## 1NC

### 1

#### We must seek to understand imprisonment as a practice of social ordering that creates the conditions for US domination to exist

Dylan Rodriguez, Professer University of California Riverside, November 2007

Kritika Kultura “AMERICAN GLOBALITY AND THE U. S. PRISON REGIME: STATE VIOLENCE AND WHITE SUPREMACY FROM ABU GHRAIB TO STOCKTON TO BAGONG DIWA” Available online at http://www.ateneo.edu/ateneo/www/UserFiles/121/docs/KK09.pdf)

**To consider the U.S. prison as a global practice of dominance, we might begin with** the now-indelible photo exhibition of captive brown men manipulated, expired, and rendered bare in the tombs of the U.S.-commandeered Abu Ghraib prison: here, I am concerned less with the idiosyncrasies of the carceral spectacle (who did what, administrative responsibilities, tedium of military corruption and incompetence, etc.) than I am with its inscription of the where in which the worst of U.S. prison/state violence incurs. As the bodies of tortured prisoners in this somewhere else, that is, beyond and outside the formal national domain of the United States, have become the hyper-visible and accessible raw material for a global critique of the U.S. state—with Abu Ghraib often serving as the signifier for a generalized mobilization of sentiment against the American occupation—the intimate and ¶ proximate bodies of **those locally and intimately imprisoned within the localities of the United States** constantly threaten to disappear from the political and moral registers of U.S. civil society, its resident U.S. Establishment Left, and perhaps most if not all elements of the global Establishment Left, which includes NGOs, political parties, and sectarian organizations. I contend in this essay that a new theoretical framing is required to critically address (and correct) the artificial delineation of the statecraft of Abu Ghraib prison, and other U.S. formed and/or mediated carceral sites across the global landscape, as somehow unique and exceptional to places outside the U.S. proper. In other words, **a genealogy and social theory of U.S. state violence specific to the regime of the prison needs to be delicately situated within the ensemble of institutional relations, political intercourses, and historical conjunctures that** precede, **produce, and sustain places like the Abu Ghraib** prison, **and can** therefore **only be adequately articulated as a genealogy and theory of the allegedly “domestic” U.S. prison regime’s “globality**” (I will clarify my use of this concept in the next part of this introduction). Further, in offering this initial attempt at such a framing, I am suggesting **a genealogy of U.S. state violence that can more sufficiently conceptualize the logical continuities and material articulations between a) the ongoing projects of domestic warfare organic to the white supremacist U.S. racial state, and b) the array of “global**” (or extra-domestic) **technologies of violence** that form the premises of possibility for those social formations and hegemonies integral to the contemporary moment of U.S. global dominance. In this sense, I am amplifying the capacity of the U.S. prison to inaugurate technologies of power that exceed its nominal relegation to the domain of the criminal-juridical**. Consider imprisonment**, then**, as a practice of social ordering and geopolitical power, rather than as a self-contained or foreclosed jurisprudential practice**: therein, it is possible to reconceptualize the significance of the Abu Ghraib spectacle as only one signification of a regime of dominance that is neither (simply) local nor (erratically) exceptional, but is simultaneously mobilized, proliferating, and global.

#### We believe the American prison system, the logic of imprisonment, and its domestic support for neocolonial fascism, especially about issues related to immigration, should be abolished.

#### Challenging the prison industrial complex can constellate struggles against all of modernity.

Rodriguez ‘8

Dyland Rodriguez. Abolition Now! 2008. Page 9-10.

The¶ vast bulk¶ of¶ my¶ organizing¶ work¶ has¶ been¶ specifically¶ around¶ politi­¶ cal¶ prisoners,¶ so¶ the¶ obvious¶ connection¶ there¶ is¶ challeng¶ ing¶ the¶ PIC¶ as¶ a¶ space¶ for¶ halting dissent.¶ I've¶ also¶ done¶ a¶ lot¶ of¶ work¶ over¶ the¶ years¶ around¶ police¶ violence,¶ [and¶ see]¶ CR¶ as¶ a¶ space¶ for¶ challenging¶ the¶ notion¶ of¶ policing¶ in¶ and¶ of¶ itself,¶ not¶ just around¶ violence-police¶ violence-but¶ what¶ gives¶ this¶ body¶ of¶ people¶ an¶ au­¶ thority¶ to¶ control¶ and¶ militarize¶ communities.¶ And¶ the¶ third¶ area,¶ in¶ terms¶ of¶ my¶ work,¶ is¶ surrounding¶ violence-sexual¶ violence.¶ Specifically¶ ,¶ I've¶ done¶ work¶ around¶ violence against women,¶ and¶ that's¶ included¶ work¶ around¶ systems¶ such¶ as¶ health¶ care,¶ systems¶ such¶ as¶ reproductive¶ freedom,¶ as¶ well¶ as¶ issues¶ around¶ interpersonal¶ violence.¶ How¶ can¶ we¶ challenge¶ how¶ we harm¶ each other,¶ and¶ how¶ can¶ we¶ come¶ up¶ with¶ different¶ strategies¶ for¶ dealing¶ with¶ the¶ way¶ we¶ harm¶ each¶ other¶ and¶ the¶ ways¶ that¶ the¶ state¶ harms¶ us?¶ As¶ a¶ visual¶ artist,¶ I¶ try¶ to¶ focus¶ on¶ representations, ideas, ¶ and commentary¶ that¶ focus¶ on¶ unleashing¶ the¶ imagination¶ [and]¶ on¶ resistance,¶ that¶ attempt¶ to¶ encourage¶ us¶ to¶ imagine¶ different¶ realities.¶ For¶ me,¶ it's¶ the¶ values¶ piece¶ to¶ Critical¶ Resistance¶ that's¶ most¶ important.

#### And, our advocacy should be understood as part of an intellectual struggle against the racialized practices that justify colonialism, imperialism, and fascism, and allow for the existence of the prison system.

