### 1AC Hemp

#### Hemp is not illegal but technicalities and highly regulated permits required by the DEA prohibit domestic production.

**Congressional Research Service 2007. (**March 23, 2007. Jean M. Rawson, Specialist in Agricultural Policy Resources, Science, and Industry Division “Hemp as an Agricultural Commodity.”)

In 1937, Congress passed the first federal law to discourage *Cannabis* production for marijuana while still permitting industrial uses of the crop (the Marihuana Tax Act; 50 Stat. 551). Under this statute, the government actively encouraged farmers to grow hemp for fiber and oil during World War II. After the war, competition from synthetic fibers, the Marihuana Tax Act, and increasing public anti-drug sentiment resulted in fewer and fewer acres of hemp being planted, and none at all after 1958. The past decade has witnessed a resurgence of interest in the United States in producing industrial hemp. Farmers in regions of the country that are highly dependent upon a single crop, such as tobacco or wheat, have shown interest in hemp’s potential as a high-value alternative crop, although the economic studies conducted so far paint a mixed profitability picture. Beginning around 1995, an increasing number of state legislatures began to consider a variety of initiatives related to industrial hemp. Most of these are resolutions calling for scientific, economic, or environmental studies, and some are laws authorizing the planting of experimental plots under state statutes. Nonetheless, the actual planting of *Cannabis*, even for state-authorized experimental purposes, is regulated by the federal Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) under the authority of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (Title II of P.L. 91-513 (21 U.S.C.§§802 *et seq.*) Congress adopted in the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) the same definition of *Cannabis* *sativa* that appeared in the 1937 Marihuana Tax Act. The CSA definition reads: The term marijuana means all parts of the plant Cannabis sativa L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin. Such term does not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound ... or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination. The statute thus retains control over all varieties of the *Cannabis* plant by virtue of including them under the term “marijuana” and making no distinctions between low- and high-THC varieties. The language exempts from control the parts of mature plants — stalks, fiber, oil, cake, etc. — intended for industrial uses. Strictly speaking, the CSA does not make *Cannabis* illegal; rather, it places the strictest controls on its production, making it illegal to grow the crop without a DEA permit. DEA issued a permit for an experimental plot in Hawaii in the 1990s (now expired), but none since then. All hemp products sold in the United States are imported or manufactured from imported hemp materials. Under a state law passed in 1999, North Dakota became the first state to authorize industrial hemp production within its borders. A North Dakota State University researcher twice applied for, but did not receive, a DEA permit. In January 2007, the North Dakota Department of Agriculture issued final regulations on licensing hemp production. One application for a permit from a state-licensed producer is pending with the DEA.5

#### Despite its potential benefits, a perceptual barrier against industrial hemp exists due to its strictly superficial connection to Marijuana. Federal reversal is key to stimulating growth.

McKendry (Peter, Applied Environmental Research Centre Ltd, Tey Grove, Elm Lane. 7/6/01. Energy production from biomass (part 1): overview of biomass.)

Hemp, a member of the mulberry family (Moraccae), which includes the mulberry, paper mulberry and the hop plant, has a cellulose content of about 80% and has long been grown for a variety of uses, providing material for medicinal, nutritional and chemical production. It has been used to produce paper for cardboard/paper bags; the cannabis hemp seeds contain all the essential amino acids and essential fatty acids to maintain healthy human life; linseed oil is a widely used derivative in the manufacture of paint and varnish; and hemp is the earliest recorded plant cultivated for the production of a textile fibre. The association with marijuana caused the demise of the hemp industry in the USA in the late 1930s. This association continues today to prevent its widespread cultivation, despite its potential as a feedstock for a wide range of uses. Its revival as a biomass feedstock may arise due to the environmental pressures. In general, most attention on biomass-to-energy schemes to date, in the UK, has been focused on woody, rather than herbaceous plant species, due to the emphasis on electricity production compared with the production of alternative, i.e. liquid, transport fuels.

#### The situation on the Pine Ridge Reservation is horrendous; it’s the poorest county in the country. The average income is one-fifth the national average, unemployment is 84%, 69% of the residents are below the poverty line. Growing hemp allows them to cash in on $100 million and build low-income housing for their residents

WinonaLaDuke, Enrolled member of the Anishinaabeg, Program Director of Honor the Earth Fund, and Ralph Nader’s running mate, “The Case for Hemp,” Indian Country Today. 9/19/2001www.lakotafriends.org/hemp.html

Consider the irony of this situation. Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota has been deemed by statisticians as the economically poorest area in the United States. The average median income on the reservation is $2,600 per year, one fifth the national average. The unemployment rate is at 84 percent, and some 69 percent of all residents are below the poverty line. Hundreds of tribal members are homeless, and most live in overcrowded and substandard housing. Jobs are far away. Many residents have to travel l20 miles round trip to work in Rapid City, and even then most jobs are minimum wage. Now consider the alternatives. Native America could cash in on the $l00 million plus, hemp food industry. Add that to the 2 million pounds of hemp fiber imported in l999, not including a pretty substantial market for already produced hemp clothing (imported from countries like China, Hungary, Poland and Romania). Then, there is the growing interest in hemp both as a fiber source for paper and a possible source for building materials. Hemp can be transformed into everything from insulation to something like the "hempcrete" building constructed at Slim Buttes on Pine Ridge.

