schools are failing in every subject and on a fundamental level. They are failing methodically, as a matter of philosophic principle. The anti-conceptual epistemology that grips them comes from John Dewey and from all his fellow irrationalists, who dominate twentieth-century American culture, such as linguistic analysts, psychoanalysts, and neo-Existentialists. And behind all these, as I argued in Ominous Parallels, stands a century of German philosophy inaugurated by history's greatest villain: Immanuel Kant, the first man to dedicate his life and his system to the destruction of reason. Epistemological corruption is not the only cause of today's educational fiasco. There are many other contributing factors, such as the teacher’s unions. and the senseless requirements of the teacher’s colleges, and the government bureaucracies (local and but epistemology is the basic cause, without reference to which none of the others can be intelligently analyzed or remedied. Now let me recount for you two last experiences, which are on the political implications of today's educational trend, one occurred at the most prestigious teacher-training institution in the country, Teachers College of Columbia University, In my first class, there, chosen at random, the professor made the following pronouncement to a group of sixty future teachers: "The evil of the West is not primarily its economic exploitation of the Third World, but its ideological exploitation. The crime of the West was to upon the communal culture of Africa the concept of the individual." I thought 1 had heard everything, but this shocked me. I looked around. The future teachers were dutifully taking it down; there were no objections. Despite their talk about "self-expression," today's educators have to inculcate collectivism. Man's organ of individuality is his mind; deprived of it, he is nothing, and can do nothing but huddle in a group as his only hope of survival. The second experience occurred in a class of juniors and seniors at a high for the academically gifted. The students had just returned from a visit to the United Nations, where they had met with an official of the Russian delegation, and they were eager to discuss their reactions. The class obviously disliked the Russian, feeling that his answers to their questions about life in Russia had been evasions or lies. But soon some- one remarked that we Americans are accustomed to believing what our government says, while the Russians naturally believe theirs "So how do I know?" he concluded. "Maybe everything is a lie" "What is truth?" asked one boy, quite sincere; the class laughed, as though this obviously unanswerable. "Neither side is good," said another student. "Both countries lie all the time. But the issue is the percentage. What we need to know is how much they lie—is it 99 percent for one, for example, 82 percent the other?' After a lot, more of this, including some pretty Beak arguments in favor of America by a small patriotic faction, one boy summed up the emerging consensus. "We can never know who is lying or telling the truth," he said. "The only thing we can know is bare fact. For example, we can know that a Korean airplane was shot down by the Russians [in 1983]. But as to the Russians' Story Of the cause vs. story, that is mere opinion." To which one girl replied in all seriousness: "But we can't even know that—none of us saw the plane shot down." This class discussion was the climax of my tour. I felt as though I "ere witnessing the condensed essence of a perceptual-level schooling. "Thought," these students were saying, "is helpless, principles are non- existent, truth is unknowable, and there is, therefore, no way to choose between the United States of America and the bloodiest dictatorship in history, not unless we have seen the blood with our own eyes." These youngsters represent the future of country. They are the children of the best and the brightest, who will become the businessmen, the artists, and the political leaders of tomorrow Does this kind of generation have the strength—the intellectual strength, the strength of con- victim—necessary to uphold the American heritage in an era dominated by incipient Big Brothers at home and missile-rattling enemies abroad? It is not the students' fault, and they do not fully believe the awful things they say, not yet. The ones I saw, at ever-y school except for Columbia—and here I want to register some positive impressions— "ere extremely likable. For the most part, they struck me as clean-cut, well-mannered, exuberant, intelligent, innocent. They were not like the typical college student one meets, who is already hardening into a brash cynic or skeptic. These youngsters, despite all their doubts and scars, still seemed eager to discover some answers, albeit sporadically. They were still clinging to vestiges of idea that man's mind can understand reality and make sense of the world. They are still open to reason—if someone would teach it to them. Nor is it basically the teachers' fault. The ones I saw '\*ere not like the college professors I know, reek of stale malice and delight in wrecking their students' minds. The teachers seemed to take their jobs seriously; they genuinely liked their classes and wanted to educate them. But given the direction of their own training, they were unable to do it. There is a whole generation of children Who still want to learn, and a profession much of which wants to help them, to say nothing of a country that devoutly wishes both groups tell. Everything anyone would need to save the world is there, it is waiting, and all that is required to activate it is what?

### Funding/Taxes

#### Increases in federal funding necessarily require increasing unfair, thieving, and discriminatory taxes that steal our private property that we earned through hard work.

Anderson 10 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, 27 December 2010, [“Our Unfair, Discriminatory, Growth-Inhibiting Income Tax”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/2010/12/our-unfair-discriminatory-growth.html>, An Objectivist Individualist] rpg

Obama wants to have a discussion about income inequality and increasing the discriminatory nature of the income tax rate structure to reduce income inequality. He claims he will win that debate. He clearly believes the American People are merry thieves and covet their neighbor's income if not his wife, his house, his manservant or maidservant, his ox or his donkey, or anything else that is his. I hope he is wrong and that most Americans will resist the Obama lure for free government goodies and services paid for by soaking the rich. An increasing number of Americans, especially Tea Party Americans, do seem to think there is nothing wrong with others becoming rich and they even wish them the best. Many have dreams of becoming rich themselves. Unfortunately, the young Americans coming out of our government-run school systems have generally been indoctrinated in the idea that income inequality is a great social injustice that transcends such trends as a generally improving lifestyle for all income groups. They have been taught that those with high incomes have somehow deprived the poor or that they must give back what they have created because, well they somehow could not have created it but for the poor? Or, in some cases, the rich are pictured as actually having taken more of their share of the dwindling resources of the planet and added more than their share of pollution, so therefore they must be made to pay back the poor whose share of resources and clean air and water they took! This is nonsense that comes from static thinking and environmental misconceptions I have discussed elsewhere. The Progressive Socialist Elitist likes to point at the fact that the very wealthy are becoming wealthier at a faster rate than most Americans have been becoming wealthier. He commonly claims this growing wealth on the part of the very rich is due to the Bush II tax cuts. He does not point out that the rate of the increased share of total income going to the wealthiest 10% of Americans grew just as fast from 1994 to 2000 under Bill Clinton. He does not point out that the share of total wealth of the top 10% has risen since 1978, which was back in Jimmy Carter's administration! Let us look at the historical data of Piketty and Saez (2003) and the update by Saez through 2007 for the share of total income held by the top 10% of tax filers including wages and salaries, pensions received, profits from business, dividends, interest, rents, and capital gains, but excluding Social Security retirement benefits, unemployment payments, and other government transfer payments: In 2007, the bottom income for the top 10% in income was $109,630, so we are hardly talking about really wealthy or really high income families here. Saez' 2007 update provides a further breakdown on how the shares of those between the 90th and 95th percentiles ($109,630 and $155,400 in 2007), those between the 95th and 99th percentiles ($155,400 and $398,900 in 2007), and the top 1 percentile with annual income above $398,900 fared historically: We see that those with incomes in the 90th to 95th percentile range actually lost share in the total national income from 2003 to 2007 following the Bush tax cut and overall had no greater share than they did in about 1970, though they were better off than in the 1940s and 1950s. So, if income inequality actually were a legitimate issue of social justice, there is no reason to increase tax rates on this group. If we then examine the group from 95% to 99% of income, we see they increased their share somewhat from 1982 to 1995, but have been rock steady ever since at the same fraction of the national income. There sure is no reason to increase taxes on this group based on some specious argument that the Bush tax cuts caused them to become proportionately wealthier. This would argue that tax rates for those earning up to about $400,000 should not be increased based on the specious argument that that would serve social justice by eliminating an increasing wealth inequality! We are left with only the top 1% of income earners as the sole group of the "rich" whose share of the national income has increased. They are the sole group making the entire top 10% of earners look as though they have increased their share of the national income. Their income share has generally increased since 1978, though recessions cause sharp reductions in their share. So, what is Obama talking about when he diatribes on the social justice need to increase tax rates for those families with incomes greater than $250,000 a year or those single filers with incomes above $200,000 per year? Apparently, he just wants more of their money so he can exercise the power that comes with distributing it as he pleases for maximal political payback. We can understand this greed and power lust, but we need not label it as virtue. The Obama and the Progressive Socialist Elitist game is one of simple power lust. It is an effort to dangle government goodies before a majority of the population who do not pay their fair share for the goodies they are to receive. Indeed, let us examine the share of taxes paid compared to the share of national income earned by income groups to evaluate fairness on a more meaningful scale. Now we can see that the top 1% of income earners had a 22.8% share of total income in 2007, but paid a far larger share of total income taxes at 40.4%. The 95% to 99% group of top earners had a 14.6% share of total income, but also paid a share of income taxes which was much larger than that at 20.2%. Our tax code clearly discriminates against them, even though we saw above that their share of total income has not increased since 1995 when Bill Clinton was President and still in his first term of office. The group of earners between 90% and 95% had equal shares of total income and of total income taxes at 10.6% of each. All but the top 10% of earners paid less into income taxes than their share of the national income! In effect, they all received a subsidy paid for by the top 5% of income earners. This was especially true for the bottom 50% of earners who paid only 2.9% of the total income tax amount in 2007! Basically, they can vote for just about any wasteful and illegitimate government program because it will be using someone else's money. They have no stake in the game. This is by design and exactly how the Progressive Socialist Elitist wants it. They want this half of the electorate to believe in free lunches, which is what this tax system gives them, except insofar as any of them may realize that hurting the higher income groups actually does hurt the economy. The unfairness we are actually dealing with in America is the unfairness of stealing the earnings of those who have worked hard and effectively to create wealth, which allows them to be paid well or to use a part of that created wealth as income from their businesses and investments. These activities do contribute greatly to the growth of the economy and to the decreasing cost of many necessary, or at least desired, goods and services. With high taxes, we force the higher income earners to move their investments from the highest yielding investments into those with tax protections such as municipal bonds or we force them to hold unto their investments longer so they will pay capital gains taxes more infrequently. Higher tax rates have always slowed down growth rates by making investment less efficient and by taking more of the time of the high earners due to their having to find ways to minimize loses to taxes. The net result in tax revenues is that whatever the marginal tax rates are set at, the actual federal government revenues do not rise above about 19% of GDP. This limit is called Hauser's Law. Increasing tax rates on the wealthy may make a Progressive Socialist Elitist feel good, but it does not actually increase tax revenues. This, in a rational society, would keep them from claiming they are increasing rates on the wealthy in order to do more to help the poor and the needy with additional government programs. Interestingly enough, Obama seems to understand this at times and is more inclined to use the argument that he simply hates the wealthy having so much income and he is eager to do anything he can to take more of it from them. He covets their income and thinks most voters do also. Simple fairness would have tax marginal rates the same for everyone with income above about the 20% level. Most of us are fine with the idea that government should not take food and other necessities out of the mouths of the poorest among us to fund government programs. Of course those who are rational also want a much, much smaller government exercising only constitutional powers and serving only to protect individual rights. With a legitimate government being about one-quarter its present size, the tax burden on everyone would be much lighter. It would be easy to have no deficits and to pay off the national debt, thereby eliminating the interest payments on that debt. It would be easy to eliminate business taxes, so businesses could much more readily compete internationally and hire many more Americans. With lower taxes, everyone, most especially the hardest and most efficient earners would be able to create more wealth and grow the economy. This would make it easier by far for every segment of the population to improve its standard of living, just as has clearly occurred in America from its founding and especially since after the Civil War. It is important to remember that if you are truly interested in raising the general standard of living in the United States, that growth rates make a huge cumulative difference. When governments do not interfere with the individual's effort to make his life better, the growth rate of the economy can be increased substantially. Let us examine the effect on the size of the economy relative to its start size at the end of 20 years for the following growth rates: 2.0% growth yields an economy 1.49 times its initial size. 2.5% growth yields an economy 1.64 times its initial size. 3.0% growth yields an economy 1.81 times its initial size. 3.5% growth yields an economy 1.99 times its initial size. 4.0% growth yields an economy 2.19 times its initial size. 4.5% growth yields an economy 2.41 times its initial size. 5.0% growth yields an economy 2.65 times its initial size. The only thing keeping the American economy from averaging 5% growth rates is the excessive size and interference of our local, state, and federal governments. The excessive services and waste is a sad substitute for the robust economy we would otherwise have. That economy would offer us many more choices tuned to our uniquely individual characters than does the retarded economy of a mixed socialist and capitalist system. Free capital and entrepreneurial talent and we will prosper in ways that governments cannot compete with the private sector to provide. What is more, we would then have a moral system allowing every individual to exercise the freedom of his own choices of values and exercising the personal control to manage his own life responsibly and in accordance with his personal values. Substituting government coercion and threats of brutal force for the free individual choices of the free market and private sector is both immoral and impractical. Wise men find that moral behavior is favorably linked to practical flourishing in life! Some rational morality with respect to income tax fairness will yield a robustly growing economy and a better life for almost everyone. The few left out by the economy will easily be handled by a more robust charitable concern by free men and women.

### Humanities Education

#### Their endorsement of humanities education devolves into meaningless relativism that leaves students unprepared to make real-world decisions.

Pesta 11 - James Pesta is an Associate Professor (Ph.D., Purdue University, 1997), specializing in Renaissance Poetry and Education. 01 December 2011 [“Moral Relativism and the Crisis of Contemporary Education”, <https://www.thenewamerican.com/culture/education/item/372-moral-relativism-and-the-crisis-of-contemporary-education>, The New American] rpg

Over the last three centuries, however — a span of time that witnessed the rise of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, the dawn of Naturalism and Modernism, and the dominance in our time of Post-Modernism — the Judeo-Christian underpinnings of Western Culture have been shaken, eroded, and ultimately rejected altogether by new, man-centered ways of viewing reality. The rise of science and the unrivaled hegemony of the scientific method — advancements that undeniably increase technological and material comforts for countless billions of human beings — also destroyed the very premises on which moral truth and consensus had been constructed. Faith no longer carried any weight in a world that sought truth only in data that could be verified empirically. Scripture became reduced to mere mythology in the face of our implacable march toward the conquest of nature, the only realm available to the study of physics and biology, based as they are on sensory observation and perception. And as theology became synonymous with superstition, and faith in God the intellectual parallel of believing in unicorns and leprechauns, the transcendent foundation of Western morality — that which kept it all together, anchored in a better world than this, and supported by a Mind much greater than ours — vanished into thin air. The inevitable rise of moral relativism was a consequence of this metaphysical vacuum, as the Big “T” truths of the past, the moral absolutes upon which any coherent and enduring system of morality depend, were replaced with the utterly subjective little “t” truths of a worldview imprisoned exclusively in nature, an outlook relentlessly hostile to the idea of a transcendent God who created nature and who exists beyond it as the first and greatest of the enduring Truths. Moral relativism, then, is the idea that all non-scientific truths, and especially moral truths, are arbitrary, subjective, and constructed entirely by the mind of man, incorporating all of the prejudices, irrationalities, and limitations of the incomplete perspectives and exclusionary approaches of the cultures that imposed these value systems in the first place. Hence, freed from the shackles of objectivity and utterly divorced from theological certainty, the study of the humanities shifted dramatically. Rather than reinforce ultimate Truth and serve as her compass and school-house, contemporary humanities evolved into a cannibalistic tool of the new scientific method, deconstructing the very notion of objective moral truth and serving only to critique and ultimately condemn as arbitrary the wisdom and moral foundations of the past. In categorically rejecting objective notions of truth and decrying traditional value systems, the humanities — as taught almost without question in schools and universities today — exist to destroy the very principles upon which humanistic learning evolved and nourished civilization, “liberating” culture from the harmful prejudices and hegemonies of traditional religion and morality. While the shock waves of these philosophical shifts can be witnessed across all fields of human endeavor, it is in education where the consequences of moral relativism are most devastating. For thousands of years, the chief aim and civilizing purpose of education had been moral development, an incessant recognition of the limits of human wisdom in the face of the divine, and an insistent reminder of the greater, unseen moral order that underpins the naturalistic world of the jungle, a world where power alone dictates right, and mere survival at any cost equals “truth” in the rawest, most naked sense of the word. Yet the educational paradigms of today — manifested most acutely in the morally relativistic approaches of the humanities — actually reinforce this Darwinian primacy of nature, and work against civilization. The Consequences of Moral Relativism in Our Schools It starts at the top, in the journal articles and published books that secure tenure and impose the ideological dictates determining the construction of curricula, the pedagogy taught in graduate programs, and the way we train teachers from kindergarten through high school and beyond. At the highest levels of academia, the tenured professoriate — and the professors, deans, provosts, chancellors, and university presidents who almost always arise from the privileged ranks of this tenured class — there exists a dangerously monolithic echo chamber, where relativistic, post-modern ideas about the world, culture, and truth have become calcified. The consequences to education of this ideological conformity can be witnessed at every level of public, and in many cases private, instruction, for many private schools only hire teachers trained and certified by state-run education programs. The dominance of moral relativism in our humanities curricula, from kindergarten through graduate school, guarantees that the study of philosophy, history, art, and literature amounts to little more than an amoral, un-reflexive acknowledgment of the random, chaotic, arbitrary, and ultimately meaningless nature of “reality.” In this system, the traditional “liberal arts” approach to learning has been transformed into an educational paradigm in which the humanities appropriate the methodology of the sciences in order to strip humanistic learning of any ultimate value or objective whatsoever. But even more insidiously, the principle of “moral relativity” has been co-opted by academics not only to displace traditional liberal arts education, but also to systematically replace it with the politically tendentious objectives of modern humanities programs. This is the great and glaring contradiction of contemporary post-modern approaches to education, which all claim to view learning through the lens of moral relativism. Beginning from the premise that all moral systems are mere social constructs without any transcendent claims to truth, the modern academic feels justified in exposing the truth claims of previous or competing cultures as bogus, rendering serious consideration of them moot from a moral perspective. Thus there can never exist the possibility that a professor or student might take seriously the faith claims and moral injunctions of Judeo-Christianity. To do so would immediately expose the “believer” as illogical and absurd. For the professor who took seriously these faith claims, the consequences could include professional isolation and even the denial of tenure, while students who persist in believing in the face of moral relativism very often face ridicule, intellectual alienation, and a reduced grade for the course. This worldview, correctly understood, is very much like a sword without a handle: As soon as you seize it to cut down your opponent’s position, you cut off your own fingers; for if moral relativism makes it impossible to take seriously any claim to truth that originates outside a laboratory, then surely that must include the faith claims of contemporary liberalism. But anyone who has spent meaningful time in our institutions of learning knows just how seriously teachers and academics take their liberal worldviews. If the goal is merely to divorce all meaning and belief from the humanities, then doing so across the board would produce a kind of level playing field, however degraded the resulting view of mankind. But the liberal post-modernism and moral relativity that dominate our schools seek to root out traditional values and meanings in order to supplant them with the liberal, materialist creeds of academics — belief-systems every bit as faith-based as those they seek to remove. Despite the obvious contradiction and hypocrisy, liberal academics proceed blithely down this intellectually tortured path by elevating politics to the exalted place in culture formally occupied by morality. The maxim “everything is political” forms a primary commandment in the church of academia, a bit of dogma so unchallenged in academic circles that it might have sprung, fully formed, from the head of Zeus himself, had not the whole concept of deity been rendered superfluous by post-modern dialectics. Although everything cultural might indeed have a “political” dynamic, to use contemporary parlance, that certainly does not prove that all things cultural are merely political, or that they can have no moral or transcendent meaning beyond politics. Nevertheless, academics today proceed religiously down this path with all the conviction of Saul before he hit the road to Damascus. As G. K. Chesterton observed trenchantly, “When people stop believing in God, they don’t believe in nothing — they believe in anything.” As we have seen, the tearing down and eventual dismissal of traditional morality underpinned by a transcendent God left a vacuum at the very core of civilization and culture. These discredited ideas had given shape and form to the vibrant cultures that grew up in their wake over thousands of years. In their absence, and because they could no longer see Moses on top of the mountain, post-modern academics could not live with the void, and so transformed politics — their politics — into a golden calf before which they continue to do obeisance. Thus the unquestioningly accepted maxim that “everything is political” justifies and privileges — at the expense and derogation of all competing ideas — the myriad leftist, ideological approaches to culture that have choked contemporary education in the humanities. Among the most pervasive of these leftist discourses are Marxist, feminist, and post-colonial studies. In today’s universities, it is almost impossible to encounter philosophy, history, literature, art, or even theology without studying them exclusively through the lens of one or all of these tendentious political perspectives. Because (liberal) politics alone provides a “neutral” platform from which to discuss culture, every painting, novel, historical movement, or economic system has meaning only insofar as it sheds light on the racism, sexism, imperialism, bigotry, or homophobia of Western culture. Thus, almost every single course in the humanities, overtly or implicitly, reduces humanistic study to a mindless and endlessly repetitive exercise in race, class, and gender — the holy trinity of contemporary academic discourse. We have reached the point in Western education where politically leftist approaches to culture have become institutionally sanctioned, unquestioningly normative, and zealously guarded: They alone offer students a legitimate position from which to analyze and critique culture. The dominance of such worldviews — to the detriment of free inquiry and the perversion of the educational mission — accounts for the overwhelming liberal bias in American education, the uniformly leftist sentiments of faculties and administrators, and the impressive success of schools in churning out factually illiterate, technically incompetent, but politically liberal and increasingly activist graduates. As Abraham Lincoln observed with alarming prescience, “The philosophy of the classroom in one generation, is the philosophy of government in the next.”

### Indeterminism

#### Linguistic indeterminacy feeds militarism and allows violence - words have to have a defined meaning to avoid Orwellian tyranny.

Masnick 14 — Michael Masnick, CEO and founder of Techdirt, a weblog that focuses on technology news and tech-related issues, CEO of the company Floor6, contributor at BusinessWeek 's Business Exchange, 2014 (“Obama Administration Learns: If You Redefine Every Word In The Dictionary, You Can Get Away With Just About Anything,” *Tech Dirt*, September 25th, Accessible Online at <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20140924/17360528630/obama-administration-learns-if-you-redefine-every-word-dictionary-you-can-get-away-with-just-about-anything.shtml>, Accessed 03-21-2016)

Obama Administration Learns: If You Redefine Every Word In The Dictionary, You Can Get Away With Just About Anything from the words-mean-something dept We've written before about how the NSA uses its own definitions of some fairly basic English words, in order to pretend to have the authority to do things it probably... doesn't really have authority to do. It's become clear that this powergrab-by-redefinition is not unique to the NSA when it comes to the executive branch of the government. Earlier this year, we also wrote about the stunning steady redefinition of words within the infamous "Authorization to Use Military Force" (AUMF) that was passed by Congress immediately after September 11, 2001. It officially let the President use "all necessary and appropriate force" against those who "planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001." But, over time, the AUMF was being used to justify efforts against folks who had nothing to do with September 11th, leading to this neat sleight of hand in which the military started pretending that the AUMF also applied to "associated forces." That phrase appears nowhere in the AUMF, but it's a phrase that is regularly repeated and claimed by the administration and the military. But, it goes beyond that. As Trevor Timm highlights over at The Guardian, pretty much the entire drone bombing (drones, by the way, are also apparently "authorized" by the AUMF) of Syria involves the administration conveniently redefining basic English to suit its purposes. Let's start with the authorization for the bombing itself: For instance, in his Tuesday statement that US airstrikes that have expanded into Syria, Obama studiously avoided any discussion about his domestic legal authority to conduct these strikes. That dirty work was apparently left up to anonymous White House officials, who told the New York Times’s Charlie Savage that both the Authorization of Use of Military Force (AUMF) from 2001 (meant for al-Qaida) and the 2002 war resolution (meant for Saddam Hussein’s Iraq) gave the government the authority to strike Isis in Syria. In other words: the legal authority provided to the White House to strike al-Qaida and invade Iraq more than a dozen years ago now means that the US can wage war against a terrorist organization that’s decidedly not al-Qaida, in a country that is definitely not Iraq. It's amazing what you can accomplish when you pretend words mean something entirely different than they do. Hell, if you can just make words mean whatever the hell you want them to mean, there's no such thing as a limitation on what you can do. It's all fair game. Who needs laws when the law is basically a mad libs for you to fill in what you want? Moving on. The definitional jujitsu covers the people who were killed by the bombing as well. Civilians? What civilians? Buzzfeed’s Evan McMorris-Santoro reported that the Pentagon is “confident” that no civilians were killed in any of the initial airstrikes in Syria, despite a credible report to the contrary. But we have no idea what that actually means either. The White House previously embraced a re-definition of “civilian” so it could easily deny its drone strikes were killing anyone than “militants” in Yemen, Pakistan, and elsewhere, according to a New York Times report in 2012: It in effect counts all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants, according to several administration officials, unless there is explicit intelligence posthumously proving them innocent. So any casualties, if they’re men, might well be tallied as “militants” even if the actual dead people were not. Kill anyone you want, just as long as they're men of a certain age. Thank you Pentagon dictionary. You just wiped out civilian deaths. But why stop there? How about "imminent threats"? Because that sounds pretty scary, right? It sure is -- especially when it can mean whatever the hell the administration wants: In addition to conducting airstrikes against Isis is Syria on Tuesday, the Obama administration also announced it had also targeted the “Khorasan Group”, a separate al-Qaida-linked terrorist organization. They justified it by claiming that the group was plotting an “imminent” attack on the US. Before last week, hardly anyone had heard of the Khorasan Group (in fact, even their name was classified), so it’s difficult to judge from public information just how threatening their alleged plot really was. But when you add in the administration’s definition of “imminent,” it becomes impossible. Take, for example, this definition from a Justice Department white paper, which was leaked last year, intended to justify the killing of Americans overseas: [A]n “imminent” threat of violent attack against the United States does not require the United States to have clear evidence that a specific attack on U.S. persons will take place in the immediate future. To translate: “imminent” can mean a lot of things … including “not imminent”. This is pretty neat. Anything else you've got for us? How about "combat" or "ground troops"? They're not what you think they are either, because a malleable language can do anything: As the New York Times’s Mark Landler detailed over the weekend, White House has “an extremely narrow definition of combat … a definition rejected by virtually every military expert.” According to the Obama administration, the 1600 “military advisers” that have steadily been flowing in Iraq fall outside this definition, despite the fact that “military advisers” can be: embedded with Iraqi troops; carry weapons; fire their weapons if fired upon; and call in airstrikes. In the bizarro dictionary of war employed by this White House, none of that qualifies as “combat”. Yes, the English language changes over time and that's generally a good thing. But we're not talking about the way the word "decimate" once meant to lop off 10% and now means "destroy everything." This is a deliberate misrepresentation of things. Hell, this seems to go further than Orwell even imagined with his authoritarian use of language and rewriting of history. In this case, rather than just saying "we were always at war with Eurasia," he could have just changed the definition of "we," "were," "always," "at," "war," "with," and "Eurasia," and it would have been that much more powerful.

### Linguistic Relativism

**Reject their denial of objective reality — it prevents us from combating false ideas about history.**

**Sokal 96** — Alan Sokal, Professor of Physics at New York University, 1996 (“A Physicist Experiments with Cultural Studies,” *Lingua Franca*, May/June, Available Online at http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/9605/sokal.html, Accessed 09-09-2008)

Why did I do it? While my method was satirical, my motivation is utterly serious. What concerns me is the proliferation, not just of nonsense and sloppy thinking per se, but of a particular kind of nonsense and sloppy thinking: one that denies the existence of objective realities, or (when challenged) admits their existence but downplays their practical relevance. At its best, a journal like Social Text raises important issues that no scientist should ignore--questions, for example, about how corporate and government funding influence scientific work. Unfortunately, epistemic relativism does little to further the discussion of these matters. In short, my concern about the spread of subjectivist thinking is both intellectual and political. Intellectually, the problem with such doctrines is that they are false (when not simply meaningless). There is a real world; its properties are not merely social constructions; facts and evidence do matter. What sane person would contend otherwise? And yet, much contemporary academic theorizing consists precisely of attempts to blur these obvious truths. Social Text's acceptance of my article exemplifies the intellectual arrogance of Theory--postmodernist literary theory, that is--carried to its logical extreme. No wonder they didn't bother to consult a physicist. If all is discourse and "text," then knowledge of the real world is superfluous; even physics becomes just another branch of cultural studies. If, moreover, all is rhetoric and language games, then internal logical consistency is superfluous too: a patina of theoretical sophistication serves equally well. Incomprehensibility becomes a virtue; allusions, metaphors, and puns substitute for evidence and logic. My own article is, if anything, an extremely modest example of this well-established genre. Politically, I'm angered because most (though not all) of this silliness is emanating from the self-proclaimed Left. We're witnessing here a profound historical volte-face. For most of the past two centuries, the Left has been identified with science and against obscurantism; we have believed that rational thought and the fearless analysis of objective reality (both natural and social) are incisive tools for combating the mystifications promoted by the powerful—not to mention being desirable human ends in their own right. The recent turn of many "progressive" or "leftist" academic humanists and social scientists toward one or another form of epistemic relativism betrays this worthy heritage and undermines the already fragile prospects for progressive social critique. Theorizing about "the social construction of reality" won't help us find an effective treatment for AIDS or devise strategies for preventing global warming. **Nor can we combat false ideas in history**, sociology, economics, and politics if we reject the notions of truth and falsity.

