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## 1NC

### 1

#### 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.’

### 2

#### 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.

### Case

#### PEOPLE LIKE BILL MAHER AND NOAM CHOMSKY GET SO CAUGHT UP IN EXPOSING THE GOVERNMENT’S HYPOCRISY THAT THEY DON’T CONCERN THEMSELVES WITH RELATIONS BETWEEN PEOPLE.

ISAAC 2, New School for Social Research, (Jeffrey C., Social Research, Summer, p. EXAC)

More to the point, when such exposure becomes itself a political project, and when it usurps the tasks of judgment, then it becomes insidious, for it lacks all nuance. In a world of media manipulation and melodramatic sensationalism it may be clever, and may even be in a sense just, to hoist politicians on their own moral petards. But in a world of serious violence and injury, in which policies are not simply about rhetoric or appearances but about human consequences, it is irresponsible to make the exposure of official hypocrisy the ultimate public intellectual project. For this makes unnecessary, and cynical, concessions to a media culture that there is no reason to embrace and many reasons to resist. Even more significantly, to do so represents a callous indifference to real human suffering. For it implies that the real issue is not what might be done to relieve the suffering, but rather how certain (American) officials can be caught in their own verbal contradictions. To do so also ignores the important fact that politicians, try though they may, do not control moral symbols or political discourse. The discourse of human rights is not a creation of the Pentagon or the State Department. While these institutions may seek to use this discourse when it suits their purposes, the discourse has a seriousness and a truth value independent of these uses. Citizens, intellectuals, relief workers, and human rights activists who invoke this discourse to justify a range of actions, including but by no means reducible to military interventions in the name of humanitarian relief, are not creatures of American propaganda.

#### Individual solutions are bad – focusing on the individual over personalizes politics and causes false believe in change

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

This **celebration of multiple micro-resistances** seems to rely on an aggregate approach - an idea that the multiplication of practices will **evolve into something substantial**. In fact, the myth of engagement obscures the actual lack of change being produced, while the broader pattern of **equating extralegal activism with social reform produces a** false belief in the potential of change. There are few instances of meaningful reordering of social and economic arrangements and macro-redistribution. Scholars write about decoding what is really happening, as though the scholarly narrative has the power to unpack more than the actual conventional experience will admit. [224](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b7d531dcca7209b987833602ed6fbb4e&docnum=23&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAt&_md5=3f8bfd4662cb01d0d1bf9f28a63e1155&focBudTerms=lobel%20and%20harvard&focBudSel=all#n224) Unrelated efforts become related and part of a whole through mere reframing. At the same time, the elephant in the room - the rising level of economic inequality - is left unaddressed and comes to be understood as natural and inevitable. [225](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b7d531dcca7209b987833602ed6fbb4e&docnum=23&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAt&_md5=3f8bfd4662cb01d0d1bf9f28a63e1155&focBudTerms=lobel%20and%20harvard&focBudSel=all#n225) This is precisely the problematic process that critical theorists decry as losers' self-mystification, through which marginalized groups come to see systemic losses as the  [\*986]  product of their own actions and thereby begin to focus on minor achievements as representing the boundaries of their willed reality.

#### The media is too bought off for your aff to solve

Branfman 13 Fred, Alternet, My Experiences up Close with the People Who Bombed a 700-Year-Old Civilization into Dust, 7-18

As I wrote at the time, "It is not difficult to understand why reporters 'suck up' to powerful officials. Reporters and officials are not merely flattering each other for the fun of it. They are trading information, the oil of Washington, a commodity which brings careers, money, Pulitzers, influence and fame to reporters, and political support to government officials to exercise the power they so enjoy. Information is literally power: the power to kill, the power to heal, the power to become rich. For all of the surface camaraderie and talk of 'friendship.' it is a deadly serious business."

#### Public criticism doesn’t deter future presidents – the history of Watergate to Iran-Contra, and then to the war on terror – proves that the public forgets

Shane 12 \*Peter M. Jacob E. Davis and Jacob E. Davis II Chair in Law, The Ohio State University Moritz School of Law. From 1978 to 1981, served in the Office of Legal Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice. Journal of National Security Law & Policy, 5 J. Nat'l Security L. & Pol'y 507

In his review of legal advice offered by recent administrations, former law dean and fellow OLC alumnus Harold Bruff inquires into the lessons of history: "Will the public beatings Bush administration officials have [\*520] received deter their successors from repeating their excesses? Recent experience suggests not. It was about a decade from Watergate to Iran-Contra, and another fifteen years to the war on terror. Attempts to aggrandize the executive branch have produced some punishments in each case, but the sting does not seem to last very long." 31

#### Secrecy prevents your aff from solving – the executive can deny future information to shut the public out

Huq 12 + Aziz Z. Assistant Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. University of Chicago Law Review, Spring, 79 U. Chi. L. Rev. 777

In summary, attention to the "social-scientific microfoundations" of the proposed publicity and credibility mechanisms of executive constraint elicits more skepticism than confidence (p 123). Diffuse publics face large and oft preclusive transaction costs. To the extent the executive does respond to public opinion, it can leverage its asymmetrical access to information to obscure objectionable policies rather than ending them. Neither political opposition nor elections does much to cure such evasion. Political contests, unlike the adversarial trial, are not reliable vehicles for surfacing factual truths. Without legal institutions to structure opposition, laws to force policy-related disclosures, and individual rights to protect dissent, it is not clear popularity can do the work assigned it by The Executive Unbound.