NIKHIL SINGH 2006,

Professor of History at the University of Washington,

South Atlantic Quarterly “The Afterlife of fascism”

The philosopher Giorgio Agamben has most fully recognized and elucidated the relationship between the production of humanity as ‘‘bare life’’ and the exercise of sovereign political power. As I will elaborate later, Agamben, building on the work of Carl Schmitt, defines sovereignty as the power to suspend normal legality and identifies this with the power of decision over life itself. Hominis sacres are those lives that are included in the law only through their exclusion—lives ‘‘stripped of every right’’ and ‘‘exposed to an unconditional threat of death’’ insofar as they can be killed without the commission of a homicide.21We can supplement these insights with Michel Foucault’s observation that **racism emerges as an institutionalized practice Within modern states as a ‘‘way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power’s control: the break between what must live and what must die**.’’ **Racism has been an indispensable means of legitimating the ‘‘murderous function of the State**’’ even as modern governmental powers have been defined primarily in terms of normalizing and securing the general conditions of social and economic life. By introducing a ‘‘biological-type caesura within a population,’’ **racism becomes the means by which an older form of sovereignty**, in the form of **the sovereign right to kill, is reasserted within a social and political field** defined by overriding imperatives of conforming human equivalence, and ‘‘biopolitical’’ regulation (‘‘the power to guarantee life’’).22 It is important to situate these general frameworks within a sufficiently dense field of historical reference and strategic analysis. **U.S. traditions of racial nationalism in this field represent an irreducible ideological kernel of U.S. imperial sovereignty and the empire’s emerging war prison**.23 Thus, when the Bush administration declares that it will use ‘‘the great liberating tradition of America’’ in the service of ‘‘the expansion of freedom in all the world,’’ we should not be surprised that in its train has come a renewal of ascriptive discourses, coupled with the deployment of arbitrary police and military power.24 Though marketed and advanced on the grounds of ‘‘securing our freedoms,’’ **the essence of contemporary U.S. imperialism has been the renovation of imaginations of and modes for containing alleged civil incapacity and civil threat that find their legal and cultural precedence in histories of racial slavery**, **settler colonialism, and fascism.**25 This is not to say either that the figures of historical racism exhaust all possible meanings of U.S. nationalism, or that racial, colonial, or fascist genealogies are without their own breaks, contradictions, and structuring dilemmas. At the same time, **the failure to interrogate and effectively confront the way that contemporary displays of U.S. state power both enjoin old and fabricate new murderous divisions within humanity has today placed the entire world in danger**.

#### Dehumanized thought at the root of the imprisonment mentality and the prison system results in impacts beyond calculation, outweighing anything the aff can claim

Berube 1997—Professor of communication at the University of Carolina, Director of Public Communication of Science and Technology, NSCU, David Berube “Nanotechnological Prolongevity: The Down Side” June-July

Unfortunately, societal views of human utility are fleeting. Cultural values are simply unfixed. For example, if we were able to decide who would get to swim in the human gene pool "a few centuries ago, men with strong backs and women with broad pelvises would have been the first ones society would have wanted to reproduce. During the industrial age, however, brainpower began to count for more than muscle power" (Kluger, 1997, p. 66). George Annas, an ethicist, argues a lot of what is a better human being is faddish. At this historical juncture, we would be faced with the prospect of letting previous generations of strapping men and women die out, replacing them with a new population of intellectual giants. This seems likely when much of the control over the technology would be in the hands of the nanotechnologists, though assuredly some have broad backs and pelvises. **Assuming we are able to predict who or what are optimized humans**, this entire resultant worldview **smacks of eugenics and Nazi racial science**. **This would involve valuing people as means**. Moreover, there would always be a superhuman more super than the current ones, humans would never be able to escape their treatment as means to an always further and distant end. This means-ends dispute is at the core of **Montagu and Matson**'s treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They **warn: "its destructive toll is** already **greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity** on record - - **and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric** of civilized society **is beyond calculation**. For that reason **this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse....Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's nest of America, lies a dehumanized image** of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. **Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable** for every epoch has evil and **dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon**.

#### a. Our interpretation is the judge should act as decisionmaker based on the nature of fiat put forth by the affirmative. The aff’s advocacy of arguments beyond the scope of instrumentally enacted resolutional examples means the neg can advocate similar intellectual positions and ask the judge to simply decide, however subjectively, which is better.

#### b. Permutations by this type of affirmative are illegitimate in this framework, as they are derived from CP theory, and require a stable resolution plan for their basis.

#### c. Our interp is best.

#### 1. It only applies when there is no instrumentally defended topical example of the resolution presented in the 1AC.

#### 2. It’s reciprocal and initiated by the actions of the aff.3. It’s best for education. Any interp they present will exclude academic interventions such as ours if the aff can just waive them away with a “do both.”

#### 4. Debate Theory Genealogy.

#### a.) generic plan/plan bad arguments don’t apply to our interp because it is ONLY relevant when the aff won’t instrumentally defend a topical plan.

#### b.) The 2AC’s desire to simply say “Do Both” to this argument is grounded in a theory of counterplan competition elucidated by Dallas Perkins in an ’89 article and Roger Solt in a 1990 article. Both of which concluded it was FIAT by example of the resolution that made the judge’s role as generally understood, and hence ability to determine CP competition, make sense. Absent that theoretical basis, the aff has no method by which cooption of the 1NC is legitimate.

### 2

#### 1. Interpretation

Statutory restrictions are limits on authority by congress

Blacks Online Legal Dictionary 13

(2nd Edition, http://thelawdictionary.org/statutory-restriction/)

Statutory Restriction- Limits or controls that have been place on activities by its ruling legislation.

