# Contention 1: The Status Quo

#### We begin by highlighting the form of inaccessibility students like us around America experience every day in rural areas

By Benjamin **Herold** (Reporter, edweek.org) ”Stuck with huge bills for Internet service that barely works, Calhoun County schools have missed out on the digital revolution.” November 19, **2015** http://www.edweek.org/ew/projects/2015/rural-schools-broadband/the-slowest-internet-in-mississippi.html

Stuck with huge bills for Internet service that barely works, Calhoun County schools have missed out on the digital revolution. Here in the tiny town of Vardaman, everything moves slowly. Especially the Internet at the local high school. The trouble begins early each morning. Teachers sweet-talk their computers while trying to load the school’s online attendance system. A few get lucky. The rest shake their heads, write the names of absent children on a sheet of paper, and send a student to the main office. Today, school secretary Lisa Sutherland is given 15 names to enter. Each click of her mouse is followed by an excruciating delay. The system times out. Sutherland grits her teeth and starts over. Nearly half an hour after it begins, a process that should take seconds is finally complete. "Not having what we need is aggravating, and it's awful for the children," says Lisa Sutherland, a secretary at Vardaman High School, of the district's slow Internet connection. The 2,500 students in Calhoun County can’t do Internet research in school. Computerized state testing here last spring was a disaster. Teachers have given up on using online tools in the classroom. The district has given up on buying the new digital technologies that are transforming schools elsewhere. REVERSING A RAW DEAL Rural schools are often charged outrageous rates for lousy Internet service. Can billions of federal dollars and a menu of market-based reforms fix the problem?And the most outrageous part: For the privilege of being stuck with the slowest Internet service in all of Mississippi, the nine-school Calhoun County district is billed $9,275 each month. “Frustrating is a mild word for it,” said Mike Moore, the district’s superintendent. “Smaller districts like us are at a tremendous disadvantage.” It’s true, despite a rapidly evolving landscape. Over the past two years, the country has made huge strides in connecting schools, including those in rural areas. More than three-quarters of districts nationally now provide at least adequate Internet access, according to a new analysis by the broadband advocacy group EducationSuperHighway. But 1 in 5 rural districts still can't access the fiber-optic cables that are bringing high-speed Internet to schools elsewhere, the analysis found. And even when they do get decent connections, rural schools are typically charged far more than their urban and suburban counterparts. In places like the vast, sparsely populated plains of western New Mexico, that means telecommunications companies routinely bill $3,000 per month or more for Internet service most U.S. schools could get for one-sixth the cost. MEDIAN MONTHLY COST FOR BANDWIDTH The result, experts say, is that many rural districts still face a steep climb to meet long-term federal goals for school connectivity, even though most currently provide students with the minimum recommended bandwidth. "The challenge for rural America is the future," said Evan Marwell, EducationSuperHighway's CEO. "If we don't get affordable fiber out to those communities, they're going to get left behind." Geography, bad policy, and a severe shortage of technical expertise within schools all contribute to the problem. So do the business practices of telecoms: AT&T and Verizon have been accused in lawsuits and other legal actions of bilking the system of millions of dollars, while many smaller companies have taken advantage of local monopolies and generous federal subsidies. Ultimately, efforts to find a solution will be underwritten by the American people. Fees on consumers’ phone bills fund a little-known federal program called the E-rate. The E-rate in turn covers a portion of the cost of phone and Internet service for schools and libraries. Since its inception in 1996, the program has paid out over $30 billion. This fall, it will begin paying out even more. The Federal Communications Commission recently approved a huge increase in E-rate spending, to $3.9 billion each year. Over the objections of the powerful telecom lobby, the commission also approved a number of policy changes intended to help rural schools. The idea is that more money, plus more competition, will add up to faster, cheaper Internet for thousands of schools like Vardaman High. Critics on the right say the more likely result is wasteful spending. Skeptics on the left question the commission’s reliance on market-based solutions, rather than better federal oversight. But with the new E-rate money already flowing to schools, and with districts now positioning themselves to take advantage of the program’s new policies, FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler is confident that America’s rural schools are in for a major upgrade. “Even if you’re in the most remote, rural area, it is [now] possible to get connectivity for your schools and libraries,” Wheeler said. “This can happen at scale.”

#### Specifically, for rural high school students, the standardization of educational resource norms forms one part of a cultural system that does violence to rural towns

**Bassett 03**

(Debra Lyn Bassett is a professor of law Southwestern Law School. This article, entitled “Ruralism” appeared in Iowa Law Review, volume 8. Accessed via L/N.)

Although ruralism does not preclude rural students from attending **[\*311]** college or obtaining employment altogether, it precludes most from attending elite colleges and obtaining the most desirable employment. n177 Similar to other forms of discrimination, the effect of ruralism is compounded through the college and employment processes. Rural schools typically are considered inferior to urban schools. n178 Rural schools often are unable to offer a variety of foreign language, mathematics, and science courses. Rural schools are often unable to offer "tracked" or Advanced Placement courses, which would enhance students' ability to compete with urban students for college admission. When applying to college, rural students are at a disadvantage as urban students' standardized test scores are higher and their course listings are more comprehensive. n179 Rural students **[\*312]** often do not have access to preparatory classes for standardized achievement tests, such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test, in which urban students routinely enroll. In addition, rural students often cannot compete with the experiences available to urban students, particularly wealthy urban students, who have traveled or engaged in specialized activities that serve as the foundation for the personal statement of their college applications. n180

# Contention 2: Ruralism

#### Dominant policy scholarship and practice ignores rural areas: In the view of policy makers, rural communities don’t exist.

**Porter 2005** (Katherine Porter [Assoc Prof of Law, U of Iowa College of Law]; "Going Broke the Hard Way: The Economics of Rural Failure," Wisconsin Law Review 969, l/n)

As some windows of perspective have opened, others have closed. An unspoken assumption permeates modern scholarship: the impact of laws should be measured exclusively in terms of how the legal system operates in America's cities and suburbs. Rural Americans have disappeared from view. When policymakers discuss economic pressures on families, they refer to urban and suburban dwellers. When scholars collect empirical data, they frequently fail to sample rural residents. When reform proposals for legislation are debated, the impact of such laws on rural residents is often ignored. Fifty-nine million strong, n1 rural Americans are ghosts in the legal system. n2 Their perspectives on the legal system and their legal needs are uncharted.

#### Specifically, the one size fits all approach to education sets up rural public schools to fail

**Bassett 03**

(Debra Lyn Bassett is a professor of law Southwestern Law School. This article, entitled “Ruralism” appeared in Iowa Law Review, volume 8. Accessed via L/N.)

The indirect impact of rural poverty upon rural education is overshadowed by the direct impact that results from how rural education is funded - and it is in this area that ruralism plays a central role. Most states rely on local property taxes as the source of funding for education. But using local property taxes as the sole educational funding source will inherently and necessarily discriminate against rural areas, which have a lower tax base due to fewer residences and commercial properties. Adding to this problem, most school funding formulas are based on average daily enrollment. n159 Rural schools, which by definition enroll fewer students, have little choice but to cut programs and staff, or alternatively, to consolidate with one or more other schools. N160 Thus, the common methods for funding public education inherently benefit urban schools and discriminate against rural schools. The combination of rural poverty and the reduced tax base in rural areas results in a double whammy against rural education. Moreover, rural schools tend to be modeled after urban schools. n161 This model dooms rural schools to inferiority, because rural schools typically are unable to provide the educational resources available in urban areas:

#### And, this creates a cycle of lack of education the also affects the academy

**Bassett 03**

(Debra Lyn Bassett is a professor of law Southwestern Law School. This article, entitled “Ruralism” appeared in Iowa Law Review, volume 8. Accessed via L/N.)

Rural education and post-college employment also suffer as a result of our society's urban focus. n156 The impact of ruralism upon education is found at all levels - elementary education through post-secondary education - as well as in subsequent post-college employment opportunities.

#### Even critical theory ignores rural spaces, furthering the violence of ruralism

**Creed and Ching 97**

(Barbara Ching, prof. of English at the University of Memphis & Gerald Creed, prof. of anthropology at Hunter College. This card comes from the first chapter “Recognizing Rusticity: Identity and the Power of Place” in their edited volume “Knowing your Place: Rural Identity and Cultural Hierarchy.” Published by Routledge in 1997. This card has been OCRed from the original text and may have very minor textual errors.)