#### They result in anti-intellectual relativism. If nothing is True, nothing is False.

**Sokal 96** — Alan Sokal, Professor of Physics at New York University, 1996 (“A Plea for Reason, Evidence and Logic,” Talk Presented at a Forum at New York University, October 26th, Available Online at http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/nyu\_forum.html, Accessed 09-09-2008)

I didn't write the parody for the reasons you might at first think. My aim wasn't to defend science from the barbarian hordes of lit crit or sociology. I know perfectly well that the main threats to science nowadays come from budget-cutting politicians and corporate executives, not from a handful of postmodernist academics. Rather, my goal is to defend what one might call a scientific worldview -- defined broadly as a respect for evidence and logic, and for the incessant confrontation of theories with the real world; in short, for reasoned argument over wishful thinking, superstition and demagoguery. And my motives for trying to defend these old-fashioned ideas are basically political. I'm worried about trends in the American Left -- particularly here in academia -- that at a minimum divert us from the task of formulating a progressive social critique, by leading smart and committed people into trendy but ultimately empty intellectual fashions, and that can in fact undermine the prospects for such a critique, by promoting subjectivist and relativist philosophies that in my view are inconsistent with producing a realistic analysis of society that we and our fellow citizens will find compelling. David Whiteis, in a recent article, said it well: Too many academics, secure in their ivory towers and insulated from the real-world consequences of the ideas they espouse, seem blind to the fact that non-rationality has historically been among the most powerful weapons in the ideological arsenals of oppressors. The hypersubjectivity that characterizes postmodernism is a perfect case in point: far from being a legacy of leftist iconoclasm, as some of its advocates so disingenuously claim, it in fact ... plays perfectly into the anti-rationalist -- really, anti-thinking -- bias that currently infects "mainstream" U.S. culture. Along similar lines, the philosopher of science Larry Laudan observed caustically that the displacement of the idea that facts and evidence matter by the idea that everything boils down to subjective interests and perspectives is -- second only to American political campaigns -- the most prominent and pernicious manifestation of anti-intellectualism in our time. (And these days, being nearly as anti-intellectual as American political campaigns is really quite a feat.) Now of course, no one will admit to being against reason, evidence and logic – that's like being against Motherhood and Apple Pie. Rather, our postmodernist and poststructuralist friends will claim to be in favor of some new and deeper kind of reason, such as the celebration of "local knowledges" and "alternative ways of knowing" as an antidote to the so-called "Eurocentric scientific methodology" (you know, things like systematic experiment, controls, replication, and so forth). You find this magic phrase "local knowledges" in, for example, the articles of Andrew Ross and Sandra Harding in the "Science Wars" issue of Social Text. But are "local knowledges" all that great? And when local knowledges conflict, which local knowledges should we believe? In many parts of the Midwest, the "local knowledges" say that you should spray more herbicides to get bigger crops. It's old-fashioned objective science that can tell us which herbicides are poisonous to farm workers and to people downstream. Here in New York City, lots of "local knowledges" hold that there's a wave of teenage motherhood that's destroying our moral fiber. It's those boring data that show that the birth rate to teenage mothers has been essentially constant since 1975, and is about half of what it was in the good old 1950's. Another word for "local knowledges" is prejudice. I'm sorry to say it, but under the influence of postmodernism some very smart people can fall into some incredibly sloppy thinking, and I want to give two examples. The first comes from a front-page article in last Tuesday's New York Times (10/22/96) about the conflict between archaeologists and some Native American creationists. I don't want to address here the ethical and legal aspects of this controversy -- who should control the use of 10,000-year-old human remains -- but only the epistemic issue. There are at least two competing views on where Native American populations come from. The scientific consensus, based on extensive archaeological evidence, is that humans first entered the Americas from Asia about 10-20,000 years ago, crossing the Bering Strait. Many Native American creation accounts hold, on the other hand, that native peoples have always lived in the Americas, ever since their ancestors emerged onto the surface of the earth from a subterranean world of spirits. And the Times article observed that many archaeologists, "pulled between their scientific temperaments and their appreciation for native culture, ... have been driven close to a postmodern relativism in which science is just one more belief system." For example, Roger Anyon, a British archaeologist who has worked for the Zuni people, was quoted as saying that "Science is just one of many ways of knowing the world. ... [The Zunis' world view is] just as valid as the archeological viewpoint of what prehistory is about." Now, perhaps Dr. Anyon was misquoted, but we all have repeatedly heard assertions of this kind, and I'd like to ask what such assertions could possibly mean. We have here two mutually incompatible theories. They can't both be right; they can't both even be approximately right. They could, of course, both be wrong, but I don't imagine that that's what Dr. Anyon means by "just as valid". It seems to me that Anyon has quite simply allowed his political and cultural sympathies to cloud his reasoning. And there's no justification for that: We can perfectly well remember the victims of a horrible genocide, and support their descendants' valid political goals, without endorsing uncritically (or hypocritically) their societies' traditional creation myths. Moreover, the relativists' stance is extremely condescending: it treats a complex society as a monolith, obscures the conflicts within it, and takes its most obscurantist factions as spokespeople for the whole. My second example of sloppy thinking comes from Social Text co-editor Bruce Robbins' article in the September/October 1996 Tikkun magazine, in which he tries to defend -- albeit half-heartedly -- the postmodernist/poststructuralist subversion of conventional notions of truth. "Is it in the interests of women, African Americans, and other super-exploited people," Robbins asks, "to insist that truth and identity are social constructions? Yes and no," he asserts. "No, you can't talk about exploitation without respect for empirical evidence" -- exactly my point. "But yes," Robbins continues, "truth can be another source of oppression." Huh??? How can truth oppress anyone? Well, Robbins' very next sentence explains what he means: "It was not so long ago," he says, "that scientists gave their full authority to explanations of why women and African Americans ... were inherently inferior." But is Robbins claiming that that is truth? I should hope not! Sure, lots of people say things about women and African-Americans that are not true; and yes, those falsehoods have sometimes been asserted in the name of "science", "reason" and all the rest. But claiming something doesn't make it true, and the fact that people – including scientists – sometimes make false claims doesn't mean that we should reject or revise the concept of truth. Quite the contrary: it means that we should examine with the utmost care the evidence underlying people's truth claims, and we should reject assertions that in our best rational judgment are false.

### Postmodernism

#### Postmodern skepticism is a silly attempt by French snowflakes to avoid the materiality and existence of social problems - things really do happen!!!

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

We do not accept the claim of some Postmodernists that the philosophy is so diverse and variegated that it cannot be defined (a very Postmodern claim in itself). If the term postmodernism has no coherent, intelligible definition, then the term is meaningless and should not be used at all. If postmodernism is not something particular, then it is nothing. We hold that postmodernism has a specific meaning, despite differences among various factions. We are concerned here only with its essential tenets. Fundamentally, as we shall see, postmodernism is the explicit, philosophical rejection of reality, reason and objectivity. According to postmodernism, the concept of an objective reality – the idea that reality exists and is what it is independent from any human mind – is invalid. Some Postmodernists allow that an objective reality may exist, but dismiss it as unimportant: “Some, including myself, do not deny the possible existence of something worth the label ‘objective reality,’ but are more inclined to emphasize that social reality is not external to human consciousness and language use” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 459). A closely related Postmodern viewpoint is that, although an objective reality may exist, by our very nature it is impossible for us to know it. Other Postmodernists dismiss objective reality outright: “Feminist analysis [a branch of postmodernism] begins with the principle that objective reality is a myth” (Ann Scales quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 23). Philosophically, the above differences are irrelevant. If reality exists but cannot be known, then for all practical purposes, objective reality can be dispensed with entirely. Do not make the mistake of thinking, as some do, that not all facts fall under the scope of postmodernism’s attack, that it wishes simply to criticize existing social or economic relations. Even scientifically established facts and science itself are under attack. “Rules for science that claim to show the ultimate or superior way to objectivity and rationality,” writes Alvesson, “has [sic] so far not proven to be uncontested or reliable in the long run ... . Data are never pure, free from theory, language and an interpretive bias, they are always constructed in terms of a particular framework, prestructured personal and cultural understanding, vocabulary and perspective” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 460). Other Postmodernists reject science even more blatantly: “our critique of the objective standpoint as male is a critique of science as a specifically male approach to knowledge. With it, we reject male criteria for verification” (Catharine MacKinnon quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 26). If objective reality and objective facts are a myth that must be abandoned, what is to replace them? According to postmodernism, “reality” is a human, subjective construction. Typically postmodernism does not endorse individual subjectivism (although such would not be logically inconsistent with its tenets given that each individual grows up in a different sub-culture). It claims that “facts” are social creations that change as society changes. “Reality” is a collective creation, a group product. Here is this view applied to leadership studies: “It is important to realize that leaders, subordinates as well as measurements of various qualities, feelings and outcomes are subjective and social constructions and not simple reflections of objective reality” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 464). Since “reality” is socially constructed and varies as different groups attempt to create their own “realities,” postmodernism embraces multiple, often contradictory and unintelligible, “realities.” “[T]he Postmodern is a view of the world where individuals are inundated with multiple voices that create a cacophony of sound and an inability to make complete sense of reality. The discovery of ultimate Truths is abandoned as impossible and mistaken” (Tierney, 1996, p. 373). “From a Postmodern perspective ... the idea ... that reality is understandable is rejected in favor of a multivocality where disintegration and instability is the norm” (Tierney, 1996, p. 374). On the Postmodernist approach, then, identity – the idea that existents in reality have an independent, definite, firm, knowable nature – is an illusion and causality is discarded, often as a male or white or arbitrary Western prejudice. In attacking objective reality and extolling the group as the creator of “reality,” postmodernism denigrates the importance of the individual. According to postmodernism, man is not an autonomous agent who possesses free will – i.e. a reasoning mind capable of reaching truth by adhering to reality. “The idea of the autonomous human being that is capable of independent thought and action is replaced by the portrait of an individual hemmed in by social and cultural constraints.” (Tierney, 1996, p. 375) Man is a mere fragment of a – usually physiological – collective. His ideas, values, interests and actions – all are determined not by his rational thought and his own choices but by his relationship to and membership in a collective: by the fact that he happens to be white or black, male or female, heterosexual or homosexual, born in North America or born in Africa. “[W]hen Postmodern arguments are extended we find it possible to replace an individualistic worldview – in which individual minds are critical to human functioning – with a relational reality” (Kenneth Gergen quoted in Tierney, 1996, p. 375). Postmodernism, in other words, embraces collective (group) determinism. By what means does a group socially construct “reality”? According to postmodernism, the usual means is: language. The group that is able to control language – to impose its meaning and definitions on the concepts we use – creates reality. “As Deetz (forthcoming, p. x) puts it, ‘conceptions are always contests for meaning. Language does not name objects in the world; it is core to the process of constituting objects... .’ ” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 470) Language and concepts, on this view, have no referents in reality (there is, after all, no independent reality for concepts to refer to), no firm meanings, no objective rules or logic in their proper use and misuse. Concepts mean simply whatever a group decides they mean. Gergen (2001, p. 805) sums it up this way, “there is no ultimate means of justifying one form of rationality, description, or explanation over another. If such justification were to be offered, they would also prove to be exercises in linguistic convention.” Because concepts and logic, according to postmodernism, are not our means of discovering and identifying the nature of reality but rather our means of creating “reality,” the individual’s faculty of reason is impotent. “From this perspective, the pursuit of truth becomes deeply problematic as a goal of social science because what counts as truth is not fixed, but derives in part from social conventions that can differ among contexts and language games” (Kilduff & Mehra, 1997, p. 463). “Postmodernists eschew the search for clarity or persuasion through rational logic because absolutes no longer exist” (Tierney, 1996, p. 374). Reason, to the extent that postmodernism retains the term, does not name some objective, specific cognitive faculty of man, his means of knowledge and discoverer of truth. “Reason” is simply a social construct used to dominate others and which changes as the dominant group changes. According to postmodernism, historically the group that was able to impose its interpretation of “reason” on others thereby came to hold tremendous power over them, capable of dismissing any dissenters as “irrational.” As one Postmodernist puts it, “like ‘fairness,’ ‘merit,’ and ‘free speech,’ Reason is a political entity” (Stanley Fish quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 25). Writes a commentator on postmodernism: “The characteristics associated with the knower – objectivity, reason, universality, intellect – are associated with men.” (Susan H. Williams quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 28). Writes still another scholar: “what Michael Foucault devastatingly labeled ‘the monologue of reason’ has been, for many contemporary intellectuals, displaced by an emphasis on the socially contingent and power-driven nature of conceptions of reality and the ubiquity of often incommensurable perspectives. No longer can those with even radically different views be facilely denounced as irrational” (Sanford Levinson quoted in Farber & Sherry, 1997, p. 29). “Reality,” then, is socially constructed by those who are able to shape and define the meaning of concepts and language. The Postmodernist view of the world is, in essence, that of group warfare. This, plus its implicit Marxist premises, explains postmodernism’s obsession with power. For it, every issue is one of cultural and political power: a struggle to see which group can impose its whims (its “social creation of reality”) on others. In any difference or dispute between two groups, there is no resort to what the facts are or to what is true, since what count as “facts” and “truth” for one group may not count as “facts” and “truth” for the other group. There is only a power struggle to see which group can control our concepts and language. Thus some Postmodernists claim that what counts as “reality,” “reason,” “objectivity,” “knowledge,” etc., has been created by males to subjugate females. Others claim that what has been called “reality,” “reason,” “objectivity,” “knowledge,” etc., has been created by the West to subjugate the non-Western world. In such an approach, there is no distinction between reason and force. (Observe the perverse rewriting of history implicit in the Postmodern approach; in fact, true subjugation – through brute force – occurs only when men abandon reason as the means of settling disputes.) Because in metaphysics and epistemology postmodernism rejects reality and reason, it necessarily rejects all objective standards, including all objective moral standards. An objective standard states that, by the inexorable nature of reality, as discovered by the faculty of reason, X is required for Y. For instance, if an entrepreneur is trying to build a bridge for his railway, the standard is that the bridge be constructed so that it is capable of sustaining the loads it is meant to carry without collapsing. A bridge that meets the standard is good or valuable; one that does not is bad or without value. The standard fundamentally is set by reality: if one wants trains to be able to cross the river, the bridge cannot be built from leaves or water but must be build from suitable materials, such as wood or steel, properly arranged. But the standard is also set by man’s reason: one must discover a whole host of knowledge, including the facts that materials and methods of construction differ, that some can withstand enormous loads while others cannot, etc., in order to know what is required to build the bridge. Because the standard is based in reality and reason, it is objective. And note that the penalty for not adopting an objective standard when building the bridge is also set fundamentally by reality: the bridge will collapse on the first run, sending the train plummeting into the river and bankrupting the entrepreneur’s business. Similarly, if the entrepreneur when building his bridge hires only the most knowledgeable construction engineers (vs., say, hiring one white engineer, one black, one female, one disabled, etc.), his action is an expression of an objective standard. By the nature of reality, it takes actual knowledge and skills – not various skin colors or gender – to erect a bridge; the entrepreneur has grasped this fact by his reason, and so chooses to hire only the most knowledgeable and skilled engineers he can find, regardless of their membership in various demographic categories. If he hires incompetent engineers, by the nature of reality disaster again will ensue. Objective standards, in other words, rest on the fundamental fact that reality is what it is and does not accommodate itself to anyone’s thoughts, desires, whims – that in order to act successfully man must obey reality, discovering by a process of reason what reality’s nature and requirements are. Postmodernism, however, rejects all this. Reality, for it, is not a firm place with a definite nature. Reality is not something we must adapt to – it is something that adapts to us. We create “reality,” constructing it out of our language games. Reason, as we have seen, is absent in such a world; “reason” is only the attempt by one group to impose its linguistic whims on others. If reason and reality are out, anything goes – and must go. The hostility that Postmodernists project toward objective standards – be they employment or grammatical or economic or moral standards – stems from the fact that any objective standard must be based on reality and reason, both of which postmodernism wishes to annihilate. “Standards” are acceptable only so long as they make no claim to be reality-based. As Gergen (2001, p. 807) puts the point in regard to moral standards, “The advantage of postmodern constructionism is that it does not seek to lodge these commitments [to values] in some form of foundation [i.e. in reality], a secure base from which others may be viewed as transcendentally wrong or evil.” This is the actual meaning behind postmodernism’s championing of “diversity.” When Postmodernists campaign in the name of diversity that grade school students should read not just Shakespeare but also stories that contain sentences like “She sweetest, goodest safe,” they do not do so because they think the latter is in reality as good as Shakespeare. When they campaign in the name of diversity to have people hired not on merit and ability but because they are “disabled,” they do not do so because they think the disabled person will in reality be as good at his job. When they campaign in the name of diversity to have Indian mysticism taught alongside Western science, they do not do so because they think the former will enable us to build better computers and send rockets into outer space. Their goal in all these cases, rather, is to smash the objective standards themselves. Postmodernism adheres to an unwavering egalitarianism. All standards, moral or otherwise, must be discarded; everything is the “equal” of everything else. In the normative realm – the realm of determining what is better and worse, be it in terms of engineering or economics or morality – anything goes. Making everything “equally valuable,” of course, in the end destroys the very concept of value. In essence, therefore, postmodernism amounts to nihilism. Postmodernists bicker among themselves about whether their philosophy is a new paradigm or just a method for attacking old paradigms (i.e. reason). But the distinction is irrelevant. Either way, it is not a positive philosophical theory but the destruction of philosophy – and so of man’s life. In rejecting reality, reason and all objective standards postmodernism deliberately rejects the essence of the Enlightenment. The “modern” in postmodernism refers to the Enlightenment and all the glories that it brought the world: reason, science, technology, freedom, capitalism, wealth.

### Public Education

#### Private education is the only system that can ensure low attendance costs and high quality teaching - monopolizing education creates inefficiencies - empirically proven by the failures of status quo public education.

Coulson 8 - Andrew J. Coulson was the director of Cato’s Center for Educational Freedom from 2005 to 2015 and a senior fellow from 2015 until his death in February 2016. Previously, he was senior fellow in education policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. He served on the advisory council of the E.G. West Centre for Market Solutions in Education at the University of Newcastle, UK, and contributed to books published by the Fraser Institute and the Hoover Institution. 2008 [“Markets vs. Monopolies in Education: A Global Review of the Evidence”, Cato Institute] rpg

Although the results reported in the previous section have the advantage of comprehensiveness, they are not as meaningful as we would like. The terms “private school” and “government school” encompass many different types of institutions. Private schools in the United States are often quite minimally regulated by the state and are funded almost exclusively through fees paid by parents. Private schools in the Netherlands, by contrast, receive virtually all their funding from the state and must follow state rules regarding curriculum, testing, teacher qualifications, and teachers’ salaries, and they may not be operated for profit. These are clearly different types of institutions. There are also great dissimilarities among the world’s government schools. In the United States, these enjoy (with only a few minor and isolated exceptions) a monopoly on government K-12 education funding (to the tune of more than $11,000 per pupil).11 In Chile, the Netherlands, Australia, parts of Canada, Sweden, and other nations, various levels of public funding are made available to private as well as government schools(though this funding usually comes with extensive regulatory strings), putting the government sector under some degree of competitive pressure. So, in order to understand what the international evidence has to say about the relative merits of education markets as compared to the state-school monopolies that exist in the United States, we must winnow down the range of studies under consideration to only those that contrast market-like private education systems with monopolistic government systems. For the purposes of this paper, market education systems are defined as those that are funded at least in part by parents paying tuition fees, do not suffer strict price controls, and are free of intrusive regulation of their curricula, methods, and personnel decisions.12 Note that this review is concerned with the level of private school regulation actually enforced, rather than with the theoretical regulatory burden expressed in law. That is because many developing countries have extensive regulatory codes for private schools but do not enforce those codes in practice. This distinction, where it is significant, is usually discussed in the studies themselves. Note, too, that this is not the strictest definition of a free education marketplace (e.g., it disregards government-created barriers to entry into the private education sector), but it serves to identify relatively market-like education systems while not overly narrowing the scope of the empirical findings under consideration.13 Monopoly state systems are herein defined as those that do not face substantial competitive pressures from the private sector because they enjoy at least a 30 percent government funding advantage per pupil over most private schools. The majority of government school systems enjoy a funding advantage well above that threshold. When the findings collected in Table 2 are winnowed down to only those comparing market to monopoly school systems (i.e., those for which the “PrF,” “Aut,” and “Mon” cells in Table 1 have the value “1”), the breakdown of results is as shown in Figure 2 and Table 3. Discussion The contrast between Tables 2 and 3 tells a new and compelling story. While private schools clearly outperform state-run schools all over the world across a host of outcome measures, this difference pales in comparison to that between relatively free education markets and state monopolies. While findings of a private-schooling advantage outnumber those of a public-schooling advantage by a ratio of nearly 8 to 1, findings of a free-market advantage outnumber those of a school–monopoly advantage by a ratio of more than 17 to 1. And while there are 17 insignificant public-versus- private findings, there is only a single insignificant market-versus-monopoly finding. These findings, moreover, span some of the most diverse cultural and economic settings on Earth: from the United States to Colombia, from the urban slums of Hyderabad to the fishing villages of Ghana. The parents whose children benefit from market-like school systems range from some of the most privileged on the planet to some of the least literate and most destitute. Contrary to the expectations of many conservative and liberal education commentators in the United States, there is little evidence that government regulation improves the operation of the marketplace. It is actually the freest, most market-like education systems that demonstrate the greatest margin of superiority over state schooling. These findings present an opportunity and a challenge for U.S. education policymakers. The opportunity is obvious: it is clearly possible to structure the provision of schooling in ways that will greatly improve educational outcomes. The challenge is to find ways of doing so that will ensure all families have ready access to the marketplace without compromising key features of markets that are responsible for their superior performance: professional autonomy for educators, unfettered choice for parents, and some direct payment of tuition by parents. The solution to that policy challenge lies in twin realizations: first, that the goal is not universal participation in a particular government program but rather universal access to the education marketplace; and second, that while direct payment of tuition by parents is crucial, even partial parental co-payments can have a significant salutary effect. The first realization means that it is unnecessary and indeed undesirable to subsidize tuition for families who can already well afford it. Education markets work best when families pay directly for their own children’s education, and so the ideal education policy is one that makes it easier for parents to assume that financial responsibility themselves. The second realization comes from research showing that there is a diminishing return to the share of funding from parental fees.14 Schools become more efficient as the share of funding that comes from parents grows larger, but the additional bang for each additional buck declines as parents’ share of total funding approaches 100 percent. In other words, the expected improvement in school efficiency when parental fees go from zero percent to 10 percent of total cost is larger than when the fees rise from 90 to 100 percent. This means that even low-income parents can enjoy a significant improvement in school efficiency by directly contributing a modest amount toward their children’s education. A policy for accomplishing this delicate balancing act of ensuring universal access to an education marketplace that remains free and vigorously competitive has already been proposed by the Cato Institute: The Public Education Tax Credit Act. This legislation derives its name from the fact that it is designed to fulfill the goals and ideals of public education through a combination of tax credits. In essence, people who pay for the education of an eligible child, whether their own or someone else’s, receive a dollar-for-dollar tax cut based on the amount they spend (up to a pre-set, perchild maximum). Hence, families who pay for their own children’s education receive a tax cut, and individual and business taxpayers who pay for other children’s education (whether directly or through donations to nonprofit scholarship funds) also see a dollar-for-dollar reduction in the taxes they owe. The total amount of any credits/scholarships for which a given child is eligible depends on his or her parents’ income, ensuring that the program offers the greatest benefit to those who need it most. The scholarships offered by nonprofit organizations and funded through tax-credited donations ensure that even the lowest-income families can easily afford to choose between public and private schools. Such a system, described in detail in a paper by Adam Schaeffer, ensures universal access to the education marketplace while impeding as little as possible the conditions required for its success.

#### Privatizing education is the best option for low income students - exhaustive studies prove

Tooley 5 - James Tooley is a professor of education policy at Newcastle University. There he is the director of the E. G. West Centre, which is dedicated to choice, competition, and entrepreneurship in education. December 7, 2005 [“Private Education is Good for the Poor: A Study of Private Schools Serving the Poor in Low-Income Countries”, <https://www.cato.org/publications/white-paper/private-education-is-good-poor-study-private-schools-serving-poor-lowincome-countries>, Cato Institute] rpg

Many observers believe that the private sector has very little to offer in terms of reaching the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of “education for all” by 2015. Private education is often assumed to be concerned only with serving the elite or middle classes, not the poor. And unregistered or unrecognized private schools are thought to be of the lowest quality and hence demanding of detailed regulation, or even closure, by governmental authorities. Our findings from a two-year in-depth study in India, Ghana, Nigeria, and Kenya suggest that these conclusions are unwarranted. Private schools, we argue, can play-indeed, already are playing-an important, if unsung, role in reaching the poor and satisfying their educational needs. The first component of our research consisted of a systematic census and survey of all primary and secondary schools, government and private, in selected low-income areas. The second component examined a stratified random sample of between 2,000 and 4,000 children from each of those areas. Tests in mathematics, English, and (in Africa) one other subject were administered. Children and teachers were also tested for their IQ, and questionnaires were administered to students, parents, teachers, and school managers or head teachers. In each area, we found the majority of schoolchildren attending private schools. In the areas officially designated as “slums” of three zones of Hyderabad’s Old City, we found 918 schools, of which only 35 percent were government schools, fewer than the 37 percent of unrecognized private schools. In total, 65 percent of schoolchildren in those low-income areas attended private unaided school. In the Ga District of Ghana (the low income suburban and rural area surrounding the capital city of Accra) we investigated 779 schools in the same way, finding that only 25 percent were government schools and that 64 percent of schoolchildren attended private school. In the “poor” areas of three local government districts (one rural, two urban) of Lagos State, Nigeria, we found 540 schools, of which 34 percent were government, and the largest proportion, 43 percent, were private unregistered. An estimated 75 percent of schoolchildren were enrolled in private schools. We also conducted research in the small shanty town of Makoko, in Mainland, Lagos State, and in the slum of Kibera, Nairobi, Kenya (reportedly the largest slum in sub-Saharan Africa). In both cases, the large majority of poor children attended private, not public, school. Moreover, in Kenya we were able to observe the impact of free primary education on enrollment. Despite the fact that huge increases in enrollment have been noted in government schools by commentators, our research suggests that, at best, children appear to have transferred from private to government schools. Given the advantages of private schools and problems found in government schools, that may not be to their advantage. In each location, the private schools are run largely by proprietors, with very few receiving outside philanthropic support and none receiving state funding. Roughly equal numbers of boys and girls attend private unaided schools, which have better pupil-teacher ratios, higher teacher commitment, and sometimes better facilities than government schools. A significant number of places in private unaided schools are provided free or at reduced rates to serve the poorest of the poor. The raw scores from our student achievement tests show considerably higher achievement in the private than in government schools. In Hyderabad, for instance, mean scores in mathematics were about 22 percentage points and 23 percentage points higher in private unrecognized and recognized schools, respectively, than in government schools. The advantage was even more pronounced for English. In all cases, this achievement advantage was obtained at between half and a quarter of the teacher salary costs. Our research indicates that a great success story is taking place, usually beneath the government’s radar. The mushrooming private schools, if noticed at all by the authorities and development experts, are assumed to be educationally inadequate. Our research shows that this assumption is false. Moreover, because so many children are in unrecognized private schools that do not appear in government statistics, achieving universal basic education - the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of “education for all” - may be much easier to reach than is currently believed. In Lagos State, for instance, including enrollment in private unregistered schools would reduce the percentage of out-of-school children from 50 to 26 percent. Certainly, the private schools for low income families could be improved even further by creating revolving loan programs to help infrastructural investment or, following the private schools’ own example, creating targeted voucher programs to enable the poorest of the poor to attend private schools. But above all, the existence and the contribution of private schools to “education for all” is a cause for celebration.