#### Judicial restrictions are court enforced interpretations of statutory restrictions

Barron ‘08

David J. Barron, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, & Martin S. Lederman,

Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 2008, “THE

COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB - FRAMING THE PROBLEM, DOCTRINE, AND

ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING,” Harvard Law Review, January, pp. LN.

4. Judicial Enforcement of Implied Statutory Restrictions. - The way the Supreme Court¶ approaches war powers generally, when combined with the increased mass of potentially¶ relevant legislative restrictions on the conduct of this military conflict, further increases the likelihood that the "lowest ebb" issue will be joined in the future. Principles of deference to executive¶ authority tend to dominate academic discussion of statutory interpretation and war powers. As we have indicated, however,¶ Hamdan, Youngstown, and other modern war powers cases demonstrate that the Court cannot be counted on to give the President¶ the benefit of the doubt. And in many war powers cases, the Court has been perfectly willing to¶ construe ambiguous statutory language against certain background rules that it presumes¶ Congress intended to honor, n84 including a presumption that the Executive must [\*719] comply with the laws of war.¶ n85 This general and longstanding judicial willingness to find implied limitations in ambiguous¶ texts concerning the use of military force and national security powers is sometimes¶ controversial. But whether justified or not, such an interpretive approach is of particular import now,¶ given the sheer mass of preexisting statutes potentially applicable to the conflict with al¶ Qaeda and the likelihood that this body of law will grow. Executive branch lawyers may be hard-pressed to advise their client¶ agencies that creative construction can overcome the apparent statutory restrictions, at least if there is a reasonable prospect of¶ judicial review (as there often will be in the war on terrorism due to its peculiar domestic connections). Instead, the prospect of¶ judicial review will impel these lawyers to advise that the courts could well construe the potentially restrictive¶ language to impose hard constraints on the Executive's preferred course of conduct - and that only¶ the assertion of a superseding constitutional power of the President could, possibly, overcome such limits. Thus, the relatively weak¶ deference the Court has long shown the President in many war powers cases, when combined with the relatively high likelihood in¶ the war on terrorism of the applicability of restrictive but ambiguous statutory language and a justiciable case to hear, make¶ constitutional assertions of preclusive executive powers a more likely occurrence than war powers scholarship typically assumes.

#### 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.

#### USFG is the national government in DC

Encarta Online Encyclopedia, 2k

(http://encarta.msn.com)

“The federal government **of the U**nited **S**tates **is centered in** Washington **DC”**

#### 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.

#### Debating legal solutions to war powers develops transferable skills through active assessment—no risk of passive spectators

Farrar-Myers, 07

[Victoria A. Farrar-Myers, professor University of Texas at Arlington, PROMOTING ACTIVE LEARNING THROUGH SIMULATIONS IN PRESIDENCY CLASSES, <http://cstl-cla.semo.edu/Renka/PRG/PRG_Reports/Fall_2007.pdf>]