A purely metaphoric place emerges from postmodern-social theory, and this intellectual trend blocks the country from view in still other ways. Postmodern social theory's stable reference point has been the city; it unquestioningly posits an urbanized subject without considering the extent to which such a subject is constructed by its conceptual opposition to the rustic (Ching I993)~ In much postmodern social theory, the country as a vital place simply doesn't exist. The influential French philosopher Henri Lefebvre (I97O: 7), for example, simply asserts that the contemporary situation is one of ,'complete urbanization." 1 This placement is tacitly assumed in more recent studies of the postmodern: Marxist theorist Fredric Jameson (I99I) feels no need to justify his equation of the postmodern with the urban, and although cultural geographers have argued that the postmodern condition demands more attention to space, in practice their focus has been almost entirely urban. In his Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory, Edward W. Soja claims that his discipline must assert the primacy of space over history and recognize the role of "formative geography" in human experience (i989" 2). Yet when Soja turns his attention to such "formative geography," he simply reaffirms the traditional terms of development and underdevelopment, tacitly assuming that the city will eventually engulf the country:

#### The invisibility of the rural allows the cultural conditions for an ongoing and ignored auto-genocide.

**Beck 15**

(“The Growing Risk of Suicide in Rural America” pub. In The Atlantic, March 10, 2015. Julie Beck is the associate editor at The Atlantic. This article also cites the findings of a peer reviewed article from Journal of the American Medical Association. Full text online @: http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2015/03/the-growing-risk-of-suicide-in-rural-america/387313/)

A study published Monday in JAMA Pediatrics analyzed suicides among people aged 10 to 24 between 1996 and 2010, and found that rates were nearly doubled in rural areas, compared to urban areas. While this gap existed in 1996 at the beginning of the data set, it widened over the course of this time period, according to Cynthia Fontanella, the lead author on the study, and a clinical associate professor of psychiatry at Ohio State University’s Wexner Medical Center. Both adults and adolescents are at greater risk of suicide in remote areas of the U.S., according to a 2006 literature review. But suicide is in general more common among adolescents and young adults: It’s the third leading cause of death for people aged 15 to 24, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the second for people 25 to 34, and the 10th most common among the general population."Suicide is the oft-ignored part of gun tragedy in America." More than half of the youths who killed themselves in this time period did so with a firearm, and gun suicides (though generally on the decline) were particularly common in rural areas—nearly three times more common. This may be because gun ownership is higher in rural regions. According to 2014 Pew data, 51 percent of people in rural areas kept a gun at home, compared to 25 percent in urban areas, and 36 percent in the suburbs.“Suicide is in many ways the oft-ignored part of gun tragedy in America, the part that few talk about, especially those who resist any efforts to decrease access to guns,” writes Frederick Rivara, a professor of pediatrics at the University of Washington, in an editorial accompanying the study. He points out that 86 percent of suicide attempts using guns end in death, compared to 2 percent of attempts using drugs. “Rural residents often grow up with guns, have guns in their homes and there’s just a general culture of guns in rural areas,” Fontanella says. Even so, she says, suicide rates by all methods were higher in the country than in the city.The factors that might contribute to this disparity make a snarled web of many threads. Gun access is just one of those. Rural life is isolating—and getting more so. Only 15 percent of U.S. residents live in non-metropolitan areas, which account for about 72 percent of the country, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And these areas continue to lose population.Plus, “a lot of young people are out-migrating because of the lack of employment opportunities,” Fontanella says, “which can lead to heightened degrees of social isolation for those left behind.”For those who feel isolated, or who suffer from mental health problems that can lead to suicidal thoughts, home might not be the most comforting place. The 2006 review suggests that stigma around psychological disorders is often high in remote areas, and at least one study found that some rural regions of the U.S. (the Great Plains and Mountain West, specifically) tend to have cultures that value individual autonomy. Both of these factors could deter people from seeking help. Even if sought, help could be hard to find.

#### And, the ongoing violence of ruralism outweighs any one shot impact

**Poynter**, Shawn, and Tim Marema. "The Death-Rate Divergence: Urban vs. Rural." Daily Yonder. N.p., 25 Jan. **2016**. Web. 28 Jan. 2016

Rural America’s above-average mortality rate ought to be getting more attention than it is, according to a former federal health official who will be part of a presentation this week on rural life expectancy. “Several million people dying too soon is as important as a terrorist attack, but it’s not on the candidate debates or the evening news,” said Wayne Myers, who was head of the federal Office of Rural Health Policy during the Clinton administration. From 2005 – 2009, the rural mortality rate was 13% higher than the mortality rate for urban residents, according to a policy brief from the National Advisory Committee on Rural Health and Human Services. Until 1990, both urban and rural death rates were improving at about the same pace (see graph above). But since then rural America has not been keeping pace with improvement in urban areas. Over the past quarter century, the gap has widened.

#### And, this violence is intersectional with other forms of discrimination

Bassett 03

(Debra Lyn Bassett is a professor of law Southwestern Law School. This article, entitled “Ruralism” appeared in Iowa Law Review, volume 8. Accessed via L/N.)

**[\*284]** The burdens imposed by ruralism carry the same devastating consequences as other, more widely-recognized, forms of discrimination. Victims of sex and race discrimination, for example, encounter discrimination in college admissions, in employment opportunities, and in a lack of mentoring. n27 These same consequences attach to ruralism. Indeed, ruralism serves to exacerbate the impact of other forms of discrimination. n28

#### Discrimination leads to dehumanization

#### Stanton, Gregory. "The Ten Stages of Genocide." *Genocide Watch*. Genocidewatch.com, no date. Web. 28 Jan. 2016. <<http://www.genocidewatch.org/genocide/tenstagesofgenocide.html>>

DISCRIMINATION: A dominant group uses law, custom, and political power to deny the rights of other groups. The powerless group may not be accorded full civil rights or even citizenship. Examples include the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 in Nazi Germany, which stripped Jews of their German citizenship, and prohibited their employment by the government and by universities. Denial of citizenship to the Rohingya Muslim minority in Burma is another example. Prevention against discrimination means full political empowerment and citizenship rights for all groups in a society. Discrimination on the basis of nationality, ethnicity, race or religion should be outlawed. Individuals should have the right to sue the state, corporations, and other individuals if their rights are violated. DEHUMANIZATION: One group denies the humanity of the other group. Members of it are equated with animals, vermin, insects or diseases. Dehumanization overcomes the normal human revulsion against murder. At this stage, hate propaganda in print and on hate radios is used to vilify the victim group. In combating this dehumanization, incitement to genocide should not be confused with protected speech. Genocidal societies lack constitutional protection for countervailing speech, and should be treated differently than democracies. Local and international leaders should condemn the use of hate speech and make it culturally unacceptable. Leaders who incite genocide should be banned from international travel and have their foreign finances frozen. Hate radio stations should be shut down, and hate propaganda banned. Hate crimes and atrocities should be promptly punished.

# Thus the Plan,

The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its funding of fiber optic broadband internet access to Elementary and Secondary educational facilities in rural areas in the United States

# Contention 3: Method

#### The method of the 1AC is a critical focus on how specific forms of education become inaccessible to rural youth, and a refocus of policy discussion on rural spaces.

**This sort of recognition is key to any chance for change**

**Bassett 03**

(Debra Lyn Bassett is a professor of law Southwestern Law School. This article, entitled “Ruralism” appeared in Iowa Law Review, volume 8. Accessed via L/N.)

Rural dwellers suffer numerous documented disadvantages, n287 and recognition of the burden of these disadvantages is long overdue. As is true of other forms of discrimination, ruralism reflects the disparities in power between urban and rural dwellers. n288 The question remains the methodology: How do we appropriately acknowledge and address the phenomenon of ruralism? The most effective remedies for ruralism are easily identified. As is true for discrimination based on race, gender, or other protected categories, the most effective remedies are the "three R's" - recognition, role models (or mentoring), and remediation. Recognition of ruralism as a phenomenon is the first necessary step. n289 The available statistics provide powerful evidence of the disadvantages faced by rural dwellers. n290 Poverty and lack of access are well-documented. n291 These disadvantages have prevented rural dwellers from full representation in society generally, and in university attendance and fuller entry into the elite professions in particular.

#### And, focusing on the rural as a place is necessary to see its impact on the dwellers within and the identity that they’re forced to take on.

**Creed and Ching 97**

(Barbara Ching, prof. of English at the University of Memphis & Gerald Creed, prof. of anthropology at Hunter College. This card comes from the first chapter “Recognizing Rusticity: Identity and the Power of Place” in their edited volume “Knowing your Place: Rural Identity and Cultural Hierarchy.” Published by Routledge in 1997. This card has been OCRed from the original text and may have very minor textual errors.)