### Regulations

#### Their increase in government regulation and authority over education is a progressive elitist tactic to increase control of society and constrain our own liberties.

Anderson 13 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, November 9, 2013 [“Limited Government v. Progressive Aristocracy”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/p/declaring-our-independence-from.html>, An Objectivist Individualist] rpg

The Progressive (Liberal, Socialist) elitists have become an aristocracy who rule, manage, and manipulate the remainder of Americans who are supposedly no more than organic bits of various special interest groups or factions. It is the responsibility of the Progressive elitists to perceive the direction of change required by the evolution of history, which they believe directs man to an understanding of the rational. The Progressives have long insisted that man's nature could evolve rapidly with proper indoctrination in the government-run schools to engineer American youth who hold socialist values. The People were incapable of thinking for themselves. What they believed was simply a function of the evolution of history, which caused history to make progress and carried the People along with it, as opposed to being made by the free-will choices of the People. Some of the indoctrinated would prove suitable to be selected as the new members of the government-guiding aristocracy, but most would just be trained to be docile followers. The government-run schools reflect this philosophy, with many schools being little more than holding cells to train the inmates in being members of an underclass and in doing as they are told by authorities. This group provides the elite with evidence that most people cannot think for themselves and that they require the active help of a powerful and all-seeing government. Some schools have effective multiple tracks and some few produce many future Progressive elitists. These indoctrinated youths are then to vote democratically to further enlarge government, which will be controlled by the Progressive elitists who pose as concerned parents of the great mass of unruly and irresponsible adult children. The old American tradition, stated in the Declaration of Independence, in which the only legitimate purpose of government is to protect the equal, sovereign rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, is the enemy of progress in their viewpoint. This traditional American viewpoint necessitates a very limited government and a very dynamic private sector, where everyone has an equal right to exercise his choices and to find others who will associate or trade with him for a given purpose in a multitude of voluntary activities. That limited government was provided for by the Constitution. This viewpoint assumed that the vast majority of men were capable of managing their own lives and only needed government to restrain others from using force against them. Once force was removed from interactions as far as possible, men were perfectly capable of working with others socialably and harmoniously. The American viewpoint was that this was a society consistent with the General Welfare and to the peace and tranquility of the nation. The Progressives claim these now traditional, but once radical, American ideals deny the science of history. They have pointed to a long history of governments around the world always trying to expand their powers and usually succeeding in doing so. They have claimed that history is a march of progress, so if many governments have succeeded in expanding their powers, this must be what progress is and progress must be good. These governments with expanded powers need to be directed by energetic leaders who will not shrink from using force to promote the General Welfare, which is always found in the organic expression of shared democratic will. The Progressive elite perceive what the shared democratic will is, even when that will is not known to the majority of the People. This elite picks from its ranks and Anointed One, who perceives the shared will of the People better than they do. The government, run by the Super Leader with his many elitist aides, tells the people what their rights are and provides for them. Those suitable for leadership are those most indoctrinated and knowledgeable about the goals of socialism. These leaders are the graduates of the right colleges and are those who are well-connected in the network of Progressive activists. The Progressives look down on people who produce goods and services in the free market and are paid with money. They believe those who serve have a higher moral status, even if those who serve do so as government employees and are well-paid with taxes levied mostly on the producers and taken from the producers under the threat of force. The producers are evil because they use resources of the earth such as materials, because they harm Mother Earth, and because they pander to individuals acting on their individual goals and needs. The Progressives believe that when the individual is subsumed by some group or other, the individual has become an organic part of a greater whole. They believe there is some higher ideal reached whenever the individuality of the individual is so diminished. But Progressives do not have a very high regard for the ability of most people to choose their own values and then to manage their own lives in accordance with those values. Indeed, they find the very idea of such an expression of individuality to be abhorrent. If people were actually to do any such thing, the government would not be able to satisfy them with its central planning efforts. The people must be taught to identify themselves with one group or even a number of different groups, so the Progressives and government can deal with the easier problem of just dealing with this much smaller number of groups. Individuality is generally to be suppressed in favor of a communitarian merging, with some exception-making for the elitist leadership. Once the people are just so many groups or special interests, or factions, then the democratic process can be used to sort out who the winners and losers will be. Of course, this results in quite a bit of a free-for-all, but that is another justification for the necessity for the elitist Progressives to provide leadership and control of the governments. They are the parents watching over the children squabbling over the toys in the sandbox and setting the rules of play. The elite Progressives make the laws and regulations in government as the democratic rulers. So, Progressives tend to flock to government positions because that is where the real action is. They shun the private sector and they grow the public sector. The game is in fact one of redistributing the wealth produced by the private sector through their hands in government and handing it out to grateful groups who will vote for them, give them money, and sing their praises. And the People will bow, trembling, at their feet while asking for hand-outs, special favors, or simply to be allowed to survive. Of course, these leaders are so important to the cause of Progressivism, that it is perfectly reasonable for them to use their power to extort those in the private sector with threats to do them harm, unless the leaders are given enough money for their re-election campaigns ad nauseam. Or, these leaders offer factions favorable legislation in exchange for re-election campaign backing, as they do to labor unions, teachers, trial lawyers, and many Wall Street investment firms. These Progressive government employees are the new aristocracy. Like the aristocracy of old, they control the levers of power to do whatever they want as they manipulate the peasants and give them just enough to keep them from rebelling. At least this is how it has often worked in the past and it is how they believe it is supposed to be working now. The Progressive elite is now furious. Many of the peasants are revolting. This is how they see the Tea Party protesters. Their response has been one of utter hatred. The hatred is so strong, that they describe the Tea Party rebels with all the words they have long associated with evil or disdain. So, the Tea Party rebels must be racists. They must be ignorant. They must be trailer trash. The Progressives know this to be so, because the peasants must be evil to rebel against the progress of history and the evolution of society. The Tea Party activists are not evil. Mostly, they are American individualists who have finally taken notice that Progressivism is an attack upon their individuality. It is an attempt to dictate to them what their personal values will be. It is an attempt to micromanage their lives. It is a refusal to recognize them as individuals. It is a thorough-going attack upon the very idea that they have sovereign and unalienable rights which are not given to them by government, but which they hold by their very nature as thinking human beings. It is an attack on the idea that legitimate government exists to protect the equal rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Tea Party protesters are sick of the attacks on the productive Americans to force them to forever subsidize less productive Americans and illegal aliens. They are sick of the transfer of wealth from the private sector to the public sector. They are sick of the transformation of their personal choices in the private sector to democratic and factional choices in the public sector. They are tired of being ignored and denigrated. They are tired of an aristocracy of bureaucrats, politicians, college professors, and media people who look upon them as peasants. They are sure that they are competent to choose their own values. They know they are able to manage their own lives and make their own choices. They have awakened to the fact that it is the free market that provides them with these choices and the opportunity to express themselves as individuals. They are coming to understand that they have made themselves the individuals they are in large part and they want to continue to be in control of the development of their own character and that of their children. Most of all, they are beings with free will and they want to exercise it. A choice has to be made about the purpose and scope of government. Our Founding Fathers and the Framers of the Constitution chose very limited government consistent with the viewpoint that the General Welfare of the People who institute government was best served when government's function and scope was to simply protect the equal, sovereign, inalienable right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The individual American was seen as capable of choosing his own values and of managing his own life. Freedoms such as freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly would allow any American to develop his knowledge, his judgment, and his character. Americans had the freedom to work and to own property and the income from their work. When an American individual wanted to work with others for a common goal, he could arrange that using his many freedoms of association and contract in the free market. There he would have a plethora of choices and ample expression of his individuality. The interests of many individuals could be worked out in great harmony in the private sector. While our government had a measure of democracy in the choosing of its leaders, that democracy was constrained by the Constitution, which gave us a representative limited government. This government of limited powers had a further balance of power within the branches of the government and between the federal government and the states that required a strong consensus to be developed before the federal government could act to affect major changes. The power of government was to be limited, so that the warfare among factions would be limited. Too powerful a government led to too many factions being created. These factions then would fight too viciously for too much power. In that environment, the rights of the individual could not be equally protected and they would not even be protected. The General Welfare and the peace and tranquility of the nation would be damaged by such factional squabbles over the exercise of government power. The antithesis of this American viewpoint is Progressivism, which is largely a European import. Now consider what we have seen. We have a Progressive government, which very little constrains itself in accordance with the Constitution. We have top leaders who are disdainful of the People. We have top leaders who have said they disagree with the Constitution and its limits on their power and who effectively ignore it. We have top leaders who tell us we only have the rights the government gives us. It is clear this government is a Progressive government. So, I ask you: Have we seen government serving the best interests of the American people (the General Welfare) with minimal factionalism and a great tranquility of our society? Do we see evidence that the rights of each of us are being equally protected? Do we see evidence that Americans have evolved such characters that they have lost their individuality and are willing to submerge themselves in a Hegelian whole of society? Have we seen solid evidence that the Progressive ruling elite is able to choose our values for us better than we can choose them ourselves? Have we seen a powerful government evolve which wisely micromanages our lives? Have we seen this government make centrally planned economic decisions which are wise? Have we seen this government responsibly manage its finances and minimize the debt to be passed on to later generations? Do we like what we see in Europe so much that we agree that their way is superior to the American way of life? I submit to you that the answer to each of these questions is NO!!!! From this objective evaluation, I conclude that Progressivism is a proven failure. It is a concept of government which is wholly unacceptable. I find its theoretical foundation foolish and without basis and its consequences are everywhere awful. The vision of our Founders and of the Framers of the Constitution was in fact astoundingly wise. They were not ignorant of the essence of Progressivism. They considered it and they astutely rejected it. They were right to do so. I wish to encourage every American to think these issues and choices through carefully and to chose the most beneficial concept of government function and scope from these two waring viewpoints. If you do so, I think most of you will be wise enough to confirm the wisdom of our Founders and the Framers of the Constitution. They were the real advanced thinkers, not these wrongheaded so-called progressives who merely added a bit of democracy to an essentially aristocrats-know-best feudal merchantilist society. We should all, as the Tea Party movement is doing, declare our independence from the Progressive Aristocracy!

### Science Education

#### The affirmative’s attempt to inspire STEM education through minimal guidance in favor of organic education fails

Kirschner et al 6 - Paul A. Kirschner, Educational Technology Expertise Center, Open University of the Netherlands Research Centre, Learning in Interaction Utrecht University, The Netherlands, John Sweller, School of Education University of New South Wales, Richard E. Clark, Rossier School of Education University of Southern California, 2006 [“Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching”, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc] rpg

The work of Klahr and Nigam (2004), discussed earlier, unambiguously demonstrated the advantages of direct instruction in science. There is a wealth of such evidence. A series of reviews by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences has recently described the results of experiments that provide evidence for the negative consequences of unguided science instruction at all age levels and across a variety of science and math content. McCray, DeHaan, and Schuck (2003) reviewed studies and practical experience in the education of college undergraduates in engineering, technology, science, and mathematics. Gollub, Berthanthal, Labov, and Curtis (2003) reviewed studies and experience teaching science and mathematics in high school. Kilpatrick, Swafford, and Findell (2001) reported studies and made suggestions for elementary and middle school teaching of mathematics. Each of these and other publications by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences amply document the lack of evidence for unguided approaches and the benefits of more strongly guided instruction. Most provide a set of instructional principles for educators that are based on solid research. These reports were prepared, in part, because of the poor state of science and mathematics education in the United States. Finally, in accord with the ATI findings and the expertise reversal effect, Roblyer, Edwards, and Havriluk (1997) reported that teachers have found that discovery learning is successful only when students have prerequisite knowledge and undergo some prior structured experiences. Medical Problem-Based Learning Research All in all, a lack of clarity about the difference between learning a discipline and research in the discipline coupled with the priority afforded to unbiased observation in the best inductivist and empiricist tradition has led many educators to advocate a problem-based method as the way to teach a discipline (Allen, Barker, & Ramsden, 1986; Anthony, 1973; Barrows & Tamblyn, 1980; Obioma, 1986). Not only did PBL seem to mesh with ideas in, for example, the philosophy of science, but it also fit well with progressive learner-centered views emphasizing direct experience and individual inquiry. Cawthron and Rowell (1978) stated that it all seemed to fit. The logic of knowledge and the psychology of knowledge coalesced under the umbrella term discovery. Why, he asked, should educators look further than the traditional inductivist and empiricist explanation of the process? In an attempt to rescue medical students from lectures and memory-based recall exams, approximately 60 medical schools in North America have adopted PBL in the past two decades. This variant of constructivist instruction with minimal guidance, introduced at the McMaster University School of Medicine in 1969, asks medical students to work in groups to diagnose and suggest treatment for common patient symptoms. PBL student groups are supervised by a clinical faculty member who is directed not to solve problems for the students but instead to offer alternatives and suggest sources of information. The best known survey of the comparisons of PBL with conventional medical school instruction was conducted by Albanese and Mitchell (1993). Their meta-analysis of the English language literature of the effectiveness of PBL produced a number of negative findings concerning its impact, including lower basic science exam scores, no differences in residency selections, and more study hours each day. They reported that although PBL students receive better scores for their clinical performance, they also order significantly more unnecessary tests at a much higher cost per patient with less benefit. There was an indication in their review that increased clinical practice evaluation scores may have been due to the fact the PBL students are required to spend more time in clinical settings. Berkson (1993) also reviewed much of the literature on PBL and arrived at many of the same conclusions as Albanese and Mitchell (1993). She reviewed studies where the problem-solving ability of PBL students was compared with the same ability in conventionally trained students and found no support for any differences, and so failed to replicate the clinical advantage found by Albanese and Mitchell. Colliver (2000) reviewed existing studies comparing the effectiveness of PBL in medicine to conventional medical school curricula. He concluded that PBL studies show no statistical effect on the performance of medical students on standardized tests or on instructor-designed tests during the first 2 years of medical school. Also important for medical educators has been the constant finding in research summaries that PBL is not more effective but is more costly than traditional instruction. Of course, some supporters of PBL are aware of its limitations. Hmelo-Silver (2004) placed strong question marks concerning the general validity of PBL. According to her, Certain aspects of the PBL model should be tailored to the developmental level of the learners … there may be a place for direct instruction on a just-in-time basis. In other words, as students are grappling with a problem and confronted with the need for particular kinds of knowledge, a lecture at the right time may be beneficial. … Some techniques such as procedural facilitation, scripted cooperation, and structured journals may prove useful tools in moving PBL to other settings. (pp. 260–261) Two major components of PBL are the explicit teaching of problem-solving strategies in the form of the hypothetico-deductive method of reasoning (Barrows & Tamblyn, 1980), and teaching of basic content in the context of a specific case or instance. Proponents argue that problem-centered education is superior to conventional education. Students taught problem-solving skills, in particular through the use of the hypothetico-deductive method, and given problems to practice those skills learn in a more meaningful way. It is assumed that because students are exposed to problems from the beginning, they have more opportunity to practice these skills, and that by explicitly applying the hypothetico-deductive method they learn to analyze problems and search for explanations, improving their comprehension of clinical problems (Norman & Schmidt, 1992). Patel and colleagues argued that the hypothetico-deductive method may not be the most efficient way of solving clinical problems (Patel & Groen, 1986; Patel, Arocha, & Kaufman, 1994). In the medical domain, Patel, Groen, and Norman (1993) showed that teaching basic science within a clinical context may have the disadvantage that once basic science knowledge is contextualized, it is difficult to separate it from the particular clinical problems into which it has been integrated. They showed that students trained in a PBL curriculum failed to separate basic science knowledge from the specific clinical knowledge associated with particular patients. Although PBL students generated more elaborate explanations, they had less coherent explanations and more errors. If students have difficulty separating the biomedical knowledge they have learned from the particular clinical cases associated with that knowledge, it is not surprising that when given a different problem they bring to bear on the new problem some irrelevant biomedical knowledge. This appears to persist after training. In a study of the effect of undergraduate training in PBL—as opposed to a conventional curriculum—on the performance of residents on the organization of clinical and biomedical knowledge and the use of reasoning strategies, Arocha and Patel (1995) found that participants trained in PBL retained the backward-directed reasoning pattern, but did not seem to acquire forward-directed reasoning, which is a hallmark of expertise. This finding means that something in PBL may hinder the development of the forward reasoning pattern. Experts use schema-based pattern recognition to determine the cause of a patient’s illness. According to Elstein (1994) knowledge organization and schema acquisition are more important for the development of expertise than the use of particular methods of problem solving. In this regard, cognitive research has shown that to achieve expertise in a domain, learners must acquire the necessary schemata that allow them to meaningfully and efficiently interpret information and identify the problem structure. Schemata accomplish this by guiding the selection of relevant information and the screening out of irrelevant information. Arocha and Patel(1995)concluded that the negative results can be accounted for by the effect of splitting of attention resources and the high working memory load on schema acquisition during problem solving. In solving clinical problems, subjects must attend to the current diagnostic hypothesis, the data in the problem presented to them, and any intermediate hypothesis between the diagnosis and the patient data (e.g., a pathophysiological process underlying the signs and symptoms). If we consider that more than one hypothesis has been generated, the cognitive resources needed for maintaining this information in working memory must be such that few cognitive resources are left for acquiring the problem schema. Although problems can be solved successfully using the hypothetico-deductive method, the scarcity of attentional and memory resources may result in the students having difficulties learning problem schemata in an adequate manner. It is possible to hypothesize that one of the reasons for the failure of PBLC subjects to acquire a forward-directed reasoning style as found in this study may be the use of problem solving strategies, such as the hypothetico-deductive method, as a learning strategy. This is completely in line with our claim that the epistemology of a discipline should not be confused with a pedagogy for teaching or learning it. The practice of a profession is not the same as learning to practice the profession.

### Social Justice

#### The affirmative’s call for social justice is just a Progressive Elitist tactic to increase authoritarian control and create dependency

Anderson 16 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, 14 May 2016, [“The Severe Limits of Social Justice”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/search/label/freedom>, An Objectivist Individual] rpg

Justice has meaning in the relationships of individuals and meaning as an aim of government. In the relationships of individuals, justice exists when an individual correctly identifies the value of another individual based on his character and actions. This evaluation is clearly dependent upon one's ethical code. Consequently, an individual will not correctly identify the value of another individual when his moral code is not correct or when he holds himself to no moral principles. Suppose an individual has a correct moral code and is highly capable in applying that code to the complex problem of evaluating the worth of another individual on the objective assessment of observations of his character as witnessed by his actions in life. This highly competent judge of value in other individuals will nonetheless not be able to form a valid opinion of the worth of all the other people he encounters in his life simply because he will not know enough about many of them to form an objective opinion. He will only be able to do justice to those he knows sufficiently well. This objective moral evaluator will understand that when dealing with people who he does not know well enough, he should be careful not to do an injustice to them. This is at least the case in the context of a society in which the initiated use of force by individuals is prohibited, as it is by legitimate governments. A further requirement is that the government itself uses no more force than that needed to prevent the initiated use of force among individuals. Once the use of force is minimized in a society, then an individual can afford to live by the principle that he should hold a benevolent assumption that others are not a threat to his life and he may assume that others are of significant value until they actually prove otherwise in actions he has had the opportunity to observe. Thus the rational individual in a free society acts on the principle that he should not do others the injustice of assuming them a threat to his life. In voluntary associations with them, he can assume that they will trade values to their mutual benefit or they will be free not to have any association at all. This benevolent assumption of value in others is conditional on a society in which our interactions with others are of a voluntary nature. It assumes that when we trade values in our interactions, we are not being forced to do so. A government which harms some individuals in order to provide favors to other individuals or groups, as our present government does on a major scale, is actively making some groups a threat to the lives of many individuals. It undermines or even denies the basis under which one may make the benevolent assumption of value in others. It can actually force individuals to do the injustice to others of having to assume that they are a threat to his life until and unless they prove that they are not a threat and actually are a value. This is what has happened in many fascist and communistic societies. Big Government or statist government is a basic threat to justice in this way. Government can clearly be the means by which massive injustice comes to characterize a society. How can government be prevented from being the cause of injustice? It is by forcing government to observe the rights of the individual. The rights of the individual are determined by the nature of man and by a basic core morality. As Ayn Rand said in her essay Man's Rights: "Rights" are a moral concept -- the concept that provides a logical transition from the principles guiding an individual's actions to the principles guiding his relationship with others -- the concept that preserves and protects individual morality in a social context -- the link between the moral code of a man and the legal code of a society, between ethics and politics. Individual rights are the means of subordinating society to moral law. A "right" is a moral principle defining and sanctioning a man's freedom of action in a social context. There is only one fundamental right (all the others are its consequences or corollaries): a man's right to his own life. Life is a process of self-sustaining and self-generated action; the right to life means the right to engage in self-sustaining and self-generated action -- which means: the freedom to take all the actions required by the nature of a rational being for the support, the furtherance, the fulfillment and the enjoyment of his own life. (Such is the meaning of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.) The concept of a "right" pertains only to action -- specifically, to freedom of action. It means freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by other men. Thus, for every individual, a right is the moral sanction of a positive -- of his freedom to act on his own judgment, for his own goals, by his own voluntary, uncoerced choice. As to his neighbors, his rights impose no obligation except of a negative kind: to abstain from violating his rights. The freedom to act on your own judgment implies the need for freedom of conscience and the exercise of voluntary choices within a society requires the freedom of association. Freedom of speech does not exist unless one is allowed to advocate wrong ideas from the perspective of others or even with respect to reality. Similarly, freedom of conscience does not exist if one is not allowed to have ideas, including moral ideas, that are wrong. Freedom of association does not exist unless one is allowed to unjustly err in assessing the value of others. While rights are a means of securing morality in the actions of government, those moral principles that government must recognize are the most basic and most core moral beliefs. The government must not dictate more than the most basic of moral requirements on the individuals of the society it serves. Government protection of the exercise of individual rights requires it to allow individuals to choose their own values and to manage their own lives in accordance with their own values. The bare minimum of morality that forms the foundation of rights is the recognition that the individual must take actions to secure his life and to maintain it in a healthy state. He has the right to pursue his own happiness. To take such actions effective in their purpose, he must be free to think and to pursue the information and develop the knowledge necessary to that effective action. Both freedom of thought and action for such purposes are critical values and he must have property rights to values he produces by his thought and actions. But, he does not have the right to initiate the use of force against others, as they do not have that right against him. No one has the right to use the force of government to do harm to others either, unless those others have first initiated the use of force. Rights reside in the individual. The individual is the sovereign rights-holder. Rights are not a grant or a privilege from government. Rights arise from the nature of man, not from the nature of the state. The state either protects the rights of the individual or it does not. It either performs its legitimate function or it does not. Man, whether singly or in numbers, is not omniscient. The development of knowledge and the understanding of nature are difficult. In attempting to understand our reality we all make mistakes and no one achieves a complete knowledge. This is a critical part of our understanding of man's nature and of the complexity of the reality in which man lives. This being the case, it is not reasonable to expect that all men will agree on most moral issues and most value judgments. So how can we live in a society together even when we are not in complete agreement, or maybe even in considerable agreement, about moral decisions? The practical answer to this is to have a government that only enforces a minimum of moral requirements. The answer is a government that simply prohibits the initiated use of force and protects our individual rights. We are then left the freedom to make our own value choices and to associate with others of our choice voluntarily in the private sector to pursue our common values and to trade with one another to our mutual advantage. In this private sector we can all aim to achieve every one of our values and to gain values we want in every association and cooperative endeavor we have with others. This is not the case in the government sector, once government expands beyond its legitimate purpose as the protector of individual rights. The Progressive Elitists say no to this concept of individual rights. They claim that rights are really only privileges granted those favored by government. Those privileges may be changed at the whim of government, at least if that government is controlled by a democratic vote, whether fraudulent or not. They say the purpose of government is not to secure and protect the rights of the individual, but to ensure Social Justice. An individual cannot form a just assessment of the character of everyone he encounters, so he cannot offer everyone justice. But, he can adopt the principle that he will do no one an actual injustice and he will most certainly not initiate the use of force against others. How can a government do more than this? A government does not have a moral assessment of every one of the individuals within the country. The government is still composed of a number of individuals and that number of individuals will never come close to having adequate objective knowledge of the character of most individuals in the country to form a valid assessment of their individual worth. The government can no more provide justice to everyone than can an individual. How does a government embarked on the endeavor of Social Justice respond to this inadequacy? It must simplify the problem. Its response to insufficient knowledge is a classification scheme that simplifies individual differences by assigning individuals to categories. Individuals are complex, so a given individual will be thrown into many categories, with his particular combination of characteristics largely lost to the process. The individual may be characterized by many pixels of information, but the whole of the individual is eradicated. For instance, one individual may be a count in each of the following categories: Skin color or the area of the origin of his ancestors Male or female or transgender Age Married or unmarried Dependent children or not Child care users or not Home-owner or not Income level Wealth level Veteran or not Heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other flavors of sexuality Employer or employee Employed, seeking employment, or not seeking employment Labor union member or not Supporter of bigger government or not a supporter Contributor to favored charities and non-profits or not Healthy or unhealthy Paid health insurance or not Citizen, legal resident, or illegal alien Supporter of green energy and catastrophic man-made global warming or not Borrower or lender Farmer or not Exporter or not Bank accounts abroad or not On and on the classification counting goes, but Abigail Adams and Patrick Henry cannot be reconstructed from the many bits they have been parsed into. The individual himself is totally eradicated. But with this simplification, the government can now pretend to pursue Social Justice. Now having partitioned the population into numerous categories, the government can indulge in legislation aimed at helping certain categories and hurting other categories. When helping a category, the usual justification is a claim that Social Justice is being served. If preferences in hiring to certain ancestral groups or to one gender are legislated, Social Justice is served. If income or property is transferred from someone who has worked hard to become educated and worked hard in business to subsidize someone else who has spent endless hours watching TV sitcoms and horror movies and who partied and played instead of studying, then Social Justice is served. If a person unhealthy due to tobacco smoking and overeating of junk food has difficulty affording health insurance, then force healthy and young people to pay much more for their insurance in order to subsidize unhealthy behaviors in the name of Social Justice. If it is impolitic to make employees file their own payroll tax forms and send their own tax payments to the government, then in the name of Social Justice make the employer spend his time providing this unpaid service. If the taxpayer wants to contribute to a non-profit organization supporting individual rights, do not allow that organization to become a tax-exempt organization or if it already is and he contributes $250 a year to it, take down his name as an enemy of Social Justice. If an individual or organization notes that the catastrophic man-made global warming hypothesis is a proven failure, prosecute him as a racketeer under RICO in the name of Social Justice. Social Justice can be used to justify every act of special interest favoritism. It is used to justify every instance in which the government hurts some individuals or groupings of individuals to supposedly help another grouping. Endless numbers of groups are pitted against one another for the favors of government or to at least avoid being the victim of government. The result is a general breakdown of the voluntary interactions that make it possible for one individual to assume that another has value to his life prior to his actually having such an evaluation of the character of that other individual. It becomes easy to determine if that individual is a threat to one's life in many cases. If you are an employer, then employees are a threat, especially if they are members of a government-favored labor union. If you are a so-called white male, than anyone who is not a white male is a threat due to government favoritism. If you have a high income or are wealthy, then those with significantly lower incomes or wealth are a threat by virtue of their ability to provide larger numbers of votes for a politician. Because of government favors rendered in the name of Social Justice and the battle to be designated a special interest, society is broken into numerous, nearly innumerable, groups at war with one another to control the use of government force for their advantage. The separation of interests of each individual into many categories is a great aid to minimizing the opposition of individuals to the government taking control of many aspects of their lives. Each enabling act of legislation or each bureaucratic regulation commonly helps a group under one category at the expense of a group in another category. The group hurt is hurt in one aspect of their lives, but that group still has many reasons to be busy attending to the many other aspects of their lives. They cannot afford to spend a great deal of time opposing the new act that is imposing upon their individual rights and depriving them of their values and freedom. The government pursuing Social Justice counts on this to perpetrate its accumulation of more and more power over the life of every individual. The Social Justice pursuing government cannot allow anyone to disagree with its moral proclamations. Disagreement implies a violation of justice within this framework. It becomes policy for the government to become intolerant of different views of ethics and of different value judgments. If you disagree with affirmative action for the hiring of Black Americans, you are a racist and because you are wrong, you do not have the right to say that affirmative action is wrong. But, note that if you do not have the right to be wrong, then you have no right to freedom of speech. If you believe you have religious reasons for thinking gay marriage is wrong and will not produce a wedding cake for a gay marriage, you must be fined heavily enough to destroy your small bakery. You cannot be wrong about this moral issue, so you are not allowed freedom of conscience, freedom of association, or the freedom of free trade. If government claims that some scientific theory implies that harm is being done to someone and you claim the science of that theory is wrong, you are proclaimed guilty of Social Injustice to those the theory claims will be harmed. You do not then have the right of free inquiry, free speech, freedom of the press, and you do not have the right to develop scientific understanding because you are not serving Social Justice as determined by the government. Governmental pursuit of Social Justice imposes much more highly elaborated moral theory on the people of a nation than does the legitimate government whose only purpose is to protect individual rights. That theory will neither be consistent nor highly rational since the government is chosen by those who vote and they are notably not experts in ethical theory. What is worse, because there is an enforced intolerance of differing moral beliefs, the People are denied the benefit of a free discussion of morality. Moral ideas are never tested and improved in the free market for the development of knowledge. Even if the People were thoughtful about ethics, they might be wrong and the politicians they vote for might trade ethics for geld or power in their dealings with the myriad special interests vying for the great powers exerted by Social Justice-pursing government. Such government must violate individual rights. It must act largely in ignorance of the interests of many of the People. It must act to hurt many people in the name of helping others. It must use force much more often than will the individual rights protecting government. It must minimize the voluntary and co-operative relationships found in the private sector and replace them with involuntary mandates and transfers of income and wealth, jobs, medical care, education, housing, and innumerable other values. The harmony of the private sector must be replaced with the strife of the Big Government sector. All of this is a necessary consequence of a government pursuing Social Justice as envisioned by the Progressive Elitists. In reality, this is the ultimate Social Injustice. The closest a society can come to maximizing Social Justice is to be a society that honors individuality and protects the rights of the individual to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. The best a society can do is to protect these individual rights equally and to provide an environment in which the use of force is minimized by not allowing either individuals or the government to initiate the use of force. The rational individual will understand his own life and his freedom to manage and secure his own life is his greatest value. He understands that to do that he must be free to think and to act upon his thoughts, with only such limits as set by the requirement that he not deprive others of an equal right to think and to act upon their thoughts in the interest of their lives as well. It is the private sector, not the force-wielding government sector, that provides us the opportunities of a good and healthy society for beneficial relationships with others to achieve our individual values in a manner consistent with a respect for individual lives and the individual minds that direct those lives. The role of a legitimate government is only to protect our individual rights. When government takes on the additional role of delivering goods and services to some at the expense of others, it is hurting some under the threat of force in a brutal manner that has no analog in the private sector. It forces individuals into an unnecessary conflict of interest, whereas the private sector provides a wealth of individual choices for relationships, cooperation, trade of values, or the freedom to not pursue a relationship, cooperative endeavor, or a trade. In comparison, the Big Government model, proclaiming itself to be pursuing Social Justice, is a shotgun wedding offering no possibility of divorce and a staid existence with ever-reduced choices. Nothing more offends my sense of justice than this evermore totalitarian state.