Lao-Tse’s insight captures the essence of an active learning based approach to education. Such an approach calls for students to have a role and responsibility in developing their own knowledge; in the words of John Dewey, learning is “something that an individual does when he studies. It is an active, personally conducted affair” (1924). Unlike more traditional teaching styles where the instructor simply transfers information to the student, who is required to do little more than act as a depository for such information (Freire, 1970) or as a sponge soaking it up (Keeley, Ali & Gebing, 1998; Fox-Cardamone & Rue, 2003), an active learning approach places an emphasis on students’ independent inquiry, restructuring of their knowledge, and other constructivist qualities (Niemi, 2002). Employing active learning strategies in political science classes not only has been shown to work (Brock & Cameron, 1999), but more importantly would seem to be a natural fit. “Learning is not a spectator sport” (Chickering and Gamson, 1987), and neither is the world of politics. As a result, one way to enhance students’ learning about the political world is for them to “talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves” (Chickering and Gamson, 1987). Further, active learning techniques – particularly if tied to learning outcomes designed to promote higher order thinking skills such as analysis, application, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom, 1956) – can help students prepare “to tackle a multitude of challenges that they are likely to face in their personal lives, careers, and duties as responsible citizens” (Tsui, 2002). As political scientists, we may be in the best position in the academy to promote a sense of civic engagement in our students, and the use of intentionally designed active learning techniques tied to specific learning outcomes can greatly assist us in helping to instill this sense. The use of active learning encompasses a wide array of teaching techniques that can be used in large classes as well as small ones; techniques such as: using guided lectures and answering open-ended, student-generated questions (Bonwell & Eison, 1991); using primary sources in the classroom (May, 1986); cooperative learning (Smith, 1986); and simulations and role-playing games (Shannon, 1986; for a general discussion on active learning strategies, see Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Astin et al., 1984; and Schomberg, 1986). However, finding a technique that works successfully can be influenced by: •Institutional variables: e.g., size of class, physical arrangement of classrooms, and lack of incentives for professors to undertake new active learning strategies (see generally Bonwell & Eison, 1991); •The professor: e.g., the professor’s comfort level with student interaction and the amount of control in the classroom the professor desires (see generally Bonwell & Sutherland, 1996); and •The students: e.g., prior exposure and experiences (Hoover, 2006), students’ different learning styles (Kolb, 1981; Cross, 1998), and student motivation (Gross Davis, 1993) or indifference (Warren, 1997) to participate in active learning activities. The POTUS and PASS projects were two semester-long, in-class simulations employing active learning techniques and designed to achieve desired course learning outcomes. Despite some initial reluctance by the students, these simulations helped them achieve the course outcomes, but more significantly generated a high level of efficacy, engagement, and understanding. Although the specific model employed may not work in every context (the variables noted above will create a different dynamic in each class), the process by which these projects were developed and employed may provide those who teach presidency-related classes with insights on how to best employ active learning techniques in their own setting. The 2008 presidential election marks the first time since 1952 that a sitting president or vice president will not be a candidate for nomination in either major party. As I was developing my general survey course on the U.S. Presidency in the fall of 2005, I contemplated how to make this factoid become more relevant to my students, especially since encouraging civic engagement and voter participation in the 18-24 year-old age group has been a focus in recent presidential races. I wanted a way to bring to life the usual discussion of presidential elections and encourage my students to become active participants in the process of identifying, evaluating, and promoting various candidates. Out of these thoughts germinated The POTUS Project – short for The President Of The United States Project. In this simulation, my students took on the role of political consultants responsible for developing a plan to guide their candidate to the Oval Office. Each student started by assessing the viability of a chosen candidate and then developing a strategy for winning that candidate’s party nomination. At mid-semester, the class divided into two groups – the two major parties – to hold a nomination convention where each party chose its own presidential-vice presidential ticket. Students had to caucus and advocate for their own candidate much like the Iowa caucus. From there, each team developed a “Vision Statement” for its candidate to let the voters know their candidate’s strategy for winning the general election, transitioning into power, and governing as president once in office. Each group presented its “Vision Statement” to the full class and to two real-world politiFall 2007 11 cal consultants. The students were not alone in their learning endeavor. I took the liberty of writing to each of our selected candidates, telling them about the project and asking them to write my students. Two of the candidates did and in sharing these letters with the class, my students and I became acutely aware that what we were learning has meaning outside the four walls of our classroom; the very lesson I hope to impart in each of my classes. In the end, The POTUS Project allowed the students to combine the course material with real life events and possibilities, and to work with their classmates to create a comprehensive electoral plan for someone who might become the next President of the United States. In doing so, the students were able to reinforce their learning through individual and group-effort written analysis and oral presentation. Further, the Project achieved the desired outcome of fostering collaborative action after individual analysis. Since most political enterprises take place within working groups or teams, these simulations allowed the students to gain experience with, as well as a direct appreciation for, this important political enterprise. Most significantly, through both a formal student evaluation of The POTUS Project and informal discussions with individual students, I found that they applied their knowledge in more sophisticated ways than in my more traditional course offering as well as reported more ownership and comfort with the core concepts of the class. They also reported a greater sense of efficacy and understanding of the presidential selection process; even two years later, I received an email from a student indicating how she is using the knowledge and insights gained from her class experience to be more engaged with this year’s actual presidential primaries. With the lessons I learned from The POTUS Project, I decided to employ a similar model in an upper-division course entitled Presidency and Foreign Policy. In The PASS Project (Presidential Advisory Strategy Simulation), the students played the role of foreign policy analysts and advisors. Each student selected his or her country of expertise, completed an assessment of the U.S. foreign relations with that country, and prepared a briefing paper for a current presidential candidate based upon a vision statement outlined by their candidate in the journal Foreign Affairs. Students then teamed-up with classmates who selected the same candidate and developed a comprehensive foreign policy/ national security strategy for that candidate. The students worked with their teams during the semester, and then shared their collective insights with their classmates in a final presentation during an “Advisory Summit.” The PASS Project required the students to play different roles throughout the simulation and, as a result, develop and employ different cognitive skills. In becoming a country expert, the students served as foreign policy analysts responsible for obtaining knowledge and being able to critically analyze it in meaningful ways. In fact, I was able to have a foreign policy analyst from the Department of State as a guest speaker by means of teleconferencing, and he showed the students how the skills they were using in class were the same ones that the speaker used in his job. The next portion of the simulation, where the students prepared a briefing paper, required them to apply their knowledge in a specific context of a presidential candidate’s general statements on foreign affairs. Finally, the group project required the students to synthesize their collective knowledge into a coherent plan for their presidential candidate and evaluate the effectiveness of their proposals. From the POTUS and PASS projects, a number of lessons emerged for effectively employing simulations in presidency classes, including: •Intentionality of design: Although the rewards in successfully employing an active-learning simulation are well worth it for both student and teacher, doing so requires that the instructor put substantial thought up front into the design of the program. Certainly, this lesson speaks to understanding the desired learning outcomes of the simulation, but also extends to such matters as evaluation and simulation mechanics. For example, students tend to be wary of group projects and free-riders who might bring a student’s grade down. To address this concern, I structured the evaluative aspects of the simulations so that most of the items for which the students were graded upon were based solely on their own work (e.g., individual assignments that were then later used in the group project or reflection papers on the group project process). In a few instances, though, where a student received the same grade as other group members for their collective effort, I limited both the number of people within each working subgroup, and also limited the percentage of the student’s overall grade attributed to the group effort. As far as design mechanics, the instructor needs to identify as many potential glitches as possible and develop prevention methods. For example, to ensure a proper balance of students working for either party in The POTUS Project or for any candidate in The PASS Project, I reserved the right to require students to switch to a different party or candidate as needed. •Assessing achievement of learning outcomes: Active learning techniques have been shown to have a powerful impact on students’ learning, for example on “measures of transfer of knowledge to new situations or measures of problem-solving, thinking, attitude change, or motivation for further learning” (McKeachie et al., 1986; for other studies measuring the impact of active learning techniques, see Kuh et al., 1997; Springer, 1997; Cabrera et al., 1998; McCarthy and Anderson, 2000; and Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005). Therefore, any simulation design should incorporate assessment tools that allow the instructor to measure the impact of the learning technique. For example, a pre- and post-test was administered to ascertain students’ base level of understanding of course material being covered by the simulation. Students also completed self-assessment and group assessments of their and their classmates’ participation in the simulation. Further, a reflection session was held to provide the students with the ability to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the simulation. The insights culled from all of these various Fall 2007 12 assessments were later employed to refine implementation of similar models in future classes. •Obtaining student buy-in: As one scholar noted, “many active learning techniques fail simply because teachers do not take time to explain them” (Warren, 1997). Perhaps the best way to obtain the necessary student buy-in, therefore, appears to be communication and guidance from the professor (Felder & Brent, 2006). To this end, I included a detailed addendum to my syllabus in each class outlining every step of the simulation process and then discussed the simulation in the first day of class. Doing so put the students on notice of what was expected of them and giving them the opportunity to drop the class if they were not willing to put forth the necessary effort. Further, I sought input and feedback from the students throughout the semester – something that has been known to mitigate students’ concern related to the simulation (Sutherland, 1996) – and found ways to act on the feed back. For example, based on discussions with students, I decided to provide an additional incentive for students to do well on their oral presentation in The PASS Project by giving the winning team, as voted on by the students themselves, two extra questions to chose from in the short-answer portion of their final exam (i.e., instead of answering all eight short answer questions I gave them, the winning team had to answer eight of ten questions with each student choosing which eight she would answer). •Surrendering control: Ultimately, if the simulation is going to be a “personally conducted affair” of learning, to use John Dewey’s words, the students at some point have to control the process for themselves. Certainly, as the instructor, I established the framework of the simulations, the minimum requirements that needed to be satisfied, and the desired outcomes. In the context of oral presentations, the students showed great initiative in their presentations – from complex slide shows, to informative and eye-catching displays, to even doing their presentation in the form of a game show (Foreign Policy Jeopardy). By my surrendering some of the control over the process to the students, they made it their own and, in doing so, learned greater lessons for themselves than I simply could have told them. Of all the ways to evaluate and document the success of these simulations, the best way to do so is in the words of the students themselves. At the end of The POTUS Project, I asked the students to evaluate the Project, their contributions, and the contributions of others. Many pointed to the nominating convention as an astonishing experience – one where they were using the course material to persuade others. They noted how one student, who was alone in backing his candidate, used his knowledge to lobby others to place the candidate on the party’s ticket as the vice presidential candidate. As one student indicated, “the power of one armed with knowledge can really rule the world of poli tics!” This is the lesson of civic engagement that I wanted my students to learn – that one person, with commitment, informa tion, and passion, can influence and better the world around them – and it is a lesson that the use of active learning simulations can help them achieve.