Hank Williams fans and chic Parisians eating "peasant food" in three star restaurants make statements about who they are and where they belong with these choices. Recreational hunters and avid gardeners sustain an identification with the countryside long after their addresses and incomes divorce these activities from economic necessity (Marks i99i). Such choices shape identity in concert with less flexible markers of place such as regional accents and hometown origins. In other words, the rural/urban opposition generates not only political and economic conflict but social identification as well. Given the pervasiveness of the rural/urban opposition and its related significance in the construction of identity, it is remarkable that the explosion of scholarly interest in identity politics has generally failed to address the rural/urban axis. The resulting representation of social distinctions primarily in terms of race, class, and gender thus masks the extent to which these categories are inflected by place identification. For example, social theorists generally fail to acknowledge that a rural woman's experience of gender inequality may be quite different from that of an urban woman, or that racial oppression in the city can take a different form from that in the countryside. As we will argue in detail, contemporary discussions of the fragmentation and recombination of identities locate this process almost exclusively in the city. Conversely, the few scholars who explicitly discuss rural identity have generally failed to connect it to these larger theoretical debates; instead they have positioned their work in other specialties such as community ideology (Hummon I99o) and rural development (Fitchen I99I). Such blindness reflects other political and economic processes that have globally "marked" the rural end of the place spectrum. In many spheres, the urban has come to be the assumed reference when terms are used that could in theory refer to both rural and urban subjects. For example, The New York Times Magazine recently published a photographic essay on farm animals with the subtitle "The barnyard animals live at a distance from us now" (Weil and Klinkenborg I995). Even though the magazine is read throughout the world, the authors and editors felt no need to specify that "us" refers only to urban readers. Even where rural residents outnumber urbanites, they can become the culturally marked category (Pigg t992). The fact that we must make a point of clearly marking the rural reveals the cultural hierarchies that make place such a politically and personally charged category. As with other dimensions of identity, it is the marked/marginalized group that experiences the distinction more intimately and for whom it becomes a more significant element of identity. In this case, the urban-identified can confidently assume the cultural value of their situation while the rural-identified must struggle to gain recognition. Ironically, the rural-identified may experience their marginalization as both invisibility and as a spectacularly exaggerated denigration, At either extreme, though, they are placed as "low others" (Stallybrass and White i986: 5-6). Thus we argue that neither an apparent decline in the demographic and economic salience of the contemporary rural sector nor any convergence of rural and urban lifestyles should be allowed to overshadow the continuing significance of rural-based identities. In order to signal both the importance of these places and the power relations concealed there, we propose familiar terms which jarringly remind us of the potential for imbuing the apparently hard facts of demography and geography with cultural meaning and value: identities based in the Country can be considered rustic while those associated with the city are urbane, or, more vernacularly, sophisticated. Presented in these antithetical terms, the possibility of a culturally valuable rusticity becomes difficult to imagine in spite of the rurality we often sentimentally associate with a sublimely unpeopled wilderness or a severe agrarian past. This collection, then, fruitfully returns to places which contemporary thought has rendered almost unthinkable. The essays confirm that people concretely live the distinction between the country and the city. Thus, we insist on the need to maintain the visibility and vitality of the rustic and the rural, not only for the sake of the food supply, but also for the analytical possibilities opened up by attention to life at the rustic margin. We focus on three interrelated issues: the nearly omnipresent cultural hierarchies, often buttressed by political and economic stratification, in which rustic people (wherever they reside) are marginalized and their culture devalued vis a vis urban(e) culture; the radical embracing of that marginality by many people in order to contest the late twentieth century's hegemonic urbanity and its associated socio-political structures; and the inability of many scholars and social commentators to see rural and urban places within the model of identity politics so central to postmodern theory. Since this threefold focus raises questions that touch several academic disciplines, we have taken a broad, interdisciplinary approach to "knowing" place. This collaboration reveals the interaction between processes that signify rusticity and conditions that shape rural life, but it violates many disciplinary conventions: in seeking to locate place identities in cultural hierarchies, we move without qualification from personal experience to ethnographic accounts, literary traditions, and popular culture. Still, we make no claim to an exhaustive survey.

# Advantage 1: Poverty

**Current internet access in rural areas is either nonexistent or woefully inadequate for educational purposes**

“Technology Is Improving, So Why Is Rural Broadband Access Still a Problem?” By Brian **Whitacre** June 9, **2016** https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-09/technology-is-improving-so-why-is-rural-broadband-access-still-a-problem

There is a well-documented "digital divide" between rural and urban areas when it comes to broadband access. As of 2015, 74 percent of households in urban areas of the U.S. had residential broadband connections, compared with only 64 percent of rural households. This gap has persisted over time. My own research reveals that broadband adoption can help improve the economy in these rural areas (including increasing income, lowering unemployment rates and creating jobs). In addition, we know that roughly 40 percent of the rural-urban adoption gap is because rural areas don't have the same level of broadband access. Technology continues to improve, enabling existing wiring to carry more and more data. The federal government has historically tried to provide infrastructure in rural areas. Its latest effort, known as the "Connect America Fund" (CAF), initially offered $10 billion in subsidies to the largest telecom companies to begin offering service in unserved areas. The Conversation In some states, those large providers rejected that offer – so that territory is now available to smaller providers. Clearly, it is still significantly more difficult to deploy broadband in rural areas. In fact, the latest data show that only 55 percent of people living in rural areas have access to the speeds that currently qualify as broadband, while 94 percent of the urban population does. Why is this, exactly What's 'Broadband,' Anyway? Legally speaking, "broadband" is whatever the Federal Communications Commission says it is. In the early 2000s, the FCC defined "broadband" connections as those that could transfer data at a speed of 200 kilobytes per second (kbps) in at least one direction – either "downstream," downloading from the internet to a user, or "upstream," uploading data from the user back to the internet. That was roughly four times faster than historical dial-up modems (56 kbps). Students' Access to Broadband Surges In 2010, the FCC changed what it called "broadband" to require speeds at least five times faster still. The minimum downstream speed increased to 4 megabits per second (mbps), with at least 1 mbps upstream. Companies currently receiving Connect America Funds are required to provide at least 10 mbps down and 1 up. However, in 2015, the FCC again upgraded the minimum broadband service to 25 mbps down and 3 mbps up. The fact that the CAF program will fund projects that do not meet the current official definition of broadband has been a point of criticism. These thresholds will continue to get higher. As that happens, rural areas will require the most work to become – and stay – compliant, because their existing bandwidth is generally slower than their urban counterparts. Only 75 percent of rural Americans have access to fixed (not mobile) connections of at least 10 mbps download speeds, compared to 98 percent of urban residents. And only 61 percent of rural residents meet the current 25 mbps threshold for any type of technology, compared to 94 percent of their urban counterparts. Distance Matters It is still more efficient for telecommunications companies to install new communications lines in areas with high population density. This is basic economics related to how many customers there are to share fixed installation costs. There are typically around 2,000 people per square mile in urban areas versus 10 in some rural areas. When companies switched data traffic from copper lines to more efficient and reliable fiber-optic ones, they did so first in the more profitable urban areas. Despite the many improvements in technology over the years, laying new line for wired internet connections still requires a significant amount of manual labor. Companies must weigh the cost of every mile laid against the expected profits from those lines. This works against rural areas, with fewer potential customers per mile. For areas still served by copper wire, sending data at high speeds has distance limitations: The signals typically degrade after three miles. To get data traveling longer distances to and through rural areas, companies must install signal-amplifying equipment called "access multipliers." That adds to the cost of serving rural customers. Along these same lines, there is more competition among broadband providers in urban areas. Over 60 percent of the urban population has access to at least three wireline providers – a diversity of choice available to just 19 percent of rural residents. This competition can lead to lower prices and improved services for consumers – which, when they happen, ultimately raise adoption rates.

**Effective Broadband internet access is key to rural communities' economies and the economy at large**

“Findings on the Economic Benefits of Broadband Expansion to Rural and Remote Areas.” **Hupka**, Yuri. **2014** (http://www.cura.umn.edu/publications/catalog/cap-188)

Internet access has become vital to a progressive society. Communities with broadband access experience a wide array of economic, educational, and social advantages. However, many rural and remote areas are without sufficient bandwidth to fully and effectively participate in the world economy. The perceived gap between areas with and without sufficient bandwidth is known as the 'digital divide'. While the 'digital divide' was once a problem of access, internet proliferation in recent years has made it an issue of connection quality and speed. Congress as well as many private and public organizations have noted these problems and are initiating policies to counter them. However, development is slow due to perceived high costs and low benefits. In reality, there are more benefits than many businesses expect. Research indicates that small communities and surrounding rural areas with high quality broadband access reap both short and long term economic benefits. Short term benefits are characterized by modest increases in business and job growth. Business growth is realized through practical applications such as e-commerce and cost reductions. For this reason, many businesses have already reached out to rural areas thus giving rise to the recent trend called 'rural sourcing'. Some long term benefits include growth in population, per capita income, and even GDP. However, broadband access does not just help businesses in these outlying areas. Rural communities and its citizens also benefit. Educational and government institutions can use high speed internet for scholastic and vocational training thus building a competent and competitive workforce. Medical providers require high-speed connections to supply telehealth which can immensely improve health care in rural areas. Also, research indicates that adequately connected citizens are often more involved in their communities. By prudently developing and creatively financing broadband, rural communities can keep pace with the global economy and prepare citizens for participation and competition in the modern world.

**Don’t Confuse the Fact that Poverty is Related to Economics With Poverty as Solely a Question of Resources—There are More than Economic Factors Involved – broadband access is key**

Siddiqur Rahman **Osmani**, Professor of Development Economics at the School of Policy,Economics and Law, University of Ulster, “Evolving Views on Poverty: Concept, Assessment, and Strategy,” Asian Development Bank, July **2003**(<http://www.adb.org/Documents/Papers/Evolving_views_poverty/Osmani_paper_final.pdf#page=5>)

Two clarifications are needed here to avoid misunderstanding. First, while the concept of poverty does have an irreducible economic connotation, the relevant concept is not low income but the broader concept of inadequate command over economic resources, of which inadequate personal income is only one possible source. Other sources include insufficient command over publicly provided goods and services, inadequate access to communally owned and managed resources, and inadequate command over resources that are made available through formal and informal networks of mutual support. If a person’s lack of command over any of these resources plays a role in precipitating basic capability failures, that person would be counted as Poor. Second, the recognition that poverty has an irreducible economic connotation does not necessarily imply primacy of economic factors in the causation of poverty. For example, when discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, or any other ground denies a person access to health care resources, the resulting ill health is clearly a case of capability failure that should count as poverty because lack of access to resources has played a role here. But causal primacy in this case lies in the sociocultural practices and political-legal framework that permit discrimination against particular individuals and groups; lack of command over resources plays merely a mediating role. However, the existence of this mediating role is crucial in distinguishing poverty from a low level of well-being in general

**Poverty is a Form of Structural Violence—The Decision To Maintain it is the Largest Impact— An Ongoing and Accelerating War Against the Poor**

Mumia **Abu-Jamal**, Activist and Prisoner, A QUIET AND DEADLY VIOLENCE, 9/19/**98** (<http://www.mumia.nl/TCCDMAJ/quietdv.htm>)

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural" violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness . Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; "By `structural violence' I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society . These are not acts of God. I am contrasting `structural' with `behavioral violence' by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on." -- (Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it – really ? Gilligan notes: "[E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world ." [Gilligan, p. 196] Worse still, in a thoroughly capitalist society, much of that violence became internalized, turned back on the Self, because, in a society based on the priority of wealth, those who own nothing are taught to loathe themselves, as if something is inherently wrong with themselves, instead of the social order that promotes this self-loathing. This intense self-hatred was often manifested in familial violence as when the husband beats the wife, the wife smacks the son, and the kids fight each other. This vicious, circular, and invisible violence , unacknowledged by the corporate media, uncriticized in substandard educational systems, and un-understood by the very folks who suffer in its grips, feeds on the spectacular and more common forms of violence that the system makes damn sure -- that we can recognize and must react to it. This fatal and systematic violence may be called The War on the Poor

# Extensions

### Soft Critical Extensions

**The Assumption of “Metero-Normativity” Encourages Exclusion of Rural Queers and Creates Structural Discrimination**

Bud **Jerke**, J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 2010, “Queer Ruralism,” Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, **2011** (<http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlg/vol341/259-312.pdf>)

The U.S. legal system and queer Americans have something important in common: an urban assumption. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender citizens—collectively referred to here as “queer”1—are deemed to be exclusively metropolitan dwellers. Queer orientations are urban orientations. The U.S. legal system is equally bound up in urbanity, assuming that social problems are exclusively those that are urban and constructing legal responses tailored to urban ills. Urban assumptions are part and parcel of deeply held stereotypes about the rural generally and rural queers particularly. Rural dwellers are popularly depicted as backwards—as uneducated, intolerant, and dirty—or idyllic— as innocent and safe. Such stereotypes work to marginalize and distort rural realities. They lend to ruralism, which has been defined as “discrimination on the basis of factors stemming from living in a rural area.”2 To compound this, rural queers are rendered invisible because popular stereotypes perceive queer people as solely urban. This “queer metronormativity” is pervasive in popular culture,3 scholarly literature, and even judicial Rhetoric.4 Rural queers reside at the intersection of ruralism and queer metronormativity. They are a particular subset of rural dwellers for whom ruralism is particularly acute. This paper examines the situation of rural queers to construct a concept of queer ruralism: structural discrimination stemming from being queer and living in a rural area

**Rurality Intersects With Gender Oppression—The Attempt to Relegate Rural Spaces to the Private Analogizes the Relegation of Women to the Home**

Lisa R. **Pruitt**, Professor of Law, University of California, Davis, “Gender, Geography & Rural Justice,” Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice, Fall **2008** (Lexis)

More than a decade ago, rural sociologist Ann Tickamyer initiated (or attempted to initiate) a conversation with legal scholars about rural women, law, and spatiality. n336 Her 1996 article seems to be the earliest attempt in legal [\*389] scholarship to bring critical geography to bear on women's lives, with particular attention to poor, rural women. Yet legal scholarship continues to ignore the rural milieu, including gender issues in that context. In spite of this oversight, and to some extent because of it, the opportunity presented by critical geography remains great. Thinking about rurality in terms of "space" reminds us, for example, of literal distance - both between the rural and the urban, and among those who reside in rural communities. As a consequence of this first aspect of rural spatiality, rural people and places are largely unseen by broader society. n337 Further, rural spaces are considered more private relative to urban and suburban spaces, n338 while women's roles and identities within rural communities are more associated, literally and figuratively, with the private. n339 Functioning in spaces that are private in the extreme burdens and constrains rural women in myriad ways, as does the immobility associated with those spaces. N340 Other aspects of rural spatiality also invite our attention, particularly as they relate to gender. Socioeconomic disadvantage - all too often rising to the level of poverty - is part and parcel of the socio-spatial landscape of rural America. n341Sparseness of population, a material aspect of spatiality itself, contributes to socioeconomic disadvantage because it results in - and is a result of - fewer jobs, fewer services, and a less diversified economy. Women are particularly vulnerable in this context because of the acute wage gap between rural men and women, as well as the entrenched form of rural patriarchy that keeps women's domestic duties primary. Lack of anonymity, a consequence of rural spatiality, is another significant feature of the rural socio-spatial landscape. This feature influences decision making and circumscribes agency. It also explains how physical distance constructs spaces in ways that foster physical privacy, while also creating vulnerabilities for rural women and undermining the sort of privacy that is associated with anonymity. N342 Attention to "place" moves us beyond the broad rural/urban axis. It adds [\*390] texture and value by making room for explicit consideration of regional identities, cultures, n343 and economies, with their attendant structures of inequality. This analytical tool helps us see and understand these differences among rural places, including those falling at different points along the rural/urban continuum. Legal actors and policy-makers whose decisions affect rural populations, as well as gender scholars and rural scholars, must explore the repercussions of these socio-spatial features and place-based differences. Intentionality about space and place helps us guard against conflating the idea of a universal women's experience with urban women's experience. It allows us to contemplate not only how a rural woman's experience of gender inequality may differ from that of her urban counterpart, but also how oppression on the basis of race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation may "take a different form ... in the countryside." n344 Indeed, just paying attention to rurality "can be a crucial form of cultural awareness and resistance." n345 The temporal is relevant, too, of course. n346 Changes wrought at specific times and over time have socio-spatial consequences in actual places. In this era of transformation and restructuring for many rural people and places, vigilance is necessary regarding assumptions about rurality. When the "rural" is more contested than ever, n347 we must be open to how demographic, economic, and social changes are reconstructing rural spaces, altering rural power structures, and aggravating or ameliorating spatial and other inequalities. N348 Professor Hari Osofsky asserts that doing legal analysis in spatial context is critical in light of ever-increasing "complexities of scale, interrelatedness of people, entities, and institutions, as well as a multiplicity of connections to and [\*391] disconnection from place." n349 Although Osofsky's focus is international law, her assertion is "spaceless": it rings true even in relation to rurality. While that which is rural has long been thought of as quintessentially local, rural livelihoods are no longer isolated economically and culturally from the rest of the country, or from the rest of the world. Though rural places are physically and socially removed from urban America to differing degrees, advances in technology and transportation have blurred aspects of the rural/urban divide. Rural locales are increasingly enmeshed with higher scales and other places, even as spatial isolation and its many consequences constitute (and are constituted by) rurality, influencing events and legal outcomes. Law is called to understand how "power operates through and in spaces and places" n350 - to investigate how space is used to perpetuate disadvantage, inequality, and oppression. n351 Otherwise, space "hides things from us." n352 Nowhere, perhaps, is this more so than in the increasingly obscured spaces and places of rural America. With respect to few groups is this as true as for women who - especially in rural places - populate the already hidden spaces of the private sphere.

**Rural discrimination relies on the implicit assumption that poor rural americans are genetically defective. This otherization is the logic of eugenics.**

**Newitz & Wray\_1997** (Annalee Newitz and Matt Wray [Newitz, Ph.D from U.C. Berkely in English and American studies, and served as a fellow at M.I.T. Wray graduated from University of California, Berkeley's doctoral program in Ethnic Studies in 2000 & spent the following academic year as a Postdoctoral Fellow at the National Museum of American History @ the Smithsonian Institute; writes about cultural and social theory and teaches courses in race and ethnic relations], *White Trash: Race and Class in America,* pp. 2-3)

According to historical dictionaries, the earliest recorded use of the term white trash dates back to the early part of the nineteenth century. Sources attribute the origin of the term to black slaves, who used it as a contemptuous reference to white servants. While there is some reason to doubt these accounts, the emergence of white trash in the context of black slavery and white servitude speaks to the racialized roots of the meaning of the term.\* More recently, current stereotypes of white trash can be traced to a series of studies produced around the turn of the century by the U.S. Eugenics Records Office (ERO). From *1880* to *1920,* the ERO and affiliated researchers produced fifteen different "Eugenic Family Studies," wherein the researchers sought to demonstrate scientifically that large numbers of rural poor whites were "genetic defectives." Typically, researchers conducted their studies by locating relatives who were either incarcerated or institutionalized and then tracing their genealogies back to a "defective" source (often, but not always, a person of mixed blood). Many of these accounts became popular with the American public, and family clans like "The Jukes" and "The Kallikaks" became widely known, entering the public imagination as poor, dirty, drunken, criminally minded, and sexually perverse people. As Nicole Hahn Rafter puts it, the central image these studies created was the degenerate hillbilly family, dwelling in filthy shacks, and spawning endless generations of paupers, criminals, and imbeciles. The eugenic family studies had a very pronounced influence on social policy and medical practice in the early twentieth century. Conservative politicians used them effectively as propaganda in their call to end all forms of welfare and private giving to the poor. The burgeoning medical and psychiatric establishments used them to enlarge their fields, resulting in the involuntary sterilization and forced institutionalization of large numbers of rural poor whites. While the adoption of eugenic theory and practice by the Nazis in the 1930s and 1940s did much to discredit eugenics in the United States, the stereotypes of rural poor whites as incestuous and sexually promiscuous, violent, alcoholic, lazy, and stupid remain with us to this day. Alarmingly, contemporary conservative thinkers like Charles Murray have resurrected this line of biological determinist thinking, blaming white trash for many of the nation's ills and using pseudoscientific eugenic theory to call for an end to the welfare state. Indeed, the widespread popularity of Herrnstein and Murray's The *Bell Curve* speaks to a renewed interest in U.S. social Darwinism as an explanation for cultural and class differences.

**THIS PORTRAYAL OF RURAL WHITES AS GENETICALLY INFERIOR FEEDS A DIALECTIC OF HATE BETWEEN THE MIDDLE-CLASS AND LOWER-CLASS WHITES. THE ELIMINATION OF LOWER-CLASS WHITES BY MIDDLE-CLASS WHITES BECOMES JUSTIFIED VIOLENCE. ADITTIONALLY, THIS RHETORICAL FRAMING IS TO POSIT WHITES AS VICTIMS, ALLOWING A SIMULATION OF RACIAL INNOCENCE. THIS PROVIDES A LOOPHOLE FOR WHITENESS TO AVOID THE QUESTION OF HOW WHITE SUPREMACY IS UTILIZED AS A TOOL OF DOMINATION AGAINST OTHER RACES**

**Newitz\_\_1997** (Annalee Newitz [Ph.D from U.C. Berkely in English and American studies, and served as a fellow at M.I.T.];“White Savagery and Humiliation”, Wray and Newitz; *White Trash: Race and Class in America,* pp. 144-145)

Seen in this light, white self-punishment is a form of psychological defense; but it is just as importantly a politically reactionary form of ideological defense. To the extent that this hatred is dependent upon a class hierarchy, in which those at the bottom punish and cleanse those at the top, it holds class divisions of every sort firmly in place. Furthermore, it justifies the containment and scapegoating of the lower classes, whose purpose is reduced to perpetually proving the strength and innocence of their betters in acts of extreme violence. One might argue that these "descents" into savagery break down the distinctions between middle-class and lower-class, and in a limited way they do. However, breaking down class distinctions in The Sadist and The Hills Have Eyes are events which are catastrophic in the extreme. The classes and "races" get equalized by becoming primitives in combat, thus sustaining the notion that the only power the disenfranchised have is to bring the powerful down to a horrific, animalistic level. In terms of economic class conflict, the idea that middle-class whites need to become savages to defend themselves is a perfect excuse for the middle classes to behave in outrageously cruel ways toward the lower classes. We might say the middle class is only "fighting fire with fire," and in addition it cannot bear responsibility for what it does in a savage state. Primitivist ideology holds that we're all savages underneath; civilized people are just repressing their inner brute. If the lower classes "bring down" the white middle class to their level, in essence they are "asking for it" when the middle class turns savage and kills them off. Ultimately, middle-class whites can use the hatred they inspire in lower-class whites to justify their own violence and to claim that they can't help being violent anyway. After all, the middle classes are just savages too. Either way, whites secure their innocence by swapping punishment and hatred back and forth between classes locked in combat with one another. It even becomes plausible to argue that a race that does such violence to itself is in the same position as the racial "others" created by whiteness. Whites become, in this formulation, a crippled race, a victim race, a divided race-not a race of conquerors. As long as whites can maintain violent class division, they can also simulate racial innocence and flee from the guilt of wielding white power over non-whites.

### Policy Ignorance

#### Rural policy has been de facto extensions of urban policy, and the absence of specific policies force rural groups to give in to urban interests

**Swanson 2001** ( Louis E, chair of Sociology at Colorado State University, past president of the Rural Sociological Society); “Rural Opportunities: Minimalist Policy and Community-Based Experimentation” Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 29, 2001.

For the past half-century and more, most efforts to develop rural nonfarm policies have been opportunistic and minimalist. Rural policies most often have been de facto extensions of urban policies, the same programmatic assumptions but on a smaller scale. Consequently, programs that impact rural people often have not fit the conditions of rural people and therefore have been seen as ineffective and even misguided. This de facto approach has forced rural officials to incorporate community-based orientations in order to bring greater relevancy of federal programs to their local conditions. This minimalist policy is directly linked to the absence of a national constituency (Browne, 2001). The absence of nationally active rural interest groups has forced rural policy advocates at the federal level to pursue strategies dependent upon temporary alliances as a very junior partner with powerful nonrural interest groups-both urban and farm based. Commercial agricultural groups, whose rhetoric embraces concerns for nonfarm issues, tend to place little or no priority on nonfarm rural concerns. They often provide an agricultural determinism message that simplifies the characteristics and therefore the needs of rural America as being one and the same as those of commercial agriculture.

#### The agricultural stereotype of rural communities prevailed in policymaking, leaving rural issues improperly addressed.

**Browne 2001** (William P. prof of political science @ Central Michigan Univ) “Rural Failure: The Linkage Between Policy and Lobbies.”Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 29, 2001.

A task force of the Rural Sociological Society (1993, P. 292) once addressed rural public policy in a most critical fashion. Its conclusion clearly states a perception of dramatic failure: "We see a near total inability on the part of U.S. governing institutions to deal successfully with the wide range of America's rural needs." That indictment was premised on historical factors as the cause for neglect. This history of neglect evolved through three means. First, rural policy was always capsuled, even captured, within farm policy (Browne, Skees, Swanson, Thompson, & Unnever, 1992, pp. 16-36). Second, a pervasively held myth of agrarianism emerged as a policy guide. This myth suggested that farm development would solve the problems of rural America through the eventual results of good farmer stewardship and the trickle-down effects of farm prosperity on surrounding communities (Brewster, 1963). Third, a set of farm development institutions was set up as a federal network of policymaking, education, extension or outreach, and research to further farm development goals (Swanson, 2001). These institutions were quite expectedly--given the myth--also tasked with caring for rural America. Rural, of course, took a back seat to farm policy.

### Impact (Discrimination/Otherization/Ruralism, etc.)

#### Rural is always defined in opposition to urban, rendering it the “other” and furthering offensive and dangerous stereotypes.

**Pruitt 2006** (Lisa R. Pruitt [Professor, University of California, Davis, School of Law] Rural Rhetoric, 39 Conn. L. Rev. 159, November, LN)

Rural and urban are commonly conceived of and presented as dichotomous. That which is rural is often popularly depicted as the "other," in contrast or opposition to an implicit urban norm. n41 That is, if a scene, situation, or person is not expressly designated as rural, it is implicitly urban, which is the default, the norm. n42 Sociologist Russell Frank has written about how rural areas are popularly perceived and defined according to what urban areas are not: If the big city is noisy, then the small town must be quiet.

If the big city is exciting, then the small town must be boring.

If the big city is a cultural oasis, then the small town must be a cultural wasteland.

If the big city is dangerous, then the small town must be safe.

If the big city is atomized, then the small town must be connected.