### State Action

#### State action necessarily limits the individual freedoms that ought to be granted to every person - only pure competition can make society the best it can possibly be

Cox 13 - Stephen Cox, Ph.D. (UCLA), Professor of English Literature, Distinguished Professor, Faculty Fellow, Revelle College, July 2013 [“Rand, Paterson, and the Problem of Anarchism”, The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1 (July 2013), pp. 3-25, Penn State University Press] rpg

From the economist Henry George (1839–97) Nock had derived a belief that “government”—as opposed to the oppressive “state”—can be supported by a 100 percent tax on “unearned” increases in the values of land. Whether this is really “anarchism” can be disputed (Cox 1992, 42–44). Rand apparently never disputed it. It is possible that she did not clearly understand Nock’s position. Paterson, who was very well read on the subject, pronounced George’s Single Tax nothing but “socialism” (Cox 2004, 53, 71, 215). Rand’s conflict with individualist anarchism came at a later time. In Atlas Shrugged (1957), Rand proposed a moral and political theory significantly based on the idea that force should never be initiated, by individuals or by government; it should be used only in direct and personal retaliation: “It is only as retaliation that force may be used and only against the man who starts its use” (1024). This severely limited-government theory naturally attracted to Rand’s circle many radical opponents of the state, including the economist Murray Rothbard (1926–95). Rothbard attended Rand’s philosophical salons but made himself unwelcome by refusing to accept her intellectual authority. Soon after, he became the twentieth century’s most formidable proponent of libertarian anarchism (“anarcho-capitalism”). Largely because of his influence, the libertarian movement of the 1970s and 1980s included a very significant minority of anarchists; the movement still does, though their numbers may be declining. And many libertarians continue to combine anarchism with an unorthodox Objectivism. It was at least in part to counter the ideas of Rothbard and his followers that Rand developed the arguments contained in three essays originally published in The Objectivist Newsletter (1963 and 1964) and republished in The Virtue of Selfishness (1964b): “Man’s Rights,” “The Nature of Government,” and “Government Financing in a Free Society.” By the time she wrote these essays, Rand had developed a decided aversion to sharing the intellectual stage with anyone else. In refuting Rothbard’s ideas, she referred to their proponents anonymously, as “some of the younger advocates of freedom” (Rand 1964b, 112). But it is plainly Rothbard and company whom she had in mind. The fact that such people generally described themselves as libertarians is reflected in the vigorous opposition she later mounted to anything called “libertarianism.” The anarcho-capitalists suggested, and continue to suggest, that the state can be replaced with private, voluntary agencies—organizations that contract with individuals to provide protection (private police) and adjudication of conflicts (private justice). These agencies would compete with one another, much as companies now compete to provide the necessities of food and shelter. As competitors, they would be anxious to please their clients by offering the greatest possible security and the most satisfactory settlement of disputes. Costs would be controlled by the competitive principle that controls costs in other areas of life. Yet while competing, these agencies would be inclined to reach amicable understandings among themselves— a cheaper alternative than fighting one another. Contrast the current situation, in which no one is guaranteed either justice or safety (including safety from predatory police and courts), but everyone is guaranteed high taxes, intrusive laws, the surrender of the right to choose for oneself in important instances, and often the surrender of the right to self-defense. This, argue the anarcho-capitalists, is ever the course of monopolistic government. The state doesn’t simply appropriate the citizens’ right to repel force; it constantly initiates force, on the citizens themselves. This, I believe, is the argument on which libertarian anarchists substantially agree.1 Rand’s own ideas are so close to those of the anarcho-capitalists that when she attempts to counter their position, she does so very much in their own terms. The anarcho-capitalists identified invasions of rights with the initiation of force; as I have noted, Atlas Shrugged had already enshrined the non-initiation-of-force principle: So long as men desire to live together, no man may initiate—do you hear me? no man may start—the use of physical force against others. . . . Whoever, to whatever purpose or extent, initiates the use of force, is a killer acting on the premise of death in a manner wider than murder: the premise of destroying man’s capacity to live. (Rand 1957, 1023) The only proper purpose of a government is to protect man’s rights, which means: to protect him from physical violence. A proper government is only a policeman, acting as an agent of man’s selfdefense, and, as such, may resort to force only against those who start the use of force. (1062) “Man’s Rights” repeats the idea that “the government, acting as a policeman, may use force only in retaliation and only against those who initiate its use” The non-initiation principle or “‘non-aggression’ axiom”—the idea that no one has the right to initiate “the use or threat of physical violence against the person or property of someone else”—was congenial both to Rothbardian anarchists and to such limited-government theorists as Robert Nozick (Rothbard 1973, 8, here quoted; Nozick 1974, 32–35). I know of no libertarian anarchist who denies the principle. Rothbard himself went so far as to claim that “all libertarians agree on nonaggression as the central axiom of their doctrine” (Rothbard 1973, 8). Indeed, the non-initiation principle was influential enough to become the basis of Libertarian Party ideology. Despite vigorous and determined criticism, mounted by many people over many years, the party still requires potential members to sign a statement declaring, “I certify that I oppose the initiation of force to achieve political or social goals.”2

#### Increasing state control of social affairs is a recipe for failure - government should operate on the local level. The government doesn’t have growing problems, it has a GROWING problem.

Anderson 9 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, 11 November 2009, [“Government Size is Beyond Manageability”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/2009/11/government-size-is-beyond-manageability.html>, An Objectivist Individualist] rpg

The size of government is far beyond a manageable size. Government in the United States of America is too big and fails constantly. Government at the local, state, and federal levels just keeps on growing and growing. It does not have a going problem, it has a growing problem. The present Obama and Pelosi socialist federal government is particularly eager to grow. The House of Socialist Representatives just passed an awful bill designed to take over the medical services business in its entirety. The scale of the new bureaucracies being set up, the extent of the new taxes, the cruel and unusual punishments set up for those who disobey its health insurance edicts, the willingness to risk losing a majority in the House, and the explicit acknowledgments that the bill has many, many problems even by its supporters, make it clear that this is the essential step in gaining complete government control of medicine and of each and every individual's body and health. The U.S. GDP in 2008 was $14.26 trillion. Tax Freedom Day in 2009 has been estimated to be 29 May, by the Tax Foundation. This is 40.8% of the year, so the tax and deficit sum of all U.S. governments is about 5.83 trillion. This includes about half of all medical spending now, so the complete takeover of the medical field by government will add about half of one-sixth of the economy to government. So this addition to government will bring it to about $7.01 trillion. So, we will have central planning management of about half of the U.S. economy. The Soviet Union did the experiment of trying to manage all of the U.S.S.R. economy. That central planning experiment broke down utterly and completely in 1990 when that economy was about $1.99 trillion. Despite many years of practice in central management of the economy, they failed at a mere $2 trillion. We Americans may be better than the Soviets, at least for now as we coast along on the remains of our Capitalist competence, but are we really three and one-half times better at central planning than the Soviets? The fact that our governments have not collapsed is a function of two things. One, they have been supported by a larger private sector, which after the medical takeover will no longer be larger. In fact, the additional incursions into energy use and production planned by our Obama-led central planners will leave the private sector smaller than the government sector. Two, as the government becomes larger, we more and more lose the mores and work ethic of the Capitalist private sector, which is critical not just for the revenues and expanding wealth it can produce, but for its encouragement of morality and virtues. Overly large government not only sucks up our property and income, but it also sucks up our independent spirit, our competence, and our willingness to work. When government devours the private sector, its days are numbered. Government is the natural servant to the People, but the People have no substance without their separate and private identities. We are losing that. To lose the Capitalist, individualistic private sector is to lose everything that gives us Americans an advantage over the Soviets. Soon, we will be the Soviets and we will not be able to maintain a government centrally planning $7 trillion or more of economic activities.

## Impact

### Relativism Bad

#### Refusal to make a determination on an issue creates the situation for every war and atrocity.

Daraweesh et al 15 - Fuad Al‐Daraweesh, PhD at the University of Toledo, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, and Dr. Dale T. Snauwaert, Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education, Department Interim Director, CNDE Director, In Factis Pax Founding Editor, 2015 [“Human Rights Education Beyond Universalism and Relativism”, Palgrave McMillian] rpg

The core problem with cultural relativism is that it presupposes the positional confinement of cultures. It suggests that individuals can never escape their cultural perspective and thus are confined within the position of that culture. Individuals tend to share a fixed position within their culture with other cultural members; as Amartya Sen points out, this fixed position leads to positional objectivity and, in turn, to the possibility of objective illusion and false consciousness. If the individuals within a group share the same, invariant position and attain agreement on the validity of their beliefs, perceptions, etc. then they have achieved positional objectivity—from within their shared position they have achieved intersubjective warrantability. However, the shared belief may be false, even though it is positionally shared (Sen, 2009). Examples include the historical beliefs that the earth is flat, the sun revolves around the earth, and slavery is morally justifiable, among many others. These beliefs constitute objective illusions; an objective illusion is “a positionally objective belief that is, in fact, mistaken in terms of transpositional scrutiny. The concept of an objective illusion involves both the idea of positionally objective belief, and the transpositional diagnosis that this belief is, in fact, mistaken” (p. 163). Objective illusions are, in turn, the basis of false consciousness, the collective beliefs that are false but passionately held to be true. An entire population may suffer from false consciousness grounded in their positional confinement (Sen, 2009). Positional confinement, in turn, blocks the possibility of a shared ethical agreement across cultures; this confinement is then the basis of violence, for there are neither fair terms of cooperation nor the possibility of the nonviolent resolution of the inevitable conflicts that arise between nations and peoples (Sen, 2006, 2009). Positional confinement renders, therefore, cultural relativism dangerously silent on ethical relations between cultural groups. From this perspective, there does not exist recognition of any ethical–political obligation between cultural groups, for each is a positionally confined social construction with its own moral norms. The relations between cultural groups thus tend to be a matter of power rather than ethics. This conception of the relations between nations and peoples has tended to take at least two theoretical forms: international political realism and the “clash of civilizations” thesis. Moral relativism and positional confinement logically lead to international political realism. If moral consideration is confined to the boundaries of one’s own community, if moral understanding is impossible across cultural boundaries, and if the moral systems of various cultures are incommensurable, then there exists a state of moral, legal, and political anarchy between societies. International, intersocietal, and intercultural relations, then, can only be conducted in terms of rational self-interest pursued through the exercise of power. Relations between nation-states and peoples can only be based in powerpolitics, in the sense that they exclusively concern rational self-interest and power, not what is right per se (Brown, 1992; Cady, 1989; Doyle, 1997; Smith, 1986). This is a Hobbesian state of nature. If cultural relativism is assumed, then anarchy follows as the context of international relations. Under these anarchical conditions, the international system exists in a perpetual state of war. These conditions lead to the phenomenon referred to as the “security dilemma.” Given the rationality of the actors, coupled with uncertain knowledge of others’ intentions, preparing to defend one’s community increases the probability of conflict; the rational pursuit of security leads to insecurity (Jervis, 1991). Thus, the assumption of anarchy generates a perpetual a state of insecurity. The only way under these conditions to maintain a modus vivendi, a state of cold war, is through a balance of power, which serves as a deterrent, giving no party advantage over the other (Doyle, 1997; Nye, 1977; Smith, 1986). A negative peace can only be achieved through deterrence. However, each culture is imminently susceptible to invasion. From this perspective, there does not exist an obligation to give others external to one’s culture moral consideration. Based upon the positional confinement of cultural relativism, international political realism entails the denial of moral consideration to others. This positional moral confinement leads to a state of perpetual conflict and violence. This inherent problem with cultural relativism was exposed at the Nuremberg Tribunal after World War II and gave rise to the human rights movement (Snauwaert, 1995).

### Freedom Outweighs

#### Every invasion of freedom must be rejected.

\*\*Also applies for framework, a link arg, an alt, or an answer to anything

Petro 74 - (Sylvester Petro, professor of law, Wake Forest University, Spring 1974, TOLEDO LAW REVIEW, p. 480.)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway – “I believe in only one thing: liberty.” And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume’s observation: “It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once.” Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value, and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

### Cap Good - Poverty

#### Empirics go our way - opening up markets has historically reduced poverty

Horwitz 16 - Steven Horwitz is the Schnatter Distinguished Professor of Free Enterprise in the Department of Economics at Ball State University, where he also is a Fellow at the John H. Schnatter Institute for Entrepreneurship and Free Enterprise. He is the author of Hayek’s Modern Family: Classical Liberalism and the Evolution of Social Institutions. and is a Distinguished Fellow at FEE and a member of the FEE Faculty Network. June 09, 2016 [“Capitalism Is Good for the Poor”, <https://fee.org/articles/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor/>, Foundation for Economic Education] rpg

Critics frequently accuse markets and capitalism of making life worse for the poor. This refrain is certainly common in the halls of left-leaning academia as well as in broader intellectual circles. But like so many other criticisms of capitalism, this one ignores the very real, and very available, facts of history. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets. Nothing has done more to lift humanity out of poverty than the market economy. This claim is true whether we are looking at a time span of decades or of centuries. The number of people worldwide living on less than about two dollars per day today is less than half of what it was in 1990. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets, such as China and India. If we look over the longer historical period, we can see that the trends today are just the continuation of capitalism’s victories in beating back poverty. For most of human history, we lived in a world of a few haves and lots of have-nots. That slowly began to change with the advent of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution. As economic growth took off and spread throughout the population, it created our own world in the West in which there are a whole bunch of haves and a few have-more-and-betters. For example, the percentage of American households below the poverty line who have basic appliances has grown steadily over the last few decades, with poor families in 2005 being more likely to own things like a clothes dryer, dishwasher, refrigerator, or air conditioner than the average household was in 1971. And consumer items that didn’t even exist back then, such as cell phones, were owned by half of poor households in 2005 and are owned by a substantial majority of them today. Capitalism has also made poor people’s lives far better by reducing infant and child mortality rates, not to mention maternal death rates during childbirth, and by extending life expectancies by decades. Consider, too, the way capitalism’s engine of growth has enabled the planet to sustain almost 7 billion people, compared to 1 billion in 1800. As Deirdre McCloskey has noted, if you multiply the gains in consumption to the average human by the gain in life expectancy worldwide by 7 (for 7 billion as compared to 1 billion people), humanity as a whole is better off by a factor of around 120. That’s not 120 percent better off, but 120 times better off since 1800. The competitive market process has also made education, art, and culture available to more and more people. Even the poorest of Americans, not to mention many of the global poor, have access through the Internet and TV to concerts, books, and works of art that were exclusively the province of the wealthy for centuries. And in the wealthiest countries, the dynamics of capitalism have begun to change the very nature of work. Where once humans toiled for 14 hours per day at backbreaking outdoor labor, now an increasing number of us work inside in climate-controlled comfort. Our workday and workweek have shrunk thanks to the much higher value of labor that comes from working with productive capital. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. And even with economic change, the incomes of the poor are much less variable, as they are not linked to the unpredictable changes in weather that are part and parcel of a predominantly agricultural economy long since disappeared. Think of it this way: the fabulously wealthy kings of old had servants attending to their every need, but an impacted tooth would likely kill them. The poor in largely capitalist countries have access to a quality of medical care and a variety and quality of food that the ancient kings could only dream of. Consider, too, that the working poor of London 100 years ago were, at best, able to split a pound of meat per week among all of their children, which were greater in number than the two or three of today. In addition, the whole family ate meat once a week on Sunday, the one day the man of the household was home for dinner. That was meat for a week. Compare that to today, when we worry that poor Americans are too easily able to afford a meal with a quarter pound of meat in it every single day for less than an hour’s labor. Even if you think that capitalism has made poor people overweight, that’s a major accomplishment compared to the precapitalist norm of constant malnutrition and the struggle even 100 years ago for the working poor to get enough calories. The reality is that the rich have always lived well historically, as for centuries they could commandeer human labor to attend to their every need. In a precapitalist world, the poor had no hope of upward mobility or of relief from the endless physical drudgery that barely kept them alive. Today, the poor in capitalist countries live like kings, thanks mostly to the freeing of labor and the ability to accumulate capital that makes that labor more productive and enriches even the poorest. The falling cost of what were once luxuries and are now necessities, driven by the competitive market and its profit and loss signals, has brought labor-saving machines to the masses. When profit-seeking and innovation became acceptable behavior for the bourgeoisie, the horn of plenty brought forth its bounty, and even the poorest shared in that wealth. Once people no longer needed permission to innovate, and once the value of new inventions was judged by the improvements they made to the lives of the masses in the form of profit and loss, the poor began to live lives of comfort and dignity. These changes are not, as some would say, about technology. After all, the Soviets had great scientists but could not channel that knowledge into material comfort for their poor. And it’s not about natural resources, which is obvious today as resource-poor Hong Kong is among the richest countries in the world thanks to capitalism, while Venezuelan socialism has destroyed that resource-rich country. Inventions only become innovations when the right institutions exist to make them improve the lives of the masses. That is what capitalism did and continues to do every single day. And that’s why capitalism has been so good for the poor.

### Cap Good - Environment

#### Capitalism is necessary to solve the environment through innovation - the uniqueness argument is we are past most tipping points so working within the system is key

Fedrizzi 15 - Rick Fedrizzi, CEO and founding chair, US Green Building Council, 30 Nov 2015 [“Capitalism is the solution to climate change”, <http://www.cnbc.com/2015/11/30/capitalism-is-the-solution-to-climate-change-commentary.html>, CNBC] rpg

Environmentalists around the world are pinning their hopes on the international climate talks happening now. But conference rooms in Paris are not where the action on climate change really is. Rather, it's in boardrooms around the world. Companies large and small are taking steps to protect the environment, while increasing their profits. They're motivated not by consensus or conservation, but by cold hard cash. It's true that industry has contributed enormously to climate change and environmental degradation. Business interests have long opposed sustainable practices they believed would negatively impact profits. And the environmental community has held fast to this dynamic, holding up industry and capitalism as the enemy for decades. But the truth is that capitalism is the only force strong enough and capable of acting quickly enough to address climate change before the damage becomes irreversible. I've seen the kind of positive effect business can have on our environment when driven by profit and economic growth — and in one of the world's largest, dirtiest industries no less: real estate. In 1993, I co-founded the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), a non-profit organization dedicated to sustainability in our built environment. USGBC created a voluntary rating system — Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, or LEED — which allows buildings to earn credits for their sustainable features, including energy and water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, and recycled materials. LEED has had a dramatic impact on profits and the planet. In just 15 short years, 14 billion square feet of real estate have been LEED registered and certified in more than 150 countries, including some of the most iconic buildings in the world, from the Chrysler Building in Manhattan, which reduced energy use by 21 percent, to Lincoln Financial Field, home of the Philadelphia Eagles, which has reduced its energy consumption by the equivalent of removing 41,000 cars per year from the road. Thanks to LEED, as legendary environmentalist Paul Hawken put it, "USGBC may have had a greater impact than any other single organization in the world on materials saved, toxins eliminated, greenhouse gases avoided, and human health enhanced." Martin J. Whitman School of Management, Syracuse University, Syracuse, Onondaga County, New York, USA. Built in 2005 by architect Bruce Fowle of FXFOWLE Architects. Included many environmentally conscious features in its roofing, heating and use of recycled materials. But the benefits are more than just environmental — they're economic. From hospitals to schools to skyscrapers to factories, communities and companies that have invested in LEED see energy savings, cost savings, and a significant return on their investment. And green buildings haven't only been profitable for building owners, but also for the American economy at large. Green construction added $167.4 billion to the U.S. GDP from 2011 to 2014, according to a new 2015 Green Building Economic Impact Study. This year, the green building sector will employ more than 2.3 million Americans, and by 2018, it is expected to nearly double in size. Of course, real estate isn't the only industry where economic and environmental benefits align. Today, the power of sustainability to drive profits is being quietly embraced throughout the global economy, and major companies are reaping the benefits. Take United Technologies, the manufacturing powerhouse that ranks 45th on the Fortune 500 list. Between 2006 and 2014, UTC reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent, and water use by 33 percent. Over those same eight years, its stock price more than doubled. Unilever, one of the world's largest consumer-goods companies, has reduced emissions by 37 percent since 2008, and its efforts have saved the company more than 400 million euros (US$422 million). GE's Ecomagination program has boosted its top line by $200 billion over the past decade, growing at four times the rate of the company at large. Last year, Siemens' Environmental Portfolio not only eliminated 428 million tons of CO2 emissions for its customers, but also brought in €33 billion. The list goes on and on. As Patagonia's CEO Yvon Chouinard says: "Every time we've made a decision that's right for the planet, it's made us more money." The private sector has long been seen as the enemy of environmentalism, and for good reason. But times have changed. Today, a select number of enlightened corporations are wasting less, earning more, and proving just how profitable sustainability can be. There's no reason to keep waiting for an elusive climate agreement. Instead, let's take action to advance market-driven solutions that have the potential — and the ability — to save the planet. It's time for environmentalists and business leaders to leverage the profit motive to achieve our common goal: a sustainable, profitable future.

#### More evidence

Eady 17 - Trent Eady is a technology writer for Seeking Alpha. FEBRUARY 16, 2017 [“CAPITALISM IS ENDING POVERTY AND SOLVING CLIMATE CHANGE. SOCIALISM IS INCAPABLE OF DOING EITHER”, <http://bullandbearmcgill.com/capitalism-ending-poverty-solving-climate-change-socialism-incapable-either/>, Bull and Bear McGill] rpg

If you are passionate about ending poverty, you should support capitalism. You should also hope — and try to ensure — that socialism doesn’t undergo a popular resurgence. Most people don’t appreciate that the world is already on a promising trajectory. Capitalism is working. For the first time in humanity’s long and brutal history, the end of poverty is in sight. Since 1990, the number of people living in extreme poverty — defined as living on less than $1.90 per day — has fallen by about one billion globally. That is staggering. In the next two decades, that number is projected to continue to rapidly decline, possibly falling as low as 200 million by 2030, compared to almost two billion in 1990. Incomes are rapidly rising in the world’s poorest countries. In the world’s wealthiest countries, what we consider as poverty is not at all comparable. Extreme poverty means being too poor to afford a toothbrush. It means losing your child to a disease that costs a few dollars to prevent. In the United States, by contrast, 84 percent of people under the poverty line own an air conditioner and 100 percent own a refrigerator. But we don’t need to draw a false equivalence to recognize that wealthy countries’ version of poverty creates real suffering, and to take heart that rising incomes and better social programs are raising the income floor here too. Looking ahead to the rest of this young century, it seems that we are barrelling toward a world with minimal drudgery, where every person’s basic needs are guaranteed — the end of poverty in every sense. This astonishing development is thanks to the convergence of revolutionary progress in science and technology, the breakout success of the capitalist economic system, the accumulation of knowledge and experience around public policy and poverty interventions, and a global consciousness that is increasingly moving toward a belief in full human equality. When people say that capitalism isn’t working, I see this as a fundamental misdiagnosis of the state of the world. The terms ‘capitalism’ and ‘socialism’ are so often used imprecisely. I define capitalism as an economic system with capital markets — like venture capital and the stock market — that allow investment in companies and partial ownership of companies by investors. I define socialism, by contrast, as an economic system without capital markets in which investment is controlled by the government and in which companies are owned by the government or by their employees. Handing over control of investment from decentralized, meritocratic capital markets to a centralized process of deliberative democracy is sure to inhibit innovation, visionary ambition, risk-taking, and the diversity of ideas The two fundamental variables that determine whether poverty exists are the creation of wealth and the distribution of wealth. Obviously, the less wealth is created, the less wealth is distributed. That is the fatal flaw of socialism: it fails to create, and even destroys, wealth. Capitalism, on the other hand, has a phenomenal ability to create wealth. From 1820 to 2013, the percentage of the world living in extreme poverty has fallen from 94 percent to 10 percent thanks to capitalism. Handing over control of investment from decentralized, meritocratic capital markets to a centralized process of deliberative democracy is sure to inhibit innovation, visionary ambition, risk-taking, and the diversity of ideas and thereby hinder the creation of wealth. If there is dramatically less wealth to distribute, even a perfectly equal distribution of wealth would leave poor people even poorer. In fact, what occurred when capital markets were abolished in the Soviet Union, and during Mao’s attempts at central planning in China, was economic collapse followed by mass starvation. The good news is that the creation of wealth and the distribution of wealth are somewhat separable. An economy can have both vibrant capital markets and generous redistribution of the wealth those markets create through government programs like universal healthcare, welfare, and free or subsidized post-secondary education — maybe even a guaranteed minimum income someday. Cities in Alberta are eliminating homelessness by offering guaranteed housing, and even expect to save money in the process. Governments can raise the income floor and redistribute poverty out of existence without changing the way capital markets operate. A common criticism is that even if capitalism is producing good social and economic outcomes now, it is producing bad environmental outcomes that will leave us worse off in the long term. However, there is no inherent reason why an economy without capital markets would be better for the environment than one with them — except perhaps that the poorer people are, the smaller environmental footprint they have. A socialist economy could be just as environmentally unsustainable, or more so, than our current capitalist economy. There is also no inherent reason why a capitalist economy has to be unsustainable. One powerful tool to gear our economy towards sustainability is a carbon tax, which factors the environmental cost of carbon emissions into the market price of fossil fuels. I’m thrilled that Canada is now implementing a carbon tax, and I hope that the idea will catch on worldwide. Another overlooked factor is that transitioning from fossil fuels to sustainable energy requires the market-driven innovation of a capitalist economy. This is best exemplified by one of the world’s fastest growing manufacturing companies, the electric carmaker and solar energy company Tesla. The culture and thought process that has enabled Tesla’s success emerged in the capitalist hot house of Silicon Valley, the global epicentre of venture capital and technology startups. Tesla is currently gearing up to produce the world’s first mass-market electric car later this year. With over 370,000 pre-orders internationally, Tesla’s Model 3 sedan is on track to be one of the best-selling cars of any kind. By comparison, the best-selling car in the United States in 2015, the Toyota Camry, sold 360,000 units. Tesla is also building the world’s largest factory, which will soon singlehandedly double global battery production relative to 2013 levels. At the same time, Tesla is scaling up rooftop production of solar energy and attempting to bring down the cost of solar panels. More than perhaps any other organization on the planet, Tesla is spearheading the fight against climate change. This kind of technological innovation and commercial application of existing technologies — which requires as much creativity and intelligence as the original invention — is something that decentralized, meritocratic markets full of diverse, risk-taking, and controversial companies can uniquely deliver. Markets allow ideas to be tested in the most direct, brutal way. Tesla stands victorious on a heap of failed electric car companies, and no one knew at the beginning which, if any, would succeed.