#### Vagueness kills solvency

Farber 9-13

Samuel, City University of New York Brooklyn College political science professor, 9-13-12, “Occupy Wall Street and the Art of Demanding” http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/11507-occupy-wall-street-and-the-art-of-demanding, accessed 10-14-13

The OWS reluctance to formulate demands might have been beneficial initially in that it might have created a more welcoming atmosphere to newly radicalized people. But as movements develop and mature, they need to state more clearly what they stands for and not only what they stand against. Movements need to develop some kind of theory to guide their actions, not as an obscure, technical body of thought only accessible to the select few, but as the clearest possible ideas about the nature of the enemy and of the movement. Movements must address the problems they are likely to confront as they go from point A – where they are – to point B – where they want to be.

### Case

#### THEIR PERFORMATIVE VIEW OF AGENCY AS MERELY CONCIEVING OF THE WORLD DIFFERENTLY SOLVING ACTUAL VIOLENCE BLAMES THE VICTIMS AND LEADS TO PASSIVE NIHILISM.

GUNN AND CLOUD 2K10

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

Below we advance a conception of agency as an open question in order to combat magical thinking in contemporary communication theory. Although we approach the concept of agency from different theoretical standpoints (one of us from the perspective of psychoanalysis, the other, classical Marxism), we are mutually opposed to the (bourgeois) idealism of magical voluntarism in recent work in communication and rhetorical studies on agency.2 Our primary vehicle of argument is a critique of Foss, Waters, and Armada’s essay, ‘‘Toward a Theory of Agentic Orientation: Communication Theory 20 (2010) 50–78 © 2010 International Communication Association 51Agentic Orientation as Magical Voluntarism J. Gunn & D.L. Cloud Rhetoric and Agency in Run Lola Run,’’ which represents a magical-voluntaristic brand of practical reason (phronesis) that is increasingly discredited among a number rhetorical scholars. We are particularly alarmed by the suggestion that even in ‘‘situations’’ such as ‘‘imprisonment or genocide ... agents have choices about how to perceive their conditions and their agency ...[which] opens up opportunities for innovating ... in ways unavailable to those who construct themselves as victims’’ (p. 33). The idea that one can choose an ‘‘agentic orientation’’ regardless of context and despite material limitation not only ignores two decades of research within the ﬁeld of communication studies on agency and its limitations (and is thus ‘‘regressive’’ in more than one sense), but tacitly promotes a belief in wish-fulﬁllment through visualization and the imagination, as well as a commitment to radical individualism and autonomy. As a consequence, embracing magical voluntarism leads to narcissistic complacency, regressive infantilism, and elitist arrogance.

#### AND ,THE EXCLUSIVELY PERFORMATIVELY CONSTITUTED VIEW OF AGENCY BLAMES THE VICTIMS OF STRUCTURAL OPPRESSION FOR FAILING TO THINK THEMSELVES FREE BY ADOPTING THE METHOD OF THE 1AC – ITS INTRINCACY BECOMES A BLUDGEONING TOOL FOR ADHERENCE TO THEIR MODEL OF THOUGHT.