If the big city is dirty, then the small town must be clean. N43 In his study of urban newspapers' depictions of rural areas, Frank comically describes these stereotypes and the binary oppositions they represent as reflected in Aesop's fable of the country mouse and the city mouse. n44 He observes the fable's depiction of country life as simple but wholesome, city life as sophisticated but threatening. n45 The fable reflects commonly-held beliefs regarding distinctions between rural and urban dwellers, as well as the dominant stereotypes associated with the places they inhabit. As reflected in these dichotomous parings, rural communities are often popularly perceived as quiet, clean, connected, and wholesome. Many rural sociologists have discussed the phenomenon of rural locales being portrayed as idyllic, n46 noting that "images and stories about countrysides have proved very alluring, with the very idyll-ised myths about nature and rural life." n47 Farms and small towns are among the rural landscapes we value. n48 Others have observed the "largely nostalgic and romantic image of rural living" along with the myth of "country living and family life as simple, pure, and wholesome; slower paced; free from pressures and tensions; and surrounded by pastoral beauty and serenity." n49 John Logan [\*170] has gone as far as to call this an "antiurban bias," which he dates to colonial traditions that "regarded the city as a defilement of nature and moral scourge." n50 He argues that we see the rural as a repository of the values that we fear have been lost in our cities and suburbs: hard work, family, community, nature, and safety.n51 The stereotypes of rural people in the collective consciousness of our nation are as familiar and enduring as those about the rural places they inhabit. These stereotypes include the ignorant and simple rube, n52 but also the wholesome, salt-of-the-earth neighbor. While rural folks are sometimes referred to with such pejorative words as rednecks, hicks, and even white trash, n53 they and their communities are highly idealized in many contexts. Rural America has been portrayed, for example, as a refuge from the city, "the place where people live genuine lives, where both individualism and community thrive, where physical and mental health are restored." n54 Political scientist Ray Pratt has somewhat similarly [\*171] writtenof the "romantic magnetism" of the rural, arguing that it "functions in a utopian way-a kind of conservative romantic longing that harks back to an earlier and allegedly simpler and somehow better time." n55 He has observed that many associate the rural community with a "special and perhaps increasingly elusive quality of human relationships." n56 Rural sociologist Sonya Salamon has likewise discussed a collective longing for the rural where we believe we can be "known, attached, nurtured, or can sustain a coherent identity." n57 Some have theorized that rural communities are romanticized in literature, films, and other vehicles of popular culture, in part to reassure Americans that somewhere a better life-including "a community of which they could be a part"-is possible. n58 Rural sociologists have challenged the authenticity of these stereotypes, but they nevertheless persist. n59

## Method

#### We must embrace place-based activism to be able solve for the intersectionality of identity politics.

**Boggs 2000** (Grace Lee, anti-racism activist) “A Question of Place” Monthly Review, Vol. 52, June 2000.

Place-consciousness, on the other hand, encourages us to come together around common, local experiences and organize around our hopes for the future of our communities and cities. While global capitalism doesn't give a damn about the people or the natural environment of any particular place because it can always move on to other people and other places, place-based civic activism is concerned about the health and safety of people and places. Place-based civic activism is also unique in the way that it links issues. Thus the Environmental Justice movement calls on people of color to struggle against environmental racism, which results in disproportionate air and land pollution in our communities. Inspired by the Environmental Justice movement, the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles decided that, whereas the struggle against transit racism in the 1950s centered around direct actions like Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat, today it means engaging bus riders, who are mostly people of color and minimum-wage workers, in the struggle for timely, clean, and safe public transit. [2] Place-based civic activism also has important advantages over activism based on racial and gender identity which, in the last few decades, has consumed the energies of most progressives. Important as these identity struggles have been in the continuing struggle to humanize our society, they can lock us into single aspects of ourselves and ignore the multiple ways that we relate to one another in our communities--as neighbors, housewives, working parents, parents of schoolchildren, elders, children, sufferers from asthma and other disabilities, consumers, pedestrians, commuters, bus riders, citizens. Thus they have tended to isolate rather than to unite different constituencies. On the other hand, place-based civic activism provides opportunities to struggle around race, gender, and class issues inside struggles around place. Equally important, women naturally assume leadership of place-based struggles because they are so pivotal to neighborhood life.

#### In order to solve we have to change the social sphere of the debate culture from within.

Reid-Brinkley 2012

Interview with Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley conducted by Scott Odekirk on 2/13/2012 at the University of Texas debate tournament. Shanara is the first black woman director of debate in the country, a professor of communications at Pitt

http://puttingthekindebate.com/2012/04/02/the-dr-shanara-reid-brinkley/

Dr. Reid-Binkley: Now here is the fear. If that was the only answer, the debate community would do research, but it would be just to cut cards and nothing really would change. So **it can’t stop at research**, but **that is literally step one**: go do some reading. That would really help you have a language and a vocabulary for talking when you are engaging these teams that will produce very good debates.  So when people say that they don’t think that what performance/movement teams are doing is intellectual, it’s because they have already decided that they are anti-intellectual. Whereas they are very much so intellectuals, as a matter of fact they are few of the debaters in our community producing scholarship rather than regurgitating it. **Our very frame of reference on how to engage in debate is about the regurgitation of information, rather than the production of it. That is where** I think **we have gone wrong**, which is also why we are not having good – we are not able to advertise to our administrations in a way that makes debate something that administrations *really* really want to support and fully fund. And the reason is because we made it such this isolated solipsistic game that people who are really interested in knowledge production don’t necessarily see their relationship to it. We are losing tenure stream jobs for debate directors in our community. The reason is because our community is becoming more and more disconnected from the academy. **What we can do in terms of how we produce scholarship for debate, in debate rounds, is that we need to change our focus from the regurgitation of information that is already produced in the academy to an engagement with it so that we are producing new knowledge.** So **rather than saying the only way you can have a plan for what to do** different with democracy assistance **is to find what the USFG has already defined it as, and get authors who**, you have to find a solvency **advocate for whatever change you are going to make.** So **somebody has already produced that idea** and gotten it into print. Stupid! **Stupid**. **We are so smart, this community of people**, I have never been around smarter people than the people in the debate community. That’s why I find it exciting. Because I’m really smart, so I enjoy talking to other smart people. And, **we are just not making use of the intelligence, the intellectual power that is at a debate tournament**, especially when you get to the top of the game, it **is amazingly powerful**. I have met graduate students and professors that are nowhere near as smart as some of our undergraduates their senior year at the height of their ability to compete. Just have not.

Odekirk: Amen. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Given that this is the case, why are we not producing knew knowledge? Rather than coming at a plan as I have to have a solvency advocate who has already defined this, and I have to define this in the context of exactly how the USFG has previously defined it. I think **we should be producing new arguments about what** democracy **assistance should look like and be like through the USFG. So rather than having a solvency advocate you would have evidentiary support to change parts of your argument. Just like writing an academic paper. If all academic papers were was regurgitation of someone else’s argument, it would never get published. The whole point of** **academic scholarship is for you to identify what’s being said in the field or around a particular issue and what’s missing from that, and then you do something to demonstrate why that thing that’s missing** in that scholarship **should be there, and you make an argument about how we need to expand our understanding** of this situation. Does that make sense to you? So it doesn’t make sense that the ways we in which we engage in policy making is to simply chain it out to what something else someone has already thought of. **When we have all this intellectual power, we should be producing new policy. That would be the change. That would change our very way of thinking about what the game is that we are playing, and what its potential connection is to both the academy but also politics**. And that would create the space for teams who want to talk about anti-blackness or teams that want to talk about the defining nature of gender and how we engage in policy. It would allow all these different things because our very frame of reference for understanding what the game is that we are engaging in would change, it would open up fields of literature, it would make sense that people are saying we need a three tier methodology where we look at organic intellectuals we look at other scholars and we look at our personal experience, guess what, that’s how you write a [ed] academic paper now.

Odekirk: Strong. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: How about you just get with the program? Odekirk: Its so obvious, but I’ve never seen it. You are so right, but I’m having a major ‘a-ha moment’ right now, to be honest. You are so [ed] right. Its also so been there my whole life, but I have literally never thought that, and.. duh. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Yeah, that’s how I feel about it, like duh! Know what I mean? Then we have a much better argument to make to our administrations about the significance of our programs, **we can start connecting debate tournament** final **rounds to what’s going on in public policy research institutions. What we produce could *literally* provide an entrance for our arguments to actually affect public policy because of the intellectual power our community holds**.