### World Getting Better

**The world is getting better - their refusal to recognize this results in a nihilistic fatalism**

**Pinker and Torres 16 -** (Stephen Pinker [Head of the Psychology Department at Harvard, Phil Torres [is an author, contributor at the Future of Life Institute, Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, and founder of the X-Risks Institute. He's published in Skeptic, Free Inquiry, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Journal of Future Studies, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Foresight, Erkenntnis, and Metaphilosophy, as well as popular media like TIME, Motherboard, Truthout, and Salon. His most recent book is The End: What Science and Religion Tell Us About the Apocalypse (Pitchstone Publishing). He makes frequent appearances on podcasts discussing existential risks, emerging technologies, and apocalyptic terrorism, and is producing a mini-documentary series on existential risks.], 12/2/16 "The United States Is Not an Apocalyptic Wasteland, Explains Steven Pinker," Motherboard, motherboard.vice.com/read/steven-pinker-talks-about-donald-trumps-victory-long-term-progress-and-wheth)

Donald Trump’s rise to power was driven in part by an apocalyptic narrative according to which, in a phrase, you are in grave danger. This is consistent with many people’s intuitions about the world, given the ongoing threat of global terrorism, the US’s slow recovery from the Great Recession, and a sense that the Washington establishment is corrupt and doesn’t care about the average citizen’s needs. Is Trump’s apocalypticism right? Are we living in an exceptionally dangerous period of human history? Are these the desperate times that call for desperate measures? According to the Harvard cognitive scientist Steven Pinker, the answer is a resounding No. In his 2011 book The Better Angels of Our Nature, Pinker presents a mountain of evidence showing that violence has been declining for millennia—a trend that has continued through the twentieth century and up to the present. For example, since World War II there have been no major wars between the world’s great powers, a phenomenon dubbed the “Long Peace,” and Pinker argues that the end of the Cold War inaugurated a “New Peace” that’s marked by a worldwide decline of “organized conflicts of all kinds—civil wars, genocides, repression by autocratic governments, and terrorist attacks.” But will this trend continue in a post-Trump, post-truth world? Pinker is clear in Better Angles that it might not—for instance, there could be accessible “weapons of total destruction” (WTDs) that precipitate a global catastrophe, or authoritarian demagogues that misuse and abuse their political power. To understand what Trump’s victory means for America and, even more, what it means for the future of civilization, I contacted Pinker via email. Motherboard: Trump has repeatedly painted an apocalyptic picture of contemporary America. He has talked about (black) people getting shot while walking down the street, about terrorists disguising themselves as refugees fleeing the atrocities of Syria, and about Mexico sending its “criminals” and “rapists” across the southern border. Could you briefly explain why this characterization of the contemporary US is factually wrong? Steven Pinker: Unfortunately, it’s all too easy for newsreaders to believe that apocalyptic picture. The news media give lavish coverage to violent incidents, seldom follow up on negative reportage in the past, and rarely put events in statistical or historical perspective. Worse, they allow themselves to be played by violence impresarios, namely terrorists and rampage killers, who correctly anticipate that they can attract the world’s attention by killing a number of innocent people at once. This is true not just of tabloids and cable news chasing eyeballs and clicks, but of high-quality outlets who feel that by highlighting what goes wrong, they are discharging their duty as watchdogs, muckrakers, and afflicters of the comfortable. The facts are as follows. The rate of violent crime is lower now than it was at any time between 1966 and 2009. Immigrants have a lower rate of violent crime than American citizens. Terrorists kill just three-tenths of one percent of all American homicide victims. The rate of death from terrorism in the United States was higher in the early 1970s than it is today. And since 2002, more Americans have been killed by right-wing American terrorists than by Islamic terrorists. It’s true that the rate of violent crime went up between 2014 and 2015, most likely a consequence of the retreat of active policing since Ferguson. But it’s a small uptick in the context of the massive downward trend since 1992. "A modern liberal democracy is a precious achievement." The media and intelligentsia were partly complicit in Trump’s depiction of the world as a dystopia headed for even greater disaster. “Charge the cockpit or you die!” cried the pro-Trump intellectual right. “I’d rather see the empire burn to the ground under Trump, opening up at least the possibility of radical change, than cruise on autopilot under Clinton,” said the pro-Trump left. When people believe that the world is heading off a cliff, they are receptive to the perennial appeal of demagogues: “What do you have to lose?” But if the media and intellectuals put events into statistical and historical context, rather than constantly crying “crisis,” they would make it clearer what the answer to that question is. Revolutionary regimes from Nazi Germany and Maoist China to contemporary Venezuela show that people have a tremendous amount to lose when a charismatic leader forces a radical personal vision on a society. A modern liberal democracy is a precious achievement. Until the messiah comes, it will always have problems, but it’s better to solve problems than to start a conflagration and hope for the best. In Better Angels, you discuss something called “integrative complexity,” which “captures a sense of intellectual balance, nuance, and sophistication.” The integrative complexity of a political speech, for example, can be determined by counting the frequency of words like “absolutely,” “always,” and “definitely”—all favorites of Trump’s—where simple, categorical words like these indicate low complexity. In fact, linguistic analyses show that Trump literally speaks at a fourth-grade reading level. This appears worrisome because you also note that war is historically more likely when political leaders have low integrative complexity scores. Does this make you anxious about Trump getting the US embroiled in new conflicts? The work was done by the political psychologist Philip Tetlock, and yes, this does make me anxious. Overconfident, good-versus-evil thinking encourages impulsive military action. We’re safer with leaders who think through the costs and benefits of different options, including ones that may take time to have their effects, such as sanctions, containment, and other forms of soft power. Though I’m wary of seeming to be pointing to any bright side—there is no bright side to this election—Trump has suggested that he is averse to foreign interventions (insofar as one can read any intentions at all from his contradictory statements). So he might continue or even extend Obama’s policy of “Don’t do stupid [stuff].” This was the “rare piece of good news” suggested by Nils Petter Gleditsch, one of the world’s foremost peace researchers, in a November 15 blog post. Trump’s presidential campaign was successful in part because of the “alt-right” movement. At the heart of this movement is a rejection of globalism, which has fueled opposition to diversity, multiculturalism, and immigration. Do you think such opposition is in the end a losing cause? Is globalization inevitable? Yes, globalization is inevitable, for a number of reasons. Many of our severest problems are inherently global, particularly climate, epidemics, migrants, and terrorism. Pretending they don’t exist is not tenable, at least not forever, and they can be solved only through international cooperation. Also, globalization has massive benefits—more affordable goods, larger markets for exports, a huge reduction in global poverty—which also can’t be denied indefinitely. While globalization doesn’t benefit everyone equally—it has increased unemployment in domestic lower-skilled occupations—most of those job losses would have happened anyway because of automation, and have to be addressed, globalization or no. Third, with the internet and inexpensive travel, there will be no stopping the flow of people and ideas. This is particularly true among younger people, who partake of a global youth culture, and as we saw in the UK following Brexit, resent their elders’ attempts to restrict their opportunities. In my considered opinion, one of the greatest casualties of this election is science. For example, Trump appointed Myron Ebell, a dogmatic climate denier who holds worrisome views about the safety of agrichemicals, to be the “lead agent in choosing personnel and setting the direction of the federal agencies that address climate change and environmental policy more broadly.” Are you worried about the consequences of a Trump presidency for scientific literacy? Why do you think science is so important for people to understand? I am indeed worried. Science is important because it seeks true explanations of the world. Defying its conclusions is bound to lead to delusions and dangerous choices. Science also offers a model for how to think rationally: that one must acknowledge one’s fallibility, submit one’s beliefs to empirical tests, and abandon ideas that are shown to be wrong. The denial of the massive evidence for human-made climate change is atrocious and one of the most dangerous consequences of a Trump presidency. The small consolation is that when it comes to scientific issues, reality won’t go away regardless of what you deny. While we may lose four precious years of US federal action, we will be forced to deal with climate change soon enough. And actors other than the US government are already dealing with it: state and local governments, scientists and technologists, businesses that rationally plan for the future, and the governments of other countries. It’s important to realize, though, that the problem is not scientific literacy. Most laypeople who believe in evolution or who acknowledge human-made climate change are just as ignorant of science as those who deny them. The issue is identity. People treat opinions as badges of loyalty to a tribe or coalition. If “good people,” people like them, believe X, they will believe X. Some climate activists believe that the worst thing that happened to the movement was Al Gore becoming its implicit spokesperson, branding it as a left-wing movement. Before that, the issue was nowhere near as polarized. The challenge is to dissociate scientific hypotheses from identity politics and bring people around to the radical notion—the core of the Scientific Revolution and the Enlightenment—that they should believe things only if they are true. How to do this is an unsolved rhetorical challenge, but finding spokespeople who break out of their coalitional stereotypes—such as prominent conservatives who acknowledge human-made climate change—is a start. You note that the number of autocracies around the world is decreasing while the opposite is true of democracies. Given Trump’s authoritarianism—as manifest in frequent campaign statements that he would “totally accept” the election results “if I win”—do you see Trump as a threat to American democracy? Could this be the beginning of fascism in America? Yes, he is a threat, and yes, it could be the beginning. The question is, what are the chances? No one knows, but I think that after 240 years, American democracy is too robust to be overturned by one man. To convert a democracy into an autocracy requires disabling an enormous, distributed infrastructure: legislators who have to respond to constituents and lobbyists, judges with reputations to uphold, bureaucrats who are responsible for the missions of their departments, and the tens of millions of people who have to carry out their jobs in order that the government and society function. "As you are forced to deal with other people who are not like yourself, you are automatically driven to universal values like reason, science, and human flourishing." It’s true that a ruthless autocrat can intimidate enough players in enough positions to consolidate absolute rule. But even autocrats can be sent packing when enough of their citizens stop playing along. As Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan have shown, this happened many times in the 20th and 21st centuries. But it’s unlikely to come to that. I doubt the mercurial Trump has the commitment and concentration it would take to implement a fascist dictatorship, nor that the stroppy American public would easily fall into line. Given global risks like climate change, biodiversity loss, and nuclear weapons, I have become rather pessimistic about the future. Nonetheless, my work and activism is guided by a kind of “pragmatic optimism” according to which major disasters can be averted if only we try hard enough. Do you feel optimistic about humanity’s future, either in the short or long term? Do you think the “moral Flynn effect”—a term you coined to refer to our collective moral progress since WWII, driven by “reason” and rising IQs—will continue? I would call the belief that activism can merely avert “major disasters” a form of pessimism! The world has done much better than avert major disasters: we’ve decimated disease, hunger, and extreme poverty; doubled longevity; multiplied global wealth; made literacy and basic education (including for girls) nearly universal; eliminated war from five sixths of the planet; expanded opportunities for leisure and travel; reduced many forms of pollution and deforestation; and much else. (See here, here, and here for data.) To be sure, some of the challenges facing us are formidable. But like you, I feel pragmatically optimistic. Not in the sense that I can prophesy a good future—only a charlatan would claim to know the future—but in the sense that problems are solvable. Nuclear weapons can be reduced in number, made more secure, and someday eliminated altogether (as Ronald Reagan, Henry Kissinger, Sam Nunn, George Shultz, William Perry, and Barack Obama, among others, have advocated). Climate change can be mitigated by an aggressive combination of policy and technology, as Joshua Goldstein and I have argued, following the lead of the ecomodernist movement. Success is by no means guaranteed, but we must not sit back and sulk, resigned to the corrosive belief that humanity is doomed. As for collective moral progress, I see it as pushed and pulled by two sides of human nature. Dragging us back are atavistic mindsets like zero-sum thinking, authoritarianism, tribalism, dominance, and vengeance, which operate pretty much by default. Pulling us forward are the better angels of our nature like empathy, self-control, and reason, which are energized by the Enlightenment institutions of democracy, science, education, open economies, and a global community. It’s impossible to prophesy which forces will prevail at a given time. But data from the World Values Survey suggest that if the world continues to get richer, better educated, and more connected—all steady trends—it will also tend to get more liberal and cosmopolitan. As you are forced to deal with other people who are not like yourself, you are automatically driven to universal values like reason, science, and human flourishing, and away from parochial ones like “My holy books are true” or “Make American great again.”

### AT: Objectivism = War

#### Ayn Rand knew you would say that - that’s why she added a non-aggression clause - the state doesn’t cause war in the world of the alt!

Wetten 12 - Martin van Wetten is a PhD and scholar in the Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, 2012 [“Objectivist Political Philosophy and the Privatization of Military Force”, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41717250?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>, The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Vol. 12, No. 2 (December 2012), pp. 263-277] rpg

Previously I presented the bottom line of Objectivist political philosophy: individual rights and their connection to freedom and force. Rights protect our freedom to act on our rational judgments. Force banishes rational evaluation altogether. But the State, according to Objectivism, is to protect individual rights by employing the "retaliatory use of physical force" (Den Uyl and Rasmussen 1984, 177). It seems like there is a contradiction if the concept of individual rights bans the initiation of force in a society, but allocates the use of force to the State. A careful reading of the non-aggression principle that Objectivism advocates (Sciabarra 1994, 274) says that the initiation of force is prohibited. The State does not initiate force. Rather, it responds to initiations of force that occur within its borders. If someone does initiate the use of force, the victim has the right to self-defense. But since individuals cannot be trusted to be objective and impartial enough concerning violations of their own rights, the State is allocated the use of retaliatory force and punishment. The State itself does not have the right to self-defense, instead it acts as the agent for those who do (Den Uyl and Rasmussen 1984, 178). The distinction of 'acting on behalf and 'having the right to act' is important, because in Rand's thinking, collectives are not entities that choose, act, think or do anything that individuals do, therefore collectives do not have rights as such (171). The State, as a collective, functions to protect individual rights from initiations of force. 2.3 Force and the State At the very heart of every war is the use of force. But what is force, exactly? According to Rand, force is something that violates our individual rights and dispels our freedom to think and (consequently) to act. Physical force concerns the violent deprivation of another human being's freedom. But then, does this mean that, in the context of war, the State should only protect individuals from initiations of force that are already ongoing or occurred in the past? Rand never discussed the ethics of war. The question remains open for others to answer. Den Uyl and Ramussen may have given the answer between the lines, when they discuss Rand's conception of the nature of force. For Rand also considered a breach of contract a form of force. Also fraud and extortion function through force. But these three are "indirect initiation [s] of force" (178; italics added). In the context of war, the State may use preventive force, because intended and planned future violations of individual rights are in the same way a kind of indirect use of force, an intended btezch. of the contract of respecting the rights of others, conceding that rights, including his or her own, have no validity in the rights-violator's mind. If the intention can be properly proved, for example, by discovering elaborate plans for a large-scale attack, then the State can use force preemptively. Naturally, evidence on the intentions of an attacker will not always be easy to obtain, which might lead some to argue that the State should be allowed to initiate force with inconclusive evidence. However, if we let inconclusive evidence be acceptable as the norm, or we reserve it for "special cases" (which are difficult to define), then any claims for due process of the law are banished (in principle), opening the doors (theoretically) to a totalitarian state, which can violate individual rights based on any "suspicion" of rights violations it deems convenient for itself. The State's "right" to use force, then, is rather restricted. But why should the State itself own the means through which it retaliates? Why not privatize military force in an anarchist fashion? Rand (1964) argues that anarchy "is a naive floating abstraction" (112) and vehemendy rejects all of its forms. I will proceed to address the issue and Rand's motivations for rejecting the anarchist alternative.

## Alt

### Performance - Productivity Good

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

Productiveness is your acceptance of morality, your recognition of the fact that you choose to live--that productive work is the process by which man's consciousness controls his existence, a constant process of acquiring knowledge and shaping matter to fit one's purpose, of translating an idea into physical form, of remaking the earth in the image of one's values--that all work is creative work if done by a thinking mind, and no work is creative if done by a blank who repeats in uncritical stupor a routine he has learned from others--that your work is yours to choose, and the choice is as wide as your mind, that nothing more is possible to you and nothing less is human--that to cheat your way into a job bigger than your mind can handle is to become a fear-corroded ape on borrowed motions and borrowed time, and to settle down into a job that requires less than your mind's full capacity is to cut your motor and sentence yourself to another kind of motion: decay--that your work is the process of achieving your values, and to lose your ambition for values is to lose your ambition to live--that your body is a machine, but your mind is its driver, and you must drive as far as your mind will take you, with achievement as the goal of your road--that the man who has no purpose is a machine that coasts downhill at the mercy of any boulder to crash in the first chance ditch, that the man who stifles his mind is a stalled machine slowly going to rust, that the man who lets a leader prescribe his course is a wreck being towed to the scrap heap, and the man who makes another man his goal is a hitchhiker no driver should ever pick up--that your work is the purpose of your life, and you must speed past any killer who assumes the right to stop you, that any value you might find outside your work, any other loyalty or love, can be only travelers you choose to share your journey and must be travelers going on their own power in the same direction.

### Performance - State Bad

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

So long as men people desire to live together, no man one may initiate—do you hear me? no man one may start—the use of physical force against others. . .. Whoever, to whatever purpose or extent, initiates the use of force, is a killer acting on the premise of death in a manner wider than murder: the premise of destroying ~~man’s~~ one’s capacity to live. (Rand 1957, 1023) The only proper purpose of a government is to protect man’s one’s rights, which means: to protect him them from physical violence. A proper government is only a policeman, acting as an agent of man’s one’s self-defense, and, as such, may resort to force only against those who start the use of force. (1062)

### Performance - Truth Good

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

There are two sides to every issue: one side is right and the other is wrong, but the middle is always evil. The man who is wrong still retains some respect for truth, if only by accepting the responsibility of choice. But the man in the middle is the knave who blanks out the truth in order to pretend that no choice or values exist, who is willing to sit out the course of any battle, willing to cash in on the blood of the innocent or to crawl on his belly to the guilty, who dispenses justice by condemning both the robber and the robbed to jail, who solves conflicts by ordering the thinker and the fool to meet each other halfway. In any compromise between food and poison, it is only death that can win. In any compromise between good and evil, it is only evil that can profit. In that transfusion of blood which drains the good to feed the evil, the compromise is the transmitting rubber tube.

### Performance - Cap Good

#### Thus, we read from Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged:*

Rand 57 - Ayn Rand, novelist and philosopher who developed Objectivism as a theory of life, 1957 [“Atlas Shrugged”] rpg

So you think that money is the root of all evil? [...] Have you ever asked what is the root of money? Money is a tool of exchange, which can't exist unless there are goods produced and men able to produce them. Money is the material shape of the principle that men who wish to deal with one another must deal by trade and give value for value. Money is not the tool of the moochers, who claim your product by tears, or of the looters, who take it from you by force. Money is made possible only by the men who produce. Is this what you consider evil?

### Alt Card

#### Our alternative is a return to objectivism - accepting the notion that reality is not constructed subjectively and exists outside of one’s consciousness is a necessary prerequisite to effective education.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

Rand begins by explicitly naming the base of her philosophy: the axioms of existence (what is, is; existence exists), consciousness (one is aware that something exists, consciousness is conscious) and identity (that which exists has a specific nature, A is A). Causality is a corollary of the axiom of identity: if every thing has a specific nature, then it can act only in accordance with that nature. A philosophical axiom is a fundamental, undeniable truth on which all subsequent knowledge rests. It is self-evident – i.e. implicit in any instance of perception – and cannot be coherently denied: any ‘denial’ must accept the axiom in the very act of trying to deny it. Whatever the degree of your knowledge, these two – existence and consciousness – are axioms you cannot escape, these two are the irreducible primaries implied in any action you undertake, in any part of your knowledge and in its sum, from the first ray of light you perceive at the start of your life to the widest erudition you might achieve at its end. Whether you know the shape of a pebble or the structure of the solar system, the axioms remain the same: that it exists and that you know it. To exist is to be something, as distinguished from the nothing of nonexistence; it is to be an entity of a specific nature made of specific attributes [this is the third axiom]. Centuries ago, the man who was – no matter what his errors – the greatest of your philosophers [Aristotle], has stated the formula defining the concept of existence and the rule of all knowledge: A is A. A thing is itself (Rand, 1961, p. 125). Together these three axioms add up to a corollary principle, which Rand calls the primacy of existence. The primacy of existence states that existence comes first: what exists, exists and is what it is independent of any consciousness. Consciousness, by contrast, is a metaphysical dependent: in order for it to be conscious of something, it requires that something first exist. In order for you to be conscious of the book on the table, for instance, the book (and table) must first exist. “If nothing exists, there can be no consciousness: a consciousness with nothing to be conscious of is a contradiction in terms... . If that which you claim to perceive does not exist, then what you possess is not consciousness” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Metaphysically, therefore, consciousness is passive (although epistemologically, it is active – see below): its function is to grasp that something exists and to grasp the nature, the identity, of that which exists. Consciousness has no power to create or alter that which exists (which is not to deny that man has the power to re-arrange what exists – see below). The opposite of the primacy of existence is what Rand calls the primacy of consciousness. On this view, consciousness comes first: its task is not to perceive existence but to create it. Ever since Kant (though the stage was set by Descartes), the primacy of consciousness has been dominant in philosophy. Whether it is Kant’s internal forms of sensibility and conceptual categories creating space, time, existence, and causality, Hegel’s cosmic mind developing itself through progressive contradictions, the Pragmatists’ feelings and actions molding the world, or the Postmodernists’ social construction of reality, the common root is the idea that the function of consciousness is not to identify but to create and alter reality. But to accept the primacy of consciousness is to reject the axioms of existence, consciousness and identity, and so to lapse into self-contradiction. A consciousness cannot be the creator of existence because it first requires that existence exist: a “consciousness conscious of nothing but itself is a contradiction in terms” (Rand, 1961, p. 124). Nor can the primacy of consciousness be saved by claiming, as so many have tried, that existence exists but consciousness determines its identity. This is to claim that there exists a thing, which is no thing in particular – i.e. there exists something, which is nothing. Note that Objectivism recognizes that there are man-made facts as distinguished from metaphysically given facts (Rand, 1982, pp. 23–34). Metaphysically given facts flow from the inexorable nature – the identity – of reality: they are, and they had to be. Man-made facts flow (in part) from man’s volition: they are, but they did not have to be (i.e. a different choice was possible). The existence of the sun, for instance, is a metaphysically given fact; the existence of the Empire State Building and the existence of the Constitution of the United States are man-made facts. The creative power that man’s faculty of volition gives him, however, is strictly limited: the existence and identity of the elements of reality are outside his power to affect. Man’s only creative power is the ability to rearrange the elements of reality in accordance with their identities. To do so successfully (i.e. in a manner that will further his existence) requires knowledge. Man can attempt, for instance, to build a skyscraper by piling up dirt and leaves, but it will crash to the ground. He can also, however, study the principles of physics, learn how to make steel and concrete, and then erect soaring towers. Man can attempt to organize a society by following “divine revelation” – and then see his society collapse into the chaos of the Dark Ages. But he can also study man’s nature, the nature and functions of government, and actual past governments, and then write a viable Constitution. Epistemology All knowledge (including knowledge of the axioms) begins with the evidence of the senses. To claim that the senses are invalid is a contradiction. On what basis could one claim the senses were invalid except on the basis of sensory evidence? The senses give us automatic knowledge of reality. So-called perceptual “errors,” such as illusions, are simply the way in which the brain integrates the whole perceptual field, e.g. the railroad tracks look like they meet off in the distance because the eyes respond to input regarding distance. We can see that the tracks do not really meet by walking down the tracks. As noted in the previous chapter, Kant’s fundamental error was the premise that having a specific means of consciousness (i.e. sensory systems and a rational faculty) automatically disqualifies one from knowing reality. But the truth is the reverse. One can know reality only through a specific means of awareness, which determines the specific way in which one is aware of reality. At the perceptual level, this means one must distinguish between the object and form of perception. We become aware of the wavelength of light, for example, through the experience of color (hue). There is no such thing as awareness of reality by no means (e.g. absent a brain and sense receptors). Having a means of awareness does not undermine the validity of our knowledge, as Kant implied. Nor does it imply that we perceive reality “as it appears to us.” We do not perceive appearances; we perceive reality by specific means. Man’s distinctive form of awareness, however, is not perceptual. He shares that level with the lower animals. Man has the power of reason. Reason functions by means of concepts. The question on which the validity of reason depends is: Do concepts give us knowledge of reality? Ever since Kant (although Plato made the same error), the dominant view in philosophy has been that they do not: concepts have no connection to reality, they are subjective products of the human mind whose inescapable distortions create a “reality” of their own. Kant’s view has dominated philosophy because no one until Ayn Rand had been able to identify the connection of concepts to sensory perception (and so to reality). No one had been able to identify how we are able validly to form a mental unit that integrates things which, though similar, are also different from each other in every observable, measurable aspect (e.g. every table is of a different width, length, height, weight, etc.). Rand’s crucial discovery in this regard is that of measurement omission (see Rand, 1990 for details). One observes, for instance, that certain man-made objects consisting of a flat, level surface with supports and that support other, small objects (tables) are similar to each other and different from related objects (e.g. chairs). One integrates the different tables into a single mental unit by omitting the particular measurements of each table on the implicit principle that a table may be of any width, length, height, weight (within certain ranges) so long as it is of some specific width, length, etc. (within those ranges). One then retains the concept by a sensoryperceptual symbol, a word. Words, therefore, are not detached from reality but stand for concepts that are themselves based in the facts of reality. The concept table stands for an unlimited potential number of actual tables, including tables not yet made. Valid higher-level concepts are formed through integrating lower-level concepts using the same principle of measurement omission. For example, tables, chairs, sofas, desks and lamps can be integrated into a more abstract concept, furniture, by integrating the facts that these are all movable articles in a home that make it fit for living and working, but omitting the measurements of the various types of moving articles. Definitions are the final step in concept formation. They have two functions: to tie the concept to its referents in reality and to differentiate the concept from other concepts. A definition, which must be formed in accordance with objective principles in order to be valid, is not synonymous with the concept. A definition simply identifies the fundamental attributes of the concretes subsumed by the concept (e.g. “man is the rational animal” is a valid definition of man because reason is man’s fundamental attribute). The definition of man ties the concept to its proper referents while connecting it to but keeping it distinct from one’s other related knowledge. Thus the two parts of a valid definition, genus and differentia. The genus “animal” connects the concept of man with the rest of our vast knowledge about the animal kingdom. The differentia “rational” distinguishes the referents of the concept of man in a fundamental way from all the other members of the animal kingdom. The enormous cognitive benefit of concepts is that of economy: an unlimited number of entities (actions, relationships, etc.) can be held in mind and dealt with by means of a single mental unit, thereby drastically increasing the range and power of man’s mind beyond that attainable at the perceptual level. Observe that for Objectivism concepts are not “out there,” intrinsic properties of objects or of reality, to be discovered by some mysterious process of intuition. Nor are they subjective constructs arbitrarily invented inside one’s head. They are mental integrations of what is out there. They are the form in which a conceptual consciousness grasps reality. They are, if formed by the correct method, objective. Contrary to the claims of some Postmodernists, for example, the concepts of male and female are not arbitrary but objective. Those who doubt this should start by looking at pictures of males and females – or in the mirror. The mind attains objectivity by connecting every concept to perceptual data and therefore to the facts of reality. The method by which it does this is logic. Logic, for Objectivism, is not primarily deductive but inductive: deriving all of one’s conclusions ultimately from sensory-perception and integrating this knowledge into a non-contradictory whole. Thus Objectivism rejects two dominant modern approaches to philosophy: rationalism (reason, especially deduction, divorced from sensory-perceptual observation) and empiricism (sensory-perceptual observation divorced from reason, i.e. from conceptual processing and integration). For Objectivism knowledge results from logic applied to experience. Postmodernism stresses the fact that different individuals and groups have different “contexts,” i.e. different ideas. For the Postsmodernist this immediately disqualifies the conclusions of any individual from being objective. There are two reasons for this. First, according to postmodernism any context is necessarily arbitrary, i.e. divorced from reality, since concepts are necessarily arbitrary. Objectivism, by contrast, shows that concepts, if formed by the correct method, are based in reality. Furthermore, Objectivism shows that context-holding – which means requiring that everything one knows be integrated without contradiction with everything else one knows – is a crucial part of logic and so of expanding knowledge; it is not the disqualifier of knowledge. Second, for postmodernism an individual’s cultural context, whether true or false, good or bad, determines his ideas; that is, the individual is helpless to avoid cultural determinism. Objectivism, by contrast, holds that the conceptual level of awareness is volitional. “[T]o think is an act of choice ... . Reason does not work automatically; thinking is not a mechanical process; the connections of logic are not made by instinct. The function of your stomach, lungs or heart is automatic; the function of your mind is not. In any hour and issue of your life, you are free to think or to evade that effort” (Rand, 1961, p. 120). Man has the sovereign power to choose the ideas that move him. Volition is a corollary of the axiom of (human) consciousness. The “perceptual self-evidency” here is that of introspection. One can observe directly that one has the power to focus one’s mind at the conceptual level (e.g. aim for understanding, integration) or to let it drift at or drop to the sensory-perceptual level. A good illustration of volition (and one that works very well with students) is reading a book: one can just look at the marks on the page or try to focus one’s mind so as to understand what the words mean. No matter what one’s culture or environment (assuming a normal brain state and freedom from physical coercion), one has the power to choose to think or to evade the effort (and then, if one chooses to think, the power to make secondary choices based on that primary choice; see Peikoff, 1991, pp. 55–72). Note that volition does not violate the law of causality; rather it is a form of that law – one applicable to a conceptual consciousness. The cause of the choice to think in each given case is: the individual man. It is a causal primary not necessitated by prior events. Nor does volition undermine science. In actuality, it is a precondition of all science and of all knowledge. If men were not free to focus on the facts, evaluate them and reach conclusions based on logic and evidence, then all claims of knowledge would reduce to nonsense (as they do in postmodernism), viz. “I was forced by my genes and conditioning to emit the follows word sounds...” Volition does not mean omniscience. All knowledge has to be acquired and men can err in reaching conclusions. It is precisely because human consciousness is volitional and conceptual – and therefore fallible – that man needs the science of epistemology, the science that identifies the fundamental means of acquiring and validating knowledge.

