

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Discourse Impact Answers

Impact Turn: Talking broadly about theories don't help build education spaces, it creates withdrawal and pessimism – only learning about and working through actual systems and scenarios is educationally liberating

Richard **Rorty 1998**, "ACHIEVING OUR COUNTRY: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America", 1998, Pg. 7-9, Richard Rorty is a professor emeritus of comparative literature and philosophy at Stanford University and a leading academic in the field of philosophy

Such people find pride in American citizenship impossible, and vigorous participation in electoral politics pointless. They associate American patriotism with an endorsement of atrocities: the importation of African slaves, the slaughter of Native Americans, the rape of ancient forests, and the Vietnam War. Many of them think of national pride as appropriate only for chauvinists: for the sort of American who rejoices that America can still orchestrate something like the Gulf War, can still bring deadly force to bear whenever and wherever it chooses. When young intellectuals watch John Wayne war movies after reading Heidegger, Foucault, Stephenson, or Silko, they often become convinced that they live in a violent, inhuman, corrupt country. They begin to think of themselves as a saving remnant-as the happy few who have the insight to see through nationalist rhetoric to the ghastly reality of contemporary America. But this insight does not move them to formulate a legislative program, to join a political movement, or to share in a national hope. The contrast between national hope and national self-mockery and self-disgust becomes vivid when one compares novels like Snow Crash and Almanac of the Dead with socialist novels of the first half of the century-books like The Jungle, An American Tragedy, and The Grapes of Wrath. The latter were written in the belief that the tone of the Gettysburg Address was absolutely right, but that our country would have to transform itself in order to fulfill Lincoln's hopes. Transformation would be needed because the rise of industrial capitalism had made the individualist rhetoric of America's first century obsolete. The authors of these novels thought that this rhetoric should be replaced by one in which America is destined to become the first cooperative commonwealth, the first classless society. This America would be one in which income and wealth are equitably distributed, and in which the government ensures equality of opportunity as well as individual liberty. This new, quasi-communitarian rhetoric was at the heart of the Progressive Movement and the New Deal. It set the tone for the American Left during the first six decades of the twentieth century. Walt Whitman and John Dewey, as we shall see, did a great deal to shape this rhetoric. The difference between early twentieth-century leftist intellectuals and the majority of their contemporary counterparts is the difference between agents and spectators. In the early decades of this century, when an intellectual stepped back from his or her country's history and looked at it through skeptical eyes, the chances were that he or she was about to propose a new political initiative. Henry Adams was, of course, the great exception-the great abstainer from politics. But William James thought that Adams' diagnosis of the First Gilded Age as a symptom of irreversible moral and political decline was merely perverse. James's pragmatist theory of truth was in part a reaction against the sort of detached spectatorship which Adams affected. For James, disgust with American hypocrisy and self-deception was pointless unless accompanied by an effort to give America reason to be proud of itself in the future. The kind of proto- Heideggerian cultural pessimism which Adams cultivated seemed, to James, decadent and cowardly. "Democracy," James wrote, "is a kind of religion, and we are bound not to admit its failure. Faiths and utopias are the noblest exercise of human reason, and no one with a spark of reason in him will sit down fatalistically before the croaker's picture.

"2

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Discourse Impact Framing Answers

Framing Turn: Focus on discourse trades off with actually implementing policy, risks cooption by special interests, and doesn't solve as effectively – need to focus on real solutions not rhetoric

Renee Irvin & John Stansbury, 2004, Citizen Participation in Decision-Making: Is it Worth the Effort?, Public Administration Review, Renee Irvin is Associate Professor in the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon & John Stansbury is Associate Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Nebraska, c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/imported/Journal_Issue1_Irving.pdf

This article, while describing the very important benefits of citizen participation, also provides a litmus test for agencies to consider when they allocate resources toward citizen participation processes. Do citizens care enough to participate actively in policy-making, or would resources devoted toward participatory processes be better directed toward implementation? Does local citizen participation imply more opportunity for economically motivated special interests to dominate the decision process? Criticism lobbed at participatory efforts in environmental management may soon be heard in other sectors, as decreasing government budgets require intense scrutiny of government performance outcomes. Delegating environmental decision-making authority to citizens is a policy strategy lauded for its holistic consideration of local economic interests, yet criticised by the environmental left for its potential to roll back decades of environmental regulatory success. Evidence for the effectiveness of community participation in environmental management is in short supply, due in part to the inherent problems in measuring the success of environmental policies that may take decades to positively affect the environment. Even more difficult, perhaps, is the prospect of measuring incremental changes in the well-being of the general public as they become more engaged in the policy process. Concern exists among environmentalists that locally-based citizen participation processes will lead to a relaxation of previously successful environmental regulation. Another concern, rarely voiced, is the potential wastefulness of the process if employed in a non-ideal community. Even if the citizen participation process does not lead to relaxed environmental regulation, it may entail a significant expenditure of resources that could be used elsewhere to achieve better on-the-ground results. With widespread public benefit as the goal of any public policy process, it behooves the administrator to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the decision-making process when determining the most effective implementation strategy, bearing in mind that talk is not cheap – and may not even be effective.