#### Polarization of political parties dilutes the ability of exposing executive abuses – the public will just assume that the exposure is an unfair reflection of political ideology

Huq 12 + Aziz Z. Assistant Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. University of Chicago Law Review, Spring, 79 U. Chi. L. Rev. 777

First, the capacity of our political system to generate meaningful checks on the national executive may be waning. National legislative politics in the United States are characterized by growing polarization between the two main parties. Legislative caucuses for both parties are more ideologically coherent than they were a generation ago; ideological overlap between the parties has [\*834] vanished. 229 The combination of ideologically homogenous and distinct parties with bicameralism and presentment predictably generates legislative gridlock. 230 Either one side or the other can be relied upon to leverage vetogates in the legislative process. This affects not only fiscal matters - as the 2011 debt ceiling debate illustrated - but also impedes the possibility of effective political checks on the executive. In the absence of a major partisan realignment, the conditions for neither significant political nor legal constraint may be met. 231 More subtly, deepening ideological commitments may render voters less receptive to new information. Revelation of executive abuse - whether it is the exploitation of Chrysler's creditors or Guantanamo detainees - may consequently be less likely to influence a chief executive's credibility or popularity. It may not be law's weakness but the short-term deliquescence of American politics that drives changes to the scope of executive power in coming decades.

#### The aff is only a symbolic protest – its too easy to contain

CELIKATES & JANSEN1 12 Robin Celikates teaches polit­ical and social philosophy at the University of Amsterdam. He is the vice-​director of ASCA and a co-​editor of Krisis. Yolande Jansen is a Researcher at the Amsterdam Center for Globalization Stud­ies (ACGS) of the University of Amsterdam. *Krisis*, RECLAIMING DEMOCRACY. AN INTERVIEW WITH WENDY BROWN ON OCCUPY, SOVEREIGNTY, AND SECULARISM, Issue 3, www.krisis.eu

Krisis: One challenge seems to be institutionalization without reproducing the problems of formal forms of political parties, political organizations, etc; another problem is what you’ve described as Oedipalization, sometimes a militant infantilism that one can’t confront state power directly. Yet another problem seems to be with the effectivity of largely symbolic protest. I can’t help going back to Marcuse’s idea of repressive tolerance in terms of how the state reacts to protests. It’s always a double strategy, it seems. Accept nice forms of protests that are easily controllable, that might still be radical in some sense, but do not really pose a challenge, even celebrate them. For instance, in Germany, every major politician seemed to be in favour of Occupy. The chancellor, Merkel, the opposition, everyone. ‘It’s great that those young people bring up these important questions. Even in this unorthodox way, that’s really nice. That’s what our democracy is about.’ So on a symbolic level, the protest was immediately sanitized, introduced into the political cycle, etc. And of course, this one strategy of answering goes hand in hand with the criminalization of forms of protest that do not as easily lend themselves to this first kind of response. This is a problem that all kinds of civil disobedience or protests in that tradition seem to face. You can’t go down the militant road, because that ends up with a fetishized idea of attacking the state on the street, but on the other hand symbolic protests also seem to run into real problems concerning their effectivity.

#### National security is too flexible

Taylor & Hendry 8, Pf of Communication at Colorado-Boulder, Comm & Journalism at New Mexico,(Bryan C., Judith, RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, Volume 11, Number 2, Summer)

In response, rhetorical critics have sought to challenge the unwarranted exclusion of cultural and political diversity from spheres of nuclear deliberation, and to restore their integrity as a standard for adequate representation of human interests in the management of potentially world-ending military technology. In this process, critics have clarified the intransigence of Cold War and "nuclearist" rhetoric in **normalizing nuclear weapons as a legitimate and necessary means of preserving U.S. national security**. In this essay, we have argued that **the flexibility of this rhetoric has enabled nuclear weapons institutions to, at least temporarily, survive the challenge** posed to their authority and mission by the end of the Cold War. Nonetheless, observes Richard Falk, the extraordinary level of violence associated with the use of nuclear weapons creates an ongoing moral and political crisis for all nominally democratic states who develop them: "Normative opposition to nuclear weapons or doctrines inevitably draws into [End Page 323] question the legitimacy of state power and is, therefore, more threatening to governmental process than a mere debate about the property of nuclear weapons as instruments of statecraft."83 For this and other reasons discussed in this essay, nuclear policy rhetoric is **highly resistant to changes that arise in cultural consciousness** in response to shifting political conditions.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### The belief that the government can only do wrong only feeds the privatization of social life

Eisenstein ‘98**,** Professor and Chair of Politics at Ithaca College,(Zillah R., Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy, http://search.barnesandnoble.com/booksearch/isbninquiry.asp?ean=9780814722053&displayonly=CHP)

A full democratization of public life means envisioning the needs of all people—especially girls and women across the color divide—while displacing the logic of consumer capital. This demands an assault against the racialized patriarchal discourses and practices of global capital and its privatized notion of the transnational state. New ways of thinking and imagining are needed to reclaim the idea of publicness. How does one establish trust and concerns across time and space? According to Anthony Giddens, this will require a "transformation of intimacy." After all, the nuclear plant disaster at Chernobyl demonstrated just how small the globe is. Women from across the globe meeting in Beijing began to draw these new lines: of a public of women and girls across and through different cultures and values speaking against global poverty, sexual violence, and discrimination of all kinds. This new notion of citizenship does not use the borders of nation/family, public/private, or government/economy. As long as we are able to creatively imagine a community at odds with capital's use of racialized patriarchy, the very idea of publicness can be used as a start to discipline transnational capital. This process of `imagining' requires an assault on mediated, antigovernment imaginaries. The rhetoric of privatization—that government can do no right—distorts the possibilities available for creating democratic publics by assuming that all government, not just bad government, is the problem**.**

