### 1

####  THE AFFIRMATIVE’S CLAIM TO PERFORMATIVELY EFFECT CHANGE LOCATES AGENCY IN RHETORICAL PERFORMANCES LIKE THE PRECIOUS 1AC. THIS SHUTS DOWN MATERIALIST COALITIONAL ANTI-CAPITALIST MOVEMENTS.

GUNN AND CLOUD 2K10

[Joshua gunn and dana cloud, Phd Communicatoins, University of Texas Austin, Agentic Orientation as magical Voluntarism, Communication Theory]

Notably, Campbell’s statement on the status of agency does not attempt to reverse the posthumanist turn, but rather, sets out to reconcile the theoretical perspectives of Judith Butler and Michelle Balif with close textual reading practices that, until the crisis of agency, were assumed to have singular, self-transparent authors. Similarly,

John Lucaites’ call to jettison agency as a concept and locate power, instead, in historically particular rhetorical performances ‘‘in relationship to a set of perceived or constituted tensions . . . between cultural, institutional, and technological norms and structures’’ is a theoretical compromise: Agency is best understood on a caseby-case basis, leading to a multiplicity of conceptions of agency (Lucaites, 2003, paras. 1–2). Carolyn R. Miller’s (2007) recharacterization of agency as an attribution that makes certain kinds of symbolic action possible also ﬁgures a subject’s actions between the constraints of an exterior and the motives of an interior. The most widely known, explicitly dialectical positions on agency in rhetorical studies, however, are those of James Arnt Aune, Dana Cloud, and other Marxist critics. For example, critical of certain posthumanist theories of agency (namely, those of Greene 1998; 2004; 2007), Cloud, Macek, & Aune (2006) argue that social groups, especially class-based groups, harbor a capacity for political action grounded in their material circumstances: Either workers and their allies claim the real agency of that they possess and take the chance of making a world in which they are free in body as well as mind; or they resign themselves to generation after generation of grinding exploitation, settling for the meaningful but insufﬁcient consolations of sporadic, creative, ungrounded, and symbolic resistance. (2006, p. 81) Cloud, Macek, & Aune (2006) argue not only that ordinary people must mobilize collectively in order to pressure or overthrow employers and institutions, but also that it is the intersection of consciousness and experience that is generative of agency. In other words, as Cloud (2005) explains, working class agency is a product of both the experience of embodied labor and explicit political intervention and collective organizing. Agency in this view is not primarily characteristic of individuals; rather, the working class is a particular kind of collective agent that can manifest a real challenge to the capitalist system. In contrast, to believe that one can individually effect political change, or worse, to believe that one is powerless to effect political change, is to succumb to oppressive structures, economic and otherwise. Again, agency is located in the tensions between a larger structure and the (collective)

subject (also see Jameson, 1977).

#### Text: VOTE NEGATIVE TO REJECT THE 1AC IN FAVOR OF MATERIALIST REVOLUTIONARY KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AGAINST CAPITALISM.

#### AND, ECOLOGICAL CATASTROPHE NECESSITATES MATERIALIST REVOLUTIONARY DIALECTICS AGAINST CAPITALISM’S EXPLOITATION TO ENSURE SURVIVAL.

Foster 2k11

[john bellamy,  professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review, Since the Great Financial Crisis hit in 2008, Foster has been sought out by academics, activists, the media, and the general public as a result of his earlier prescient writings on the coming crisis. He has given numerous interviews, talks, and invited lectures, as well as written invited commentary, articles, and books on the subject]