Capitalism Kritik

Discursive Impact Scenario - Impact

Their capitalist discourse and framing reduces the debate to a mere extension of economic managerialism – this crushes the real, transformative potential of education

Marie Lall, 2012, Policy, Discourse and Rhetoric How New Labour Challenged Social Justice and Democracy, EDUCATIONAL FUTURES RETHINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE Volume 52, Professor Marie Lall is a South Asia expert (India, Pakistan and Burma/Myanmar) specialising in political issues (with regard to the economy, geopolitics of energy, foreign policy formulation, citizenship and Diaspora politics) and education (with specific regard to policy, gender, ethnicity and conflict, the formation of national identity and its close links with citizenship), She received her MPhil from Cambridge in 1993 and her PhD from the London School of Economics in 1999, <https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/767-policy-discourse-and-rhetoric.pdf>

Neoliberalism can be identified as the predominant ideology of the last decades (Giroux, 2002); in effect the new 'common sense' that has replaced the social democracy of the post-war era. It has penetrated education (Harris, 2007) changing the purpose of education itself (Bartlett et al., 2002; Wolf, 2002). Education currently is seen as a main condition for economic success, central to any modern economy. (Gamanikov 2009) Often forgotten is that education is relevant for the development of citizenship values (see chapter 2 in this volume), and for the sake of learning (McGregor, 2009; Wolf, 2002). Although it brings economic benefits it also brings an essential contribution to the public good (Margison 1993 in McGregor, 2009). Neoliberal ideology not only changed the purpose of education, but it also changed the structure of education systems (Bartlett et al., 2002; Wolf, 2002). Through the implementation of neoliberal policies, education was opened to the market assuming the features just described. This has meant that there are private providers entering into the education system in a context of deregulation, which constitutes the commercialisation and marketisation of education (Ball, 2007; Verger, 2008). The debate over the role of the state led to reforms across all UK public services. Over the last 20 years the way the public sector has been managed has changed markedly - there has been a shift away from old-style bureaucratic administration. The elevation of effectiveness and efficiency as the sole criteria of legitimacy reflects the increasing dominance of an ethic of managerialism and a concomitant emphasis upon measuring and improving performance (see chapter 1 in this volume). This new way of perceiving public services also gave rise to an 'accounting logic,' promoting a general perception that what is visible and quantifiable is what is important. However professional 'outputs' are not easily standardised and measurable: 'In various guises, the key elements of the education reform 'package' – and it is applied with equal vigour to schools, colleges and universities - are embedded in three interrelated policy technologies: the market, managerialism and performativity.' (Ball 2003) As the role for the state has changed from provider to regulator, there has been the loss of a distinctive public sector. It is important not to suggest a 'golden age' of public sector administration. There are lots of criticisms that can be (and were) made, for example, issues of professional discretion and judgement, the lack of client consultation, the slow and weighty bureaucracy, the hierarchy and the lack of accountability. But the reforms leading to a change from public sector bureaucracy to managerialism have also affected the character, ethos, values and behaviour of individuals and organisations. Today the discussion of education focuses not so much on the transformations in peoples' lives brought about by education, or the quality of their educational experiences, but the number of qualified students, the savings made in the delivery of services and the proportion of students going on into higher education. **The effects of neoliberalism on social justice and education 'It is clear therefore that with increased market logic there is also an increase in democratic deficit and with it a reduction of the social justice agenda, especially in the public sector arena as new inequalities are created.'** (Lall and Nambissan 2011 p.7) The effects of the reforms across the UK education sector have led to substantial change. The new policy discourse is restricting both for head teachers managing the schools and teachers in the classroom (Harris: 2007). With regard to schooling the focus has shifted to an instrumentalist thinking with measurable outputs. Schools aim to raise achievement in order to compete with each other through league tables. The influx of new educational providers such as academies has led to increased opportunities for students from poorer backgrounds to attend different types of schools. Nevertheless, as Roberts (2001 in Reay, 2006) argues, this transformation has created the illusion of a fairer society while it creates a stratification along the system which relegates the working classes to different trajectories than middle classes (Reay, 2006). The underlying assumption is that free markets allow parents to choose the school that aligns with their expectations and needs. The possibility of choosing a school would act as a natural selection process through which unpopular schools will be forced to change or to close if they do not adapt to clients expectations (Ball, 1993). However the rhetoric of choice assumes that all parents have equal cultural capital and are equally informed and capable of making such a choice for