#### INJURY DOESN’T DETERMINE IDENTITY – INJURY CLAIMS ARE CRITICAL TO CHALLENGING OPPRESSION

Zivi 5, U of Southern California, Karen, *Politics & Gender*, September, Issue 1, Vol 3

By stressing her Jewishness, Arendt engages in a form of action that is meant to bring something new into existence. Her appreciation of identity as a political fact suggests that we can acknowledge injury and identity **without being bound by them.** Facts of identity can be made public **without their being a claim about one’s timeless and essential nature**, **without their serving as a narcissistic attachment to one’s victimhood, and thus without the kind of ressentiment Brown so fears**. By giving the facts that conditioned her existence narrative form, Arendt seeks not to “master the past,” but rather to begin a process of reconciliation. Knowing what happened and “endur[ing] this knowledge” are necessary steps, she suggests, toward creating a better, albeit uncertain, future: We must “wait and see what comes of knowing and enduring” (1968, 20). And thus, Arendt’s appreciation of the political facticity of identity reminds us that identity claims are an important part of political resistance, a necessary, but by no means perfectly emancipatory, step in challenging relations of oppression and domination.16

#### TURN – THE FEAR OF RESENTIMENT IS RESENTIMENT

ROJAS 6 (Carlos, The Naked Gaze, 7/21, http://www.nakedgaze.com/2006/07/twilight\_of\_the.html)

However, Brown’s reliance on a theory of ressentiment  to make this critique introduces a potential paradox, insofar as any theory of ressentiment, as Fredric Jameson reminds us in Political Unconscious, is necessarily recursive: What is most striking about the theory of ressentiment is its unavoidably **autoreferential** structure. . . . [The] theory of ressentiment, wherever it appears, will always itself be the **expression and the production of ressentiment.** That is to say, insofar as ressentiment describes a morality grounded on imaginary revenge against a superior force, a theory of ressentiment can be seen as precisely an example of such theoretical morality, wherein the “superior force” is none other than an earlier ressentiment-based morality which has subsequently become hegemonic and oppressive (like Christianity, for instance). Although Brown’s argument is too specific and nuanced to lend itself to a simple inversion (e.g., to allow us to posit that **Brown’s theory is itself a form of ressentiment** against the oppressive power of identity politics….), this inherent invertability of Nietzsche’s model does, nevertheless, underscore an important tension within Brown’s writing.

#### RESISTANCE IS NOT FAILING – the SQ is solving better before you read your aff

Maani 12 TruthDig, 5-11, http://www.truthdig.com/arts\_culture/item/zombie\_politics\_dangerous\_authoritarianism\_or\_shrinking\_democracy\_-\_part\_ii/P100/

I am not opposed to “action,” nor am I attempting to “diffuse” anything. I am simply pointing out that, contrary to your claims, the “people” as a whole have not acquiesced to most of the items you list. Indeed, you may remember that the run-up to the invasion of Iraq - even before it began - invoked the largest global protest in the history of the world: over 30 million people in 60 cities in 20 countries - including millions in the U.S. As for your other items: -“The election fraud of 2000 with the illegal appointment of Bush II, the war criminal, to office by our SCOTUS.” There was plenty of popular outrage over this - including in some of the “corporate-controlled media” you speak of. “Expanded militarization of America.” In this case, it is actually the media - including some MSM - who are LEADING the outrage. -“Domestic survelliance of the populace.” And again, not only popular outrage, but much of the MSM took this on in a major way. -“The assassination of American citizens abroad accused of being ‘terrorists’ or ‘terrorists sympathizers.’ This, too, is being reported - and questioned - even in the MSM, though I would agree there seems to be too little outrage on the part of the general populace. -“The enactment of the NDAA which empowers the our POTUS with life or death power over any citizen without due process of law.” Although I am as mortally opposed to the NDAA as anyone, it really doesn’t change anything that was in the AUMF of 2001, or the prior NDAAs. Still, you are right in this case that there has been precious little outrage re this. -The enactment of the US Patriot Act that effectively shredded the US Constitution.” Actually, while the Patriot Act (and Patriot Act II) did indeed do damage to the Constitution, I would argue that the Military Commissions Act did far more, as it all but eviscerated both habeas corpus and posse comitatus, two of the most sacred and critical provisions. But there was, in fact, quite some backlash over the original Patriot Act. In most of these cases, there was in fact been outrage, including in some, if not much, of the MSM (to say nothing of the AM). And the rise of the TP and OWS (and particularly the national, even global, conversation about income inequality that OWS has generated (among other things)) are further proof that there is active - and effective, particularly vis-a-vis the “public eye” (media) - protest against some or many of the things that are occurring. When I talk of “acquiescence,” I am talking about WHOLESALE acquiescence; i.e., at very least a majority of the populace simply (as elisalouisa and SHE suggest) “surrendering” or “submitting” to a fascist State. However, although both of us may be frustrated by the fact that MORE people are not actively involved in protest, etc. - though, to be fair, even many of those who are not actively involved nevertheless support those who are, whether on the left or the right - I would still suggest that this country is nowhere NEAR becoming a fascist state, despite your punch-list items, and despite some of the seeming attempts by our plutocracy to fashion itself as a proto-fascist or fascist State. Again, this is by no means a call to simply sit on our hands and do nothing. And despite your frustration-derived claims about me, I have and will continue to quite actively protest both your punch-list items and many other things, and encourage others to do the same. However, they should do it because the things we are discussing are wrong and dangerous - NOT because the “sum” of those things somehow “add up” to fascism. They do not. Peace.