In the twenty-first century it is customary to view the rise of planetary ecological problems as a surprising development scarcely conceivable prior to the last few decades. It is here, however, that we have the most to learn from the analysis of nineteenth-century thinkers who played a role in the development of ecology, including both early ecological scientists and classical historical materialists. Science has long warned of the negative, destructive side of the human transformation of the earth—a warning which the system, driven by its own imperatives, has continually sought to downplay. Indeed, what distinguishes our time from earlier centuries is not so much the conservation of catastrophe, which has long been recognized, but rather the accelerated pace at which such destruction is now manifesting itself, i.e., what I am calling the accumulation of catastrophe. The desertification arising in pre-capitalist times, partly through human action, manifested itself over centuries, even millennia. Today changes in the land, the atmosphere, the oceans, indeed the entire life-support system of the earth, are the product of mere decades. If in the past, Darwin was struck that in a mere three centuries after European colonization, the ecology of the island of St. Helena had been destroyed to the point that it was reduced to “desert”—today, in only two generations, we have altered the biogeochemical processes of the entire planet.28The absence of a historical perspective on the conservation, even accumulation, of catastrophe is a major barrier to needed change in our time. Many environmentalists, including some who perceive themselves as being on the left, persist in believing that we can address our immense and growing ecological problems without altering our fundamental social-production relationships. All that is necessary in this view is the combined magic of green technology and green markets. Short-term fixes are presumed to be adequate solutions, while society remains on the same essential course as before. Indeed, the dominant perspective on ecology can be characterized, I believe, as consisting of three successive stages of denial: (1) the denial altogether of the planetary ecological crisis (or its human cause); (2) the denial that the ecological crisis is fundamentally due to the system of production in which we live, namely capitalism; and (3) the denial that capitalism is constitutionally incapable of overcoming this global ecological threat—with capital now being presented instead as the savior of the environment.The first stage of ecological denial is easy to understand. This is the form of denial represented by Exxon-Mobil. Such outright denial of the destructive consequences of their actions is the automatic response of corporations generally when faced with the prospect of environmental regulations, which would negatively affect their bottom lines. It is also the form of absolute denial promoted by climate-change denialists themselves, who categorically reject the reality of human agency in global climate change. The second stage of denial, a retreat from the first, is to admit there is a problem,while dissociating it from the larger socioeconomic system. The famous IPAT formula, i.e. Environmental Impact = Population x Consumption x Technology (which amounts to saying that these are the three factors behind our environmental problems/solutions), has been used by some to suggest that population growth, the consumption habits of most individuals, and inappropriate technology carry the totality of blame for environmental degradation. The answer then is sustainable population, sustainable consumption, and sustainable technology. This approach, though seemingly matter-of-fact, and deceptively radical, derives its acceptability for the vested interests from the fact that it generally serves to disguise the more fundamental reality of the treadmill of capitalist production itself.29 The third stage of denial, a last-ditch defense, and exhibiting a greater level of desperation on the part of the established order, is, I would argue, the most dangerous of all. It admits that the environmental crisis is wrapped up with the existence of capitalism, but argues that what we need is an entirely new kind of capitalism: variously called “sustainable capitalism,” “green capitalism,” “natural capitalism,” and “climate capitalism” by thinkers as various as Al Gore, Paul Hawken, Amory and L. Hunter Lovins, and Jonathon Porritt.30 The argument here varies but usually begins with the old trope that capitalism is the most efficient economic system possible—a form of “spontaneous order” arising from an invisible hand—and that the answer to ecological problems is to make it more efficient still by internalizing costs on the environment previously externalized by the system. Aside from the presumed magic of the market itself, and moral claims as to “the greening of corporations,” this is supposed to be achieved by means of a black box of technological wonders. Implicit in all such views is the notion that capitalism can be made sustainable, without altering its accumulation or economic growth imperative and without breaking with the dominant social relations. The exponential growth of the system ad infinitum is possible, we are told, while simultaneously generating a sustainable relation to the planet. This of course runs up against what Herman Daly has called the Impossibility Theorem: If the whole world were to have an ecological footprint the size of the United States we would need multiple planets.31 The idea that such a development process can persist permanently on a single planet (and indeed that we are not at this point already confronting earthly limits) is of course an exercise in delusion, bordering on belief in the supernatural. “Capitalism,” as the great environmental economist K. William Kapp once wrote, is “an economy of unpaid costs.”32 It can persist and even prosper only insofar as it is able to externalize its costs on the mass of the population and the surrounding environment. Whenever the destruction is too severe the system simply seeks to engineer another spatial fix. Yet, a planetary capitalism is from this standpoint a contradiction in terms: it means that there is nowhere finally to externalize the social and environmental costs of capitalist destruction (we cannot ship our toxic waste into outer space!), and no external resources to draw upon in the face of the enormous squandering of resources inherent to the system (we can’t solve our problems by mining the moon!).Market-based solutions to climate change, such as emissions trading, have been shown to promote profits, and to facilitate economic growth and financial wealth, while increasing carbon emissions. From an environmental standpoint, therefore, they are worse than nothing—since they stand in the way of effective action. Nor are the technologies most acceptable to the system (since not requiring changes in property relations) the answer. So-called “clean coal” or carbon capture and storage technologies are economically unfeasible and ecologically dubious, and serve mainly as an ideological justification for keeping coal-fired plants going. Worse still, are geoengineering schemes like dumping sulfur particles in the atmosphere or iron filings in the ocean (the first in order to deflect the sun’s rays, the second in order to promote algal growth to increase ocean absorption of carbon). These schemes carry with them the potential for even greater ecological disasters: in the first case, this could lead to a reduction of photosynthesis, in the second the expansion of dead zones. Remember the Sorcerer’s Apprentice!33 The potential for the accumulation of catastrophe on a truly planetary level as a result of geoengineering technology is so great that it would be absolute folly to proceed in this way—simply in order to avoid changes in the mode of production, i.e., a fundamental transformation of our way of life, property relations, and metabolism with nature. Science tells us that we are crossing planetary boundaries everywhere we look, from climate change, to ocean acidification, to species destruction, to freshwater shortages, to chemical pollution of air, water, soil, and humans. The latest warning sign is the advent of what is called “extreme weather”—a direct outgrowth of climate change. As Hansen says: “Global warming increases the intensity of droughts and heat waves, and thus the area of forest fires. However, because a warmer atmosphere holds more water vapor, global warming must also increase the intensity of the other extreme of the hydrologic cycle—meaning heavier rains, more extreme floods, and more intense storms driven by latent heat.” Scientists involved in the new area of climate-attribution science, where extreme weather events are examined for their climate signatures, are now arguing that we are rapidly approaching a situation where the proverbial “‘hundred-year’ flood” no longer occurs simply once a century, but every few years. Natural catastrophes are thus likely to become more severe and more frequent occurrences in the lives of all living beings. The hope of some scientists is that this will finally wake up humanity to its true danger.34 How are we to understand the challenge of the enormous accumulation of catastrophe, and the no less massive human action required to address this? In the 1930s John Maynard Keynes wrote an essay entitled “Economic Possibilities of Our Grandchildren,” aimed at defending capitalism in response to revolutionary social challenges then arising. Keynes argued that we should rely for at least a couple more generations on the convenient lie of the Smithian invisible hand—accepting greed as the basis of a spontaneous economic order. We should therefore continue the pretense that “fair is foul and foul is fair” for the sake of the greater accumulation of wealth in society that such an approach would bring. Eventually, in the time of our “grandchildren”—maybe a “hundred years” hence (i.e., by the early 2030s)—Keynes assumed, the added wealth created by these means would be great enough that we could begin to tell the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. It would then be necessary for humanity to address the enormous inequalities and injustices produced by the system, engaging in a full-scale redistribution of wealth, and a radical transformation of the ends of production.35 Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is fairer—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

### 2

#### 1. Restrict means to limit, confine, or restrain within bounds

Words and Phrases 04 (Volume 37A, p. 405).