# A2's

**A2 STATES:**

**Federal Action is Crucial to Rebuilding Rural Infrastructure—Only Federal Leadership, Funding, Knowledge and Uniformity is Substantial Enough to Solve**

Dale J. **Marsico**, Executive Director of the Community Transportation Association, “Transportation Challenges of Rural America,” March 12th, **2009** (http://www.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/Marsico\_Testimony\_3-12-09.pdf)

Although it is sometimes easier to separate communities by size and distance, it is important to remember that there is no way to separate the future of rural America from the rest of our nation, particularly as it relates to mobility. The inter-relationships between these areas is always vital — but they are especially important today because of the terrific pressure on our transportation and mobility system created by the current economic crisis, the ongoing problems in our energy area, the changing ways in which health care is being delivered, and an aging population that requires additional needs to remain in the places they call home. Each of these situations — taken alone — represent a significant challenge but combined they create a crisis that requires leadership and investment that our federal government can provide. For the people living in rural America the stakes are high, and without mobility they risk losing access to education, employment, basic health services and other opportunities that smaller communities can no longer provide. There are tools available to Congress to address this situation and my testimony is an attempt to highlight those that are the most significant. The most important of these tools include opportunities that will soon begin to make their way through the legislative process concerning the reauthorization of our highway and transit legislation, health care initiatives, energy legislation, and our continued legislative response to the economic crisis. Since no single issue is responsible for the mobility problems we face, no single piece of legislation will solve the rural mobility crisis. That being said, the most important opportunity to address the situation lies in the reauthorization of SAFETEA LU. This legislation is the cornerstone of our national mobility strategy and is both the most important piece of policy making that affects existing mobility for rural Americans, as well as the premier opportunity to create new ways of developing services that are needed.

**Only the Perm Can Solve—Federal and Local Action is Critical to Coordinated Policy**

Dale J. **Marsico**, Executive Director of the Community Transportation Association, “Transportation Challenges of Rural America,” March 12th, **2009** (http://www.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/Marsico\_Testimony\_3-12-09.pdf)

Rural transit in our country has taken the traditional concepts of public transportation and service and adapted them to the special role they fill in small towns and rural areas. Smaller vehicles, flexible services, low cost, and a high commitment to customer service are all hallmarks of the rural transportation programs serving our nation today. Federal funds available for rural transit flow through our states and help create a constructive partnership between federal, state, and local officials that is also a unique factor in the successes of our current rural transit programs. Because of the success of the rural transit program, these services play important roles in creating access for millions of our fellow citizens — especially our seniors and those with limited financial resources. Our proposals in our New Surface Mobility Vision call for increasing these important partnerships and services, building on the successes we currently enjoy. Enhancing these services will improve rural mobility, but alone they cannot solve the problems created when our rural communities are disconnected from each other as well as from the rest of our country. Our plan calls for a new series of steps to connect communities by building a new expanded effort we call a new era of connectivity

**A2: TIX**

**Your Disad is Fundamentally Ruralist—The Lack of Political Power Which Makes Your Disad Possible is Based on The Poverty and Structural Discrimination Criticized by the 1AC**

Bud **Jerke**, J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 2010, “Queer Ruralism,” Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, **2011** (http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlg/vol341/259-312.pdf) ark rural places and entrench rural poverty.”65

On the political level, ruralism is compounded because rural dwellers lack significant political power. In the 1960s, congressional districts with a majority rural population constituted forty-two percent of all districts.56 By the late twentieth century, this number had decreased to just thirteen percent. 57 One scholar notes that “[r]ural people are so widely dispersed that they are politically invisible.”58 This level of political invisibility has significant implications, particularly for national policymaking. For example, Professor Pruitt argues that the Personal Responsibility Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (“PRWORA”), the 1996 welfare reform legislation, “reflects an urban political agenda that failed to consider rural realties.”59 National dialogue surrounding PRWORA embraced rural myths and stereotypes, such as the belief that the “informal economy” assists the rural poor by allowing them to rely on family and neighbors to supplement income and provide networks for assistance,60 and a broad collective notion that challenges of rural life are minor and “offset by its many pleasures.”61 Consequently, PRWORA failed to respond to the unique structural challenges confronting rural dwellers, such as housing, transportation, childcare, employment, and education.62 For example, in the area of housing, rural dwellers have a more difficult time than their urban counterparts purchasing a home or paying rent.63 With regard to transportation, rural dwellers face unique challenges due to spatial isolation.64 Like much national legislation, PRWORA did not “attend[] to the different economic structures, institutions, social norms, and demographics that mark rural places and entrench rural poverty.”65

**A2 PRIVITIZATION CP:**

**Relying on Free Market Solutions to Poverty is an Attempt to Relieve Ourselves of Responsibility for the Social Structure of Impoverishment**

Mark Robert **Rank**, Associate professor in the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, One Nation, Underprivileged: Why American Poverty Affects Us All, **2005** (Google Books)

As we look at the conditions of poverty in this and the next chapter, a fundamental question to be asked is, How close to reality is such a perspective? One of the unspoken advantages and appeals of such a perspective is thai U lets us all off the hook- In other words, it serves to relieve us of any responsibility regarding poverty. Although 1 may feel sorry or distressed about the plight of the poor, I bear no accountability for their situation or their troubles. In fact, my active engagement may only make the situation worse. It is no coincidence that such a perspective lies at the heart of the think tanks, such as the American Enterprise Institute, that have funded Charles Murray's research. Their purpose has largely been to provide quasi-scientific support for their conservative political agenda.2 That agenda has been to promote unfettered free-market capitalism and individual responsibility as the sole solutions to poverty, while governmental social programs and safety nets have been derided as abject failures. Throughout the next several chapters, we will see that this perspective largely represents political ideology, rather than empirical reality. In fact, the evidence suggests that free-market capitalism leaves in its wake millions of impoverished households, while governmental actions and supports can effectively reduce the extent of poverty

**A2 GENERIC K:**

**Our Aff is a Pre-Requisite—Using Any Construction of Poverty Subordinating it to Alternate Concerns or Failing to Critically Interrogate It Causes Our Criticism to Fail**

Gavin **Jones**, American literature and American studies at Stanford University, “Poverty and the Limits of Literary Criticism,” American Literary History, **2003** (Project Muse)

This "in between-ness" of poverty as a category of social being is exactly what makes it such a powerful tool of inquiry in the hands of writers like Melville, Wharton, and Wright. They all explore poverty as a temporal condition of transition yet a social location nonetheless, as a haze of shifting socioeconomic relations that never loses material shape, as the very inverse of "identity" but still a description of structural forces that make minority consciousness matter. To form assumptions about the representation of poverty based on the class background of the writer or to found treatments of social marginalization solely on the writer's cultural background—these approaches leave us poorly equipped to interpret a social category that has always failed to behave within neat boundaries of class or cultural affiliation. But this in between-ness of poverty is also exactly what makes it such a difficult critical category to approach. The ease with which Agee, like Thoreau before him, becomes ambivalent on this issue flags the dangers that haunt any isolation of poverty as a distinct category of human suffering and economic need. If Agee and Thoreau—progressive heroes, of a sort, for the generation in which the "war on poverty" took political shape—seem to stumble, then we can understand why a critical discourse of poverty has also stuttered. Or at least we can appreciate why this discourse has splintered into approaches emphasizing class as the oppressive motor that constructs underclasses and into approaches stressing race or cultural background as an alternative to, more than a product of, disadvantaged socioeconomic situations. The opposing tendencies to view culture transhistorically if not affirmatively, and to undermine apparently hegemonic social categories, have to some degree combined to hinder analysis of literature as a forum in which poverty can be investigated as a social and historical problem that demands definition more than it does deconstruction

**A2 Queerness:**

**Focusing on Underlying Queer Epistemology Doesn’t Solve the Aff—Queer Ruralism is a Qualitatively Different Category**

Bud **Jerke**, J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 2010, “Queer Ruralism,” Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, **2011** (http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlg/vol341/259-312.pdf)

Here, rural becomes inextricably linked with conservative and religious: queer rights will never prevail in this rural geography. Rather, one should focus on enlightened urban areas, where queer people actually reside, and where chances for success will be greatest. But while the unanimous decision of the Iowa Supreme Court directly contravenes such rural assumptions, the story is not so simple. In November 2010, Iowans voted against retaining all three justices on the ballot—all three of whom participated in the unanimous decision.7 It marks the first time that an Iowa Supreme Court justice has not been retained since the current retention system was adopted in 1962.8 The court’s decision and subsequent electoral backlash demonstrate the complexity of queer ruralism. On the one hand, the Iowa Supreme Court decision undermines backward stereotypes of rural, while the ouster of the justices reinforces those very stereotypes. The episode recognizes that rural queer existence is not simply the oppressive monolith underlying the stereotypes, but neither is it, even in the wake of a highly favorable judicial opinion, a progressive oasis. Rural queer realities are dynamic.