#### Power is never total. We don’t need your aff. Voting neg is a way to affirm the radical contestation of the SQ. Our argument is a better understanding of power relations by focusing on resistance

**Lipschutz**, Professor of Politics at the University of California at Santa Cruz, **05**

(Ronnie D, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol.33, No.3, pp. 747-769)

On the one hand, power ‘produces’ the subject, **but the subject that is produced is not always as standardised as the parameters of governmentality might suggest**. **We are not mere social automatons.** On the other hand, agency seems to be highly constrained. Is there no way to break out? In a discussion of ‘The Subject and Power’, Foucault suggested that ‘in order to understand what power relations are about, perhaps we should investigate the forms of resistance and attempts made to dissociate these relations’.64 He described a set of ‘transversal struggles . . . that are not limited to one country’. These are ‘immediate’ struggles for two reasons. In such struggles, people criticize instances of power that are the closest to them, those which exercise their action on individuals. They look not for the ‘chief enemy’ but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date (that is, liberations, revolutions, end of class struggle). In comparison with a theoretical scale of explanations or a revolutionary order that polarizes the historian, they are anarchistic struggles.65 In the course of these struggles, people attack those things that, in effect, lead to alienation of the individual from others, from the community, indeed, from himself: they are struggles against the ‘government of individualization’.66 And, argued Foucault, if we recognise that power generates its own resistance, insubordination, and ‘a certain essential obstinacy on the part of the principles of freedom, then there is no relationship of power without the means of escape or possible flight’.67

#### Just because a discourse is dominant or the official party line of the state doesn’t mean that it will be effective. Even if a discourse is hegemonic it still produces resistances that create new leaders who articulate the repressed

**Schwalbe 2k**

(Michael Schwalbe et al, “Gender processes in the reproduction of inequality: an interactionist analysis,” Social Forces, Vol 79, No 2, JSTOR)

Cohns (1987) study of the "technostrategic" language of defense intellectuals provides an example of how a form of discourse can mute potentially inhibiting emotions. Cohn reports that technostrategic discourse strictly avoids reference to human pain and suffering, and instead uses the abstract and dispassionate language of strikes, counter-strikes, megatonnage, and megadeaths. Given the rules of this discourse, to speak of pain and suffering is to discredit one's self as a "soft-headed activist instead of an expert" (708). We see here a form of discourse being used as an emotional anesthetic that allows technical experts to more efficiently serve the interests of political and military elites. Corporate managers, as Jackall (1988) shows, use a similar rationalist discourse when making decisions that will hurt people (cf. Maccoby 1976). This discourse helps corporate managers stay focused on profits, even taking pride in their ability to make tough decisions that are "best for the company." In this case, corporate elites use a form of discourse — a language of efficiencies, returns, and fiduciary responsibilities — that keeps compassion at bay and facilitates the pursuit of narrow economic interests. As in the world of defense intellectuals, the privileged discourse of corporate managers can also be used to exclude or discredit those who are unable or unwilling to engage in it. Discourse can be regulated to simultaneously quell some emotions and evoke others. This is most apparent in wartime, when political and military elites try to regulate the national discourse in ways that arouse and sustain enthusiasm for mass violence, while provoking hatred for enemy leaders and decreased sympathy for civilians on the other side. In the case of war, discourse must be regulated institutionally, via the mass media. This is accomplished by describing events, if they are described at all, in the frames preferred by elites (Gamson & Modigliani 1989), and by excluding dissident voices that might, by using alternative language and frames, evoke resistant emotions in the citizenry. When a form of discourse is established as standard practice, it becomes a powerful tool for reproducing inequality, because it can serve not only to regulate thought and emotion, but also to identify Others and thus to maintain boundaries as well. Those who wish to belong to the dominant group, or who simply want to be heard, may feel compelled to use the master's linguistic tools. Hegemonic discourses are **not**, however, **eternal**. As Wasielewski (1985) suggests, discourses that deny expression to the pain and anger of the oppressed create a powerful emotional tension, which in turn fosters the emergence of charismatic leaders. Such leaders catalyze change by articulating what is repressed and linking the resolution of repressed feelings to dissident action. All hegemonic discourses may thus carry within them the **seeds of their own destruction**.

#### Baudrillard’s critique is non-falsifiable

Marsh 95 – Philosophy Professor, Fordham (James, Critique, Action, and Liberation, p 292-3)

In such a postmodernist account is a reduction of everything to image or symbol that misses the relationship of these to realities such as corporations seeking profit, impoverished workers in these corporations, or peasants in Third-World countries trying to conduct elections. Postmodernism does not adequately distinguish here between a reduction of reality to image and a mediation of reality by image. A media idealism exists rooted in the influence of structuralism and poststructuralism and doing insufficient justice to concrete human experience, judgment, and free interaction in the world.4 It is also paradoxical or **contradictory** to say it really is true that nothing is really true, that everything is illusory or imaginary. Postmodemism makes judgments that implicitly deny the reduction of reality to image. For example, Poster and Baudrillard do want to say that we really are in a new age that is informational and postindustrial. Again, to say that everything is imploded into media images is akin logically to the Cartesian claim that everything is or might be a dream. What happens is that dream or image is absolutized or generalized to the point that its original meaning lying in its contrast to natural, human, and social reality is lost. We can discuss Disneyland as reprehensible because we know the difference between Disneyland and the larger, enveloping reality of Southern California and the United States.5

#### Baudrillard is the worst example of ivory tower academia—instead of dealing with real problems on the ground, he retreats into his safe western university and makes statements which echo colonialism and authorize genocide by cloaking war in philosophical terms. Technology makes war MORE real, not less—the correct course is ACTION to abate the CONSEQUENCES OF WAR. Star this card, because it lights their kritik on fire.

**BALSAS, 2006** [BALSAS is an interdisciplinary journal on media culture. Interview with Art Group BBM, “on first cyborgs, aliens and other sides of new technologies,” translated from lithiuanian <http://www.balsas.cc/modules.php?name=News&file=print&sid=151>]

Valentinas: We all know that Jean Baudrillard did not believe that the Gulf War did take place, as it was over-mediated and over-simulated. In fact, the Gulf War II is still not over, and Iraq became much more than just a Frankenstein laboratory for the new media, technology and “democracy” games. What can we learn from wars that do not take place, even though they cannot be finished? Are they becoming a symptom of our times as a confrontation between multiple time-lines, ideologies and technologies in a single place?

Lars: Actually, it has always been the same: new wars have been better test-beds for the state of art technologies and the latest computer-controlled firearms. The World War I already was a fully mechanized war where pre-robots were fighting each other and gassing the troops. And afterwards, the winners shape the new world order.

Olaf: **Who on hell is Baudrillard**? The one who earns money by publishing his prognoses after the things happen? **What a fuck,** **French philosophy deals too much with luxury problems and elegantly ignores the problem itself**. It’s no wonder, **this is the colonizer’s mentality**, you can hear it roaring in their words: **they use phrases made to camouflage genocide.**

I went to see that Virilio’s exhibition "Ce qui arrive" at Foundation Cartier in 2003. I was smashed by that banal presentation of  the evil of all kinds: again, natural catastrophes and evil done by man were exposed on the same wall, glued together with a piece of "theory". There you find it all, filed up in one row: the pure luxury of the Cartier-funded Jean Nouvel building, an artwork without any blood in its veins, and that late Christian philosophy about the techno-cataclysm being the revenge of God. **Pure shit, turned into gold in the holy cellars of the modern alchemists’ museums.**

The artist-made video "documents" of the Manhattan towers opposed to Iraqian war pictures: that’s not Armageddon, that’s man-invented war technology to be used to subdue others. And **there is always somebody who pushes the buttons,** even when the button is a computer mouse some ten thousand kilometers away from the place where **people die**, or even if it is a civil airplanes redirected by Islamists. Everybody knows that. **War technology has always been made to make killing easier**. And to produce martyrs as well.

Janneke: Compare Baudrillard with **Henry Dunant,** the founder of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Dunant was no philosopher, he was just an intelligent rich man in the late 19th century. But his ideas went far more in the direction where **you should hope to find** **philosophers** as well. He experienced war as a "randonneur": he passed by, he saw the suffering and the inhumanity of war. **And he felt obliged to act**. Apart from the maybe 10 days he spent on the battlefield, on the beautiful meadows in the Europeans Alps, helping wounded people to survive, as a complete medical layman he decided to do something more sustainable against these odds. He knew that his efforts couldn’t prevent war in general, but he felt that he could alter the cruelty of reality. **And he succeeded in doing it**. No wonder that in our days we find the most engaged people to support the TROIA projects intention in Geneva, where they are still based. And they are not only doing their necessary surgeon’s work in the field: they are as well **fighting with the same energy on the diplomatic battlefield.**

#### We do, in fact, know the difference between simulation and reality—the media plays a healthy role in the public sphere.

March, 95 James Marsh, Professor of Philosophy, Fordham University, 95, Critique, Action, and Liberation, pp. 292-293

Such an account, however, is as one-sided or perhaps even more one-sided than that of naive modernism. We note a residual idealism that does not take into account socioeconomic realities already pointed out such as the corporate nature of media, their role in achieving and legitimating profit, and their function of manufacturing consent. In such a postmodernist account is a reduction of everything to image or symbol that misses the relationship of these to realities such as corporations seeking profit, impoverished workers in these corporations, or peasants in Third-World countries trying to conduct elections. Postmodernism does not adequately distinguish here between a reduction of reality to image and a mediation of reality by image. A media idealism exists rooted in the influence of structuralism and poststructuralism and doing insufficient justice to concrete human experience, judgment, and free interaction in the world.4 It is also paradoxical or contradictory to say it really is true that nothing is really true, that everything is illusory or imaginary. Postmodemism makes judgments that implicitly deny the reduction of reality to image. For example, Poster and Baudrillard do want to say that we really are in a new age that is informational and postindustrial. Again, to say that everything is imploded into media images is akin logically to the Cartesian claim that everything is or might be a dream. What happens is that dream or image is absolutized or generalized to the point that its original meaning lying in its contrast to natural, human, and social reality is lost. We can discuss Disneyland as reprehensible because we know the difference between Disneyland and the larger, enveloping reality of Southern California and the United States.5 We can note also that postmodernism misses the reality of the accumulation-legitimation tension in late capitalism in general and in communicative media in particular. This tension takes different forms in different times. In the United States in the 1960s and 1970s, for example, social, economic, and political reality occasionally manifested itself in the media in such a way that the electorate responded critically to corporate and political policies. Coverage of the Vietnam war, for example, did help turn people against the war. In the 1980s, by contrast, the emphasis shifted more toward accumulation in the decade dominated by the “great communicator.” Even here, however, the majority remained opposed to Reagan’s policies while voting for Reagan. Human and social reality, while being influenced by and represented by the media, transcended them and remained resistant to them.6 To the extent that postmodernists are critical of the role media play, we can ask the question about the normative adequacy of such a critique. Why, in the absence of normative conceptions of rationality and freedom, should media dominance be taken as bad rather than good? Also, the most relevant contrasting, normatively structured alternative to the media is that of the “public sphere,” in which the imperatives of free, democratic, nonmanipulable communicative action are institutionalized. Such a public sphere has been present in western democracies since the nineteenth century but has suffered erosion in the twentieth century as capitalism has more and more taken over the media and commercialized them. Even now the public sphere remains normatively binding and really operative through institutionalizing the ideals of free, full, public expression and discussion; ideal, legal requirements taking such forms as public service programs, public broadcasting, and provision for alternative media; and social movements acting and discoursing in and outside of universities in print, in demonstrations and forms of resistance, and on media such as movies, television, and radio.7