Iowa 1905. To “restrict” is to restrain within bounds; to limit; to confine. Mumford v. Chicago R.I. & P.R. Co., 104 N.W. 1135, 128 Iowa 685.

#### Authority is the legal right to take action, power is the ability to do so

Forsythe and Hendrickson 96

[David P. Forsythe, Professor and Chair of Political Science University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Ryan C. Hendrickson, Ph.D. Candidate University of Nebraska-Lincoln. “U.S. Use of Force Abroad: What Law for the President?” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 4]

The crisis is most precisely about authority, not power. Authority, in the legal sense, concerns the right to do something. Power refers to the capability to do something. Part of the problems ¶ in the U.S. constitutional crisis over use of force abroad is that the president has the power to ¶ make war, and to obtain congressional deference most of the time, whatever the proper under ¶ standing of authority.

#### B. The aff doesn’t restrict the authority of the President.

#### Vote neg for fairness and topic educations.

#### Standards.

#### A) Decisionmaking - a limited topic of discussion that provides for equitable ground is key to decision-making and advocacy skills

Steinberg & Freeley 8

\*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007. Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### Discussion of specific policy-questions is crucial for skills development – it overcomes preconceived ideological notions and breaks out of traditional pedagogical frameworks by positing students as agents of decision-making

Esberg & Sagan 12

\*Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University's Center on. International Cooperation. She was the winner of 2009 Firestone Medal, AND \*\*Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” 2/17 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations. Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7 By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave and how their own government works.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits, from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

#### Decision-making outweighs – it’s the most portable skill - key to social improvements in every and all facets of life

Steinberg & Freeley 8

\*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp9-10

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition.¶ Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions.¶ Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations.¶ We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car. what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration?¶ Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game? And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs. online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs?¶ The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.¶ Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized.¶ Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.¶ Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

#### B) Dialogue –---there are an infinite number of reasons that the scholarship of their advocacy could be a reason to vote affirmative--- these all obviate the only predictable strategies based on topical action---they overstretch our research burden and undermine preparedness for all debates making effective deliberation impossible which makes it impossible to be negative – voting issue for limits and ground

#### Effective deliberation is the lynchpin of solving all existential global problems

Lundberg 10

(Christian O., Professor of Communications @ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p311)

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech—as indicated earlier, **debate builds capacity for critical thinking**, analysis of public claims, **informed decision making**, and **better public judgment**. If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a **puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate**. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because **as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change**, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems place such a high premium on education (Dewey 1988,63, 154). Debate provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it **builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed** about policy decisions that impact them, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them. The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources: To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144) Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of **problem-solving skills** demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials. There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology **for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities**. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a **crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life**. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of **meaningful political engagement** and **new articulations of democratic life.** Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to **produce revisions of democratic life** that are **necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive**. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including: domestic and international **issues of class, gender, and racial justice**; wholesale **environmental destruction** and the potential for **rapid climate change**; emerging **threats to international stability** in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing **challenges of rapid globalization** including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an **informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill** and sensitivity provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the **existential challenges** to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

### 3

#### Their use of irony only makes sense when we are detatched from the material experience of deprivation. Those folks who continue to suffer and resent their suffering are seen as dupes who can’t overcome their personal biases.

Karen A Foss (associate professor of speech communication at Humbolt State University) and Stephen W. Littlejohn (professor of speech communication at Humbolt State University). “The Day After: Rhetorical Vision in an Ironic Frame.” Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 3. 1986.

The rhetorical vision of nuclear war, however, does not fit well into any of these three deep structures: none is powerful enough to justify the drama. The strongest source might be righteousness,but the limited number of references to who started the war and the rationale for doing so—both in our sample and in the film—suggests that this is not the foundational meta-theoretical stance underlying this rhetorical vision. We maintain that a fourth frame is necessary to explain the deep structure of this particular vision—the frame of irony.

 Irony is characterized by incongruity between what is expected and what occurs. In its narrowest form, it is a specific figure of speech in which words express a meaning different from their literal denotation. Irony also can take the"pose of ignorance" of a Socrates—that is, a dramatic technique useful for bringing an audience to view something in a particular way. Or, it can be viewed as a general outlook or framework from which to view the contradictions or inconsistencies of life (Karstetter, 1964;Kaufer, 1977, pp. 91-92).

 But irony involves more than simply the placing together of incongruous experiences. It involves the assumption of a particular role on the part of the audience—that of ironic detachment. To grasp irony, we must separate out the two meanings involved—the literal and the intended. This act is possible only from a detached standpoint; if we cannot step back from the words, we cannot see them in their two senses (Booth, 1978,p. 6).

 At the same time, there is the recognition of universality about the situation which provokes emotional identification with it. We emotionally feel for the situation as well as intellectually under-stand it. Thompson (1948) put it this way: "To perceive it one must be detached and cool; to feel it one must be pained for a person or ideal gone amiss"(p. 15). Frye (1957) also captures this contrast when he describes irony as "the sense of looking down on a scene of bondage, frustration, or absurdity" but simultaneously feeling that one has been, is, or might be in such a situation oneself (p. 34).