GUNN AND CLOUD 2K10

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

Although we do not dismiss certain forms of constructivist thought, it is important to detail the consequence or ‘‘outcome’’ of choosing magical voluntarism. Both The Secret and Foss, Waters, and Armada invoke physics to argue that structural change is possible for anything you desire through conscious thought and choice. Hence, magical voluntarism denies that some material and social conditions are not changeable: Agentic orientations... are achieved within, rather than simply given by, the conditions of individuals’ lives. Thus, individuals may be in a dominant position as deﬁned by economic and other structural conditions or in a subordinate position as deﬁned by a lack of access to such resources, but they may choose any agentic orientation and produce any outcome they desire. We acknowledge that such a view may be difﬁcult to accept in extreme cases such as imprisonment or genocide; even in these situations, however, agents have choices about how to perceive their conditions and their agency. Even in these situations, adoption of the agentic orientation of director opens up opportunities for innovating in ways unavailable to those who constructthemselves as victims. (p. 223, emphasis added) In other words, the starving prisoner in a concentration camp should choose the director orientation and dream-up the possibility of her liberation or escape.7 Aside from the offensiveness of such a perspective on imprisonment and genocide, what is the outcome of adopting this ontological view about ‘‘structural’’ conditions? The Secret is quite clear on the answer: narcissistic complacency. ‘‘Anything we focus on we do create,’’ explains Hale Dwoskin, ‘‘so if we’re really angry, for instance, at a war that’s going on, or strife or suffering, we’re adding our energy to it’’ (pp. 141–142). So although the rhetoric of magic exempliﬁed by The Secret acknowledges structural injustice, it gets explained away in mystical terms that urge the reader to turn her back to the world and seek within. The video and book openly discourage social protest, invoking Carl Jung’s phrase, ‘‘what you resist persists’’ (p. 142). ‘‘Don’t give energy to what you don’t want,’’ intones one of the video’s ‘‘teachers.’’ For example, the DVD segment on wealth begins with black-and-white footage of sweatshop laborers in dreary factories, but sweatshops are a mere blip on the screen. Immediately, the text explains that today one can be free from such exploitation and drudgery simply by wishing for money.8 The real world outcome of the constructivism that supports magical voluntarism is ultimately selﬁsh inaction. ‘‘You cannot help the world by focusing on the negative things,’’ says Byrne. ‘‘When I discovered The Secret I made a decision that I would not watch the news or read newspapers anymore, because it did not make me feel good’’ (pp. 144–145). Although professional scholars in the United States may be buffered from some of the vagaries of economic crisis and barriers to achievement, there are, in fact—as opposed to the fantasy of a ﬁlmic game or magnetizing your desires into reality—millions of people around the world who cannot wish away the ‘‘conditions, people, or events external to them’’ (p. 209). Nongovernmental organizations, grassroots banks and crafts projects, and other forms of localized ‘‘self-help’’ can do little to curtail the broader abuses of capitalist globalization. But Foss, Waters, and Armada chastise critical postcolonial scholars Radha Hegde and Raka Shome, as if the (magical) options available to a ﬁctional Lola actually apply to sweatshop workers in India (p. 223). Similarly, The Secret encourages readers to turn on to the law of attraction and stop resisting injustice: ‘‘The antiwar movement creates more war,’’ explains Jack Canﬁeld (quoted in Byrne, p. 142). Shockingly, however, Foss, Waters, and Armada carry their magical voluntarism beyond the fuzzy magnetism of The Secret to a most extreme conclusion: Symbolic choices, Run Lola Run argues, can and do affect the structural world. We acknowledge that a belief in this tenet is disputable in the presence of certain kinds of conditions, but we ask our readers to consider seriously for a moment...the possibility that it might be true under all conditions. (p. 220) Even in the contexts of famine and genocide, Foss, Waters, and Armada believe that changing one’s interpretation of events is the correct strategy, especially because ‘‘what you resist, persists.’’ While demonstrably different, both their article and The Secret counsel passivity—implicitly and explicitly respectively—in the face of the most brutal exploitation and oppression, letting the purveyors of inequality off the hook for their actions, urging millions to think positively in the face of their immiseration.9

#### THEIR PERFORMATIVE VIEW OF AGENCY HAS NO REAL WORLD SOLVENCY – PRIMARY FOCUS ON PERSONAL IDENTITY GENERATES IGNORANCE ABOUT THE MATERIAL STRUCTURING OF POLITICAL SUBJECTIVITY AND IS A FORM OF NEO-CONSERVATISM.

GUNN AND CLOUD 2K10

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

Finally, both The Secret and Foss, Waters, and Armada’s versions of magical voluntarism repeatedly stress a radical individualism in two ways: (a) by insisting the individual alone has the power to transcend limitation without the help of others; and (b) by insisting that individuals must take full responsibility for their material, social, and cultural existence. ‘‘You are the master of your life,’’ intones Byrne, ‘‘and the Universe is answering your every command’’ (p. 146). Such juvenile omnipotence is reﬂected in the opening remarks of the most recent program on The Secret and the law of attraction by Oprah Winfrey (2008): ‘‘I am grateful that ... millions of people, for so many millions of people, the door was at least opened to the idea that we are each responsible for the quality of our lives ... so that people can begin to understand that our thoughts... are literally creating our experiences.’’ Throughout the hour-long program various individuals testify to the transformative power of the law of attraction (for example, ‘‘34-year-old Meadow’’ was ‘‘fat, broke,’’ and ‘‘crying every day’’ until she picked up and read Oprah magazine and saw The Secret DVD). The ‘‘experts’’ onOprah continuously underscore the centrality of the individual and necessity for forgiveness and personal responsibility even to the point of ‘‘disappearing’’ those who have harmed you through acts of forgiveness.The Secret always comes back to this refrain: ‘‘To love yourself fully, you must focus on a new dimension of You. You must focus on the presenceinside you’’ (p. 173). In a manner that resembles Ayn Rand’s (1964) defense of the ‘‘virtue of selﬁshness,’’ Byrne argues that focusing on others is the problem: ‘‘It is not people who are giving you the things you desire. If you hold that false belief, you will experience lack, because you are looking at the outside world and people as the supply’’ (p. 163). Only by forsaking the world and centering in oneself can true, positive change ///