## 2NC

### 2NC Limits

#### 4. 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.

#### 5. Small schools—small topics minimize resource disparities. A narrow research base allows a more level playing field.

### 2NC Decision Making

#### 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.

### A2 Language Bad

#### No impact – even if words mean different things, our interpretation can enact a précising function that creates communicative consensus

Kemerling ’97 Garth Kemerling, professor of philosophy at Newberry College, 1997 <http://www.philosophypages.com/lg/e05.htm>

We've seen that sloppy or misleading use of ordinary language can seriously limit our ability to create and communicate correct reasoning. As philosopher [John Locke](http://www.philosophypages.com/ph/lock.htm) pointed out three centuries ago, the achievement of human knowledge is often hampered by the use of words without fixed signification. Needless controversy is sometimes produced and perpetuated by an unacknowledged ambiguity in the application of key terms. We can distinguish disputes of three sorts: Genuine disputes involve disagreement about whether or not some specific proposition is true. Since the people engaged in a genuine dispute agree on the meaning of the words by means of which they convey their respective positions, each of them can propose and assess logical arguments that might eventually lead to a resolution of their differences. Merely [verbal disputes](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/v.htm#verbal), on the other hand, arise entirely from ambiguities in the language used to express the positions of the disputants. A verbal dispute disappears entirely once the people involved arrive at an agreement on the meaning of their terms, since doing so reveals their underlying agreement in belief. Apparently verbal but really genuine disputes can also occur, of course. In cases of this sort, the resolution of every ambiguity only reveals an underlying genuine dispute. Once that's been discovered, it can be addressed fruitfully by appropriate methods of reasoning. We can save a lot of time, sharpen our reasoning abilities, and communicate with each other more effectively if we watch for disagreements about the meaning of words and try to resolve them whenever we can. Kinds of Definition The most common way of preventing or eliminating differences in the use of languages is by agreeing on the [definition](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/d2.htm#def) of our terms. Since these explicit accounts of the meaning of a word or phrase can be offered in distinct contexts and employed in the service of different goals, it's useful to distinguish definitions of several kinds: A [lexical definition](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/l5.htm#lexi) simply reports the way in which a term is already used within a language community. The goal here is to inform someone else of the accepted meaning of the term, so the definition is more or less correct depending upon the accuracy with which it captures that usage. In these pages, my definitions of technical terms of logic are lexical because they are intended to inform you about the way in which these terms are actually employed within the discipline of logic. At the other extreme, a [stipulative definition](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/s9.htm#stip) freely assigns meaning to a completely new term, creating a usage that had never previously existed. Since the goal in this case is to propose the adoption of shared use of a novel term, there are no existing standards against which to compare it, and the definition is always correct (though it might fail to win acceptance if it turns out to be inapt or useless). If I now decree that we will henceforth refer to Presidential speeches delivered in French as "glorsherfs," I have made a (probably pointless) stipulative definition. Combining these two techniques is often an effective way to reduce the [vagueness](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/v.htm#vag) of a word or phrase. These [precising definitions](http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/p7.htm#prec) begin with the lexical definition of a term but then propose to sharpen it by stipulating more narrow limits on its use. Here, the lexical part must be correct and the stipulative portion should appropriately reduce the troublesome vagueness. If the USPS announces that "proper notification of a change of address" means that an official form containing the relevant information must be received by the local post office no later than four days prior to the effective date of the change, it has offered a (possibly useful) precising definition.