## FW

### Individualism Key

#### The focus on philanthropic principles of social justice and charitable giving back obscures the individual role in society. Only an objectivist and individualistic approach can maximize the efficiency and complementarity of a society.

Parnell and Dent 15 - John A. Parnell is the William Henry Belk Professor of Management at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Dr. Parnell earned the BSBA (Marketing), MBA, and MA (Adult Education) degrees from East Carolina University, the Doctor of Education degree from Campbell University, and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Strategic Management from The University of Memphis. Eric B. Dent, Ph.D. (born November 20, 1961) holds the Uncommon Friends Endowed Chair in Ethics at Florida Gulf Coast University. December 2015 [“Reconciling Economics and Ethics in Business Ethics Education: The Case of Objectivism”, Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Volume 15, Number 2] rpg

Proponents of this perspective argue that firms function best when managers concentrate on maximizing returns through the legal and ethical production of goods and services. When executives commit resources to CSR objectives, they become the arbiters of what benefits society and contributes to the common good. If excess resources are returned to the owners instead of being allocated toward CSR objectives, then shareholders will be able to identify and pursue their own goals designed to advance society. Moreover, the firm becomes less competitive when resources are allocated to CSR objectives that are not directly related to financial performance, which ultimately raises prices, reduces tax revenues, and creates fewer jobs. This critique of social responsibility notwithstanding, members of society generally view CSR from a broad perspective and associate it with such virtues as honesty, integrity, and charity. When evaluated critically, however, the notion of CSR raises a number of key questions from organizational, economic, and social perspectives. Perhaps the most salient of these concerns is the juxtaposition of CSR and business ethics. The two concepts are readily conflated in ethical theories of CSR (Garriga and Melé 2004), yet the distinction is critical. Business ethics concerns individual decisions that affect an organization. In contrast, social responsibility refers to an expectation and obligation that a firm should serve both society and the financial interests of its owners (i.e., shareholders) (Parnell 2013). Even if differences between the two concepts are acknowledged, frequent references to both in the same sentence can obfuscate this key distinction. Giacalone and Thompson (2006), for example, seek to help “students become more socially responsible and ethically sensitive” (266). They also note that “the inoculations of immoral behavior that we provide students, often through the direction of philosophical strategies and notions of social responsibility, are inadequate . . . teaching ethics and social responsibility might mitigate the problem” (266). Giacalone and Thompson imply that one’s acceptance of social responsibility is ethical, and hence rejecting one’s social responsibility is unethical. Within the literature there is a lack of agreement as to whether CSR is a subset of business ethics, business ethics is a subset of CSR, or the two are separate fields (Enderle 2010). This divergence of themes in the literature, coupled with the ongoing effort to address ethics and CSR more extensively, has created confusion with regard to how these challenges can be met most effectively. One conceptual solution, Objectivism, is outlined in the following section. The early years of business ethics taught intentional explanations, a normative approach that has transitioned to a descriptive approach during the past thirty years (Epstein 2010; Jones 1995). Quite simply, we used to teach “right from wrong.” Whereas the dominant framework in business schools has evolved in a way that intentional explanations have been overtaken by causal explanations, conceptual frameworks that offer coherent, intentional explanations remain. Rand’s work offers an intentional explanation integrated with a descriptive, causal model suggesting one possible means of reconciling economics and ethics in response to the concerns of Ghoshal (2005). Rand’s (1957) ideas have attracted persistent interest since the publication of her most famous novel, Atlas Shrugged, over a half century ago. Many see parallels between events in her novel and the policies and practices of the U.S. government today. Rand’s Objectivism purports to offer a reality-based, integrated worldview for achieving success and happiness (Smith 2006) and is popular with many businesspeople (Miesing and Preble 1985). Organizations such as BB&T, the twelfth largest bank in the United States, encourage their leaders and managers to incorporate Objectivist principles as a means of improving organizational performance (Parnell and Dent 2009; Woiceshyn 2011). Scholars have both touted (e.g., Barry and Stephens 1998; Becker 1998; Locke 2006; Locke and Becker 1998) and critiqued (e.g., Audi 2009, 2012; Jacobs 2009) Objectivism as a basis for understanding ethics in organizations. Her philosophy addresses both economics and ethics, as capitalism and morality are seamlessly entwined within Randian Objectivism. Objectivism offers a link between economics and ethics. To demonstrate this link we focus on what Rand calls the trader principle, the idea that individuals and societies prosper through mutually beneficial voluntary exchange (Simpson 2009). Objectivism is not merely an approach to business; it is an integrated philosophy to guide one’s life. According to Rand, for it to be effective, it should be accepted as an integrated view of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, and politics—the main branches of philosophy. In an oft-repeated story, Rand was asked to present her philosophy while standing on one foot. Her succinct responses, addressing each branch of philosophy, were objective reality, reason, self-interest, and capitalism, respectively (Rand 1962). The following sections briefly elaborate on Rand’s answers, showing how her views of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics/ morality, and politics are integrated, offering a basis for reconciling economics and ethics. We then address the trader principle in more detail.

#### The current operative nature of government and education create subjects that believe they are not really individuals - countering that notion in debate is key

Anderson 16 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, 05 July 2016, [“Independence Day Thoughts on Freedom”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/2016/07/independence-day-thoughts-on-freedom.html>, An Objectivist Individualist] rpg

When Americans declared their independence from Great Britain 240 years ago, they were a people who were largely self-employed and proud to manage their own lives. They believed they had no need for a government to choose their values for them and to micromanage their lives. Their principal need for a government was to prevent individuals from initiating the use of force against one another and to protect them from outlaw gangs, warring Indians, and attacks by other nations. Most of those needs they were quite willing to fulfill in large part at the very local level, including a local militia. They certainly did not need a government dominated by special interests and aristocrats a long distance away from them dictating numerous laws and taxing them. But what is the American condition today? Relatively few people are self-employed. The result is that relatively few people believe that they are capable of controlling their own lives. For the ease of being an employee, most people have given up the ability to earn their own living under their own management. Most people have consequently lost a key ingredient to their independence and their self-confidence. This is a loss partly brought on by political decisions in which a people more and more frequently employed by others came to be in greater and greater numbers in the electorate. Frustrated with their lack of control and holding a great political power in their numbers, but lacking self-direction, these Americans became susceptible to special interests who wanted to gain power and wealth at the expense of the less numerous employers who had made their wealth in a largely free market. More and more legislation came to regulate employers and to transfer their wealth to groups politically favored by government. This further weakened the spirit of self-sufficiency, independent mindedness, and encouraged the creation of huge barriers to starting and operating businesses. Americans became more and more dependent upon their government and the whims of the special interests that came to control that ever more powerful government. Today, government and the education system it dominates insist that we are not really individuals at all. No, we are simply members in some identity group. White males are only capable of thinking like a stereotypical white male does. Black males are only capable of thinking as a stereotypical black male does. Those exceptions, such as Justice Clarence Thomas, Dr. Thomas Sowell, and Professor Walter E. Williams are simply abominations abhorrent to nature and traitors to their group identity. In an interesting twist, it is fine however for a white male to think outside his abhorred group, provided he thinks like one of the approved identity groups. Well, that is true to a fair degree, though there are increasing numbers who now resent such a person's theft of their identity. Overall, our special interest serving government found it very convenient to lump Americans into a few groups so that we might be divided and controlled more readily. This also serves the critically important function of obscuring the fact that the government cannot know us as individuals and cannot do anything but suppress our individuality with its ever-increasing legislation and regulations. People will be less aware of the suppression of their individuality if they have been taught that they only have a group identity. This is a fundamentally collectivist idea. Americans are a self-contradictory group these days. They want less government, but they rarely want to give up any program that currently exists, except for ObamaCare, maybe. They want the government to spend less, except on a few new programs that they want. They are not infrequently willing to break a law they think the government will not notice, but they are eager to create new laws to prevent others from doing anything that might aggravate them. Indeed, Congress is held in super-low regard because it is so often in gridlock, though the last time it was not in gridlock it passed the hated ObamaCare act. Generally, the people believe that a legislature is not doing its job unless it is passing loads of new laws. Now, because I view the only legitimate function of government, as did the Declaration of Independence, as being the protection of the rights of each and every individual to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of personal happiness, I see little need for new laws doing what most new laws have done in recent decades. Most new laws further restrict the freedom of action of at least some Americans, though most laws are aimed at a minority subset of Americans if great harm is to be done to them. Those laws restricting most Americans are usually designed to cause them only a small and largely unnoticed loss, but which in the aggregate allows a substantial transfer of wealth or power to a small, politically favored special interest group. After many decades of following such a "practical" and unprincipled political course, we now have a government that does most Americans far more harm than it does us good. We do presently have a need for much new legislation. We need to repeal decades of laws that have interfered with our natural individual rights. We have far too many laws providing for the theft of the value of the hours many put into productive work. We have far too many restrictions on our freedom of association. We have far too many prohibitions against our exercise of freedom of conscience, which includes, but is not limited to, our freedom of religion. We have ever more constraints on freedom of speech and of the press. Our property rights are in frequent jeopardy, whether it be to use our property for production or to keep it from being confiscated because some law enforcement arm of government imagines that it might have been used in a crime or even only that some action involving it fits a pattern of some organized crime or terrorist action, however implausibly that may apply to this particular property owner.

### Limits Bad/Constraints Bad

#### A freedom of conscience is necessary to a productive life - that’s an impact turn to the attempt to set limits to what should be debated

Anderson 4 - Charles Anderson, PhD, President and Principal Scientist at Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Anderson Materials Evaluation, Inc., Case Western Reserve University, November 29, 2004 [“Freedom of Conscience”, <https://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/p/freedom-of-conscience.html>, An Objectivist Individualist] rpg

In this note I will develop the reasons why society and each of us as individuals should allow others the widest possible range of freedom of conscience. The burden of proof lies heavily upon us and society to provide the most rational of reasons for any use of force on our part directed at limiting another’s freedom of conscience and of their developing their subsequent values in their own life. Everyone has the right to develop and manage their own life. Everyone is inherently unique and individual, so it is inappropriate to think that we can evaluate their choices and values for them. We would not be willing to accept their unhappiness upon our lives should we make a mistake with theirs. Only each of us as an individual has the right to stake his life and happiness upon his choices of values and his choice of actions to attain and secure his values. Yet, maybe as a consequence of this lack of consequences for making the wrong choices for others, many people seem to relish using their time and effort to prescribe and force choices upon others through societal norms and beyond to making them a matter of law. Meanwhile, they leave their own personal affairs under-attended. Curiously, some of these people point at each other’s under-attended affairs and note them as proof that others are incapable of caring for themselves, so the busybodies, acting through government, must do it for them. Of course, the affairs of others often seem simple to the casual observer. Yet, human interactions are extremely complex. Most of us appreciate this better in our own lives then when we assess the life choices of others. When each of us knows as much as we do about the complete fabric of our own life (to borrow a phrase from David Kelley), we cannot help but to see a huge complexity of activities and relationships. It is a never-ending intellectual and emotional challenge to handle it all. But this is what makes life so rich with value and interest. It also means that errors of choice are inevitable and not infrequent. The exercise of freedom of conscience allows each of us the means to discover, develop, and alter our lives until we achieve the conditions that make us happy. Each of us is necessarily experimenting with his own life. This gives others some opportunity to observe the results and to either follow or avoid those paths those paths of others that they believe may be right or wrong for them. This may be a lifesaver or it may at least make others more efficient in finding the right path for their lives. Their evaluation of our actions in living our life does not necessarily affirm or deny the choices we have made for ourselves, however. Our choices are good, bad, or neutral in the context of our very rich individual lives and largely based upon a long string of daily choices and our differing natures. What is right for me may or may not be right for you. Now, you may be concerned that I am arguing for an ethics of moral relativism. I am not. Yet, I do not think we should confuse good and bad choices with moral principles. There are moral principles appropriate for a relatively solitary life in nature. These change somewhat for a man in a primitive society where the use of force is rampant with one tribe taking anything they can get from another by force. Again, the appropriate moral principles change for men living in a relatively free and civilized society. While our primary moral values are always based on the value of our own life and our need to use our ability to reason to maintain our life, the complete code of principles that we each have is very dependent upon our personal circumstance. A major component is determined by the kind of society in which we live. It is very important to understand that as individuals we are each so complex that we need still more moral principles to help us make the choices that apply only to our own personal pursuit of our own values. My detailed values differ from yours. My complete code of ethics starts with an Objectivist ethics, but it adds many, many principles that help me to cope with the complex choices in my own life. Some of these additional principles may be unique to me and probably are. Similarly, I expect that most thinking people will have some principles important to them that are not to me. If I try to prescribe what your choices should be in life, I may very well be at odds with some of your important moral principles. I would be messing with your freedom of conscience. You see, our freedom of conscience is as tied to our freedom of action and choice as our mind is tied to our body. Each individual needs freedom of conscience for the following reasons: \* to formulate an idea - Simple ideas do not require that a society recognize freedom of conscience, but life and our world are complicated. Complex ideas or those standing on an understanding of complex issues of reality need to be developed by many thinkers who can make their ideas known to one another without fear of suffering violence (or excommunication, in some circumstances) \* to experiment with that idea and its consequences - Many ideas require that experiments be performed to test them and to illuminate the productive paths for further development. If an idea is important, whether it deals exclusively with physics or it involves the interaction of many human beings, experimentation must in many ways be used to test theory, or fallible man can and will go far astray over time. \* to evaluate the results - When an idea is put to use, it is essential that many minds are free to evaluate and compare their evaluations so that more effort may be put in those directions which are fruitful and less into those that are deadends. \* to redevelop the idea or abandon it as a failure - This is the result of evaluating the truth and consequences of ideas. Those that have problems may be corrected or must be abandoned. \* to improve upon an accepted idea - The idea that is evaluated as resting substantially upon a true perception of reality and has demonstrable good consequences, may often be improved upon by others with other viewpoints and experiences either now or in the future. \* to question an accepted idea - It is usually an unpopular role to be the one who questions the truth of a generally accepted idea. But generally accepted ideas are often wrong and have very harmful consequences. The one who questions the bad idea performs a very valuable service to everyone else. We should all be very willing to provide for the general right of freedom of conscience in order that we can enjoy the great benefit the questioner of the generally accepted idea provides us in helping us to see the rut we are in.

### Interrogation Key

#### Interrogating the methods in which knowledge is imparted to students is necessary - it’s a prior question to any of their solvency claims.

Peikoff 14 - Leonard Peikoff, PhD from NYU in Philosophy, founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. 2014 [“Why Johny Can’t Think”, Ayn Rand Institute] rpg

With that brief orientation, I do need to say a word to motivate you to read this book. (Chapter 2 will make clear why I think it is important to do so.) The primary beneficiaries of a book on the philosophy of education are parents and teachers, those concerned directly with children. If you are a teacher, it should be obvious why this book is of value to you. This is your life work, training children in something. It is assumed that you want to know in what and for what purpose. If a teacher is anything other than the lowest hack, it is essential that he or she have this knowledge. If you are a parent, this material is crucial because parents are the ones responsible for their child's maturation. You cannot just accept what the teacher says, particularly today. You have to know: Are they equipping my child properly or are they harming him? Are they giving him the essentials he needs to develop properly? What are the essentials? If he is having trouble in school, is that his problem or is that the fault of the school? What are the schools doing, and is that what they should be doing? A philosophy of education, in short, is essential to being a proper parent; otherwise, you are merely turning your child over to blind chance. Even if you happen to have good teachers, you have to supplement their work at home in order to enhance your child's ability to succeed. There are two other groups that I think can benefit. First, any- body who wants to communicate, teach, or persuade others of specific things—a husband and a wife, an employer and an employee, a speech- maker, a politician—will find the proper methods of teaching applicable. This book is partly theory, but largely practical tips and advice on communication and teaching. From that point Of view, anyone other than a hermit could benefit. Finally, I think you can benefit even if you are not in any of these categories. This information can provide you with a standard of self-evaluation. If you know a proper philosophy of education, you can look at yourself and say, "How was I educated? Did my parents and teachers give me what I needed for mature life? If not, can I supply the lack, myself, now?" If you know the standard that one ~~man~~ requires by his nature, you can begin to judge your own case and remedy any deficiency you might observe. In that sense, a philosophy of education is like a checklist for your own readiness to face the tasks of life. The pure philosophy—metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, poli- is standard Objectivism but the application to education is my tics— own. (I had very little discussion through the years with Ayn Rand on this particular subject. Clearly, I do not believe I have made any false applications, but I do not want Miss Rand saddled with the responsibility.) If education is instruction in the powers necessary for life, what are those powers and for what kind of life? I have to give specific Objectivist content; otherwise, the topic is simply too broad to guide us in any meaningful direction. A proper theory of education, like a proper theory of ethics, must tell you specifically how to function on earth. It cannot be just ambiguous, floating abstractions. At the very least, it has to tell you two things: how to instruct (method) and what to instruct (content). If a theory doesn't tell you that much, it is just worthless verbiage.

## Alt Solvency

### Ethics

#### Objectivism provides the best ethical framework for maximizing the utility for every involved party.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

The existence of a volitional, living organism is a precondition of the science of ethics. Telling an individual what he should do is pointless if he has no choice of how to act. But Ayn Rand does not take the need for a science of ethics for granted (for Objectivism’s ethics see Peikoff, 1991; Rand, 1964). She begins by asking the fundamental question: why does man need a code of ethics? The answer, she holds, rests precisely in the fact that man is a certain kind of living organism. A living organism’s life is conditional: its continued existence depends upon it reaching certain goals that are set by its specific nature (a gazelle, for instance, must obtain grass to live, a lion must obtain gazelles or the like to live). The organism’s life, in other words, is the standard that determines what goals it must reach and what it must avoid, what is a value and disvalue to it: the grass (as food) is a value to the gazelle, but not to the lion. “It is only the concept of ‘Life,’ ” Rand states in a crucial identification, “that makes the concept of ‘Value’ possible” (Rand, 1964, p. 17). For animals other than man, the standard of value is built-in to their actions: within the range of their power, they act automatically to pursue the goals needed to further their lives. The same is not true for man. He can act as his own destroyer. He must choose to hold his life as his standard of value. And even if he makes this choice, he must discover how – which values, goals and actions are necessary – to sustain his life.¶ By the nature of reality and man’s nature as a living organism, ethics is needed to teach man how to live successfully. The only objective standard of value, Rand shows, is man’s life, which means each individual’s life. Thus does Rand refute Hume’s view that you cannot get an “ought” from an “is.” Man’s nature, what he is, determines what he ought to do – if he chooses to live. Life is the ultimate standard in ethics. If a man chooses not to live (ignoring here people with painful incurable illnesses who might rationally want to end the suffering), then he has rejected reality (including his nature) and there is nothing more to say (Rand, 1982, pp. 95–101).¶ Since the purpose of morality is to teach a man how to live, the individual is the proper beneficiary of his moral action. Thus Rand advocates egoism as against altruism. Altruism mean’s “other-ism,” the sacrifice of oneself to other men. A moral code that tells an individual to sacrifice himself to others tells him to disregard his life, to renounce his own values, to value his own destruction – which is a contradiction in terms. (An egoist might properly risk his life for someone or something he values if his life would have no meaning to him without that value; see Rand, 1964, pp. 43–49.)¶ Because reason is man’s method of forming and validating concepts, that is, his means of gaining knowledge, and because knowledge enables man to achieve the values necessary to live, reason is man’s basic means of survival. Thus Objectivism advocates rational egoism.¶ The standard of value of the Objectivist ethics – the standard by which one judges what is good or evil – is man’s life, or: that which is required for man’s survival qua man. Since reason is man’s basic means of survival, that which is proper to the life of a rational being is the good; that which negates, opposes or destroys it is the evil (Rand, 1964, p. 23). The cardinal virtue in Objectivism – the fundamental method by which man obtains his values and lives – is rationality. “The virtue of Rationality means the recognition and acceptance of reason as one’s only source of knowledge, one’s only judge of values and one’s only guide to actions” (Rand, 1964, p. 25).¶ Other virtues, all of which are implicit in the virtue of rationality, are: honesty (the refusal to fake reality), integrity (loyalty to one’s rational judgment in action; see also Becker, 1998), independence (taking responsibility for one’s own thinking and for sustaining one’s existence), productiveness (creating the material objects required to fulfill one’s needs), justice (rationality applied to judgments of and actions toward other men), and pride (moral ambitiousness). All the virtues pertain to the proper relationship between consciousness and existence, mind and reality. Note that in Objectivism, the individual is the unit of moral value. This stems most fundamentally from the Objectivist metaphysics. Only the individual exists as a real, independent entity. This is validated through sense perception. A group or collective is not an entity but an abstraction, a collection of individuals. Thus there can be no moral principles that pertain to a group separate from moral principles that apply to each individual member.¶ Objectivism also totally rejects the “morality” of hedonism, the mindless indulgence of one’s whims or emotions. Since emotions stem from one’s implicit value judgments (Peikoff, 1991), the doctrine of hedonism tells people, in effect: value whatever you already happen to value. This is an empty doctrine, because it does not tell people what to value. And man cannot sustain his life long-range if he engages in mindless action. For similar reasons, Objectivism rejects pragmatism: do whatever seems to “work” in the short run. There is no standard in pragmatism by which to define what “works” other than emotions. For Objectivism morality is not doing whatever one happens to feel like doing, it is identifying and then doing what is actually in one’s long-range interest as a human being. Adhering to the dictates of reason is in one’s self-interest; rejecting reason is not. The anti-rational is the anti-life.¶ Objectivism also rejects utilitarianism: the greatest good for the greatest number. “Utilitarianism is a union of hedonism and Christianity. The first teaches man to love pleasure; the second, to love his neighbor. The union consists of teaching man to love his neighbor’s pleasure” (Peikoff, 1982, p. 122). This doctrine is clearly based on altruism and collectivism; the minority must be sacrificed to the whims of the majority. But a majority does not gain moral stature by dint of its numbers. Utilitarianism is a recipe for amorality and cannibalism, not for the survival and well being of the individual.¶ Finally, in Objectivism there is no dichotomy between the (truly) practical and the moral. The purpose of morality is not to sacrifice your life in order to serve God or society, but to live successfully and happily, long range, on earth. Consider, by way of example, one of the virtues inherent in rationality. Honesty means the refusal to fake reality. The justification of honesty is not that it benefits society but that it benefits the individual. The first consequence of trying to fake reality is to sabotage one’s own mind. Instead of using one’s rational faculty to perceive that which exists, the dishonest person uses it to deny or evade that which exists. This will make him, in principle, unable to deal with existence. The second consequence is that dishonesty will lead him to take actions in defiance of reality. The third consequence is that the results of his actions, in the end, will undermine his life and well being. Consider something as simple as a person who is planning on spending money. If he refuses to consider the amount of money he actually has to spend – focusing only on what he wants to buy – he will buy things he cannot afford and end up deeply in debt or bankrupt. If he pays with a bad check, he could even end up in jail. Honesty – regardless of his feelings – is in an individual’s rational self-interest (Locke & Woiceshyn, 1995). Objectivists are practical but they are not pragmatists. They believe in moral absolutes – because reality itself is absolute. It is what it is and cannot be changed by one’s whims – or one’s words.

### Politics

#### Objectivism provides the best political framework for create social coherence and order - also, our economic policies are better and more effective than yours.

Locke and Ghate 2003 - Edwin A. Locke (born January 5, 1938) is an American psychologist and a pioneer in goal-setting theory. He is a retired Dean’s Professor of Motivation and Leadership at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, College Park. He was also affiliated with the Department of Psychology. Onkar Ghate is a senior fellow and chief content officer at the Ayn Rand Institute. He is the Institute’s resident expert on Objectivism and serves as its senior trainer and editor. He has taught philosophy for over ten years at the Institute’s Objectivist Academic Center. 2003 [“OBJECTIVISM: THE PROPER ALTERNATIVE TO POSTMODERNISM”, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 21, 251–280] rpg

Socially, a man’s survival requires that he have the freedom to follow his reason and to benefit from his actions. This means that in a proper society the initiation of physical force must be prohibited (fraud is a form of force): to coerce a man is to negate his rational judgment and thus his means of survival. Politically, freedom to act one one’s own judgment is secured by upholding the rights of the individual: the right to life, liberty (earned) property and the pursuit of happiness. Far from being a Western prejudice, the concept of individual rights is derived from the nature of man and identifies the precondition of his survival in a political society. The concept of rights rests most directly on the concepts of reason and egoism. In a social context rights protect man’s freedom to use his rational faculty in his own self-interest. Individual rights are incompatible with all forms of statism, including Nazism, Communism, socialism, militarism, monarchy, theocracy, oligarchy, tribalism, the welfare state, and democracy (in the Greek sense of unlimited majority rule).¶ The proper function of government amounts to only one thing: to protect individual rights, using force only in retaliation against those who have initiated its use against others.¶ Economically, the system based on individual rights is: capitalism. Capitalism is the social system in which all property is privately owned and men deal with one another only through voluntary trade. Anti-capitalist forms of government, such as socialism or communism or fascism, destroy the mind’s ability to function and replace it with government coercion. It is no accident but a perfect expression of the law of causality that the primary consequences of statism in all its forms are stagnation, mass poverty and death.¶ Postmodernists typically attack capitalism and harbor sympathies for socialism although, because of their relativist premises, they lack Marx’s moral fervor and moral confidence (however misguided). Postmodernists are more likely simply to make snide comments to the effect: How can anyone justify a hierarchy of authority or vast individual differences in wealth? The implication of course is that the “social arrangements” under capitalism are arbitrary, based on little more than the lust for power of Western, white males. Objectivism, by contrast, views the capitalist system as objective and moral – a logical consequence of enacting the principles of freedom and justice. In a free society, those who are more productive will usually be able to earn more money that those who are less productive. They attain positions with more authority and responsibility than others in business firms because of their greater ability and drive. The productive do not get rich under capitalism by stealing from the poor; they get rich by creating wealth that did not exist before. They make more money, in short, because they earn it. Capitalism is the true system of “social justice.”¶ As to the “exploitation” of the poor, we will quote Ayn Rand (1992, pp. 978–980):¶ When you live in a rational society, where men are free to trade, you receive an incalculable bonus: the material value of your work is determined not only by your effort, but by the effort of the best productive minds who exist in the world around you. When you work in a modern factory, you are paid, not only for your labor, but for all the productive genius which has made that factory possible: for the work of the industrialist who built it, for the work of the investor who saved the money to risk on the untried and the new, for the work of the engineer who designed the machines of which you are pushing the levers, for the work of the inventor who created the product which you spend your time on making, for the work of the scientist who discovered the laws that went into the making of that product...¶ In proportion to the mental energy he spent, the man who creates a new invention receives but a small percentage of his value in terms of material payment, no matter what fortune he makes, no matter what millions he earns. But the man who works as a janitor in the factory producing that invention, receives an enormous payment in proportion to the mental effort his job requires of him. And the same is true of all men between, on all levels of ambition and ability. The man at the top of the intellectual pyramid contributes the most to all those below him, but gets nothing except his material payment, receiving no intellectual bonus from others to add to the value of his time. The man at the bottom who, left to himself, would starve in his hopeless ineptitude, contributes nothing to those above him, but receives the bonus of all of their brains. Such is the nature of the “competition” between the strong and the weak of the intellect.¶ Crucially, Objectivism holds that economic and political power are fundamentally different – actually opposites. Political power is the power of physical coercion, the power of the gun. Either one obeys the government, regardless of one’s judgment, or one goes to jail (or worse). Economic power is the power of voluntary trade. Company X, for instance, can offer the customer a certain product at a certain price; but the customer is free to buy it or not to buy it as he judges best. Even a company that ends up dominating a market can do so only by offering a better product or price or service than its competitors, a product customers choose to buy. And the company can only maintain its dominance by continuing to offer more than its competitors. Precisely because it is achieved through voluntary agreements and not physical force, market dominance disappears very rapidly – as IBM, Xerox, GM, Ford, Kodak and others discovered – when a company stagnates.

### AT: Rand Indicts

#### 1. Your indicts don’t link to us - our alternative isn’t “affirm Rand” but affirm some of her political theories - furthermore we read contemporary authors who have filtered out her lewd rhetoric and beliefs.

#### 2. Rand’s theories are applicable to daily life and they have manifested themselves in influential and best-selling works.

Berliner 5 - Michael Berliner is the senior advisor to the Ayn Rand Archives. He was the executive director of the Ayn Rand Institute from its founding to January 2000. 2 FEB 2005 [“Ayn Rand: A Legacy of Reason and Freedom”, <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2005/02/ayn-rand-a-legacy-of-reason-and-freedom/>] rpg

Born 100 years ago in Holy Mother Russia and educated under the Soviets, Ayn Rand became the quintessential American writer and philosopher, upholding the supreme value of the individual’s life on earth. She herself led a “rags to riches” life, wrote best-selling novels that championed individualism, and developed a philosophy of reason that validates the American spirit of achievement and independence. The story of Ayn Rand’s life is, in the words of the Oscar-nominated documentary Ayn Rand: A Sense of Life: “a life more compelling than fiction.” Born February 2, 1905, she wrote her first fiction at age 8, when she also showed signs of being an intellectual crusader, vowing to refute a newspaper article claiming that school was the sole source of a child’s ideals. A year later she decided to become a writer: inspired by the hero of a children’s story, who embodied “intelligence directed to a practical purpose,” she had a “blinding picture” of people–not as they are but as they could be. In high school and college, she discovered two figures whom she never ceased to admire: Victor Hugo, for “the grandeur, the heroic scale, the plot inventiveness” of his stories, and Aristotle, as “the arch-realist and the advocate of the validity of man’s mind.” Escaping the tyranny and poverty of the U.S.S.R., she came to America in 1926, officially for a brief visit with relatives. A chance meeting with her favorite American director, Cecil B. DeMille, resulted in jobs as a movie extra and then a junior screenwriter. After periods of near-starvation, she sold her first play to Broadway and her first novel, We the Living, set in the Soviet tyranny she had escaped. With her first best-seller, The Fountainhead in 1943, she presented her ideal man, individualist architect Howard Roark. But it was, she said, “only an overture” to her magnum opus, Atlas Shrugged in 1957, a mystery story about the role of the mind in man’s existence. With Atlas Shrugged her career as a fiction writer ended, but her career as a philosopher had just begun. Her philosophy–Objectivism–upholds objective reality (as opposed to supernaturalism), reason as man’s only means of knowledge (as opposed to faith or skepticism), free will (as opposed to determinism–by biology or environment), and an ethics of rational self-interest (as opposed to the sacrifice of oneself to others or others to self). The only moral political system, she maintained, is laissez-faire capitalism (as opposed to the collectivism of socialism, fascism, or the welfare state), because it recognizes the inalienable right of an individual to act on the judgment of his own mind. Your life, she held, belongs to you and not to your country, God or your neighbors. Ayn Rand understood that to defend the individual she must penetrate to the root: his need to use reason to survive. “I am not primarily an advocate of capitalism,” she wrote in 1971, “but of egoism; and I am not primarily an advocate of egoism, but of reason. If one recognizes the supremacy of reason and applies it consistently, all the rest follows.” This radical view put her at odds with conservatives, whom she vilified for their attempts to base capitalism on faith and altruism. Advocating a government to protect the individual’s right to his property, she was not a liberal (or an anarchist). Advocating the indispensability of philosophy, she was not a libertarian. Despite being outside the cultural mainstream, her novels became best-sellers and her books sell more today than ever before–half a million copies per year. There is a reason that Atlas Shrugged placed second in a Library of Congress survey about most influential books. There is a reason that her works are considered life-altering by so many readers. She had an exalted view of man and created inspiring fictional heroes. A sui generis philosopher, who looked at the world anew, Ayn Rand has long puzzled the intellectual establishment. Academia has usually met her views with antagonism or avoidance, unable to fathom that she was an individualist but not a subjectivist, an absolutist but not a dogmatist. And they have thus ignored her original solutions to such seemingly intractable problems as how to ground values in facts. But even in academia her ideas are finding more acceptance, e.g., university fellowships and a subgroup within the American Philosophical Association to study Objectivism. Ayn Rand left a legacy in defense of reason and freedom that serves as a guidepost for the American spirit–especially pertinent today when America and what it stands for are under assault.

# Aff

## Impact Turns

### Privatization Bad

#### Education cannot and should not be privatized - it is an example of market failure because the student is the consumer but not the decision-maker.

Strauss 16 - Valerie Strauss is an education blogger and reporter for education policy at the Washington Post. July 14, 2016 [“Why the movement to privatize public education is a very bad idea”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2016/07/14/why-the-movement-to-privatize-public-education-is-a-very-bad-idea/?utm_term=.fbe3f4396042>, Washington Post] rpg

A) My decision to write this book goes back a decade. I had written a thesis on for-profit school management for a master’s degree in economics and education at Teachers College, Columbia University. My adviser, Henry M. Levin, recommended I turn the thesis into a book. Though daunted by the prospect of doing so, I forged ahead because I was and remain convinced that advocates of the free market had taken their argument too far. Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman and their many disciples were certainly right that the free market efficiently allocates resources in many domains. But they were wrong to contend it does so in all domains. In the wake of the fall of the Berlin Wall, this is the argument that won over so many policymakers. All government services — from waste collection and postal delivery to corrections and schooling — laissez-faire exponents contended, could and should be outsourced to private providers. This outsourcing is what defines privatization. Where there is sufficient transparency for proper contract enforcement, the free market works beautifully, and privatization thus makes good sense. We don’t begrudge a restaurateur or bookseller a profit because we as consumers can easily judge the quality of goods, service and ambiance provided and, thus, decide whether to return. Likewise, privatizing the delivery of discrete goods and services is justifiable. For a school district, in this light, to outsource bus transportation or textbook provision to for-profit enterprises is understandable and efficient. However, where there is insufficient transparency for proper contract enforcement, the free market fails. Laissez-faire enthusiasts neglected to differentiate discrete (that is, easily measurable) from complex services. In the case of schooling, which is a classic complex service, the direct consumer is a child, who is in little position to judge whether classes are being properly taught. The parent, taxpayer and legislator are at a necessary distance. And standardized testing as a check on quality is rife with problems. It isn’t merely that teachers and principals under tremendous pressure to raise test scores can correct wrong answers on bubble sheets, as documented in Atlanta most notably, but they can also give students more time to complete tests and lend help in the process. More fundamentally, heavy reliance on standardized testing leads to teaching to the test, which means crowding out instruction in subjects that aren’t tested, particularly art, music, crafts and play, which are fundamental to a well-rounded education. Predictions on Wall Street a generation ago that for-profit school managers — educational management organizations (EMOs), to be precise — could do a far better job in managing schools than municipalities and would, thus, be running 10 to 20 percent of the nation’s K-12 public schools by 2010 were way off. EMOs by that time would be running 0.7 percent of the nation’s K-12 public schools. Wall Street underestimated the challenge of managing public schools and overestimated the appeal of EMOs to parents and taxpayers. Investors in firms such as Edison Schools — launched in 1992, taken public by Merrill Lynch in 1999 and running 133 schools (including 20 in Philadelphia alone) by 2002 — accordingly got crushed, as I explain in my book. Yet Wall Street was implicitly right that policymakers would embrace a bottom-line approach to assessing school quality and favor substantial choice for parents. The bottom-line approach has meant annual testing in reading and math in grades three through eight and one year at the secondary level. Choice has meant a proliferation of nonprofit charter schools. We started with two in Minnesota in 1992. We now have nearly 7,000 across 41 states and the District of Columbia. Whether such outsourcing to nonprofit school managers has been wise is another matter. Q) Please carry on with that thought, whether it has been wise to turn over schools to nonprofit managers. There are some who argue that even nonprofit charters are part of the privatization movement because they do not have to operate like public institutions in terms of transparency and accountability to the public. And some courts and labor boards have said they were in effect private institutions for certain purposes. What do you think of this sort of thinking? A) Privatization takes the form of nonprofit as well as for-profit school management, as privatization technically means outsourcing the provision of government services to independent operators, whether nonprofit or for-profit. Insufficient transparency and, thus, accountability can become problems. While nonprofit charter operators must file 990s with the IRS documenting expenses and salaries, for instance, many are less detailed in their reportage than they should be. Moreover, these charters report only indirectly, if at all, to elected school board members. Yet there are far greater issues with outsourcing school management to nonprofit charter operators: First, this outsourcing generates the atomization of school districts, meaning the diminishment of neighborhood schools and the civic involvement such neighborhood affiliation involves; second, this atomization makes for navigational challenges for many parents, who either have a hard time finding the right school for their children or getting them there day after day when the school is across town; third, this atomization translates into “good schools” and “bad schools,” with students who can’t succeed in the “good schools” concentrated in the “bad schools,’ which are often default neighborhood schools, where learning can become far harder given the negative effects struggling students can have on other students. In sum, such outsourcing leads to opportunities at high-performing schools for some students but leaves many others behind. Privatization accordingly amounts to a flawed response to state failure, not a solution. The solution calls for investing the resources necessary to make all neighborhood schools solid in the way all neighborhood schools are solid in middle- and upper-class suburbs, with well-paid teachers, good working conditions and smaller classes. But we have to go further than that. We have to invest in quality preschool, with college-educated teachers, so children show up to school ready to learn. We have decades of evidence of the positive impact of quality preschool. It’s expensive, but only in the short run. We likewise must invest in school-associated medical, dental and counseling services, which are also expensive but only in the short run. Privatization has brought many bright, dedicated agents of change, but it diverts us from addressing our state failure squarely.

#### Privatization of education will result in diverted tax dollars for school choice, exacerbating inequality

Pelto 17 - Jonathan W. Pelto is an American politician from the state of Connecticut. A member of the Democratic Party, he served in the Connecticut House of Representatives. 02/10/17 [“Beware of Trump and DeVos’ grand plan to privatize public education”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/education/318948-beware-of-trump-and-devos-grand-plan-to-privatize-public>, The Hill] rpg

As Fox Business News reported, DeVos told a group in 2015, “Let the education dollars follow each child, instead of forcing the child to follow the dollars. This is pretty straightforward. And it’s how you go from a closed system to an open system that encourages innovation. People deserve choices and options,” Although critics point out, the nation’s public schools are already underfunded and vouchers and other privatization programs further undermine the ability of public schools to provide students with the comprehensive educational opportunities they need and deserve, the Trump administration is likely to “go all in” with the effort to redirect public resources to privately owned and operated school settings. These privatization efforts will probably include education savings accounts and school vouchers, either paid for directly with tax dollars or funded through a system of tax credits. Under an Education Savings Account program, parents who withdraw their children from public school are given stipends that are deposited into government-authorized savings accounts. Parents can then use those funds to pay for private school tuition and fees Alternatively, parents are given a School Voucher that they can then use to direct public funds to a selected private or parochial school. In this case, the funds meant for paying for the child’s public school education follows that child to the private school. According to the pro-privatization advocacy group, Ed Choice, about 400,000 children in 29 states attend schools with the help of vouchers. In many of the existing situations, school vouchers are limited to families with lower incomes and schools that accept vouchers must meet a series of mandatory academic standards. To fund their voucher system, Trump and DeVos may look to have the program funded out of federal dollars or they may seek to utilize tax-credit to fund the vouchers. Tax-credit vouchers, also called, scholarships, allow taxpayers, often businesses, to receive full or partial tax credits when they donate to nonprofits that provide private school scholarships. While a school voucher proposal is likely, Critics say that DeVos’ voucher plan would exacerbate educational inequality, that “voucher programs do not work to improve student achievement”, and “voucher programs and charter school expansion drain both money and social capital from the traditional public schools, creating even more of an imbalanced, two-tiered system.” The problem is that undermining the nation’s public education system is exactly what Trump and DeVos are trying to do.

### Universalism Bad

#### Pure universality or relativism led to extreme viewpoints that destroy society - prefer the permutation as a method of combining the best parts of both.

Daraweesh et al 15 - Fuad Al‐Daraweesh, PhD at the University of Toledo, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, and Dr. Dale T. Snauwaert, Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education, Department Interim Director, CNDE Director, In Factis Pax Founding Editor, 2015 [“Human Rights Education Beyond Universalism and Relativism”, Palgrave McMillian] rpg

It will be argued that there are inherent problems with both cultural relativism and a universalism based in metaphysical realism, rational intuitionism, essentialism, and Kantian moral constructivism. In turn, it will be argued that a “freestanding” universal scope of human rights is an alternative conception of a culturally sensitive universalism that solves the inherent problems of both metaphysical, essentialist-based universalism and cultural relativism. It will be argued that this freestanding universalism takes the form of an overlapping human rights consensus, and this form of universalism has the potential for achieving cross-cultural legitimacy and stability. 1.2 Ethical Universalism as Grounded in Metaphysical Realism and Essentialism Historically, the universal scope of human rights has its origins in metaphysical realism and rational intuitionism. This tradition maintains that there exists a universal independent moral order that can be comprehended by human rationality, and, when comprehended, this moral order provides individuals with a legitimate and justifiable claim to the moral truth. The moral order is independent in the sense that it exists in itself separate from human interpretation. Yet it is accessible to rational intuition (Finnis, 1980; Nussbaum, 1992). On the grounds of metaphysical and epistemological realism, the ancient Greeks and Romans (the Stoics) claim that a fundamental symmetry exists between the human mind and the cosmic order. From this perspective, human consciousness is a microcosm of the universe. Universal patterns or archetypes exist and structure the cosmos, including the mind. Given this basic structural symmetry, by comprehending the universal moral order the mind and human conduct would be ordered and fulfilled in accordance with the imperatives of that order. By knowing one’s self, one could come to the knowledge of an independent moral order, aligning one’s self to its order. Hence, the cornerstone of ancient philosophy, and its subsequent manifestations throughout the history of philosophy and theology, were the Socratic injunctions: “know thyself” and “knowledge is virtue” (Foucault, 2005; Hadot, 2002; Hadot and Davidson, 1995; Hadot and Marcus, 1998; Jaeger, 1943; Nussbaum, 1992; Tarnas, 1991). Modern moral theory calls into question metaphysical realism and rational intuitionism, while attempting to preserve a universal moral scope. This attempt is perhaps best exemplified in Immanuel Kant’s moral constructivism. Kant puts forth the idea that ethical principles originate in and are expressions of the nature of practical reason and the conception of the person as autonomous. Given that the capacity for practical reason is universally found in all human beings, the principles of right are the moral imperatives given to one’s self as morally autonomous, reasonable persons (Kant, 1964). As John Rawls (1993) points out: Constitutive autonomy says that the so-called independent order of values does not constitute itself but is constituted by the activity, actual or ideal, of practical (human) reason itself. I believe this, or something like it, is Kant’s view. His constructivism is deeper and goes to the very existence and constitution of the order of values. This is part of his transcendental idealism. (p. 99) From this perspective, practical reason and, in turn, moral value and principle are grounded in the universal rational autonomy of the person. A third potential grounding of universalism is the idea of essentialism, the proposition that there exists a basic good, grounded in an essential human nature, that is universal. Various forms of essentialism (e.g., utilitarianism, moral perfectionism, civic humanism) have a teleological structure in the sense that they posit a universal human good and maintain that the realization of that good is what is universally right (Rawls and Freeman, 2007; Rawls and Herman, 2000). As discussed below, when taking into consideration the social conditions of cultural pluralism these philosophical attempts at universalism do not survive critical scrutiny. 1.3 Critique of Metaphysical-Based Universalism The rise of cultural moral relativism proceeds from a critique of universalism grounded in metaphysical and epistemological realism. There are two general approaches to this critique, one descriptive and the other normative. The descriptive approach is grounded in nominalism and “perspectivism.” This critique leads to cultural relativism, the position that the existence and substance of rights, or any other moral principle, ideal, and/ or norm, is contingent upon the cultural belief systems of the people in question. From this perspective, morality is grounded in and emerges out of cultural, communal traditions. The descriptive approach to questioning of universalism began in the fourteenth century with the nominalism of William of Ockham and culminates in Friedrich Nietzsche’s perspectivism. Ockham’s basic claim was that universals, including the universal moral order, are not real, nor independent; they are constructions of the mind. For Ockham, universals are conceptual schema linguistically structured. David Hume argued in a similar fashion in the eighteenth century that the mind only experiences impressions of the world, and we, in turn, project order and meaning onto those impressions. However, there is no inherent pattern or order in the world that exists independently of the mind (Snauwaert, 1999; Tarnas, 1991). Kant attempted to rescue universalism from this critique through his constructivist epistemology and moral theory. Kant concurs that the mind is capable of knowing only the phenomenal (one’s own mental impressions); however, he maintains that reliable knowledge of the world is possible. Kant maintains that the mind does not passively receive sense data; the mind constructs those data in terms of innate cognitive categories of the mind. Thus, we know the world as it is constructed by our minds. We can know reality, however, to the extent that the world corresponds with the structure of the mind. The innate structures of the mind mirror the order of the world. This epistemological perspective is a modification of metaphysical realism, a modification of the idea that there exists a basic symmetry between the mind and the universe. In building on the perspective of Ockham and Hume, Friedrich Nietzsche refutes Kant’s modified position on the grounds of perspectivism, which posits that what we know is constituted by the socially constructed position or perspective we assume—a type of cognitive relativism. There is no objective truth, no symmetry or correspondence with the world per se, only diverse perspectives and corresponding interpretations (Lukes, 2008). Through socialization, the individual forms a representation of his or her cultural worldview, and interprets experience of the world through this worldview. The structure of the mind is neither innate nor universal; rather the mind is a product of historically contingent social and cultural environments. The world from this perspective is thereby socially constructed. This position is fundamentally different from metaphysical realism and Kant’s constructivism, in that, instead of our mental conceptual schema accurately mirroring or representing reality, they represent a socially constructed interpretation of reality. From this perspective, the empirical existence of cultural pluralism, a diversity of cultural worldviews, results in a relative array of cultural interpretations of reality, not a singular, universal perspective. This descriptive approach to the critique of metaphysical realism yields cognitive relativism or perspectivism. It has been argued that the existence of a plurality of cultural worldviews and cognitive relativism automatically results in the validity of moral relativism; that is, moral norms and customs are relative to empirically based, descriptive cultural pluralism. However, the empirical existence of cultural plurality alone is not sufficient to invalidate the normative claim of universalism; a normative critique must be offered as well (Lukes, 2008; Nussbaum, 1992; Rawls and Freeman, 1999). Moral relativism, in this context, refers to the position that the existence and substance of rights, or any other moral principle, ideal, and/or norm, is contingent upon cultural belief systems. From this perspective, morality is grounded in and emerges out of cultural traditions and is thereby pluralistic and culturally relative. This ethical perspective is developed within the communitarian tradition of moral and social thought. An example of this perspective is Michael Walzer’s theory of the spheres of justice and complex equality.

### Objectivism Bad - Generic

#### The aff employs the educational model of constructivism - that’s net better for a multitude of reasons

Elkind 8 - David Elkind is professor emeritus of Child Development at Tufts University[1] in Medford, Massachusetts. He was formerly professor of Psychology, Psychiatry, and Education at the University of Rochester. Elkind obtained his doctorate at UCLA and then spent a year as David Rapaport's research assistant at the Austen Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. In 1964–65 he was a National Science Foundation Senior Postdoctoral Fellow at Piaget's Institut d'Epistemologie Genetique in Geneva. 30 Jan 2008 [“Response to Objectivism and Education”, The Educational Forum] rpg

At the end of his paper, Carson returned to the comparison between constructivism and objectivism. He portrayed the constructivist as a straw man who does not believe in a reality that exists independently of the self. As pointed out previously, this is an idealistic philosophy far rem oved from constructivism. For Carson, objectivism holds that reason is the only means of attaining true knowledge, and constructivism argues that there are other means. He failed to acknowledge, however, how reasoning can be fallible. His own reasoning about NCLB illustrated how correct logic, if the premises are wrong, can lead to wrong conclusions. His argument that constructivism accepts ways of knowing other than reason was correct. Social consensus is one of the ways we come to agree upon the nature of reality. We also can learn through observation- the phenomenological approach. Carson misrepresents constructivism again when he (2005, 236) claimed, "Constructivism posits that objective knowledge or truth is possible." This is another straw man. The constructivist does not deny objective knowledge or universal truth, but looks to social consensus regarding what is real and what is true. Carson further demonstrated his misunderstanding of constructivism when he asked his students to "construct" an English class. The constructivist teacher would not do this. He also was mistaken when he (2005, 236) claimed that, according to constructivism, "a child's knowledge is equal to that of an adult and that a student is no less an authority on a subject than is a teacher." Perhaps Carson has never read Piaget (1950)- the father of modern constructivism-who described the different levels of reasoning attained by children as they mature. His research and the many replications of his work have demonstrated how children construct different views of the world as they mature. If only an objective reality exists, from where do these ideas come? The constructivist does not deny that a body of socially constructed knowledge exists and needs to be acquired for children to be fully educated. No constructivist expects children to construct algebra, evolution, or language on their own. That would be silly. The constructivist attempts to involve students actively in the learning process. I would not ask students to design an English course. However, I certainly would have them relate, say, a Shakespearean play to current events. In my own teaching, in my introductory course in child development, I have groups of students find a film, book, or television program that illustrates some of the concepts we have covered in class. I am truly amazed at how innovative they are. For example, some students used the film Finding Nemo (Disney 1995) to illustrate father-son relationships. Young people should not be expected to reconstruct all knowledge. In my class, I choose the textbooks and readings, but I have students apply their own understanding to the material presented and make it their own. Dewey (1938) suggested that learning is the "representation of experience." We only truly know something when we represent it in some way and make it our own. That is constructivist education-helping young people make knowledge their own by representing it in their own way. Though Carson rejected constructivism in favor of objectivism, his description of objectivism could well be a definition of the view he criticized at such length. Humankind possesses prior knowledge that informs new knowledge, and that prior knowledge makes the new knowledge meaningful"-Piaget's (1950) assimilation of new schemata to existing schemata. If the prior knowledge is incorrect, eventually new knowledge will conflict with it and people will be forced to update their old knowledge-Piaget's (1950) accommodation of existing schemata to adapt to new schemata. Carson (2005, 238) concluded, "If constructivists believe in an independent reality, then they not only must believe in it, but also must possess an objective method of perceiving it and, therefore, have objective knowledge and truth. There is no middle ground." This is another example of faulty logic that belies the idea that objective knowledge is gained through reason alone. Belief in an independent reality does imply a belief in a common sensory system in all humans, but it does not imply that all reality is known in this way. The proposition suggests a disembodied intelligence acquiring knowledge. However, knowledge-particularly scientific knowledge-is a successive social reconstruction of reality. Knowledge is accepted not because we have an objective method of perceiving reality, but because we have a social method of agreeing upon what reality is. In many ways, Carson's argument reminded me of Professor Gradgrind in Dickens' (1854) HardTimes. He did not want plums on the wallpaper because plums do not grow on walls. Gradgrind wanted the children only to learn only the facts. A middle ground does exist between the idealistic philosophy that suggests all reality is in our heads and the realistic philosophy that says all knowledge of reality comes from the senses. Constructivism is the middle ground-the widely-accepted answer to the nature/nurture controversy. Constructivism is the recognition that reality is a product of human intelligence interacting with experience in the real world. As soon as you include human mental activity in the process of knowing reality, you have accepted constructivism.