begin. Again, while not as extreme, Foss, Waters, and Armada similarly advocate individualism and personal responsibility when they stress the ‘‘internal’’ locus of choice. As withThe Secret and Oprah’s experts, the problem with achieving the ideal is a basic misunderstanding about how the Universe truly works: That everyone has the same capacity for agency, regardless of access to resources, is not to be confused with the notion that everyone chooses well. With their agency, all individuals may choose situations that make them suffer and reduce their control over structural conditions. Those who make agentic choices that appear less desirable gain at least some rewards from such choices—possibly a greater capacity to attract others to a cause, the generation of positive responses in the form of sympathy or avoidance of responsibility. (p. 224) Herein we confront the outcome of choosing a radical individualism: elitist arrogance. The elitism of The Secret and Foss, Waters, and Armada’s agentic orientation is pronounced in their claim that oppression is a matter of perception. For example, Foss, Waters and Armada argue that ‘‘Lola sees herself as helpless and disempowered’’ in the ﬁrst ﬁlmic run (p. 209), but when an individual in the real world confronts a real, deadly situation, she mightreally be helpless and disempowered (e.g., the stories of child abuse, rape, American slavery, Indian Removal, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as well as the Holocaust, come to mind). According to Foss, Waters, and Armada, Lola dies in the ﬁrst run, not because her father is a misogynist, but because of her ‘‘adoption of the victim orientation’’ (p. 209). ‘‘Because Lola views structural conditions as controlling, she sees them as limiting’’ (p. 210). Never mind that space, time, and social relations are actually constraints on human action (and more so for some than for others). Indeed, in both The Secret and the theory of agentic orientation, every act is ‘‘an interpretation of a set of conditions’’ (Foss, Waters, and Armada, p. 207). Oppression is a matter of perception and liberation is an outcome of wishful thinking. ‘‘Lola also cedes power to structural conditions by refusing to take responsibility for what happens to Manni and her. She places the blame for events in their lives on conditions, people, or events external to them’’ (p. 209). For practitioners of The Secret, Oprah and her experts, as well as Foss, Waters and Armada, Lola is wholly responsible for her existential condition.11 McGee (2007) calls attention to the conservative consequences of this way of thinking: ‘‘What about the unfortunate corollary that would necessarily apply to those who are ill, impoverished, dispossessed, or worse? What about The Secret’s more egregious claims...that the children of Darfur attracted the starvation their families are facing with their wrong thinking.’’ Strangely, this judgment—that women and oppressed others are wrong to blame ‘‘conditions, people, or events external to them’’ for the hardships of their lives—resembles the rhetoric of conservative real world policies and agencies, suggesting a common ideological underpinning (see Cloud, 1998). Neoliberal structural adjustment programs, in which the World Bank or International Monetary Fund ‘‘help’’ suffering populations only if those populations interpret their problems as something other than a structured result of global capitalism, are good examples (see Soederberg, 2006). Some of these programs compel the desperately hungry to grow luxury crops for export, asking debtor nations to sacriﬁce infrastructure—plumbing, waste management, transportation, employment, and social services—to the servicing of their debt (see Bond, 2001; Geier, 2000).12 Likewise, now that the U.S. war in Iraq has destroyed (for the second time) that country’s infrastructure and stripped the nation’s resources, creating a crisis that opened the door to al Qaeda and other insurrectionary groups, the rationale for continuing the occupation is that the Iraqis are not taking enough responsibility for solving their problems. For example, in January, 2007, Senator and Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton (2007) complained during Congressional hearings on the Iraq troop ‘‘surge’’ strategy that the hardship faced by the US in Iraq ‘‘has everything to do with the years of lost opportunities and the failures of the Iraqis to step up and take responsibility for their own future.’’ Like the starving in less-developed countries, perhaps the beleaguered Iraqis have failed to adopt the proper agentic orientation? When we consider a theory of agency derived from structural antagonisms and global realities, instead of from mystical claptrap or Hollywood ﬁlms, magical voluntarism appears like child’s play.

## 2NC

### Overview

#### 2) Makes the debate into an echo-chamber – destroys fairness, education, and turns the aff

Talisse 5

Professor of Philosophy @Vandy¶ Robert, Philosophy & Social Criticism, Deliberativist responses to activist challenges, 31(4) p. 429-431

The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. **The deliberativist view** I have sketched hold that reasonableness **involved some degree of** what we may call **epistemic modesty. On this** view, **the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reflect the best available reasons,** and so she enters into public discourse **as a way of testing her views against the objections** and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly hold that **her present view is open to reasonable critique** and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justifications for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of **politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justification is unreasonable**. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness **for the activist** consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reflection seem adequate to underwrite action; **discussion with those who disagree need not be involved**. **According to the activist,** there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which **there is no room for reasoned objection.** Under such conditions, **the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational**. It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001A; ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political **activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies,** demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. Activists also must engage in deliberation among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movement must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tact’s; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. **Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists**. **Group polarization** is a well-documented phenomenon that **has ‘been found all over the world** and is many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81-2). Importantly, **in group that ‘engage in repeated discussions’** over time, **the polarization is even more pronounced** (2003: 86). Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of an individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.).17 The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that **he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees** in cases in which the requirement of justice are so clear that he can be confidents that has the truth .Group polarization suggest that even deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even we have the truth. **For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views,** but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth ,In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggest that a engagement with those with whom one disagrees is essential to the proper pursuitof justice. Insofar as the activist denies this, he is unreasonable.