 In addition to an emotional component, detachment carries with it a sense of superiority in knowing that we have grasped the various levels of meaning involved in a phrase or situation: " 'We' are the insiders, we know what we know, we have seen the wheels within wheels that make this complex and mysterious world go round" (Booth, 1978, p. 12). This kind of special knowledge implies the creation of and participation in a hierarchy in which some are in a position of control while others emerge as victims. This class of victims involves not only those whom we observe from afar who are ignorant of their condition—such as characters in a play—but also naïve believers and poor readers who do not realize that the situation should be taken as ironic. The victims stand in stark contrast to those with superior knowledge, whose sense of control and participation is thereby reinforced:

since the reader has in a sense put the final position together for himself, he can scarcely resist moving immediately to the third judgment: "Not only do I see it for what it is, but it must be sound since it is my own." Even short of that agreement, he has inevitably judged it to be in some sense better, since more plausible, than the position implied by the overt statement. (Booth, 1974, p. 41)

According to Booth (1974), then, the essential nature of irony dramatizes the choices involved. There is no gray area but a strong and inescapable sense of division between victims and superiors. Irony points to the *"significance of the situation,* it brings the conflict of dramatic forces *into clearer view,* it *heightens* the sense of pity and terror"(Sedgewick, 1948, p. 63). While those left out have no choice but to respond passively, for those in the know, irony demands active involvement. We must confront our choices, make value judgments, and participate wholeheartedly or not at all. As a consequence, irony has the potential for substantial impact on those who grasp the irony of a situation:"It [irony] risks disaster more aggressively than any other device. But if it succeeds, it will succeed more strongly than any literal statement can do"(Booth, 1974, pp. 41-42). In the case of *The Day After,* irony works paradoxically: the superiority of detachment enable some to see clearly one's own involvement as a potential victim.

 A final component of irony—a cohesive bond between audience and rhetor-is a natural outcome of the superior/victim hierarchy. A close partnership emerges among those who know:

Whenever an author conveys to his reader an unspoken point, he creates a sense of collusion against all those, whether in the story or out of it, who do not get that point. Irony is always thus in part a device for excluding as well as for including, and those who are included, those who happen to have the necessary information to grasp the irony,cannot but derive at least part of their plea-sure from a sense that others are excluded.(Booth, 1983, p. 304).

#### The affirmative is dependent upon a prioritization of irony and play above material struggle. The only stance is US off the planet.

**Kenis, 03**(Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader.  THE NEW FACE OF LIBERATION:

Indigenous Rebellion, State Repression, and the Reality of the Fourth World).

Most **nonindians** (of all races and ethnicities, and both genders) have been indoctrinated to believe the officially contrived notion that, in the event “the Indians get their land back, ” or even if the extent of present federal domination is relaxed, native people will do unto our occupiers exactly as has been done to us; mass dispossession and eviction of nonindians, especially Euroamericans, is expected to ensue. Hence, even those progressives who are most eloquently inclined to condemn U. S. imperialism abroad and/or the functions of racism and sexism at home tend to deliver a blank stare or profess open “disinterest” when indigenous land rights are mentioned. Instead of attempting to come to grips with this most fundamental of all issues concerning the continent upon which they reside, the more sophisticated among them **seek to divert discussion into “higher priority” or “more important” topics like “issues of class and gender equity” in which “justice” becomes synonymous with a redistribution of power and loot deriving from the occupation of Native North America even while** the **occupation continues** (presumably permanently). Sometimes, Indians are even slated to receive “their fair share” in the division of spoils accruing from expropriation of their resources. Always, **such things are** couched—and typically **seen**—in terms **of some “greater good**” than decolonizing the .6 percent of the U. S. population which is indigenous. Some marxist and environmentalist groups have taken the argument so far as to deny that Indians possess any rights distinguishable from those of their conquerors. AIM leader Russell Means snapped the picture into sharp focus when he observed that: So-called **progressives** in the United States **claiming** that **Indians are obligated to give up their rights** because a much larger group of non-Indians “need” their resources **is** exactly**the same as** Ronald **Reagan and** Elliot **Abrams asserting** that the rights of **250 million North Americans outweighs the rights of a** couple million **Nicaraguans. Colonialist attitudes** are colonialist attitudes, and it **doesn’t make one** damn bit of **difference whether they come from the left or the right.** Leaving aside the pronounced and pervasive hypocrisy permeating their positions, which add up to a mentality defining “settler state colonialism, ” the fact is that the specter driving even most radical nonindians into lockstep with the federal government on questions of native land rights is largely illusory. The alternative reality posed by native liberation struggles is actually much different:  • While government propagandists are wont to trumpet—as they did during the Maine and Black Hills land disputes of the 1970s—that an Indian win would mean individual nonindian property owners losing everything, the native position has always been the exact opposite. Overwhelmingly, the lands sought for actual recovery have been governmentally and corporately held. Eviction of small land owners has been suggested only in instances where they have banded together—as they have during certain of the Iroquois claims cases—to prevent Indians from recovering any land at all, and to otherwise deny native rights. • Official sources contend this is inconsistent with the fact that all nonindian title to any portion of North America could be called into question. Once “the dike is breached, ” they argue, it’s just a matter of time before “everybody has to start swimming back to Europe, or Africa, or wherever. ”Although there is considerable technical accuracy to admissions that all nonindian title to North America is illegitimate, **Indians have** by and large **indicated we would be content to honor the cession agreements entered into by our ancestors** even though the U. S. has long since defaulted. This would leave something on the order of half to two-thirds of the continental U. S. in nonindian hands, with the real rather than pretended consent of native people. The remaining one-third-to-one-half, to which the U. S. never acquired title at all, should be recovered by its rightful owners. • Nonetheless, it is argued, there will still be at least some nonindians “trapped” within such restored areas. Actually, they would not be trapped at all. Federally-imposed genetic criteria of “Indianness” to the contrary notwithstanding, indigenous nations have the same rights as any other to define citizenry by allegiance (naturalization) rather than by race.319 Nonindians could apply for citizenship, or for some form of landed alien status which would allow them to retain their property until they die. In the event they could not reconcile themselves to living under any jurisdiction other than that of the U. S., they would obviously have the right to leave, and they should have the right to compensation from their own government (which got them into the mess in the first place). • Finally, and one suspects this is the real crux of things from the government/corporate perspective, any such **restoration of land**and attendant sovereign prerogatives to native nations **would result in** a truly massive **loss of “domestic” resources to the U. S.,** thereby **impairing the country’s economic and military capacities.** 321  For everyone queued up to wave flags celebrating America’s recent imperial adventures in Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf, this prospect may induce a certain psychic trauma. But, for oppositionists at least, it should be precisely the point.  When you think about it like this, the great mass of nonindians in North America really have much to gain, and almost nothing to lose, from native people succeeding in struggles to reclaim the land which is rightfully ours. The tangible diminishment of U. S. material power which is integral to our victories in this sphere **stands to pave the way for realization of** most other agendas—from **anti-imperialism to environmentalism, from Afroamerican liberation to feminism, from gay rights to the ending of class privilege**—pursued by progressives on this continent. Conversely, **succeeding** with any or even all **these** other agendas **would still represent an** inherently **oppressive situation if their realization is contingent upon an ongoing occupation of Native** North **America without**the **consent of Indian people. Any** North American **revolution which failed to free indigenous territory** from nonindian domination **would be** simply **a continuation of colonialism in another form**. Regardless of the angle from which you view the matter, the liberation of Native North America, liberation of the land first and foremost, is the key to fundamental and positive social changes of many other sorts. One thing, as they say, leads to another. The question has always been, of course, which “thing” is to be first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about achieving (rather than merely theorizing and endlessly debating) radical change in the United States might be **“First Priority to First Americans. ”** Put another way, this would mean, “U. S. Out of Indian Country. ”

### Case

**Satire reinforces the status quo**

**LaMarre et al. 2009**. Heather L. LaMarre, Kristen D. Landreville and Michael A. Beam. The Irony of Satire: Poliltical Ideology and the Motivation to See What You Want to See in The Colbert Report.

While considerable attention has been paid to effects of consuming late-night political comedy television (e.g., Young 2004) little empirical research has examined the underlying processes and mechanisms (Young 2008). Using the satirical political comedy of Stephen Colbert (*The Colbert Report*), this study extends beyond political entertainment effects studies and examines how audiences process political messages found in late-night political satire. **Recent work in social psychology demonstrates that individuals process information in ways that personally benefit them and that people tend to see what they want to see when the information is ambiguous** (e.g., Balcetis and Dunning 2006; Kunda 1990; Long and Toppino 2004). **Because satire is often ambiguous, biased information processing models provide an excellent framework for understanding how audiences see what they want to see in** Colbert’s **political satire**.As such, the present study uses ambiguous message processing theory (Balcetis and Dunning 2006) to address two core questions: (1) what role does individual-level political ideology play in processing political satire, and (2) are individuals driven by in-group favoritism or a similar need to reinforce the favorable status of their political group to “see what they want to see in political satire?” Taken together, these questions raise the possibility that **individuals, motivated by their needs for political affiliation and self-enhancement, engage in biased processing of political messages offered in ambiguous form (i.e., deadpan satire or parody).** What follows is an overview of these concepts and ideas, results of an online survey with an embedded clip of Stephen Colbert, and a discussion of the findings and their implications for political entertainment research.

**Satire does not sponsor political change**

Amber **Day. 2011**. Satire and Dissent: Interventions in Contemporary Political Debate. P. 12

There are, on the other hand, theories of satire that take a more idealistic view of satire’s function and intent. As Hutcheon puts it, this view holds that satire and irony have “the potential to offer a challenge to the hierarchy of the very ‘sites’ of discourse, a hierarchy based in social relations of dominance.” **Satire is looked to, here, for its ability to unmask and to deconstruct,** pointing us toward the flaws and the posturings of official policy. The image of physically unveiling something or someone is one that recurs again and again in discussions of satire. Lillian and Edward Bloom argue further that, due to its ability to reveal our wrongs to us, great satire implies that “sensitivity to moral stumbling makes rectification a hope and preservation of the good possible.” However, they go on to explain, as do most theorists of satire, that **despite its ability to reveal, satire ultimately has little possible effect because it does not in itself initiate change and, in fact, rarely encourages it.** Dustin **Griffen**, **citing a study** by Bertrand Goldgar **on the relationships between satirists and politicians during the politically volatile period of Walpole’s rule in Great Britain, concludes that since the writers of the time played no direct role in pressing measures in Parliament, it seems unlikely that their satire had any influence on politics itself.** The summation, time and again, is that **satire is generally removed from the real machinations of the political world and thus has negligible political power.**

#### The 1491 performances are RACIST and should be rejected; their re-appropriation of that performance FAILS and replicates racism

**Indian Country Today ‘12**

[http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/article/videos-the-1491s-stir-up-controversy-with-clips-showing-blackface-and-utah-utes-fans-139289, mg]