#### Our utilization of a constructivist approach is the only way to recognize and deal with the unique needs of each student - objectivism devolves into universalisms that are inapplicable

Vrasidas 2k - Charalambos Vrasidas, Ph.D., Professor & Associate Dean for e-learning, at University of Nicosia; Executive Director, CARDET, 2000 [“CONSTRUCTIVISM VERSUS OBJECTIVISM: IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERACTION, COURSE DESIGN, AND EVALUATION IN DISTANCE EDUCATION”, goo.gl/4JwfsR, International Journal of Educational Telecommunications] rpg

The process of development in a constructivist paradigm does not consist of clearly distinct phases. The three major phases of curriculum development of analysis, design, and evaluation, overlap and they are ongoing (see Figure 3). One of the components of the first phase is content analysis. Content areas do not have strict boundaries since relevancy can be found in multiple disciplines. The teacher can define a major content domain but she cannot limit its scope with arbitrary boundaries. Clear-cut boundaries of relevancy are impossible to set in online courses that use extensively the Web. The interactive nature of the Web allows learners to explore a variety of resources and establish connections with other knowledge domains that are meaningful to them (Dede, 1996; Jonassen, 1996). Context and content are crucial in a constructivist approach and they determine the method and strategies employed in a course. Learning is situated in rich contexts and knowledge gained from a given domain has particular relevance to that domain (Suchman, 1987). Therefore, the goal of constructivist educators is to guide students to think and act like experts (Bednar, Cunningham, Duffy, & Perry, 1992; Brown et al, 1989; Resnick, 1987). What do experts in their domains do in their everyday work? For example, in the online course Telecommunications for learning and instruction, the goal is not to simply teach the basic technology systems, teaching methods, and learning principles. Instead, the goal is to provide students with opportunities to think like experts in making decisions about selecting such systems for appropriate use, structuring learning activities, and employing sound pedagogical strategies in real-life contexts. Figure 3. The constructivist approach to instructional design. Constructivists are also interested in the learner's prior knowledge. However, the emphasis is not on the learner's prior knowledge but on his cognitive processes, self-reflective skills, and the learning process itself. The goal is to cultivate the learners’ thinking and knowledge construction skills. How is knowledge and meaning constructed in given situations? How can the learning environment be arranged to facilitate the learning and knowledge construction processes? Although there is an extensive amount of literature that discusses the idea of learner control in distance education (Baynton, 1992; Moore, 1994), objectivist distance educators do not account for that. Garrison and Baynton (1987) argued that the concept of control consists of three major components: independence, power, and support. Therefore, control should be examined as International Journal of Educational Telecommunications 9 the balancing result among these three factors. Independence is defined as the degree to which the learner is free to make choices within a program. Power refers to the abilities and competencies of the learner to engage in learning experiences. Support refers to the resources available to learners that will enable them to successfully participate in a learning environment. In a constructivist course, the learner has a lot of control over her own learning and is given the opportunity to negotiate content, assignments, procedures, and deadlines. In addition, learners should be provided with the tools, resources, and support necessary to manage their own learning and assigned tasks. The role of the teacher in constructivist settings changes from authority figure to that of a coach and partner in learning. The constructivist teacher does not expect that all students learn the exact same thing. Cziko (1989) argued that it is impossible to control variables such as motivation, intelligence and background knowledge. The course Telecommunications for learning and instruction can have some general prespecified general goals but its structure will be flexible to allow for goals to emerge from the content and student activities. The teacher cannot know in advance all the specific knowledge that each student will construct. What she can know is the broad area of knowledge and provide for opportunities for learners to develop the skills necessary to further explore a given domain.

### Objectivism Bad - STEM

#### Authoritarian models of instruction cause students to reinforce incorrect ideas about the world - they also prevent the teacher from discovering student gaps in understanding

Davis 6 - Dr. Nancy T. Davis, Associate Professor, joined the faculty in 1988 in the Science Education Program. She earned a Bachelor's degree in chemistry education and a M.S. in physical science education from Western Carolina University. She earned her Ph.D in Science Education in 1989 at the University of Georgia. Prior to beginning her doctoral work, Dr. Davis taught middle school science for 11 years. 09 Jul 2006. [“Transitions from objectivism to constructivism in science education”, International Journal of Science Education, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group] rpg

The question of what science content will be taught cannot be divorced from the question of who determines that content. Within the objectivist paradigm the answer to the question of who decides what is to be taught is obviously an 'expert' who is believed to know best. Several problems stem from this authoritarian model. First, who determines who the expert is? Is it a professional scientist, science educator, textbook author, researcher, or curriculum co-ordinator? Second, what specific science content should be taught? Since the knowledge base of most scientific disciplines is growing at an exponential rate, the amount of knowledge required to develop competence and currency within even a narrow field of study becomes problematic (Hurd 1985). ¶ The authoritarian model poses additional problems because mandates of appropriate curriculum content are prepared and levelled across many differing contexts. A Hispanic in downtown Miami is assumed to require the same science content and to learn in the same manner as a Caucasian in rural northern Florida, or an African-American from suburbia. In some states, the same basic science textbooks are adopted throughout, without taking into account the differing cultures and contexts in which students operate. ¶ Many students today do not see the need to learn facts that some remote authority has deemed necessary. Nor do they perceive the relevance of what is being taught. Consequently, schools have alienated learners by isolating the facts from the context from which they arose and in which they are useful. ¶ The authoritarian model also poses problems for the teacher who must interpret from the mandates how to present the concepts and decide when the student has acquired sufficient knowledge to advance to the next topic or course. This model, teacher-as-source-of-knowledge, is prevalent in schools today and places the teacher in a role of omnipotence within the classroom. Students and much of the public assume that teachers have all the answers and look to them for those answers. But, when the objectivist school system fails to produce productive knowledgeable citizens, the blame often falls on the teachers. This model is destined for failure. From a constructivist perspective, the individual learner has a primary role in determining what will be learned. Emphasis is placed on providing students with opportunities to develop skills and knowledge which they can connect with prior knowledge and future utility. Instead of teaching a multitude of facts, processes of thinking and constructing relationships are stressed (Kieren 1988, Steffe 1988). The learner decides with others what learning is important to him or her and means of learning are explored. While working with others, the student solves problems and examines solutions. This view of curriculum is closer to the actual work of scientists. Because the learner determines what makes sense within whatever context he or she is operating and what problems are important, issues or relevancy diminish. Students are able to see the need for learning skills and particular content and can make applications to problems within their particular culture. ¶ The role of the teacher in the science classroom changes within a constructivist paradigm. The teacher becomes more of an investigator, trying to understand how his or her students are constructing knowledge, so opportunities for developing and modifying understanding, making connections and negotiating with others are available. The constructivist teacher realizes that concepts learned today may need to be modified tomorrow, and assists the learner in developing confidence and adaptability. ¶ Teachers operating from this paradigm are learners. Their students do not look at them as all-knowing; they view them as only one source of information. They do not view knowledge as absolute and unchanging; they view it as adaptive and ever changing. They realize there are alternative ways of viewing reality and of solving problems and realize the responsibility for learning is their own. ¶ Evaluation¶ As demands for accountability become more prevalent it becomes necessary to reexamine evaluation practices. Reports abound which criticize the impact of testing on education (Haladyna et al. 1991, Smith 1991). In recent years, testing practices have come under fire for a multitude of problems including minority and gender discrimination, improper reporting procedures, practices of teaching to the tests, and lack of correlation between student's abilities and test performance. Many of the current evaluation techniques and methodologies are based on an objectivist paradigm. Lorsbach et al. (1990) summarize the effect of this paradigm on testing: Questions of validity have been couched within a belief that the purpose of science education was to facilitate student learning of truths and procedures for determining right answers. Accordingly, the technology of testing evolved to determine whether students could reproduce these truths and determine correct answers to problems, (p. 1) Test makers are viewed as having the 'correct' answers and student knowledge is judged against the test makers' knowledge. Prevalent testing practices consist of 'objective' questions designed to remove teacher judgement and subjectivity from the grading. Yet, the teacher or test designer determines the wording and content of the questions asked, and assumes the students will interpret the questions as they were designed. Lorsbach et al. (1990) explain:¶ There is always a chance that a student frames a problem that is different from the problem intended by the teacher. With multiple-choice tests, answers are provided with each question; but if a student frames a problem such that it is different from the problem intended by the teacher or test-writer, then what is a student to do? Failing to find a response that matches a solution, the only recourse is to simply leave the answer blank or guess, (p. 7)¶ Alternative solutions or alternative understandings of words are not considered in assessing the answers, although those solutions may be viable. Objective tests can never reveal what a student knows; they can only reveal how well his or her knowledge matches the testmakers'. ¶ Because matching predetermined objectives is based on an objectivist view, evaluation is a particularly complicated problem for constructivists. Evaluation or assessment of student understanding is a puzzle which is receiving much attention. In summarizing the results of a study of alternative assessment methods Lorsbach et al. report:¶ Teachers who ... have constructivist perspectives on the curriculum are likely to have difficulty in quantifying their evaluations of student learning. There is a need for further research and development on identifying valid and viable ways of assessing student knowledge and assigning meaningful grades, (p. 18)¶ Techniques which attempt to reveal the individual's construction of knowledge are being researched: for example, concept mapping and Vee diagrams (Novak and Gowin 1984), portfolios, performance-based tests and team test-taking approaches are being examined. From a constructivist perspective evaluation of student learning should not be judged only on the specifics of the knowledge, but whether the student can solve the problem posed with a viable solution.

### Ayn Rand Bad

#### Rand believed that the destruction of indigenous peoples by white settlers was justified.

Norton 15 - Ben Norton is a politics reporter and staff writer at AlterNet. OCT 14, 2015 [“Libertarian superstar Ayn Rand defended Native American genocide: “Racism didn’t exist in this country until the liberals brought it up”, <http://www.salon.com/2015/10/14/libertarian_superstar_ayn_rand_defended_genocide_of_savage_native_americans/>, Salon] rpg

Ayn Rand is the patron saint of the libertarian Right. Her writings are quoted in a quasi-religious manner by American reactionaries, cited like Biblical codices that offer profound answers to all of life’s complex problems (namely, just “Free the Market”). Yet, despite her impeccable libertarian bona fides, Rand defended the colonization and genocide of what she called the “savage” Native Americans — one of the most authoritarian campaigns of death and suffering ever orchestrated. “Any white person who brings the elements of civilization had the right to take over this continent,” Ayn Rand proclaimed, “and it is great that some people did, and discovered here what they couldn’t do anywhere else in the world and what the Indians, if there are any racist Indians today, do not believe to this day: respect for individual rights.” Rand made these remarks before the graduating class of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on March 6, 1974, in a little-known Q&A session. Rand’s comments in this obscure Q&A are appearing in full for the first time, here in Salon. “Philosophy: Who Needs It” remains one of Ayn Rand’s most popular and influential speeches. The capitalist superstar delivered the talk at West Point 41 years ago. In the definitive collection of Rand’s thoughts on philosophy, Philosophy: Who Needs It, the lecture was chosen as the lead and eponymous essay. This was the last book Rand worked on before she died; that this piece, ergo, was selected as the title and premise of her final work attests to its significance as a cornerstone of her entire worldview. The Q&A session that followed this talk, however, has gone largely unremembered — and most conveniently for the fervent Rand aficionado, at that. For it is in this largely unknown Q&A that Rand enthusiastically defended the extermination of the indigenous peoples of the Americas. In the Q&A, a man asked Rand: At the risk of stating an unpopular view, when you were speaking of America, I couldn’t help but think of the cultural genocide of Native Americans, the enslavement of Black men in this country, and the relocation of Japanese-Americans during World War II. How do you account for all of this in your view of America? Rand replied insisting that “the issue of racism, or even the persecution of a particular race, is as important as the persecution of individuals.” “If you are concerned with minorities, the smallest minority on Earth is an individual,” she added, before proceeding to blame racism and the mass internment of Japanese-Americans on “liberals.” “Racism didn’t exist in this country until the liberals brought it up,” Rand maintained. And those who defend “racist” affirmative action, she insisted, “are the ones who are institutionalizing racism today.” Although the libertarian luminary expressed firm opposition to slavery, she rationalized it by saying “black slaves were sold into slavery, in many cases, by other black tribes.” She then, ahistorically, insisted that slavery “is something which only the United States of America abolished.” Massive applause followed Rand’s comments, which clearly strongly resonated with the graduating class of the U.S. military. Rand’s most extreme and opprobrious remarks, nevertheless, were saved for her subsequent discussion of Native Americans. “Savages” who deserved to be conquered In a logical sleight of hand that would even confound and bewilder even Lewis Carroll, Ayn Rand proclaimed in the 1974 Q&A that it was in fact indigenous Americans who were the racists, not the white settlers who were ethnically cleansing them. The laissez-faire leader declared that Native Americans did not “have any right to live in a country merely because they were born here and acted and lived like savages.” “Americans didn’t conquer” this land, Rand asserted, and “you are a racist if you object to that.” Since “the Indians did not have any property rights — they didn’t have the concept of property,” she said, “they didn’t have any rights to the land.” If “a country does not protect rights,” Rand asked — referring specifically to property rights — “why should you respect the rights they do not have?” She took the thought to its logical conclusion, contending that anyone “has the right to invade it, because rights are not recognized in this country.” Rand then blamed Native Americans for breaking the agreements they made with the Euro-American colonialists. The historical reality, though, was exactly the contrary: white settlers constantly broke the treaties they made with the indigenous, and regularly attacked them. “Let’s suppose they were all beautifully innocent savages, which they certainly were not,” Rand persisted. “What was it that they were fighting for, if they opposed white men on this continent? For their wish to continue a primitive existence, their right to keep part of the earth untouched, unused, and not even as property, but just keep everybody out so that you will live practically like an animal?” she asked. “Any white person who brings the elements of civilization had the right to take over this continent,” Rand said, “and it is great that some people did, and discovered here what they couldn’t do anywhere else in the world and what the Indians, if there are any racist Indians today, do not believe to this day: respect for individual rights.”

#### She was also heteronormative.

Moskovitz 10 - Damian Moskovitz, Harvard University, Psychology Department, Alumnus. Studies Psychology, June 29, 2010 [“Is Homosexuality Moral?”, <https://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/3791-is-homosexuality-moral>, The Atlas Society] rpg

So according to Objectivism , sex is potentially moral, but what about homosexuality? The few times Ayn Rand spoke publicly about homosexuality, her remarks were disparaging. She said that homosexuality is a manifestation of psychological "flaws, corruptions, errors, [and] unfortunate premises" and that it is both "immoral" and "disgusting" ("The Moratorium on Brains," Ford Hall Forum Lecture [Boston, 1971]). Apparently, she thought that heterosexuality was a universal fact of human nature. "The essence of femininity," she wrote, "is hero worship" (Ayn Rand , "About a Woman President," in The Voice of Reason, ed. Leonard Peikoff [New York: Penguin, 1989], 268), the worship of men as producers. It is human nature, she believed, for a woman of self-esteem to want to be ruled, in sexual matters, by a man worthy of ruling her, and for a man of self-esteem to want to rule, in sexual matters, a woman worthy of being ruled. To Rand, the "unfortunate premises" that lead to homosexuality are, presumably, premises that contradict this view of sex roles. (For further discussion and debate on Rand's views on sex, see Mimi Gladstein and Chris Sciabarra, eds., Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand [University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999].) Current psychobiological research indicates that Rand's conception of sex roles is, in part, mistaken. Biological factors such as genetics and prenatal development play substantial roles in determining sexual orientation. While the developmental mechanisms are not yet fully understood, it is known that many, if not most, homosexuals are attracted to members of the same sex by no choice of their own. Moreover, to the extent that homosexuality is not a product of choice, it is not a moral issue. As Ayn Rand wrote in Atlas Shrugged (New York: Penguin, 1957), "a sin without volition is a slap at morality and an insolent contradiction in terms: that which is outside the possibility of choice is outside the province of morality" (938). While sexual orientations may not be chosen, in many cases, what behaviors people exhibit in response to their orientations are chosen, and such behaviors can be evaluated morally. A person who by nature, rather than by choice, is more attracted to members of the same sex than the opposite sex still has the choice to recognize and act in accordance with this fact or to repress or act against it. If a person wishes to achieve happiness and promote his life, then he must, in a realm as morally important as sex, act in accordance with his nature. For example, it is morally right for a woman whose nature it is to be sexually attracted to women rather than men to become romantically involved with a woman she loves and desires. In contrast, it is morally wrong for a man whose nature it is to be sexually attracted to women rather than men to become romantically involved with a man rather than seeking out a woman. So there are contexts in which homosexual behavior is immoral (just as there are contexts in which heterosexual behavior is immoral), but there is nothing immoral about homosexuality per se. However, this moral fact has no political implications. While many conservatives believe that homosexuality should be outlawed and many liberals believe that homosexuals should be given special rights, Objectivism holds that as long as no force is involved, people have the right to do as they please in sexual matters, whether or not their behavior is considered by others to be or is in fact moral. And since individual rights are grounded in the nature of human beings as human beings, homosexuals do not deserve any more or less rights than heterosexuals.

#### She was also most likely anti-woman

Sanders 11 - Nicole Sanders is the Director of Student Programs at the Atlas Society. January 25, 2011 [“Feminism and Objectivism”, <https://atlassociety.org/objectivism/atlas-university/objectivism-q-a/objectivism-q-a-blog/4302-feminism-and-objectivism>, The Atlas Society] rpg

Question: What is feminism, according to Objectivism? And what is the place of women in society according to Objectivism? Answer: Objectivism is an individualist philosophy. It holds that each person is a rational animal and that all individuals deserve to be free to make any choices in life that do not involve initiating force against others (which also means that one's choices should not violate obligations one has chosen to take on, such as contracts). It holds that all men and women have essentially the same rights, and all should be free to live as they choose. It does not distinguish between men and women in its concepts of moral virtues or fundamental values. Because it rejects traditional restrictions on women and regards productive work as a virtue for women as well as men, Objectivism shares many of the views of classical, individualist feminism. It rejects the traditional idea that men deserve to have power over women or that women should have different or less freedom than have men. This can be seen in the portrait of business executive Dagny Taggart in Atlas Shrugged , for example. In addition, Objectivists have generally been in favor of a woman's right to abortion , as an extension of the individual's general right to control the uses of his own body. Ayn Rand herself rejected the label "feminist" and even went so far as to provocatively declare herself a "male chauvinist." In addition to her philosophical views per se, she had a view of sexual psychology that ascribed distinctive "masculine" and "feminine" attitudes to healthy men and women respectively. She argued that sexually, women should desire to engage in "hero worship," and that this required having at least one man to whom they could each look up. For this reason she argued in her essay "About a Woman President" that a women should not want to be the commander-in-chief. However, she was clear to explain in that context that she nevertheless held that ability was not the basic issue: "women are not inferior to men in ability or intelligence..." Neither I nor any Objectivist thinker of note today thinks Rand's psychological concepts of femininity and masculinity are integral to the philosophy of Objectivism . There are strong strands of collectivism in today's feminism. These strands of thought treat men and women as hostile classes. Some infamously ascribe radically different thought patterns to men and women as such. Objectivism rejects group-think of this sort, and holds that each individual should be judged based on character, actions, and ability, not merely on the person's sex. Rand called herself a "male chauvinist" because she admired the many great men of history, to whom all of civilization owes so much. Her rhetoric was chosen in response to collectivist feminists and racists who denigrated "dead white men" as such. Objectivism holds, based on the foregoing, that a woman's place is where she chooses to make it. As a rational being, a women needs to pursue relationships based on mutual respect and the honest exchange of value-for-value. She needs to engage in a career of productive work. She needs friendship and love. Child-rearing may be an important part of her life, but if she so chooses she should approach raising children with the seriousness of engaging in serious work. In short, there is no objective basis for restricting women's choices based merely on their sex. Like all individuals, women have the political right and the moral need to be free and choose their own courses in life.

## Perm

### Perm - Generic

#### Dominant paradigms are almost completely inapplicable in the context of primary and secondary education - a combination of both student learning and teaching instruction is necessary - proves the perm solves

Vrasidas 2k - Charalambos Vrasidas, Ph.D., Professor & Associate Dean for e-learning, at University of Nicosia; Executive Director, CARDET, 2000 [“CONSTRUCTIVISM VERSUS OBJECTIVISM: IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERACTION, COURSE DESIGN, AND EVALUATION IN DISTANCE EDUCATION”, goo.gl/4JwfsR, International Journal of Educational Telecommunications] rpg

The objectivist paradigm is based on the assumption that there is a real world and the purpose of education is to map the entities of that world on the learner's mind. The constructivist paradigm is based on the idea that reality is constructed during interaction with the environment and peers and that knowledge is both individual and communal. Therefore, in a constructivist course the major goal is to cultivate the learners' thinking and knowledge construction skills. Radicals of each camp argue that is impossible to mix the two paradigms. You can either be an objectivist or a constructivist instructional designer because philosophical assumptions of each paradigm are contradicting each other (Bednar et al., 1992). However, dominant paradigms, in both the physical and social sciences, rarely replace each other by falsification (Erickson, 1986; Lakatos, 1978). Instead they tend to co-exist and are used whenever they are appropriate. For example, quantitative and qualitative research methods are based on different epistemological assumptions. They coexist and they are used when they are appropriate. Some research questions lend themselves more to be examined using quantitative International Journal of Educational Telecommunications 13 methods whereas some other questions lend themselves more to qualitative methods. This paper argues that reality is constructed in the mind through social interaction. Knowledge is both individual and shared. There is an objective world that shapes our experience and places constraints on our interpretations and meanings. As an instructional designer, the author rejects idealism, according to which everyone constructs his or her own reality. There is a shared reality and some interpretations of experience are more robust and plausible than others. Different approaches to instructional design and curriculum development should be seen as a set of tools from which educators can choose the most appropriate for a given purpose. Posner (1995) refers to this approach as “reflective eclecticism” (p. 4). Specifically, he argued that “different situations require different practices” (p. 4). This is a pragmatic view of curriculum development. One of the weaknesses and criticisms of the constructivist approach is its inability to evaluate learning (Prawat & Floden, 1994). How can the teacher know what to teach when there are no clear-cut defined performance objectives? How can the teacher evaluate and assess student learning without having concrete criteria and objectives to refer to? Eisner (1994) argues that in some instances specifying objectives is very useful and appropriate, but in most cases those objectives will emerge from the class activities. In his own words, “I believe behavioral objectives to be appropriate for some types of educational aims, even though I recognize that they are in no way adequate for conceptualizing most of our most cherished educational aspirations” (p. 45). In some instances it is appropriate to be more linear. For example, in teaching someone how to use a computer, the teacher can allow her to experiment and explore it for a while. But, there will be a time that, unless the teacher presents specific steps for her to follow and have her practice those steps, it is very likely that the student will get frustrated and discouraged. There are instances that one needs to be more linear and instances when one needs to be more holistic. The nature and structure of constructivist learning activities are more likely to stimulate students to engage in learning. Using authentic tasks in real-life situations increases the likelihood that learners will invest the effort and time to construct their understandings on a topic. Perkins (1992), however, while addressing the demands that a constructivist approach places on the learner, argued that learners will have to take control of their own learning, otherwise, they will never be able to become "autonomous thinkers" (p. 163). Therefore, one skill that the learner will have to develop is task-management. When learners become efficient in managing their learning in constructivist environments, they are more likely to be accountable for it. Nevertheless, not all learners come into a constructivist distance education course with the necessary task management skills. Perkins argued that "it is the job of the constructivist teacher (or interactive technology) to hold learners in their 'zone of proximal development' by providing just enough help and guidance, but not too much" (p. 163). Therefore, the teacher should coach the learners to manage their tasks and help them take control of their learning. Constructivist approaches rely heavily on learners to manage their learning tasks and engage in interaction with their peers and content. In order for learners to manage their learning, structure is crucial for providing the guidelines and skills necessary to succeed in distance education courses (Vrasidas & McIsaac, 1999). In face-to-face traditional classrooms, it is easier to allow students to engage in activities that are open-ended with no clearly defined objectives. When misunderstandings and confusions arise, they can easily be International Journal of Educational Telecommunications 14 resolved. At a distance, if there is confusion, it is difficult to resolve it in a timely manner. Therefore, distance education courses require clear and specific structure in order to be successful. Structure, however, does not necessarily suggest an objectivist approach to instructional design. Good planning is a characteristic of good teaching regardless of philosophical paradigm. Clearly defined activities, student role, homework submission guidelines, course expectations, and evaluation procedures are characteristics of any well-prepared course.

### Perm - Econ Affs

#### Subjectivism and objectivism can be combined to reveal the best aspects of both - every credible author agrees with us.

Yagi 12 - Kiichiro Yagi is a Japanese economist born on February 11, 1947. He is a professor at Setsunan University after teaching the analysis of the economic system at Kyoto University Graduate School of Economics and he works at the Foundation of the Institute of the Virtual System of Tokyo. 2012 [“Subjectivism and objectivism in the history of economic analysis”, Routledge Studies in the History of Economics] rpg

As a discipline, economic science investigates the processes in and the results of individuals’ economic behavior. Thus, its study inevitably involves subjective elements that, in reality, affect the behavior of individuals. In this introduction, in using the terms “subjective” and “subjectivity,” we refer to the states and content of comprehension as it takes place in the consciousness of individuals. Indeed, the coverage of “subjectivity” within economic science differs considerably, according to the focus of a given theorist. Nonetheless, we can refer to the attitude that stresses the significance of subjective elements as “subjectivism.” On the other hand, as a science that can provide definitive and meaningful information, economics requires objective elements that can determine or limit the range of economic behaviors of actors and their outcomes, independent of subjective comprehension. The quantities of available resources, the intensity and distribution of the needs of individuals, and knowledge of technology and consumption can all be considered “objective” elements. Further, in cases where the outcomes of the economic behavior of actors – as well as prices – are determined uniquely, they can in turn also be considered “objective” elements that influence the behavior of actors. Thus, economic theories involve both subjective and objective elements and aspects. If we consider the comprehension of economic actors as no more than a reflection of such objective elements, then “objectivism” is the antithesis of “subjectivism” in economics.¶ Here, we notice that “subjectivism” and “objectivism” – two topics with which this volume deals – are classifications of alternative positions in science, that is, elements of attentively controlled epistemology. No one can deny that economic behavior and its aggregation have elements of both subjectivity and objectivity. However, as a methodology or canon of a disciplined science, each position sets a priority among these elements in the course of their investigations.¶ Marxists – who consider the comprehension and motivation of economic actors, which are, in their view, ultimately determined by their position in a given set of social production relations – have a theory of labor value that is relevant to their “objectivism.” Sraffian economists deduce a consistent value system from a set of technological coefficients and a distribution ratio between wage and profit; in this respect, they too are objectivists. Starting with bestowed labor or given technological coefficients is a process that reflects the objectivistic canon of sciences of which those economists conceive. However, as has been argued recently, under more realistic conditions involving joint production and plural technologies, even the concept of “class exploitation” cannot hold without introducing market prices; thus, the subjective element of demand is inserted into such species of objective economic analysis (Yoshihara and Veneziani 2009, Yoshihara 2010). The reinterpretation of the theorems of “objectivist” economics, by introducing into them “subjective” elements, is worth doing, as it may open a path to a new kind of integration.¶ It is common knowledge among historians of economics that a turn toward subjectivism occurred in the late nineteenth century, when the determination of prices by the maximization of utility of individuals was introduced to economic analysis. As the basic concept of “utility” can be traced back to the scholars of that age, the mainstream of present-day academic economics, that is, neoclassical economics, also belongs to the camp of “subjectivism”; however, it still represents a peculiar integration of subjectivism and objectivism. In the standard analysis of neoclassical economics, a set of possible alternatives (or the probability of their occurrence) is assumed to be known by all actors, and those actors are assumed to be able to attribute their utility estimates to every particular alternative. Regarding this assumption in addition to the assumption of nonexistence of elements that cause market failures, it is argued that the rational behavior of individuals can produce a unique equilibrium solution. In other words, neoclassicism in economics represents the conviction that an objective outcome in economic analysis can be drawn by the subjective principle of utility maximization. Thanks to this synthesis of subjectivism and objectivism, economics in the twentieth century acquired the reputation of an advanced discipline within the family of social and human sciences.¶ Is this synthesis of subjectivism and objectivism tenable? Around the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, many theorists were no longer so optimistic as to assume that economic analysis could provide unique equilibrium solutions under any relevant condition. In fact, at present, many of them are skeptical of the assumption of perfect knowledge and even of the reality of utility maximization. Even if the concept of equilibrium were to be maintained, it can be indeterminate or intelligible, since there are plural equilibria, depending on the locality, path, or interpretation involved.