their children. The middle classes benefit whilst the lower classes have to make do with the leftovers (Leathwood, 2004; Reay, David and Ball, 2005). This has also affected those with Special Educational Needs, where a rhetoric of inclusive education has not resulted in equitable education provision for all. (See Chapter 3 in the volume) There have been similar effects in the higher education sector: Marketisation across the sector has made performativity and accountability cornerstones of higher education policies today. Increasing the number of institutions has led to a stratified system with 'first' and 'second class' universities providing a different quality learning experience and catering to different sections of society. The pressure to increase the number of students, account for how time is spent and the general concern with national and international rankings are all effects of the changing understanding of what higher education stands for. The role of the university is no longer that of a 'public interest institution' but being sites of 'knowledge production' in light of the economic imperatives of the 'knowledge economy.' (see Chapter 4 in this volume).

Capitalism Kritik

Discursive Impact Scenario - Framing

Focus on discourse is first priority - it defines the possible field of policies and determines what that policy will ultimately be

Les **Bell & Howard Stevenson, 2006**, 'What is Educational Policy?', Education Policy published by Routledge, Les Bell is Professor of Education at the Centre for Educational Leadership and Management and Director of the Doctor of Learning programme. Howard Stevenson is a lecturer in Educational Leadership and Management based at the Centre for Educational Leadership and Management, University of Leicester, eprints.lincoln.ac.uk/1851/1/Ed_Policy_book_proofs.pdf pages 8-9

All those working in schools and colleges must make sense of their policy context. Policy agendas require a response as those in the institution are faced with the task of implementing policy directives. Those in senior leadership positions face a particular challenge as they often represent the interface between the organization and the external policy environment. Key decisions must be made relating to the interpretation and implementation of external policy agendas – those decisions will in turn reflect a complex mix of factors including personal values, available resources and stakeholder power and perceptions. Understanding and anticipating policy therefore becomes a key feature of 'leadership' (Day et al. 2000) – understanding where policies come from, what they seek to achieve, how they impact on the learning experience and the consequences of implementation are all essential features of educational leadership. To some extent it may be argued that in recent years studies of 'leadership' have supplanted studies of policy. This in part reflects the emergence of a managerialist agenda in which institutional leadership and management is often reduced to a technical study of the 'one best way' to deliver education policy objectives determined elsewhere within the socio-political environment and legitimated by a dominant discourse which may be located outside the immediate sphere of education (Thrupp and Willmott 2003). Policy is treated uncritically and denuded of its values, neglecting to assess how policy impacts differentially on different social groups. The importance of policy, as distinct from leadership, is recognized in this volume, but a simple dichotomy between leadership or policy is avoided – the key issue is to explore the relationship between the interdependent themes of leadership, policy and power. This volume acknowledges the importance of leadership, but seeks to make the case that leadership must be located within a policy context. A failure to fully understand the complex ways in which policy shapes, and is shaped by, leadership fails adequately to explain the actions and practices of leaders at both the organizational and operational levels. Key practitioners in schools and colleges, rather than being passive implementers of policies determined and decided elsewhere, are able to shape national policy at an early stage, perhaps through their involvement in interest groups, professional associations or their favoured position in government policy forums and think-tanks. In other cases, influence may be exerted at an institutional level as the organizational principles and operational practices through which policy is implemented are formed and re-formed. Leaders in educational institutions, therefore, are both policy implementers and policy generators. For these reasons it can be more accurate to describe a process of policy development, rather than use the more traditional, but less helpful, term of policy making. Sharp distinctions between policy generation and implementation can be unhelpful as they fail to account for the way in which policy is formed and re-formed as it is being 'implemented'. The term policy development also more accurately conveys the organic way in which policy emerges. This is not to argue that policies develop in entirely serendipitous ways. On the contrary, an important theme of this book is to argue that policy is decisively shaped by powerful structural forces of an economic, ideological and cultural nature. Nevertheless the crucial role of human agency in the development of policy must be recognized. Furthermore, if institutional leaders do not mechanically implement policy from the state, nor do those studying and working in educational institutions mechanically implement the policies of their institutional leaders. Policy is political: it is about the power to determine what is done. It shapes who benefits, for what purpose and who pays. It goes to the very heart of educational philosophy – what is education for? For whom? Who decides? The point is well made by Apple: