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## 1NC

### 1

#### There exists an intrinsic antagonism in debate – on one side, debate is always shaped by strategy, winning, and debate theory. The other side is the desire to influence a larger public. The aff’s desire to change the debate community by bridging the drone gap and speaking out refusing to be complicit like the rest of the public is always shaped by the norms of debate. Your aff will never be receptive to the larger public. We should view outside of the academy as more important than our debate spaces

Welsh 12 Scott Department of Communication Appalachian State University (“Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012, Jstor)

Giroux’s concluding words, in which scholars reclaim the promises of a truly global democratic future, echo Ono and Sloop’s construction of scholarship as the politically embedded pursuit of utopia, McKerrow’s academic emancipation of the oppressed, McGee’s social surgery, Hartnett’s social justice scholar, and Fuller’s agent of justice. Each aims to unify the competing elements within the scholarly subject position—scholarly reflection and political agency—by reducing the former to the latter. Žižek’s advice is to consider how such attempts are always doomed to frustration, not because ideals are hard to live up to but because of the impossibility of resolving the antagonism central to the scholarly subject position. The titles “public intellectual” and “critical rhetorician” attest to the fundamental tension. “Public” and “rhetorician” both represent the aspiration to political engagement, while “critical” and “intellectual” set the scholar apart from noncritical, nonintellectual public rhetoric. However, rather than allowing the contingently articulated terms to exist in a state of paradoxical tension, these authors imagine an organic, unavoidable, necessary unity. The scholar is, in one moment, wholly public and wholly intellectual, wholly critical and wholly rhetorical, wholly scholar and wholly citizen—an impossible unity, characteristic of the sublime, in which the antagonism vanishes (2005, 147). Yet, as Žižek predicts, the sublime is the impossible. The frustration producing gap between the unity of the ideological sublime and conflicted experience quickly begins to put pressure on the ideology. This is born out in the shift from the exhilarated tone accompanying the birth of critical rhetoric (and its liberation of rhetoric scholarship from the incoherent and untenable demands of scientific objectivity) to a dispirited accounting for the difficulty of actually embodying the imagined unity of scholarly reflection and political agency. Simonson, for example, draws attention to the gap, noting how, twenty years later, it is hard to resist the feeling that “the bulk of our academic publishing is utterly inconsequential.” His hope is that a true connection between scholarly reflection and political agency may be possible outside of academia (2010, 95). Fuller approaches this conclusion when he says that the preferred path to filling universities with agents of justice is through “scaling back the qualifications needed for tenure-stream posts from the doctorate to the master’s degree,” a way of addressing the antagonism that amounts to setting half of it afloat (2006, 154). Hartnett is especially interesting because while he also insists on the existence of the gap, dismissing “many” of his “colleagues” as merely dispensing “politically vacuous truisms” or, worse, as serving as “tools of the state” and “humanities-based journals” as “impenetrably dense” and filled with “jargon-riddled nonsense,” he evinces a considerable impatience with the audiences he must engage as a social justice scholar (2010, 69, 74–75). In addition to reducing those populating the mass media to a cabal of “rotten corporate hucksters,” Hartnett rejects vernacular criticisms of his activism as “ranting and raving by fools,” and chafes at becoming “a target for yahoos of all stripes” (87, 84). In other words, the gap is not only recognized on the academic side of the ledger but appears on the public side as well; the public (in the vernacular sense of the word) does not yield to the desire of the social justice scholar. Or, as Žižek puts it, referencing Lacan, “You never look at me from the place in which I see you” (1991, 126). More telling still, Hartnett’s main examples of social justice scholars are either retired or located outside of academia (2010, 86). As Simonson suggests, and Hartnett implicitly concedes, it may well be that it really is only outside the academy that there can be immediate, material, political consequences.

#### Our argument is particularly true to the 1AC – using debate for political purposes tradeoffs with producing tools useful for the public.

Welsh 12 Scott Department of Communication Appalachian State University (“Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012, Jstor)

What does it mean to say rhetoric scholarship should be relevant to democratic practice? A prevailing answer to this question insists that rhetoric scholars are participants in the democratic contest for power just like all other citizens, no more and no less. Drawing on the work of Slavoj Žižek, the argument of this essay is that reducing scholarship to a mode of political agency not only produces an increasingly uninhabitable academic identity but also draws our attention away from producing results of rhetorical inquiry designed to be useful to citizens in democracy. Clinging to the idea that academic practice is a mode of political action produces a fantastic blindness to the antagonism between scholarly reflection and political agency that structures academic purpose. While empirical barriers to the production of rhetorical resources suitable for democratic appropriation undoubtedly exist, ignoring the self-frustrating character of academic desire is no less of an impediment to the production of democratically consequential rhetoric scholarship.

#### Alternative – Reject the affirmative because of their use of debate as a conception of political agency. We should keep competing elements of the antagonism in view to understand the limits of debate as political agency in itself

Welsh 12 Scott Department of Communication Appalachian State University (“Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012, Jstor)

In light of Žižek’s account of antagonism, one should not be surprised, however, by the conclusion that broadly effective activism is only possible outside of academia. The failure to unify scholarship and politics was predestined in the symbolic imagination that rendered them unified. Instead, effectively coming to terms with an antagonism means finding ways to keep the competing elements of the antagonism in view—and not simply as “bad” academic pretensions in conflict with “good” political motives. Rather, the two elements that constitute the scholarly subject position, reflective investigation and the production of unavoidable consequences, must be constantly present, each vying for our attention. And, insofar as the two elements are not kept in tension with each other, the scholarly subject position becomes increasingly unbearable, leading to the production of what Žižek calls supplemental ideological fantasies or ready explanations for the gap.

#### Our goal as rhetorical scholars should be the exploration and production of inventional resources suitable for the larger public, otherwise we get lost in TOO-EASY ASSURANCES that what we are doing here – in the debate space – is necessary and sufficient

Welsh 12 Scott Department of Communication Appalachian State University (“Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012, Jstor)

The challenge is to resist synthetically resolving these antagonisms, whether in confirming or disconfirming ways. Rather, as Žižek might suggest, the aim should be to “come to terms” with these antagonisms by articulating academic identities less invested in reparative fantasies that imagine a material resolution of them (1989, 3, 5, 133; 2005, 242–43). Accounts that fail to come to terms with the impossibility of closure and continue to invest in such fantasies yield either indignant calls for activism or too-easy assurance of the potential consequence of one’s work, neither of which is well suited to scholar-citizen engagement. Coming to terms with these antagonisms, I ultimately argue, is aided by a reconsideration of a number of Jürgen Habermas’s (1973, 1970) early works on the relationship between theory and practice and C. Wright Mills’s (2000) account of the relationship between scholarly reflection and political agency in The Sociological Imagination. Turning to Giambattista Vico, Habermas shows us how to keep the antagonisms clearly in view, even though he does not suggest a vision of scholarship that might allow academics to deliberately respond to the antagonism between scholarship and political agency. It is Mills, rather, through his concept of academics working in support of the sociological imagination, who suggests how academics might do just that. Directly and indirectly returning, in a sense, to classical rhetorical roots, each challenges rhetoric scholars to emphasize, as the aim of rhetoric scholarship, the exploration and production of inventional resources suitable for appropriation by citizen-actors. Such a construction of the relationship between academics and politics locates political agency and the situated pursuit of practical wisdom in democratic publics without absolving scholars of responsibility to them.

#### The question of institutional support is key to expanding wider base for change and caring for other communities – radical exposures fail

Ruggero 9 E. Colin, The New School for Social Research in New York, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, University of Delaware, Radical Green Populism: Climate Change, Social Change and the Power of Everyday Practices, 11-11, http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/e-colin-ruggero-radical-green-populism-climate-change-social-change-and-the-power-of-everyday-p

Radicals must carefully deliberate the development of alternative social institutions and intellectual resources for subversion and, ultimately, change. What will they look like? Self-managed energy systems, car and bicycle shares, farming collectives, green technology design firms, recycling and composting operations, construction and refitting operations...the needs are broad and the possibilities are endless, but each must be carefully considered. What institutions and resources might prove most valuable over the long term? What institutions and resources can help strengthen radical communities? What institutions and resources would other communities be best served by, a particularly important question in the process of broadening the cultural-social unity of a wide social base for change.

### 2

#### Our interpretation is that the aff must defend an advocacy in the direction of the topic, which is an increase in statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President.

#### Increase means to make greater

Dictionary.com No Date Given <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase?s=ts> increase - Show IPA verb, in·creased, in·creas·ing, noun verb (used with object)

to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: “to increase taxes.”

#### Restriction on war power authority must be a limit that controls the president

Fisher, 97 **–** (Louis, Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, “Presidential Independence and the Power of the Purse,” U.C. Davis J. Int'l L. & Pol'y 107, Lexis)

A legal analysis by Walter Dellinger, at that time Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, draws a bold definition of presidential war power but appears to concede that if Congress gets its act together to enact a statutory restriction, the legislative limit controls the President: "By establishing and funding a military force capable of being sent around the globe, and declining in the War Powers Resolution or elsewhere to forbid the President's use of his statutory and constitutional powers to deploy troops into situations of risk such as Haiti, Congress left the President both the authority and the means to take such initiatives." n131

#### First is Limits – resolutional limits encourage aff innovation, predictive research on a designated topic, and clash—a precursor to productive education. The inherent value of arguments within limits is greater, which link turns education arguments

#### Second is Fair ground – the resolution is the only neutral site of stasis for controversy – changing this allows them to define the debate in ways that make it impossible for us to compete and really easy for them to win

#### Third is decision-making – only maintaining a limited topic of discussion and a clear stasis for both teams provides the necessary and requisite foundation for decision-making and advocacy skills – even if they are contestable, that is different from being valuably debatable

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 concernsto 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 upsimply 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.

#### Effective decision-making is the lynchpin to solve all social and political problems --- this is an impact to limits, role-playing and decision-making that turns case

Lundberg ‘10 **–** (Christian Lundberg, 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 forcritical thinking, analysis of public claims, informeddecision making, and better public judgment. If the picture ofmodem political life that underwrites this critique of debateis 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 citizenryto 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 supportfor expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology for enhancing democratic deliberativecapacities. The unique combination of critical thinking skills**,** researchand information processingskills, oral communicationskills, 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; andincreasing challenges of rapid globalization including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenrythat deliberateswith 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.

#### Discussions of specific policy-questions is crucial for skills development – we control uniqueness: students already have dogmatic notions about the world – government policy discussions is vital to force engagement with competing perspective to improve social outcomes and break down pre-conceived barriers of what is right – this turns case

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 topredict 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

#### Prefer our evidence because it is more specific to the debate context. Game spaces like debate are distinct from other forms of education and public speaking. There has to be a balance of ground or else one side claims the moral high ground and creates a de facto monologue

Hanghoj ‘8 2008 – PhD, assistant professor, School of Education, University of Aarhus, also affiliated with the Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, located at the Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark (Thorkild, http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf)

Debate games are often based on pre-designed scenarios that include descriptions of issues to be debated, educational goals, game goals, roles, rules, time frames etc. In this way, debate games differ from textbooks and everyday classroom instruction as debate scenarios allow teachers and students to actively imagine, interact and communicate within a domain-specific game space. However, instead of mystifying debate games as a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1950), I will try to overcome the epistemological dichotomy between “gaming” and “teaching” that tends to dominate discussions of educational games. In short, educational gaming is a form of teaching. As mentioned, education and games represent two different semiotic domains that both embody the three faces of knowledge: assertions, modes of representation and social forms of organisation (Gee, 2003; Barth, 2002; cf. chapter 2). In order to understand the interplay between these different domains and their interrelated knowledge forms, I will draw attention to a central assumption in Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy. According to Bakhtin, all forms of communication and culture are subject to centripetal and centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981). A centripetal force is the drive to impose one version of the truth, while a centrifugal force involves a range of possible truths and interpretations. This means that any form of expression involves a duality of centripetal and centrifugal forces: “Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear” (Bakhtin, 1981: 272). If we take teaching as an example, it is always affected by centripetal and centrifugal forces in the on-going negotiation of “truths” between teachers and students. In the words of Bakhtin: “Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (Bakhtin, 1984a: 110). Similarly, the dialogical space of debate games also embodies centrifugal and centripetal forces. Thus, the election scenario of The Power Game involves centripetal elements that are mainly determined by the rules and outcomes of the game, i.e. the election is based on a limited time frame and a fixed voting procedure. Similarly, the open-ended goals, roles and resources represent centrifugal elements and create virtually endless possibilities for researching, preparing, presenting, debating and evaluating a variety of key political issues. Consequently, the actual process of enacting a game scenario involves a complex negotiation between these centrifugal/centripetal forces that are inextricably linked with the teachers and students’ game activities. In this way, the enactment of The Power Game is a form of teaching that combines different pedagogical practices (i.e. group work, web quests, student presentations) and learning resources (i.e. websites, handouts, spoken language) within the interpretive frame of the election scenario. Obviously, tensions may arise if there is too much divergence between educational goals and game goals. This means that game facilitation requires a balance between focusing too narrowly on the rules or “facts” of a game (centripetal orientation) and a focusing too broadly on the contingent possibilities and interpretations of the game scenario (centrifugal orientation). For Bakhtin, the duality of centripetal/centrifugal forces often manifests itself as a dynamic between “monological” and “dialogical” forms of discourse. Bakhtin illustrates this point with the monological discourse of the Socrates/Plato dialogues in which the teacher never learns anything new from the students, despite Socrates’ ideological claims to the contrary (Bakhtin, 1984a). Thus, discourse becomes monologised when “someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error”, where “a thought is either affirmed or repudiated” by the authority of the teacher (Bakhtin, 1984a: 81). In contrast to this, dialogical pedagogy fosters inclusive learning environments that are able to expand upon students’ existing knowledge and collaborative construction of “truths” (Dysthe, 1996). At this point, I should clarify that Bakhtin’s term “dialogic” is both a descriptive term (all utterances are per definition dialogic as they address other utterances as parts of a chain of communication) and a normative term as dialogue is an ideal to be worked for against the forces of “monologism” (Lillis, 2003: 197-8). In this project, I am mainly interested in describing the dialogical space of debate games. At the same time, I agree with Wegerif that “one of the goals of education, perhaps the most important goal, should be dialogue as an end in itself” (Wegerif, 2006: 61).

#### If our interpretation is net-beneficial it means there’s no reason to vote affirmative. If the case is true then it de-justifies the resolution. Teams are still signified by ‘AFF’ and ‘NEG’, so the resolution is a required measurement for ‘affirmation.’

### Case

#### The refusal to participate in the state cedes too much power to neoliberalism

Connolly 12 William E. Krieger-Eisenhower Professor at Johns Hopkins University where he teaches political theory. Political Philosophy > Theory & Event > Volume 15, Issue 1,

The democratic state, while it certainly cannot alone tame capital or reconstitute the ethos of consumption, must play a significant role in reconstituting our lived relations to climate, weather, resource use, ocean currents, tectonic instability, glacier flows, species diversity, work, local life, consumption, and investment, as it responds favorably to pressures to forge a new ethos. A New, new democratic Left will thus experimentally enact new intersections between role performance and political activity, outgrow its old disgust with the very idea of the state, and remain alert to the dangers states can pose. It will do so because, as already suggested, the fragile ecology of late capital requires state interventions of several sorts. A refusal to participate in the state today cedes too much hegemony to neoliberal markets, either explicitly or by implication. Some drives to fascism, remember, emerged the last time around in capitalist states after a total market meltdown. Most of those movements failed. But a couple became consolidated through a series of resonances (vibrations) back and forth between industrialists, state officials, and vigilante groups in neighborhoods, clubs, churches, the police, the media and pubs. You do not fight the danger of a new kind of neofascism by withdrawing from either micropolitics or state politics. You do so through a multi-sited politics designed to shift systemic interactions and to infuse a new ethos into the fabric of everyday life. Changes in ethos can sometimes open doors to new possibilities of state and interstate action, so that an advance in one domain seeds that in the other. And vice versa. A positive dynamic of mutual amplification might be generated here. Could a series of significant shifts in the routines of state and global capitalism even press the fractured system to a point where it hovers on the edge of capitalism itself? We don’t know. That is one reason it is important to focus on interim goals. Another is that in a world of becoming, replete with periodic and surprising shifts in the course of events, you cannot project far beyond an interim period. Another yet is that activism needs to project concrete, interim possibilities to gain support and propel itself forward. That being said, it does seem unlikely to me, at least, that a positive interim future includes either socialist productivism or the world projected by proponents of deep ecology.23 7. To advance such an agenda it is also imperative to negotiate new connections between several nontheistic constituencies who care about the future of the earth and numerous devotees of diverse religious traditions who fold positive spiritualities into diverse creedal practices. The new, multi-faceted movement needed today, if it emerges, will take the shape of a vibrant pluralist assemblage acting at multiple sites both within and across states, rather than a centered movement with a series of fellow travelers attached to it. Electoral victories are important but they work best when they rest upon priorities that also become embedded in churches, universities, film, consumption practices, media reporting, citizen investment priorities, and the like. A related thing to keep in mind is that capitalist modes of acceleration, expansion and intensification that heighten the fragility of things today also generate pressures to minoritize the world along multiple dimensions at a more rapid pace than heretofore. A new pluralist constellation will build upon the latter developments as it works to reduce the former pressures.

#### Your absolute fear of the state feeds conservative privatization agendas

Lobel 7, Assistant Professor of Law, University of San Diego, (Orly, Harvard Law Review, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 937)

In a classic example of cooptation, activists should be concerned about the infusion (or indeed confusion) of nonlegal strategies with conservative privatization agendas. Indeed, in significant social policy contexts, legal scholarship oriented toward the exploration of extralegal paths reinforces the exact narrative that it originally resisted - that the state cannot and should not be accountablefor sustaining and improving the lifeworld of individuals in the twenty-first-century economy and that we must seek alternative ways to bring about social reform. Whether using the terminology of a path-dependent process, an inevitable downward spiral, a transnational prisoner's dilemma, or a global race to the bottom, current analyses often suggest a lack of control over the forces of new economic realities. Rather than countering the story of lack of control, pointing to the ongoing role of government and showing the contradictions between that which is being kept regulated and that which is privatized, alternative extralegal scholarship accepts these developments as natural and inevitable.

#### The question of this debate should be how to ensure that the left survives.

Grossberg, 92 [Lawrence, “Professor of Communications Studies at the University of North Carolina, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, 1992 p. 388-390]

If the Left can give up its demand for purity, it may be able to make the compromises which may be necessary for effective political opposition in the contemporary world. It will act strategically and tactically, For example, it could use contemporary advertising to its own advantage ie.g., when Reagan came out in support of gun control, or in the "Big (keen" campaign in California, where effec¬tive advertising could have prepared people tor the corporate-spon¬sored media barage opposing the initiative). Politics is always a strategic matter: one must decide where and how to struggle, it has to be decided when identities, or ideologies or state politics are appropriate and important sites of struggle. And this will sometimes involve the need to compare, evaluate and perhaps even prioritize the demands and claims of particular struggles**,** based not soley on moral commitments or theoretical reductions (as in alliance;- of solidarity) but on the exigencies and possibilities of the context. Questions need to be raised about the effective mobilization and deployment of resources, about when different fractions have to come together under a common identity, and when one group should act on behalf of another group's interest, rather than its own immediate interest. Such decisions will have to be based on political calculations of importance and possibility, but also on calculations about how best to mobilize people into the particular struggle and into a broader movement. Sometimes that will mean having to bear defeats in one place, in order to win a victory somewhere else.

#### The ESSENTIALIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT gets it wrong. It pre-decides what all governments can do and it becomes a way to ignore radical shifts in governing

Triantafillou 2K, Dept of Intercultural Communication & Management @ Copenhagen,

(Peter, Work and subjectivity – A review of psychological, sociological and

post-structuralist approaches, IKL Working Paper, no 39, Feb)

From this perspective, government may change its forms but it essentially remains the same, namely the attempt by one group to govern others. Governmentality is thereby reduced to a transcendental and essentially undifferentiated (Same) activity. However, as shown not only by Foucault but also by numerous political historians and philosophers, such as Quentin Skinner and James Tully, the problematizations, techniques, and knowledges informing the attempts to govern in Western Europe has undergone several radical shifts just within the last four or five centuries. Moreover, as noted by several authors - such as Nikolas Rose, Peter Miller, Jacques Donzelot, and Mitchell Dean - government has undergone a crucial mutation after WWII with the emergence of neo-liberal rationalities of government in the industrialized countries. In fact, du Gay’s own analysis of the emergence of the entrepreneurial self as a model for government, is an excellent demonstration of the transformation of the rationalities and practices of government in the UK during the 1980s. Thus rather than travelling through history in an empty sameness characterized by some abstract will to govern, the notion of governmentality – conceived in terms of rationalities and practices of government – may be more adequately understood as designating a historically specific phenomenon.

#### We shouldn’t decide the debate on the basis of first-person traumatic stories – it’s impossible to validate, it’s easily exploited, and it inhibits debate

Subotnik ‘98, Professor of Law, Touro College, (Daniel, Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy, Spring)

What can an academic trained to question and to doubt possibly say to Patricia Williams when effectively she announces, "I hurt bad"? "No, you don't hurt"? "You shouldn't hurt"? "Other people hurt too"? Or, most dangerously - and perhaps most tellingly - "What do you expect when you keep shooting yourself in the foot?" If the majority were perceived as having the well- being of minority groups in mind, these responses might be acceptable, even welcomed. And they might lead to real conversation. But, writes Williams, the failure by those "cushioned within the invisible privileges of race and power... to incorporate a sense of precarious connection as a part of our lives is... ultimately obliterating." 74 "Precarious." "Obliterating." These words will clearly invite responses only from fools and sociopaths; they will, by effectively precluding objection, disconcert and disunite others. "I hurt," in academic discourse, has three broad though interrelated effects. First, it demands priority from the reader's conscience. It is for this reason that law review editors, waiving usual standards, have privileged a long trail of undisciplined - even silly 75 - destructive and, above all, self-destructive arti [\*695] cles. 76 Second, by emphasizing the emotional bond between those who hurt in a similar way, "I hurt" discourages fellow sufferers from abstracting themselves from their pain in order to gain perspective on their condition. 77 [\*696] Last, as we have seen, it precludes the possibility of open and structured conversation with others. 78 [\*697] It is because of this conversation-stopping effect of what they insensitively call "first-person agony stories" that Farber and Sherry deplore their use. "The norms of academic civility hamper readers from challenging the accuracy of the researcher's account; it would be rather difficult, for example, to criticize a law review article by questioning the author's emotional stability or veracity."

#### We should not reduce politics to our own oppression – our argument doesn’t assume you have to check your identity at the door – but if this politics is over-emphasized, it impeded judgment by reducing all experience to more of the same and helps conservative politicians who want to reduce experience into special interests

Grossberg ‘92 [Lawrence, “Professor of Communications Studies at the University of North Carolina, We Gotta Get Out of This Place, p. 365-366]

Identity politics is an extension of feminists' argument that the personal (i.e., experience, determined by social difference) is politi¬cal. But it ignores the fact that "the political cannot be reduced to the personal." It assumes that politics is determined by identity and consequently, ignores the most obvious lesson of contemporary political history: the politics of any social position is not guaranteed in advance, even if it appears to be stitched tightly in place. There is no necessary reason why anyone inhabiting a particular experien¬tial field or located in a particular social position has to adhere to particular political agendas and interests. The illusion can be maintained only by assuming that people who do not have the "right" politics must be suffering from false consciousness and they have yet to authentically experience their own lives. It is too easy to assume that abortion is "a woman's issue" and, further, that a woman who is against abortion is acting against her own experience and interests. More importantly, this often leads people to miss broader political possibilities (e.g., that Rust v. Sullivan limits free speech in any federally funded institution and overrides professional codes of re¬sponsibility and significantly strengthens both state courts and the Executive Branch). As June Jordan puts it, People have to begin to understand that just because somebody is a woman or somebody is black does not mean that he or she and I should have the same politics. We should try to measure each on the basis of what we do for each other rather than on the basis of who we are. Political struggle is too easily replaced by the ongoing analysis of one's own oppression and experience or, only slightly better, by a politics in which the only site of struggle is the local constitution of one's experience within a structure of difference. While the personal is most certainly political, it is often impossible to reach it other than through indirection, through struggles over and within the public sphere. As a political practice, identity politics has (unintentionally) played into efforts by the Right to marginalize many important struggles over both civil liberties and civil rights as "special interests." A politics of identity can easily lead one to assume that every activity of a subordinated social fraction is an authentic expression of its position and, as such, must be celebrated as some form of resistance (e.g., Black anti-Semitism or the Islamic treatment of women), creating complex and often impossible contradictions. And since subordination is only defined by its opposition to an imaginary abstract other always located in a dominant position (Black against white, street culture against "legitimate culture," female against male, workers against capitalists), there is little room for any distinctions. All struggles are apparently equal since every struggle has an equally credible case for those implicated within the space of its specific identifications. The claim of every subordinated social group, and just about every social group is subordinated in some dimension, must be granted equal validity since there is no way to measure oppression from outside of the experience or position of the specific imagined community. There can be no measure of political immediacy, importance and value, no way of evaluating the reasons, forms, legitimacy or at least pragmatic necessity of particular moments of subordination. All subordination is evil; all subordinated groups are good! Of course, in practice, particular forms of subordi¬nation are privileged, and politics can degenerate into comparative measurements of suffering.

#### Sharing personal experience will causes judges to fake it

Whitlock ‘7, Pf Post Colonial Studies – U of Queensland, (Gillian, Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature, Spring)

At the same time, these postcolonial contexts also suggest the limitations of this healing paradigm: empathic engagement can be denied, victims may fail to receive affirmation by telling their stories: "Shock and shame can lead to an ethics of recognition and gestures of reconciliation. They can also provoke feelings of guilt and denial." 7 At the very least, these cycles of [\*145] testimonial narrative establish victims as "knowing victims of history and of human rights violations;" however truth and reconciliation do not necessarily proceed from this, and the intersubjective relations that are produced are always open to question. For example, the conference session in Cape Town was transformed as the dynamics of the TRC were invoked when mothers testified to their grief and pain with the blessing of Archbishop Tutu. For them, the process of reconciliation and restorative justice remains incomplete. For many of us who were called upon to witness this testimony, the change of dynamics in a conference milieu was challenging both intellectually and emotionally. This may be in part because of denial, as some of us were forced to confront our own complicity as beneficiaries of settler colonialism elsewhere. Yet the performance also raised questions about commodification of testimony, the agency of the mothers themselves in the ongoing staging of stories of grief and loss by victims of apartheid, and the overtly Christian symbolism and ceremony that surrounded this event. Equally, the appearance of Adriaan Vlok as a perpetrator indicated a contradictory and painful legacy that continues to be felt personally in South Africa. Ultimately the measure of this book, as with any other scholarly project, is what frameworks for further research emerge, and what other kinds of projects might be enabled using similar methodologies. As I have argued, this field of scholarly inquiry is a particularly demanding one. Life narratives have been invoked in processes of healing across very different social, historical, and political contexts in the recent past, and in a series of processes that are intercontinental. This requires an expansive and comparative methodology, and a capacity to work across disciplines to link two phenomena: the emergence of human rights as a privileged mode of addressing trauma and the rise in popularity of published life narratives. It also requires a rigorous assessment of what life narrative can do when it is deployed in the wake of trauma and in the interests of healing and reconciliation. One of the interesting features of the recent conference at Cape Town was the passive resistance to questions of representation.

#### We should refuse suffering-centric story-telling

Nair ‘10, U of Illinois at Chicago’s, Dept of English, Queers for Economic Justice Project Advisory Committee on Immigration & Chicago LGBTQ Immigrant Alliance, (Yasmin, Immigrant City: Chicago, 6/6, http://www.usmarxisthumanists.org/articles/what%E2%80%99s-left-of-queer-immigration-sexuality-and-affect-in-a-neoliberal-world/)

Personal stories can help to make systemic conditions more easily understood. But is there a way to use them without buying into pathos and abjection? As we move forward to what most progressives are dearly hoping will be a full-scale change in administration, we might start to ask ourselves about the costs and downfalls of telling stories. What tropes and emotions govern them? If they came from angry immigrants who spoke up forcefully and not as abject humans, would we be inclined to listen? Can we assume that our leftist politics insulates us from the need to examine our own ideologies and othering practices? Can we work with stories that provide no comfort about the goodness of our land and the fairness of the American Dream? We need to refuse the narratives of abjection that are routinely forced upon us. They only render us immobile creatures, begging for help. We are all neoliberals now. We’re all selling our bodies, our lives, our stories to the media and to provide comfort to ourselves. Those stories have to be challenged and reworked or we lose sight of the larger story of economic exploitation, at our peril.

#### Big old overgeneralization – focuses on discourse of the powerful at the expense of real efforts by the oppressed to contest security constructions.

**MCDONALD**, University of Warwick, UK, **08**

(Matt, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 14(4): 563–587)

In perhaps the clearest statement of this limitation, Lene Hansen (2000) has discussed the ways in which the focus on speech acts means contributing to the silencing of women, whose suffering and engagement with security discourses is neglected in a framework that focuses on the articulations of the powerful: of those whose voices can be heard and of those whose successful attempts at securitization can result in the enactment of emergency measures. Such a framework clearly has little to say about the plight of the most vulnerable in global politics and their experiences of — and engagement with — security and threat. Indeed for Hansen, the Copenhagen School does not simply neglect the experiences of women but in fact serves to further marginalize them. ‘If security is a speech act’, Hansen (2000: 306) suggests, ‘then it is simultaneously deeply implicated in the production of silence’. In many ways this focus on dominant voices in the construction of security is not a problem for the Copenhagen School alone. Traditional security proponents and some post-structuralists limit the number of actors deemed important in security terms in focusing on either state policy or dominant discourses. While Copenhagen School proponents allow the possibility for security actors and ‘securitizers’ other that state political leaders (Buzan et al., 1998: 31–3), this move is ultimately closed off by the dual suggestions that security is ultimately about states (e.g. Wæver, 1989: 314; Wæver, 1995: 47–9) and that security is articulated from a position of institutional power (Wæver, 1995: 57; Buzan et al., 1998: 32–3). The default position here is therefore a focus on the political leaders of states and their designations of threat. The methodological focus on speech acts might also be seen as relevant to this bias. As Jennifer Milliken (1999: 243–5) has argued, the tendency to ignore subjugated knowledge or voices is a general inclination within discourse analytical approaches to international relations. In short, the focus only on dominant voices and their designation of security and threat is normatively problematic, **contributing to the silencing of marginal voices and ignoring the ways in which such actors have attempted precisely to contest these security constructions.** But it also has problematic implications analytically. First, and echoing criticisms noted above, it pays insufficient attention to the means through which particular articulations of security and threat become possible: how, for example, are marginal actors and their articulations of security silenced or marginalized? Focusing on these marginalized or subjugated actors could point to some of the ways in which ‘securitization’ becomes possible, expanding the emphasis on ‘contexts’ noted in the previous section.

#### Unifying theories distract time and energy from a democratic renaissance – they divide ranks, telling people that their current forms of resistance are a waste of time.

RUDD 5 \* JEFFREY, Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Montana; University of Wisconsin-Madison, William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review, Spring, 29 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 551

Society should give up the unproductive pursuit of unifying theories purporting to explain the underlying structure of environmental law, policy, and regulation, and focus instead on the particular regulations and agency decision-making processes impeding the resolution of environmental conflicts. Practical solutions to regulatory problems develop in context, not through philosophical holism justified by "unifying" theories. Foundationalist n28 theories will never "screen off" n29 uncertainty or eliminate normative influences from regulatory decisions. [\*557] Democratic principles should guide efforts to improve the quality of the environmental regulatory system and its decision-making organizations. The hopeless endeavor of searching for "unifying" principles diverts valuable time and energy away from a productive, democratic renaissance in environmental law and regulation. "The answer to the defects of democracy is not denial of the democratic idea." n30

#### GENDER CRITICISM IS EASILY CO-OPTED INTO THE STATE

**MANN**, Department of English - Pomona College, **96**  (Paul, PMC 6.2)

It is a critical commonplace that the state is **not a monolithic hegemony** but rather a constellation of disorganized and fragmentary agencies of production. This is often taken as **a validation for the political potential of marginal critical movements:** inside-outside relations can be facilely deconstructed and critics can still congratulate themselves on their "resistance." But the contrary is clearly the case. The most profitable intellectual production does not take place at the center (e.g., Romance Philology), where mostly obsolete weapons are produced; the real growth industries are located precisely on the self-proclaimed margins. It will be argued that resistance is still possible; nothing I propose here argues against such a possibility. I wish only to insist that effective resistance will never be located in the position, however oppositional it imagines itself to be. Resistance is first of all a function of the apparatus itself. What would seem to be the transgressive potential of such institutional agencies as **certain orders of gender criticism might demonstrate the entropy of the institution,** but it does nothing to prove the counterpolitical claims of the position. **Fantasies of resistance often serve as alibis for collusion.** Any position is a state agency, and its relative marginality is a mode of orientation, not an exception. Effective resistance must be located in other tactical forms.

#### Turn – your K of masculinity increased gendered violence and can’t resolve any root causes

Amar 11 Paul, Journal of Middle East Women's Studies, Volume 7, Number 3, Fall

To date, masculinity studies remains focused on charting the social norms that characterize subgroups of men, with particular interest in norms that foster violence, including domestic violence, gang membership, homophobia, terrorism, and militarism, among others. In a certain light, this agenda can seem emancipatory, shifting attention from the deviancy of homosexuals or the marginality of women and turning it toward the constructed nature of masculinized, heteronormative identities, heterosexual forms of family and social life, and modes of violence embedded in so-called "normal" male behavior (Kimmel 1994, Kimmel, Hearn, and Connell 2003). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans-gender (LGBT) scholars and feminists have drawn on the literature of masculinity studies in order to shed light critically on how the norms of heterosexuality and/or homosociality are generated in relationship to ethnic cultures, territorial identities, and social histories. But the field's dominant branch still leans toward broad behavioralist generalizations and therapeutic similes: masculinity as homophobia, masculinity as misogyny, masculinity as myth. Elaborating psychological or biomedical generalizations, and, delinked from theories of specific social and historical power locations, critical approaches to masculinity can easily become incorporated within liberal, colonial, or disciplinary state projects. For example, accounts of masculine norms and socialization processes that generate domestic violence can be utilized to increase [End Page 45] repressive interventions by the state in racialized and immigrant communities in ways that increase gendered violence and economic marginality. Studies of male youth self-organization and militarization can feed the extension of gang injunction legislation, the mainstreaming of counter insurgency policing policies, and the re-segregation and re-racialization of social space. Studies of men's homophobia, misogyny, and harassment behavior can be misused to create gender and class segregation in urban spaces and workplaces, leading to projects of class and ethnic cleansing that never resolve root questions of gender and sexual justice.

#### Changing gendered linguistic representations is too partial to be liberatory

MOONEY 6, Roehampton University,

(ANNABELLE, International Journal for the Semiotics of Law, WHEN A WOMAN NEEDS TO BE SEEN, HEARD AND WRITTEN AS A WOMAN: RAPE, LAW AND AN ARGUMENT AGAINST GENDER NEUTRAL LANGUAGE)

However, to change the linguistic evidence would **not re-make the** gendered **world** in which we live. While people do live in language, **we also live in thoughts, ideas and bodies**. It seems to me, that to make the language speak an imagined and desired world would not only not bring such a world about, but it would also **potentially deprive us of prima facie evidence** of the position of women; crucial to keep attention on the issue. Pauwels argues, Feminist language campaigns have made it increasingly difficult for substantial sections of the population to ignore this linguistic expression of gender discrimination. Even if people don’t adopt the changes or embrace the principles of such linguistic change, they can no longer ignore its existence. This is, for instance, clear from increased meta-linguistic comments in both speech and writing referring to the issue. Examples include apologies for not adopting dual, gender-inclusive generic pronouns, making statements such as I do not want to sound sexist, but...’.114 I am not denying that awareness of language issues may have increased. But there is a danger that if we focus too much on language as a site of violence, **its symptom status and other sites of violence, will be forgotten**.

#### Oppression is too multiple to be explained by gender

**Nagoshi1** phd student in social work @ ASU **and Brzuzy** Chair and Associate Professor of Social Work @ xavier **2010** (Julie L, Stephan/ie “Transgender Theory: Embodying Research and Practice “ Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work 25(4) 431-443)

She stated that ‘‘gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and [that] gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power’’ (p. 1067). According to Shields (2008), one’s identity is not just about his or her own self-identification but is also about the intersecting larger social structures and the power differentials that are associated with belonging to a certain group or groups. Individuals may belong to multiple socially oppressed groups, experiencing not only the sexism addressed by feminism but also the racism, classism, homophobia, and so forth. These intersections generate both oppression and opportunity (Zinn & Dill, 1996) including opportunities for coalition building to oppose multiple oppressions. As Risman (2004, p. 442) noted, ‘‘one must always take into consideration multiple axes of oppression; to do otherwise presumes the whiteness of women, the maleness of people of color, and the heterosexuality of everyone.’’ A feminist theory that adheres to an essentialist, fixed binary conception of gender identity is inadequate in addressing intersectional issues and fails to account for how a supposedly autonomous self in such a system can be empowered to resist oppression (see also, critique of liberal-individualist models of Shotwell and Sangrey, 2009)

#### Gender studies are easily co-opted into the law

Spade 10 \* Dean is an assistant professor at Seattle University School of Law. Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, 19 Colum. J. Gender & L. 1086

Reflecting on the title of this symposium, I was thinking about the metaphor of "the frontier" and what it means to place our conversations about gender and US law in the context of US law as a project of settler-colonialism. In particular, the title of this symposium made me think about how the theorization and practice of resistance to coercive gender norms is often invested in narratives of citizenship and belonging that undergird colonialism and white supremacy. How does an understanding of genocide and slavery as the conditions of the creation of the US nation-state and US law impact our analysis of the relationship between law and gender? 1 The title of this symposium evokes the most basic questions that legal scholars and activists must ask ourselves as we seek to transform systems that we understand as harmful or violent. What is the law? What is violence? Are racialized-gendered distributions of harm and violence incidental to American law and the US nation-state or co-constitutive with it? One theme that has been touched on by today's discussions is the concern over cooptation and how resistance struggles can be co-opted into narratives of citizenship and belonging in law that actually reinforce conditions of subjection.

## 2NC

### 2NC Limits

#### Studies prove—depth is better than breadth.

Arrington 09 (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.

### 2NC DM

#### But more importantly, the type of decision-making, critical thinking, info processing and research skills that we inculcate creates actively engaged citizenry that can resolve a number of existential risks that are unfolding in the status quo --- things like environmental destruction, climate change and international security exist which citizenry provides the best solution to --- prioritize these because they are existential and come first

Bostrum 12 (Nick, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute and winner of the Gannon Award, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/>)

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

### 2NC DM K2 Resistance

#### That enables ACTUAL RESISTANCE and spills up to societal change—it answers their Foster card, which says that we shouldn’t have overly technical policy solutions

Hager, professor of political science – Bryn Mawr College, ‘92

(Carol J., “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-70)

What is the role of the citizen in the modern technological state? As political decisions increasingly involve complex technological choices, does a citizen's ability to participate in decision making diminish? These questions, long a part of theoretical discourse, gained new salience with the rise of grassroots environmental protest in advanced industrial states. In West Germany, where a strong environmental movement arose in the 1970s, protest has centered as much on questions of democracy as it has on public policy. Grassroots groups challenged not only the construction of large technological projects, especially power plants, but also the legitimacy of the bureaucratic institutions which produced those projects.

Policy studies generally ignore the legitimation aspects of public policy making.2 A discussion of both dimensions, however, is crucial for understanding the significance of grassroots protest for West German political development in the technological age and for assessing the likely direction of citizen politics in united Germany.

In the field of energy politics, West German citizen initiative groups tried to politicize and ultimately to democratize policy making.3 The technicality of the issue was not a barrier to their participation. On the contrary, grassroots groups proved to be able participants in technical energy debate, often proposing innovative solutions to technological problems. Ultimately, however, they wanted not to become an elite of "counterexperts," but to create a political discourse between policy makers and citizens through which the goals of energy policy could be recast and its legitimacy restored. Only a deliberative, expressly democratic form of policy making, they argued, could enjoy the support of the populace. To this end, protest groups developed new, grassroots democratic forms of decision making within their own organizations, which they then tried to transfer to the political system at large. The legacy of grassroots energy protest in West Germany is twofold.

First, it produced major substantive changes in public policy. Informed citizen pressure was largely responsible for the introduction of new plant and pollution control technologies. Second, grassroots protest undermined the legitimacy of bureaucratic experts. Yet, an acceptable forum for a broadened political discussion of energy issues has not been found; the energy debate has taken place largely outside the established political institutions. Thus, the legitimation issue remains unresolved. It is likely to reemerge as Germany deals with the problems of the former German Democratic Republic. Nevertheless, an evolving ideology of citizen participationa vision of "technological democracy"-is an important outcome of grassroots action.

### 2NC Tradeoff DA

#### It commodifies their politics and makes it less likely to generate change – destroys coalitions and solutions

Atchison and Panetta 9, 09 – \*Director of Debate at Trinity University and \*\*Director of Debate at the University of Georgia (Jarrod, and Edward, “Intercollegiate Debate and Speech Communication: Issues for the Future,” The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies, Lunsford, Andrea, ed., 2009, p. 317-334)

The final problem with an individual debate round focus is the role of competition. Creating community change through individual debate rounds sacrifices the “community” portion of the change. Many teams that promote activist strategies in debates profess that they are more interested in creating change than winning debates. What is clear, however, is that the vast majority of teams that are not promoting community change are very interested in winning debates. The tension that is generated from the clash of these opposing forces is tremendous. Unfortunately, this is rarely a productive tension. Forcing teams to consider their purpose in debating, their style in debates, and their approach to evidence are all critical aspects of being participants in the community.¶ However, the dismissal of the proposed resolution that the debaters have spent countless hours preparing for, in the name of a community problem that the debaters often have little control over, does little to engender coalitions of the willing. Should a debate team lose because their director or coach has been ineffective at recruiting minority participants? Should a debate team lose because their coach or director holds political positions that are in opposition to the activist program? Competition has been a critical component of the interest in intercollegiate debate from the beginning, and it does not help further the goals of the debate community to dismiss competition in the name of community change.¶ The larger problem with locating the “debate as activism” perspective within the competitive framework is that it overlooks the communal nature of the community problem. If each individual debate is a decision about how the debate community should approach a problem, then the losing debaters become collateral damage in the activist strategy dedicated toward creating community change. One frustrating example of this type of argument might include a judge voting for an activist team in an effort to help them reach elimination rounds to generate a community discussion about the problem. Under this scenario, the losing team serves as a sacrificial lamb on the altar of community change. Downplaying the important role of competition and treating opponents as scapegoats for the failures of the community may increase the profile of the winning team and the community problem, but it does little to generate the critical coalitions necessary to address the community problem, because the competitive focus encourages teams to concentrate on how to beat the strategy with little regard for addressing the community problem. There is no role for competition when a judge decides that it is important to accentuate the publicity of a community problem. An extreme example might include a team arguing that their opponents’ academic institution had a legacy of civil rights abuses and that the judge should not vote for them because that would be a community endorsement of a problematic institution. This scenario is a bit more outlandish but not unreasonable if one assumes that each debate should be about what is best for promoting solutions to diversity problems in the debate community.¶ If the debate community is serious about generating community change, then it is more likely to occur outside a traditional competitive debate. When a team loses a debate because the judge decides that it is better for the community for the other team to win, then they have sacrificed two potential advocates for change within the community. Creating change through wins generates backlash through losses. Some proponents are comfortable with generating backlash and argue that the reaction is evidence that the issue is being discussed.¶ From our perspective, the discussion that results from these hostile situations is not a productive one where participants seek to work together for a common goal. Instead of giving up on hope for change and agitating for wins regardless of who is left behind, it seems more reasonable that the debate community should try the method of public argument that we teach in an effort to generate a discussion of necessary community changes. Simply put, debate competitions do not represent the best environment for community change because it is a competition for a win and only one team can win any given debate, whereas addressing systemic century-long community problems requires a tremendous effort by a great number of people.

### 2NC Steinberg & Freely

#### Effective decision-making outweighs and turns the case --- first as a theory impact, it should be prioritized because the skills that we learn from debate can be taken from this round and applied to other settings and fostering this skill should come first because it is something we will use every day --- we always have to make decisions

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-

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and thenthe 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 itand 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.

## 1NR

### Case

#### Here are 15 things that are happening better than you

Benjamin & Mir ‘ 13, Huffington Post M

edea Benjamin is author of Drone Warfare: Killing by Remote Control. Noor Mir is the Drone Campaign Coordinator at CODEPINK. ”Finally, the Backlash Against Drones Takes Flight” March 2013 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/medea-benjamin/finally-the-backlash-against-drones\_b\_2950601.html

Rand Paul's marathon 13-hour filibuster was not the end of the conversation on drones. Suddenly, drones are everywhere, and so is the backlash. Efforts to counter drones at home and abroad are growing in the courts, at places of worship, outside air force bases, inside the UN, at state legislatures, inside Congress -- and having an effect on policy. 1. April marks the national month of uprising against drone warfare. Activists in upstate New York are converging on the Hancock Air National Guard Base where Predator drones are operated. In San Diego, they will take on Predator-maker General Atomics at both its headquarters and the home of the CEO. In D.C., a coalition of national and local organizations are coming together to say no to drones at the White House. And all across the nation -- including New York City, New Paltz, Chicago, Tucson and Dayton -- activists are planning picket lines, workshops and sit-ins to protest the covert wars. The word has even spread to Islamabad, Pakistan, where activists are planning a vigil to honor victims. 2. There has been an unprecedented surge of activity in cities, counties and state legislatures across the country aimed at regulating domestic surveillance drones. After a raucous city council hearing in Seattle in February, the mayor agreed to terminate its drones program and return the city's two drones to the manufacturer. Also in February, the city of Charlottesville, Va., passed a two-year moratorium and other restrictions on drone use, and other local bills are pending in cities from Buffalo to Ft. Wayne. Simultaneously, bills have been proliferating on the state level. In Florida, a pending bill will require the police to get a warrant to use drones in an investigation; a Virginia statewide moratorium on drones passed both houses and awaits the governor's signature, and similar legislation in pending in at least 13 other state legislatures. 3. Responding to the international outcry against drone warfare, the United Nations' special rapporteur on counterterrorism and human rights, Ben Emmerson, is conducting an in-depth investigation of 25 drone attacks and will release his report in the spring. Meanwhile, on March 15, having returned from a visit to Pakistan to meet drone victims and government officials, Emmerson condemned the U.S. drone program in Pakistan, as "it involves the use of force on the territory of another State without its consent and is therefore a violation of Pakistan's sovereignty." 4. Leaders in the faith-based community broke their silence and began mobilizing against the nomination of John Brennan, with more than 100 leaders urging the Senate to reject Brennan. And in an astounding development, The National Black Church Initiative (NBCI), a faith-based coalition of 34,000 churches comprised of 15 denominations and 15.7 million African Americans, issued a scathing statement about Obama's drone policy, calling it "evil," "monstrous" and "immoral." The group's president, Rev. Anthony Evans, exhorted other black leaders to speak out, saying, "If the church does not speak against this immoral policy we will lose our moral voice, our soul, and our right to represent and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ." 5. In the past four years the congressional committees that are supposed to exercise oversight over the drones have been mum. Finally, in February and March, the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee held their first public hearings, and the Constitution Subcommittee will hold a hearing on April 16 on the "constitutional and statutory authority for targeted killings, the scope of the battlefield and who can be targeted as a combatant." Too little, too late, but at least Congress is feeling some pressure to exercise its authority. 6. The specter of tens of thousands of drones here at home when the FAA opens up U.S. airspace to drones by 2015 has spurred new left/right alliances. Liberal Democratic Senator Ron Wyden joined the tea party's Rand Paul during his filibuster. The first bipartisan national legislation was introduced by Rep. Ted Poe, R-Texas, and Rep. Zoe Lofgren, D-Calif., saying drones used by law enforcement must be focused exclusively on criminal wrongdoing and subject to judicial approval, and prohibiting the arming of drones. Similar left-right coalitions have formed at the local level. And speaking of strange bedfellows, NRA president David Keene joined The Nation's legal affairs correspondent David Cole in an op-ed lambasting the administration for the cloak of secrecy that undermines the system of checks and balances. 7. While trying to get redress in the courts for the killing of American citizens by drones in Yemen, the ACLU has been stymied by the Orwellian U.S. government refusal to even acknowledge that the drone program exists. But on March 15, in an important victory for transparency, the D.C. Court of Appeals rejected the CIA's absurd claims that it "cannot confirm or deny" possessing information about the government's use of drones for targeted killing, and sent the case back to a federal judge. 8. Most Democrats have been all too willing to let President Obama carry on with his lethal drones, but on March 11, Congresswoman Barbara Lee and seven colleagues issued a letter to President Obama calling on him to publicly disclose the legal basis for drone killings, echoing a call that emerged in the Senate during the John Brennan hearing. The letter also requested a report to Congress with details about limiting civilian casualties by signature drone strikes, compensating innocent victims, and restructuring the drone program "within the framework of international law." 9. There have even been signs of discontent within the military. Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta had approved a ludicrous high-level military medal that honored military personnel far from the battlefield, like drone pilots, due to their "extraordinary direct impacts on combat operations." Moreover, it ranked above the Bronze Star, a medal awarded to troops for heroic acts performed in combat. Following intense backlash from the military and veteran community, as well as a push from a group of bipartisan senators, new Defense Secretary Senator Chuck Hagel decided to review the criteria for this new "Distinguished Warfare" medal. 10. Remote-control warfare is bad enough, but what is being developed is warfare by "killer robots" that don't even have a human in the loop. A campaign against fully autonomous warfare will be launched this April at the UK's House of Commons by human rights organizations, Nobel laureates and academics, many of whom were involved in the successful campaign to ban landmines. The goal of the campaign is to ban killer robots before they are used in battle. Throughout the U.S. -- and the world -- people are beginning to wake up to the danger of spy and killer drones. Their actions are already having an impact in forcing the administration to share memos with Congress, reduce the number of strikes and begin a process of taking drones out of the hands of the CIA.

### Welsh

#### There’s also a form of dismissiveness to just “reading” these arguments in debate for “exposure” – it’s a cheap substitute that creates an unstable compromises – prevents effective reflection and reaction

Welsh 13, Scott, Department of Communication Appalachian State University, “Giving Way on One’s Desire: Response to Fuller,” Philosophy and Rhetoric, Volume 46, Number 1, pp. 114-121 February 2013 http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/philosophy\_and\_rhetoric/v046/46.1.welsh.html

Might we say that academics work amid a broader competition to enact particular policies, just as internal campaign pollsters work amid those directly competing to win elections? Hence, are not both academics and internal campaign pollsters “in” the contest but not “of ” the contest? Might we say that faithful service to either of the two demands it? In Slavoj Žižek’s language (following Lacan), attempting to cut the corner, to directly engage in the contest, would be an example of what he calls “giving way” on one’s “desire” (1989, 117–18). In the language of my prior article, it is an example of refusing the challenge that constitutes the antagonism, in this case, the antagonism between reflection and action that constitutes the academic subject position. Recall, however, that antagonism does not mean simple opposition. Rather, it points to a state of affairs in which an ideology or subject position unavoidably contains elements that are in tension. And “tension” is the right word because it can mean both pressing together and pulling apart. Antagonism, in Žižek’s sense, means inseparability paired with incommensurability (to be a politically effective internal campaign pollster one must forswear politics). At his most esoteric, Žižek writes that antagonisms do not exist in what he calls “the real” (which can mean something like reality in the absence of symbols), because antagonisms are products of language (2005, 249–54). No word or set of words can say everything, and what is left unsaid in any moment will continue to torment what is said, creating the experience of antagonism—or an anxiety-producing need to say two different things at the same time (1991, 154; 1989, 21, 43, 49; 1994, 21, 26). Yet, while both things must be said, those two things, within language, always manifest as in tension with each other (in the world but not of the world, wholly God and wholly man, the mysteries of the sublime). [End Page 115] Effacing an antagonism by reducing the saying of one thing to the saying of another—and acting as if it “resolves” the antagonism—entails giving way on one’s desire. It is the construction of a cheap substitute when what is needed is not exactly the real thing itself, but the pursuit of the real thing. Hence, the pursuit of the real thing entails refusing to take a shortcut to one’s desire (1989, 117–18; 1993, 60). The very idea of an “academic as public intellectual” is just such a shortcut. In it’s material manifestation, it is an unstable, unsatisfying compromise that is wholly committed to neither reflection nor action. And, because it is neither one nor the other, it also cannot be both.

#### Judge this debate by its effects – rhetorical criticism does nothing if we don’t pay attention to how it’s appropriated – our responsibility should be to provide argument that others can use

Welsh 12 Scott Department of Communication Appalachian State University (“Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency”, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012, Jstor)

It is also tempting to conclude that one could still essentially engage in activist rhetorical reflection to the degree that one promotes particular inventional resources over others. Nevertheless, owing to the unpredictable, constantly shifting rhetorical challenges surrounding even a single issue, this is also wrong. The practical effect of any argumentative form, vocabulary, concept, or criticism always depends on how it is appropriated, cast, recast, or responded to in a particular political moment. For example, calls from critics of war rhetoric to substitute humanizing for dehumanizing figures are easily co-opted by political leaders pursuing war in the name of humanitarian concern. Hence, in context, even “humanizing” rhetorics often need to be displaced by seemingly amoral rhetorics of national interest if military action is to be avoided ([Motter 2010](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.usc.edu/journals/philosophy_and_rhetoric/v045/45.1.welsh.html" \l "b27" \t "_blank), 520–22). As Terry Eagleton argues, “This is not to say that theories and literary forms are politically neutral.” Rather, “they are politically polyvalent, capable of generating a multiplicity of sometimes quite contradictory social effects” (1990, 30–31). Instead of being a limitation, however, as Eagleton implies, the polyvalent quality of the products of rhetorical reflection is their most valuable quality. As critical “interventions” addressed to a particular political moment, the products of rhetorical reflection have a very brief shelf life, often spoiling before they reach market; regarded as contributions to a complex, conflicted rhetorical imagination, they become indefinitely valuable. [End Page 20] They become available for appropriation and reappropriation by citizens, who, at the “right point in time,” in the words of Michel de Certeau, discover an “unexpected pertinence” (1984, 83, 89). We as debate-scholars can actively aid democratic practice, by providing a space for reflection where political ideas can be tested. Our job should be to hypothetically advocate as many real policy positions proposed by actual political actors as possible, especially those arguments and advocacies that we think are flawed or wrong, so that we can make their weaknesses available to the public in the form of arguments they could use (and likewise, we should actively negate whatever ideas we personally think are the best so as to push them to their limits). Citizen activists on all sides of an issue will find things to appropriate from our discourse; regardless of how it turns out, the real-world political deliberations will be better informed, better reasoned, better debated. That is our politics.

#### It will be co-opted by politicians which waters down both movements and doesn’t provide inventional resources

Welsh 12Scott, Department of Communication Appalachian State University. Coming to Terms with the Antagonism between Rhetorical Reflection and Political Agency. Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2012

It is also tempting to conclude that one could still essentially engage in activist rhetorical reflection to the degree that one promotes particular inventional resources over others. Nevertheless, owing to the unpredictable, constantly shifting rhetorical challenges surrounding even a single issue, this is also wrong. The practical effect of any argumentative form, vocabulary, concept, or criticism always depends on how it is appropriated, cast, recast, or responded to in a particular political moment. For example, calls from critics of war rhetoric to substitute humanizing for dehumanizing figures are easily co-opted by political leaders pursuing war in the name of humanitarian concern. Hence, in context, even “humanizing” rhetorics often need to be displaced by seemingly amoral rhetorics of national interest if military action is to be avoided (Motter 2010, 520–22). As Terry Eagleton argues, “This is not to say that theories and literary forms are politically neutral.” Rather, “they are politically polyvalent, capable of generating a multiplicity of sometimes quite contradictory social effects” (1990, 30–31). Instead of being a limitation, however, as Eagleton implies, the polyvalent quality of the products of rhetorical reflection is their most valuable quality. As critical “interventions” addressed to a particular political moment, the products of rhetorical reflection have a very brief shelf life, often spoiling before they reach market; regarded as contributions to a complex, conflicted rhetorical imagination, they become indefinitely valuable. They become available for appropriation and reappropriation by citizens, who, at the “right point in time,” in the words of Michel de Certeau, discover an “ unexpected pertinence” (1984, 83, 89).