#### Even if there is no absolute truth, consensus can create common understanding

Ferguson ‘2 Yale Ferguson, professor of IR at Rutgers, and Richard Mansbach, professor of IR at Iowa State 2002 “International Relations and the “Third Debate,” ed. Jarvis)

Although there may be no such thing as “absolute truth” (Hollis, 1994:240-247; Fernandez-Armesto, 1997:chap.6), there is often a sufficient amount of intersubjective consensus to make for a useful conversation. That conversation may not lead to proofs that satisfy the philosophical nit-pickers, but it can be educational and illuminating. We gain a degree of apparently useful

### A2 Resolution Bad

#### The rez is the most educational and predictable way to focus the debate

Zwarensteyn ‘12 2012 Ellen C., Masters Candidate in Communications at Grand Valley State University, High School Policy Debate as an Enduring Pathway to Political Education: Evaluating Possibilities for Political Learning, Masters Theses. Paper 35, http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/35

Galloway (2007) also advances an argument concerning the privileging of the resolution as a basis for debating. Galloway (2007) cites three pedagogical advantages to seeing the resolution and the first affirmative constructive as an invitation to dialogue. “First, all teams have equal access to the resolution. Second, teams spend the entire year preparing approaches for and against the resolution. Finally, the resolution represents a community consensus of worthwhile and equitably debatable topics rooted in a collective history and experience of debate” (p. 13). An important starting point for conversation, the resolution helps frame political conversations humanely. It preserves basic means for equality of access to base research and argumentation. Having a year-long stable resolution invites depth of argument and continuously rewards adaptive research once various topics have surfaced through practice or at debate tournaments.

### Solvency

#### If we win a link, they are net worse: The absolute negation of the state is a form of falling asleep

Falk 11 Richard, American professor emeritus of international law at Princeton University, Is The State a Monster? Pro and Contra Nietzsche , June, http://richardfalk.wordpress.com/2011/06/

We need protection to live moderate and satisfying lives, to avoid crippling feuds. Nietzsche, shouting to be heard, exaggerated in some ways that are not instructive. We must not deify the state, or renounce our responsibilities as citizens to speak truthfully, or free the government from its obligations at home and abroad to act within the law, but even most of those among us who try to be citizens in the proper sense would still not opt for the chaos of an ungoverned social order if given a free choice. Our task is to build a just and ethically accountable state, not to abandon the enterprise as futile. It is not a middle ground that we seek that is content with more moderate forms of secular forms of idolatry. The struggle I support is what the French philosopher, Jacques Derrida, called for, I believe, when speaking of ‘the democracy to come.’ We need to listen carefully to the words of Nietzsche, but not be seduced by them to indulge idolatry in its negative form. To remove the blindfold, and see the state as the coldest of monsters is a necessary wakeup call for which we should thank Nietzsche for, even now, 140 years after Zarathustra was published. And yet we also need to resist the temptation to fall into a deeper sleep by adopting a posture of unrealizable and unacceptable negation of this strange political creature called the state. In the end, the state is not a monster, but a work in progress.

## 1NR

### Epistemology

#### Focusing on epistemology selfishly ignores real world problems

Jarvis 0 Prof Philosophy @ U South Carolina Darryl, Studies in International Relations, “International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism”, pg. 2

While Hoffmann might well be correct, these days one can neither begin nor conclude empirical research without first discussing epistemological orientations and ontological assumptions. Like a vortex, metatheory has engulfed us all and the question of "theory" which was once used as a guide to research is now the object of research. Indeed, for a discipline whose purview is ostensibly outward looldng and international in scope, and at a time of ever encroaching globalization and transnationalism, International Relations has become increasingly provincial and inward looking. Rather than grapple with the numerous issues that confront peoples around the world, since the early 1980s the discipline has tended more and more toward obsessive self-examination.3 These days the politics of famine, environmental degradation, underdevelopment, or ethnic cleansing, let alone the cartographic machinations in Eastern Europe and the reconfiguration of the geo-global political-economy, seem scarcely to concern theorists of international politics who define the urgent task of our time to be one of metaphysical reflection and epistemological investigation. Arguably, theory is no longer concerned with the study of international relations so much as the "manner in which international relations as a discipline, and international relations as a subject matter, have been constructed."4 To be concerned with the latter is to be "on the cutting edge," where novelty has itself become "an appropriate form of scholarship."5

### Turns Aff

#### 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.

#### Voting for the AFF because what we say in this room makes the process of influencing the larger public more difficult. Every time they say “WHAT WE SAY HERE IS MORE IMPORTANT” or describe their arg in terms of ETHICS -- they are denigrating the outside debate space and they can never mobilize a larger public to oppose government killing. Focusing on yourself makes reinventing democracy impossible

Brown 12 Wendy Brown is a Professor of Political Science at the University of California

in Berkeley. *Krisis*, RECLAIMING DEMOCRACY. AN INTERVIEW WITH WENDY BROWN ON OCCUPY, SOVEREIGNTY, AND SECULARISM, Issue 3, www.krisis.eu