Sketch and YouTube comedy group **the 1491s** are on a roll with their **latest videos** -- though some are saying that the pranksters **are rolling in the wrong direction**. The fun and games started with a video framed as a PSA (public service announcement) to white people considering dressing up Indian for Halloween. **The PSA ends with a white actor wearing blackface. The choice was not hailed as clever satire by all viewers**.¶ ¶ The troupe followed the PSA video up with another video criticizing the outrage and ultimately encouraging civil dialogue -- and ending with an interview with a college student dressed in what might be called a stereotypical "Pocahottie" outfit. That footage was filmed at the University of Utah, at an event sponsored by Budweiser, and again the reaction to the video was not universally supportive.¶ ¶ To complete the unintentional trilogy, the 1491s posted footage of some discussions between a Native student at Utah and some white fans of the football team, one of whom is wearing a feather headdress. Again, the clip proved controversial with viewers.¶ ¶ Below are all three clips, along with some sample reactions from the YouTube commenters. To watch and read more, visit The 1491s' YouTube channel, youtube.com/user/the1491s¶ ¶ A few comments about the above video from YouTube users:¶ ¶ "**Satire or not, blackface is NEVER okay. You? can't justify the wrongness of making a costume out of a culture by doing the exact same thing. You just come off as an anti-black racist instead**."¶ ¶ "I think **1491s proved their point and all these comments about the blackface scene just confirmed what I already knew; Black-face is not ok; but red-face in mainstream society... is ok? Nope! Wrong! Both are not OK**, but majority of mainstream society has that mentality; "blackface is wrong, but redface is? not!" Both are racist and that is what this video conveys! Or at least attempted to convey, for some folks."¶ ¶ "What's the commotion about? **I just see another racist white person who believes with all their white might that they aren't? or can never be racist 'cause it's a "joke."** They're honestly never going to learn better."¶ ¶ "**Natives have used all the rhetorical tools our disposal for YEARS to point out that dressing up in redface is abusive and offensive. What's the result? Dressing up in redface became the? hottest trend of the year.**¶

#### Blackface is racist and oppressive EVEN if done in satire – reduces people to the color of their skin

Sawyer 09

Associate professor of African American Studies and Political Science at UCLA and the director of the Center for the Study of Race, Ethnicity and Politics, <http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/asiapcf/10/14/sawyer.blackface/>

Blackface is one of the most pernicious and painful stereotypes about people of African descent. It is also global. Blackface has appeared everywhere from Mexico to Japan, and it is always ugly, despite what those who put it on claim. The doctors who did the Jackson "tribute" claimed that they were honoring Michael Jackson. They were mocking him, and that is what blackface has always been. The same applies for those like a responder on the Guardian Web site who suggests that blackface models presented in French Vogue magazine are simply cultural play: "The American cultural imperialists of the Anglosphere are out in force again." It is neither imperialist or wrong to point out racist imagery, even if done in good fun. In a cruel twist, the commenter takes the victims of racism and imperialism and calls them the perpetrators. But both the photographers and French Vogue are aware of the problems of racism in Europe and the barriers black women face in the fashion industry. Like old blackface minstrelsy, when you can't find blacks you think are worthy to play the part, you simply blacken up white actors or, in this case, models. The message: Real black people aren't good enough at being themselves. Whether it is the original white "Amos and Andy" or white fraternity/sorority girls and boys, blackface is always about mocking black skin and presenting stereotypical black behavior. Minstrels always clown around, sing and dance and otherwise dehumanize the individuals they represent. The blackface itself by whites reduces them to one critical feature: their black skin. And in almost every case, even this one, it's exaggerated. None of the Jacksons are that dark; it is a rank racial caricature. It always has been.

## T

### Limits Good - Long

#### Limits outweighs – education is inevitable, but unfocused education isn’t productive – limits determine the direction and productivity of learning

#### Broad interpretations cause unmanageable research burdens

Taylor 5

Taylor III, now a JD from William and Mary, 2005¶ (Jarred, “Searching for a More Perfect Union,” <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ypiOXjRVPWzNxDsFVJ0S1n-QfIGtXzp7Y59meEwd-bE/edit?hl=en_US>)

**It would take even the most seasoned scholar years of research and hundreds of pages to** adequately **analyze** the development of **any presidential power** over the course of American history; **war power is** certainly **no exception**. Every President since George Washington has interpreted the martial prerogatives of his office in different ways, and most have set some sort of precedent for succeeding officeholders. Nevertheless, some of the major changes in executive military power bear highlighting.

#### Limits literally double the educational benefit of debate

Arrington 2009

(Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

#### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

Intrator 10

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

#### Clash – they add a ton of unpredictable affs, combined with tons of solvency mechanisms – it makes debate impossible for the neg, which prevents any offense gained from their interp

#### Small schools - huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities - big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

#### Independently, it’s a voter on jurisdictional grounds - if the aff falls outside of your jurisdiction, you reject it

### Agency

#### Reasons to prefer their narrative approach to debate and identity is neurophysiologically fallacious and ethically undesirable.

**Strawson 2k4**

[galen, chair philosophy, university of texas, against narrativity, Ratio, XVII, 4, Dec., 420-460]

On the strong form of Schechtman’s view, I am not really a person. Some sentient creatures, she says ‘weave stories of their lives, and it is their doing so which *makes* them persons’; to have an ‘identity’ as a person is ‘to have a narrative self-conception . . . to experience the events in one’s life as interpreted through one’s sense of one’s own life story’. This is in fact a common type of claim, and Schechtman goes further, claiming at one point that ‘elements of a person’s narrative’ that figure only in his ‘implicit self-narrative’, and that ‘he cannot articulate . . . are only partially his – attributable to him to a lesser degree than those aspects of the narrative he can articulate’.45 This seems to me to express an ideal of control and selfawareness in human life that is mistaken and potentially pernicious. The aspiration to explicit Narrative self-articulation is natural for some – for some, perhaps, it may even be helpful – but in others it is highly unnatural and ruinous. My guess is that it almost always does more harm than good – that the Narrative tendency to look for story or narrative coherence in one’s life is, in general, a gross hindrance to self-understanding: to a just, general, practically real sense, implicit or explicit, of one’s nature. It’s well known that telling and retelling one’s past leads to changes, smoothings, enhancements, shifts away from the facts, and recent research has shown that this is not just a human psychological foible. It turns out to be an inevitable consequence of the mechanics of the neurophysiological process of laying down memories that every studied conscious recall of past events brings an alteration.46 The implication is plain: the more you recall, retell, narrate yourself, the further you risk moving away from accurate self-understanding, from the truth of your being. Some are constantly telling their daily experiences to others in a storying way and with great gusto. They are drifting ever further off the truth. Others never do this, and when they are obliged to convey facts about their lives they do it clumsily and uncomfortably and in a way that is somehow essentially narrative-resistant. Certainly Narrativity is not a necessary part of the ‘examined life’ (nor is Diachronicity), and it is in any case most unclear that the examined life, thought by Socrates to be essential to human existence, is always a good thing. People can develop and deepen in valuable ways without any sort of explicit, specifically Narrative reflection, just as musicians can improve by practice sessions without recalling those sessions. The business of living well is, for many, a completely non-Narrative project. Granted that certain sorts of self-understanding are necessary for a good human life, they need involve nothing more than form-finding, which can exist in the absence of Narrativity; and they may be osmotic, systemic, not staged in consciousness. Psychotherapy need not be a narrative or Narrative project. It regularly involves identifying connections between features of one’s very early life and one’s present perspective on things, but these particular explanatory linkings need not have any sort of distinctively narrative character to them. Nor need they be grasped in any distinctively Narrative way. Nor need they interconnect narratively with each other in any interesting way. I don’t need to take up any sort of Narrative attitude to myself in order to profit from coming to understand how the way X and Y treated me when I was very young is expressed in certain anxieties I have now. The key explanatory linkings in psychotherapy are often piecemeal in nature, as are many of the key impacts of experience. Ideally, I think, one acquires an assorted basketful of understandings, not a narrative – an almost inevitably falsifying narrative.

## K

#### ONLY A MATERIALLY INFORMED MARXIST CRITIQUE OF CAPITALISM CAN SOLVE MYRIAD SOCIAL OPPRESSIONS RESULTING FROM CAPITAL’S EXPLOITATION.

SMITH 2K8

[Sharon, the politics of identity, January-feb., international socialist review, 57, activist, political commentator, publishes regularly in socialist worker and ISR]

FIGHTING AGAINST oppression is an urgent issue in U.S. society today. Racism, sexism, and homophobia have all reached appalling levels—that seem only to rise with each passing year. White students in Jena hang nooses, and Black students end up in prison.1 Squads of Minutemen vigilantes patrol the Mexican border with impunity, for the sole purpose of terrorizing migrant communities.2 College campuses across the U.S. commemorate “Islamo-fascism awareness week” as if it were just another legitimate student activity.3 Fred Phelps and his Kansas-based Westboro Baptist Church congregation regularly picket outside funerals of gay soldiers killed in Iraq, proclaiming that they belong in hell.4 To be sure, the problem extends way beyond the extremist fringe. Media pundits barely comment on the outrages described above, while mainstream discourse regularly heaps contempt on those attempting to fight against oppression—including young women organizing against date rape (which is assumed to be a figment of their feminism-charged imaginations) and immigrants demanding basic legal rights (as if they are out to steal jobs from native-born workers). If the “playing field is level,” as so many in the mainstream media assume, those who object must therefore be seeking an unfair advantage. It is no wonder, therefore, that so many people who experience oppression feel so embattled in the current political climate. Only a movement aimed at fighting oppression in all its forms can challenge the victim-blaming ideology that prevails today. The pressing need for such a movement is acknowledged here. Indeed, this article is intended to address the issue of how to most effectively fight back, since different political strategies lead to quite different conclusions about the kind of movement that is needed to challenge oppression. The bulk of this article is a critique of the theory behind what is known in academic and left circles as “identity politics”—the idea that only those experiencing a particular form of oppression can either define it or fight against it—counterposing to it a Marxist analysis. My central premise is that Marxism provides the theoretical tools for ending oppression, while identity politics does not.