**A2 Race:**

**Considering Poverty as a Question of Racial Factors Ignores its Specificity as a Cultural Connection**

Gavin **Jones**, American literature and American studies at Stanford University, “Poverty and the Limits of Literary Criticism,” American Literary History, **2003** (Project Muse)

Poverty is not today a key word among literary scholars because it raises these dilemmas of definition. So politically contentious are the associations of poverty and culture that any type of cultural perspective on the poor becomes inherently suspect. Criticism has been directed recently at the idealistic treatment of culture in a certain type of multiculturalist criticism—culture as an autonomous and collective domain, abstracted from its socioeconomic contexts (Turner 410-11). If the debate concerns the socioeconomic specifically, then the recourse to culture becomes more questionable still, more of an obvious distraction from the social and political roots of domination and exploitation. And if the cultural context becomes problematic in this way, then we are left with a void, at least from the perspective of culturally concerned literary criticism. It is easy to appreciate why academic treatments of social marginalization have privileged issues of race, ethnicity, and gender over socioeconomic factors, when poverty as a social category seems so beyond the possibility of affirmative [End Page 770] social identity from within and so troubling ethically when constructed as a cultural condition from without

**The Anti-Ruralist Subordination of the Poor is a Strategy to Enforce Domination and Continue Class Warfare**

Garrett Dash **Nelson**, PhD Candidate at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, “Towards the New Ruralism,” **2009** (http://people.matinic.us/garrett/ttnr/Full-WebBound.pdf)

Thus, although the guiding interest of Katahdin Iron Works’s owners was simple economic profit, in practice the place had taken on a quasi-utopian aspect from the beginning. By its last major overhaul, it was, in W. H. Bunting’s assessment, “the most advanced, hopelessly outdated ironworks in the country.”15 The company town featured boarding-houses, the Silver Lake Hotel, a photo saloon, a company store, the homes for its workers, and two farms.16 When the first wood-burning locomotive, “Black Maria,” made its maiden voyage from the works to Brownville, it carried the entire population of the village, and “men, women, and children made the trip with songs and shouts and laughter in high holiday mood”—a far cry from the mechanistic doom which often accompanied anxious writing about industrialization.17 The town even had its own benign autocrat, Owen W. Davis, who, in addition to his role as a major shareholder in the Katahdin Iron Company, served as “dictator, councilor, judge and jury for the entire township.”18 His “Davis scrip” was accepted as legal tender as far away as Bangor. When the bank finally foreclosed on the works, Davis stalled the sheriff who had been sent to seize the property at the train depot in Brownville and rushed back to the iron works to distribute the company’s entire reserve of cash and goods amongst the workers so that the state would have little left to seize from the corporation.19 In this way, Katahdin Iron Works became an inadvertent emblem of the ruralist-industrial utopianism which charged American economic development throughout the nineteenth century. Even Karl Marx, famously suspicious of “the idiocy of rural life,” recognized the extent to which a connection with the land could prevent economic exploitation. “We have seen,” he wrote in Capital, that the expropriation of the mass of people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production. The essence of a free colony, on the contrary, consists in this—that the bulk of the soil is still public property, and every settler on it can turn part of it into his private property and individual means of production, without hindering the later settlers in the same operation.20 The oppressive cancer of the wage-labor system could thus be tempered by enough open land to absorb the primary economic needs of a growing population. Indeed, this point—that “virgin countries, such as America, were ideal for the development of free societies”—is one of the few where Marx and Adam Smith held coincident opinions.21 With a heavy dose of sarcasm, Marx wrung his hands over how, in America, where “the cultivation of land is often the secondary pursuit of a blacksmith, a miller, or a shopkeeper,” the “constant transformation of the wage-laborers into independent producers” made “the degree of exploitation of the wage-laborer remain indecently low.”22 The economic independence which Crèvecoeur once described in factual terms was here put in service of an ideological optimism that America alone could evade the perils of industrial change through the force of its rural life. In this “doctrine of the safety valve,” then, American rurality acquired an economic power with international appeal, invoking a cultural myth that “a beneficent nature stronger than any human agency, the ancient resource of Americans that would solve the new problems of industrialism.”23

# NEG CASE ARGS

**Law is Fundamentally Ruralist—Legal Strategies Ultimately Fail**

Bud **Jerke**, J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 2010, “Queer Ruralism,” Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, **2011** (http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlg/vol341/259-312.pdf)

Of particular importance to this Article is how ruralism affects law and public policy. Negative stereotypes associated with ruralism work to marginalize rural constituents and litigants, rendering rural dwellers invisible and fostering an urban-centric legal and political regime. The urban assumption is embraced by our political and legal actors, which has the effect of perpetuating and institutionalizing ruralism. As Professor Pruitt observes, the “urban norm . . . is implicit in contemporary legal scholarship and in a great deal of law- and policy-making.”43 She argues that the “law’s constitutive rhetoric about rural people, places, and livelihoods” reflects many stereotypes about rurality and influences legal outcomes.44 When legal and political actors give purchase to rural stereotypes they exacerbate those perceptions; their rhetoric is not merely shaped by rural stereotypes, but has constitutive force in prospectively shaping or affirming them. Rural stereotypes are embedded in several areas of the law. The concern of “local bias” with regard to diversity jurisdiction often involves rural stereotyping, “which assumes provincialism and lack of intelligence” of the rural judiciary.45 The area of venue also assumes negative stereotypes of rural juries and their inabilities—inabilities that allegedly prejudice litigants and lead to lower damages awards.46

**Attention to Rurality is Fundamentally Analogous to Attention to Whiteness**

**Hail to You**, Racial Interest Blog, “USA Metropolitization By Race,” January 8th, **2012** (http://hailtoyou.wordpress.com/2012/01/08/usa-metropolitanization-by-race/) –

Whites are the only major racial group that is not near-totally-urbanized. A respectable share of American-Whites (22.6%) live in communities of less than 50,000 people. – Blacks and Hispanics are thoroughly urbanized groups in today’s USA. Hispanics, especially, have a negligble presence in Rural-America, with only 7.5% (3.8 million) of them living in communities of less-than-50,000. I’d presume that most of these are concentrated in the Southwest. – There are now an equal number of Blacks/Hispanics as Whites in the USA’s nine 5-million+ ‘megalopolises‘ — NYC, LA, Chicago, Dallas, Philadelphia, Houston, Washington, Miami, Atlanta. Combined, these megalopolises are home to 33.4 million Blacks/Hispanics and 33.5 million Whites. Among young megalopolis-dwellers, Whites are certainly already a minority. – Asians are the most urbanized group in the USA, which follows what we would expect from the densities with which they seem to be comfortable in their own societies. A negligible 500,000 Asians (3.2% of their national population) live outside a 50,000-person metro area. I suspect that a large share of these 500,000 may be either foreign college students in smaller college towns or “GI-bridges”. The remainder may live in a smattering of communities in the far west. The actual ‘organized Asian’ presence in Rural-America, outside the west coast, is likely all-but Zero. – American-Indians are the most rural racial group, with nearly half living in communities of less than 250,000. I presume this reflects the reservation system. Some Internet sources claim that 800,000 Indians now live on reservations, which would make sense given this data. To live in an urbanized region teeming with millions of people can be psychologically distressing, in certain ways — especially when those millions are of diverse ethnic-cultural-linguistic-religious origins. (Thus, ‘Bowling Alone’). Trust declines, civic activity declines. The feeling of special connection and pride in the region from which you come, your ‘Heimat’ feeling (as the Germans say), is unable to properly develop. And how can anyone, or any group, know where it is going if it does not know from whence it comes? Commentary: From Yeoman to Metropolitan The American, historically, had always set himself apart from his cousin in Europe, even from his closest of ethnoreligious kin back on the old continent, in large part because Europe was so long-settled, so densely-populated, often (and consequently) with few opportunities. North-America was different. After brushing aside the Indian, the early American inherited a vast and empty domain, which he began to settle, and imbue with a rural-soul. There was so much land, good land, in North-America that the early American could never even imagine it ever becoming as densely-populated as Europe. In the colonial days of the 1600s and 1700s, and in the ‘Westward March’ days of the 1800s, American population density was minimal. Those who so-desired could always move on, to the empty frontier, to settle the vast stretches of empty land. A place like Iowa saw its first permanent white settlers only in the 1820s. The solid majority of Americans still lived on farms when Lincoln was elected. (I suspect this knowledge is part of the drive behind Civil War interest, it is follk-nostalgia for the time when Americans were a rural-spirited, true nation [or nations, if you are a partisan of the CSA]). To understand the USA — at least the historical USA, as well as the ‘Tea Party‘ and other implicitly-White social-political movements of today — one must understand the rural-nature of American Civilization. The frontier mentality is part of this, but not its entirety. For centuries, the American had been busy-at-work creating this rural civilization. The frontier ‘closed’ in the late 1800s, but lingered on in a sense through the WWI era or later (My own great-grandfather took Uncle Sam up on the offer of free land in the western USA still on offer in the 1910s, though ended up not staying out west very long). Echoes of frontierism were able to be seen in the Dust Bowl migrations of the 1930s. It’s true that urbanization started to weaken the rural character of the USA in the early 20th century, but on through the mid to late 1900s, most non-Ellis-Islander Whites still had at least some kind of memory or folk-memory of living ‘on the farm’, even if vicariously-so through parents or grandparents.