I don’t think it is possible to think democracy from a Foucauldian perspective for several reasons, and I think it’s telling that Foucault himself seemed utterly uninterested in the question of democracy. I don’t mean he was an anti-democrat. He became interested in the question of counter-conducts, individual efforts at crafting the self, to subvert, interrupt or vivisect forces governing or constructing us, but that’s very different from attending to the question of democracy. I want to say one other thing here before I then directly answer your question. I’ve lately been rereading his lectures on neoliberalism and one thing I’m very struck by is that there is an absent figure in Foucault’s own formulation of modernity, when he offers us the picture of homo economicus and homo juridicus as the two sides of governance and the human being in modernity. Foucault just says you’ve got on the one hand the subject of interest, homo economicus and on the other hand homo juridicus, the derivative from sovereignty, the creature who’s limiting sovereignty. But for Foucault there’s no homo politicus, there’s no subject of the demos, there’s no democrat, there’s only a creature of rights and a creature of interest. It’s an extremely individually oriented formulation of what the modern order is. There’s the state, there’s the economy and then there’s the subject oriented to the economy by interests and toward the state by rights. But isn't it striking for a French thinker that there’s no democratic subject, no subject oriented, as part of the demos, toward the question of sovereignty by or for the people? Here Foucault may have forgotten to cut off the king’s head in political theory! There are just no democratic energies in Foucault. So one of the reasons one can’t think democracy with Foucault has to do with his own inability to think it. The other reason has to do with the extent to which he has given us such a thick theoretical and empirical account of the powers constructing and conducting us – there’s no way we can democratize all of those powers. So I think there one has to accept that if democracy has a meaning for the left today, it’s going to have to do with modest control of the powers that govern us overtly, rather than that of power tout court. So it’s going to be a combination of the liberal promise and the old Marxist claim about the necessary conditions of democracy. It’s going to be at some level a realization of the Marxist critique of the liberal promise. We have to have some control over what and how things are produced, we have to have some control over the question of who we are as a people, what we stand for, what we think should be done, what should not be done, what levels of equality should we have, what liberties matter, and so forth. It will not be able to reach to those Foucauldian depths of the conduct of conduct at every level. The dream of democracy probably has to come to terms with that limitation. If we can, we will be able to stop generating formulations of resistance that have to do with individual conduct and ethics. In other words, I think that the way Foucauldian, Derridean, Levinasian and Deleuzian thinking has derailed democratic thinking is that it has pushed it off onto a path of thinking about how I conduct myself, what is my relation to the other, what is my ethos or orientation toward those who are different from me – and all that’s fine, but it’s not democracy in the sense of power sharing. It’s an ethics, and maybe even a democratic ethics. But an ethics is not going to get us to political and economic orders that are more democratic than those we have now. The danger of theory that has too much emphasized the question of the self’s relationship to itself, or to micropowers, as useful as it has been for much of our work, is that it has derailed left democratic thinking into a preoccupation with ethics.

### 2NC Alternative

#### 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%22%20%5Cl%20%22b27%22%20%5Ct%20%22_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.

### A2 Speak Evil

#### A. EMPIRICALLY THE GOVERNMENT WILL CO-OPT YOUR DISCOURSE TO JUSTIFY FURTHER MILITARIZATION

**Gusterson**, Pf in the Program on Science, Technology, and Society @ MIT, **01**

(Hugh, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 65, November/December)

WEAPONS SYSTEMS, TREATIES, and strategies **come to seem right (or wrong) in the context of the stories we tell ourselves about them.** Social scientists and historians call these stories discourses. Sometimes new discourses (like our discourse on civil rights) originate from below and **eventually gain enough credibility that they are coopted by the government.** Other discourses (like the discourse on deterrence during the Cold War) originate within the government, and within the tight circle of think tanks that speaks to the government, and are then propagated outward through society by waves of speech-making and media dissemination. From time to time there are sharp historical breaks as new stories and propositions become accepted with startling suddenness. Senior officials in the Bush administration are now trying to create this kind of radical shift in our discourse about nuclear weapons. The Cold War saw the rise of an official discourse on nuclear weapons that is now looking more than a little tattered. Its chief assumptions were: that the genie having escaped the bottle in a dangerous world, nuclear weapons could not be abolished, and anyone who thought otherwise was näive or worse; that even though the two superpowers were inevitable rivals racing to improve their arsenals, they were rational enough to manage their competition in ways that would not cause a nuclear war; that the arms race could be channeled and disciplined, though not prevented, by arms control treaties; and that certain avenues of competition were destabilizing and should therefore be foreclosed by mutual agreement. These included a race to build defensive anti-missile systems and a race to put nuclear, anti-satellite, or anti-ballistic weapons in space. After the Cold War, this way of looking at the world began to look increasingly outmoded. The Clinton administration attempted to strike up some new discursive themes, but its attempts were undercut by their own half-heartedness. For example, the administration made some vague remarks about moving toward a world without nuclear weapons, but it failed to negotiate any new arms reductions and it proclaimed through its Nuclear Posture Review that the United States would rely on nuclear weapons for its security for the indefinite future. Similarly, Clinton administration officials said that they supported the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty only to sponsor research and development programs that pointed in the direction of its erosion or demise. And President Clinton spoke of a new global order founded on strong international treaties and institutions only to wage war in Kosovo without U.N. approval and to walk away from an international convention on landmines. THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION, ON THE other hand, has attempted to use the debate about ballistic missile defense to transform the official discourse on nuclear weapons and arms control. It has sought to dramatically redefine the U.S.-Russian relationship, the morality and effectiveness of deterrence, and the significance of arms control. If some of the statements made by administration officials had been uttered by President Clinton, they would have met with Republican derision. The Bush administration has also **appropriated some of the anti-nuclear movement’s rhetoric, only to use it in support of a further round of militarization**. The new discourse, like its predecessor, **starts with the assumption that the world is a very dangerous place**, although the source of danger is no longer Soviet-style militant communism, but the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to “rogue states.” As Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz recently testified to Congress: “The shortrange missile threat to our friends, allies, and deployed forces arrived a decade ago; the intermediate missile threat is now here; and the longrange threat to American cities is just over the horizon—a matter of years, not decades, away—and our people and territory are defenseless.”1 Within the old discourse, military threats from abroad were used to justify nuclear deterrence. No longer. Remarkably, it is now becoming axiomatic that leaders of “rogue states,” unlike the old Soviet leaders, cannot be deterred by nuclear weapons. This axiom is being used to justify not only the development of missile defenses but also a new, earth-penetrating “mini-nuke” that would supposedly hold the leaders of “rogue states” personally at risk in their underground bunkers.