#### Their theory of indigenism obfuscates class oppression and pits groups against each other. You should prefer class analysis as a better method to solve oppression

James Herod Getting Free: A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it Fourth Edition, January 2004 <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm>

This is actually the same issue as the nationalities question and the identity question, but it might be worthwhile to treat it separately because there is an outstanding Native-American writer, Ward Churchill, who develops and advocates this theory. It is a theory, of native or indigenous peoples, which tends to replace class analysis, and generates a view of the history of the last five hundred years of world history which is quite at odds with an understanding of capitalism. I have never seen a critique of the idea (although surely some marxist journal has published one). It is quite erroneous to identify the enemy as Western Civilization, Europeans, or White People and to attribute the world's problems to these false abstractions. The rise and spread of capitalism was not only massively resisted by peoples all over the world, generating brilliant articulations of this resistance by writers and leaders like Fanon, James, Cabral, Nkrumah, Gandhi, Magon, Mandela, and Cesaire. It was also resisted by Europeans themselves. The European peasants were among the first so-called indigenous or native peoples to be dispossessed and colonized by the emerging capitalist ruling class. They were driven off their lands and forced into wage-slavery. Their villages were destroyed, and their local cultures, as were their unique languages. European resistance to capitalism was vigorous and long lasting. It gave rise to massive movements: the labor movement, the cooperative movement, communism, socialism, anarchism, syndicalism. It resulted in revolutions: the revolutions of 1848, the Paris Commune, the failed revolutions in Central Europe in 1919, the Spanish Civil War, the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, Polish Solidarity, and so forth. There was a worldwide upsurge of anti-capitalist resistance in 1968, and this took place also throughout Europe and the West. Recently there has been another such wave of global opposition to capitalism, but which has appeared also in Seattle, Quebec  City, and Genoa. Thus I believe that Indigenism mis-identifies the enemy, and is therefore incompatible with an Association of Free Peoples (anarchism, communism). Actually, we are just now witnessing a still basically peasant population in Europe, in the Balkans, being hit with an improved, strengthened, new, enclosures movement. Are the peasants in twenty-first century Eastern Europe indigenous peoples who are being attacked by Western Civilization or are they being dispossessed by the neoliberal offensive of late capitalism? Indigenists I think will have to be double-jointed to apply their theory to recent events in Eastern Europe, because peasants there are White, European, a part of Western Civilization, and are Indigenous, if by that term we mean that they have lived there for eons (although most of them moved there from elsewhere in some distant past, as have all so-called Indigenous peoples on earth). So I guess they are attacking themselves, if we follow Indigenism. Thus, rejection of and resistance to capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism has been going on in Europe too, not just in the world outside Europe. It distorts the picture to deny this. Marx himself wrote some of the earliest analyses of colonialism in his essays on India and Ireland. Western Civilization thus includes not only capitalism, but also the critique of capitalism. If we use the term at all it should include both these movements, the evil of capitalism and the good of anti-capitalism. It includes not only White Europeans who fought to impose capitalism on the world, but White Europeans who fought to stop this and to get free from capitalism completely. The terms European and White are false abstractions, in that it is only some Europeans and only some Whites that have colonized the world. Just as it was wrong for some radical feminists to see all men as the enemy, or for some black nationalists to see all whites as the enemy, so also it is wrong for Native Americans to see all non-indigenous people as the enemy, and for Indigenists to blame all Europeans and all Whites for imperialism.       Thus I can no longer accept the notion of indigenous versus nonindigenous people. I much prefer to think in terms of oppressors and the oppressed, exploiters and the exploited, criminals and victims, rulers and the ruled, rather than in terms of western civilization versus the rest of the world, and certainly rather than Whites versus People of Color. Ireland, one of the first countries to be colonized, was a nation of white people.

#### Capitalism forecloses historical contradictions, highlighting short-term gains—our alt fosters historical consciousness which must be the ideological starting point for social change.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.35-36,

No individual and no conceivable form of society today or in the future can avoid the objective determinations and the corresponding burden of historical time, together with the responsibility necessarily arising from them. In general terms, perhaps the greatest indictment of our given social order is that it degrades the inescapable burden of meaningful historical time-the life-time of both the individuals and of humanity---into the tyranny of capital's reified time-imperative~ irrespective of the consequences. Capital's historically unique mode of social metabolic reproduction must degrade time because the most fundamental objective determination of its own form of human interchange is the irrepressible drive to continued self-expansions defined by the intrinsic characteristics of this mode of societal interchange as necessary capital- expansion achievable in commodity society only through the exploitation of labor-time. Thus capital must become blind to all dimensions of time other than that of maximally exploitable surplus-labor and the corresponding labor-time. This is why all possible value and meaning potentially arising from historically created relations must be obliterated from capital's equations~ other than those directly linked to the systemic imperative of capital-accumulation. This is so whether the potential meaning and values involved are concerned with the personal relations of the individuals among themselves as separate individuals, or with the social groups of which the particular individuals form a part, or indeed with humanity in general when that relationship can be and must be consciously grasped, under determinate historical circumstances, like our own historical time today. Meaning and values become legitimate concerns in this reproductive system only if they are readily reducible to the capitalistically idealized cash nexus (as regards the isolated individuals), or to the imperative of profitability in general, when the issue at stake is the accumulation-securing class relation of structural domination and exploitation in the established social order. Naturally, our interest in this context is human historical time, and not some "metaphysical" or "cosmological" considerations of time. For us the time relations linked to the question of "cosmological contingency"-regarding, for instance, the possibility of other earth-like planets which might be capable of supporting advanced forms of life in far away solar systems: a well-known part of some ongoing astrophysical enquiry today-are totally irrelevant. But focusing on human historical time does not mean that any form of relativism is acceptable in our assessment of meaningful time relations. On the contrary, the question of historical necessity is a vital issue here, although it must be evaluated in a qualitatively different way from those who, with hostile ideological intent, try to ascribe a crude mechanical deterministic view to the Marxian-profoundly dialectical-conception of historical time. For the core meaning of human historical necessity is precisely that it is only historical, which means that it is an ultimately disappearing necessity (eine verschwindende Notwendigkeit in Marx's words l), and should not be treated on the model of naturalistic determinations.