### Limits Good - Long

#### 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.

### AT Framework = Policing

#### Arguments stand or fall based on whether they are good – nothing more nothing less – the negatives argument isn’t policing

Amanda Anderson 6, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Humanities and English at Brown University, Spring 2006, “Reply to My Critic(s),” Criticism, Vol. 48, No. 2, p. 281-290

Lets first examine the claim that my book is "unwittingly" inviting a resurrection of the "Enlightenment-equals-totalitarianism position." How, one wonders, could a book promoting argument and debate, and promoting reason-giving practices as a kind of common ground that should prevail over assertions of cultural authenticity, somehow come to be seen as a dangerous resurgence of bad Enlightenment? Robbins tells us why: I want "argument on my own terms"-that is, I want to impose reason on people, which is a form of power and oppression. But what can this possibly mean? Arguments stand or fall based on whether they are successful and persuasive, even an argument in favor of argument. It simply is not the case that an argument in favor of the importance of reasoned debate to liberal democracy is tantamount to oppressive power. To assume so is to assume, in the manner of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, that reason is itself violent, inherently, and that it will always mask power and enforce exclusions. But to assume this is to assume the very view of Enlightenment reason that Robbins claims we are "thankfully" well rid of. (I leave to the side the idea that any individual can proclaim that a debate is over, thankfully or not.) But perhaps Robbins will say, "I am not imagining that your argument is directly oppressive, but that what you argue for would be, if it were enforced." Yet my book doesn't imagine or suggest it is enforceable; I simply argue in favor of, I promote, an ethos of argument within a liberal democratic and proceduralist framework. As much as Robbins would like to think so, neither I nor the books I write can be cast as an arm of the police. ¶ Robbins wants to imagine a far more direct line of influence from criticism to political reality, however, and this is why it can be such a bad thing to suggest norms of argument. Watch as the gloves come off: ¶ Faced with the prospect of submitting to her version of argument roughly, Habermass version-and of being thus authorized to disagree only about other, smaller things, some may feel that there will have been an end to argument, or an end to the arguments they find most interesting. With current events in mind, I would be surprised if there were no recourse to the metaphor of a regular army facing a guerilla insurrection, hinting that Anderson wants to force her opponents to dress in uniform, reside in well-demarcated camps and capitals that can be bombed, fight by the rules of states (whether the states themselves abide by these rules or not), and so on-in short, that she wants to get the battle onto a terrain where her side will be assured of having the upper hand.¶ Lets leave to the side the fact that this is a disowned hypothetical criticism. (As in, "Well, okay, yes, those are my gloves, but those are somebody elses hands they will have come off of.") Because far more interesting, actually, is the sudden elevation of stakes. It is a symptom of the sorry state of affairs in our profession that it plays out repeatedly this tragicomic tendency to give a grandiose political meaning to every object it analyzes or confronts. We have evidence of how desperate the situation is when we see it in a critic as thoughtful as Bruce Robbins, where it emerges as the need to allegorize a point about an argument in such a way that it gets cast as the equivalent of war atrocities. It is especially ironic in light of the fact that to the extent that I do give examples of the importance of liberal democratic proceduralism, I invoke the disregard of the protocols of international adjudication in the days leading up to the invasion of Iraq; I also speak about concerns with voting transparency. It is hard for me to see how my argument about proceduralism can be associated with the policies of the Bush administration when that administration has exhibited a flagrant disregard of democratic procedure and the rule of law. I happen to think that a renewed focus on proceduralism is a timely venture, which is why I spend so much time discussing it in my final chapter. But I hasten to add that I am not interested in imagining that proceduralism is the sole political response to the needs of cultural criticism in our time: my goal in the book is to argue for a liberal democratic culture of argument, and to suggest ways in which argument is not served by trumping appeals to identity and charismatic authority. I fully admit that my examples are less political events than academic debates; for those uninterested in the shape of intellectual arguments, and eager for more direct and sustained discussion of contemporary politics, the approach will disappoint. Moreover, there will always be a tendency for a proceduralist to under-specify substance, and that is partly a principled decision, since the point is that agreements, compromises, and policies get worked out through the communicative and political process. My book is mainly concentrated on evaluating forms of arguments and appeals to ethos, both those that count as a form of trump card or distortion, and those that flesh out an understanding of argument as a universalist practice. There is an intermittent appeal to larger concerns in the political democratic culture, and that is because I see connections between the ideal of argument and the ideal of deliberative democracy. But there is clearly, and indeed necessarily, significant room for further elaboration here.

## 1NR

#### Abolishing prisons is a call for a broader movement connecting a kritik of racism, sexism, heterosexism and other forms of oppression. Moreover, it is possible to create a system that provides actual alternatives to imprisonment and domination

Social Justice Movements '06

http://socialjustice.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/index.php/Abolish\_Prisons

Given that over two million people are currently imprisoned in US facilities and 20% of the world incarcerated population lives in the United States, it is incredulous that the situation remains invisible and only continues to worsen. However, this only highlights the entrenched character of the system and the public dialogue framed both in its language and proposed solutions within the narrow confines of this system that many seemingly accept. Today, **prison** is considered an inevitable and permanent structure of our social lives. However, as we know from the historical origins of prisons, we understand that they **were not a superior form of punishment fit for all time, but rather**, without taking its complexity lightly, **what made sense at a particular point in history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Slavery, lynching, and segregation are all examples of social institutions once considered to be just as much an eternal fixture in life**. **We need to create a new imagination that calls for a world that is completely different**. **Angela Davis emphasizes that** **with the prison system** **so entrenched in U.S. economic, political, and ideological life, the reality behind the prison-industrial complex is** not a simple conglomeration of bodies and interests, but instead **the relationships** between all of those groups. **Abolishing the prison system is truly about abolishing those relationships and proposing alternatives that pull them apart**. The approach to decarceration needs to envision a popular discourse on a spectrum of alternatives to prisons, not just one answer. **Davis cites education, demilitarization of schools, adequate housing, physical and mental health care for all, additional public resources and services, and a justice system based on reparation and reconciliation rather than retribution and vengeance, as critical components to structuring alternatives**. Fundamentally, **our thinking and actions need to radically transform the underlying racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and other structures of dominance and oppression**, in order to make the abolition of prisons feasible. **Our focus must** not **be** only **on the prison system** as an isolated institution **but also towards all social relations that support its permanence**. **Our language and our aims need to** shift away from simple adjustments of the current prison system, and instead **link the prison reform initiative to a larger movement - one with a clear goal of prison abolition**.