#### Lakotas living on the Pine Ridge reservation have made efforts to cultivate hemp. Enforcement of federal laws by the DEA and FBI to stop this cultivation constitute genocide.

Laura Finley (Adjunct Professor in Sociology and Criminology, University of. Northern Colorado and Metropolitan State College of Denver and is Adjunct Professor, at the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity at Colorado State University. “The Case of Pine Ridge and Industrial Hemp: Genocidal Actions and Sovereignty Violations,” The Online Journal of Justice Studies.) June 2003. <http://ojjs.icaap.org/issues/1.2/01_finley.html>

The actions taken by the DEA and FBI to thwart the cultivation of industrial hemp on reservation land can be considered a form of economic genocide. Lack of adequate housing is a significant issue on many reservations, as noted above, and Pine Ridge is no exception. In addition to normal affordability issues, tornadoes and high winds frequently destroy homes. In fact, former President Clinton acknowledged the severity of the housing issue on Pine Ridge in 1999, calling the area an “enterprise zone,” or location in need of economic stimulus and jobs (Keohane, 2002, 1). This is a clear indication that the federal government is aware, and is choosing to virtually ignore, the conditions on Pine Ridge; a condition of genocide. It is recognized that starting a business is a difficult if not impossible endeavor for most Pine Ridge residents, at least without some substantial assistance. Mark St. Pierre, executive director of the Pine Ridge Chamber of Commerce, explains that someone seeking to start a new business would first have to petition the tribal government for available land. This is more difficult than it may sound, as none has been set aside for business development. Next you would have to apply for a five-year lease, which is not likely to be granted, as the banks generally negotiate 25-year leases. If you were able to complete these two steps, your application would appear before the tribal land committee, which does not contain any businesspeople. Final approval must be granted by the BIA and is done through a process that can take over a year. In the end, all you have is a “short-term lease on a bare piece of prairie” (Miller, 2002, 28). Further, there are some cultural issues regarding the appropriateness of starting certain types of businesses. Many see partaking in the capitalist economy as a “white” thing to do, and want no part of it. As Pickering (2000) states “It is difficult for Lakotas to be part of a system that is failing to serve, or is actually harming, their community” (26). Because of the lack of businesses on the reservation, many travel the 120 miles to work in Rapid City, often for minimum wages (LaDuke, 2002). Approximately 90% of the reservation’s total income is spent off the reservation, much of it within 72 hours (Miller, 2002). Yet cultivation of industrial hemp could provide a nice exception to the cultural hesitation, as it would not be a traditional capital-based business but rather an agricultural and community-based endeavor. It would also allow for a variety of off-shoot businesses, like construction, that would help to keep earned income on the reservation. Existing facilities on Pine Ridge are in shambles. As of August, 2002 there were seven BIA schools in need of serious repair (Melmer, 2002). About one-third of the households on Pine Ridge lack electricity and indoor plumbing (Miller, 2002). According to Miller (2002), getting a mortgage for a house is beyond the reach of many residents of Pine Ridge. “That’s one reason there are so many trailer homes in Indian country: Banks are willing to lend the money for them, because repossession is possible if it becomes necessary” (30). A similar problem exists in Canada, where in 1999 Yolanda Redcalf, a resident of the Sunchild Reserve, went on a hunger strike to protest the way that tribal leaders play favorites in the granting of houses (Bunner, 1999). Tom Cook, Project Director of the LUA, states, “Industrial hemp is the key component to sustainable housing. We make hemp-based concrete that is lighter, stronger and easier to work with than masonry concrete. Not only that, but we are putting people to work here on the reservation with good jobs” (Keohane, 2002, 2) In an area with at least 80% unemployment rates (Afraid-of-Bear, 1998), any employment efforts are sorely needed. As Pickering (2000) maintains, unemployment is consistently high here. “In addition to high unemployment, underemployment is severe; many individuals find only seasonal jobs for a few weeks a year” (16). Those who are working often face poor labor conditions, as, “In an area of high unemployment, Lakota workers have little or no power to influence the requirements of their employers” (Pickering, 2000, 20). Furthermore, workers face a lack of control over working hours, poor conditions, and “boredom and negative health effects plague many workers” (Pickering, 2000, 21). Above all, “it is difficult for Lakotas to be part of a system that is failing to serve, or is actually harming, their community” (Pickering, 2000, 26). Caught in the intersection between a capitalist, white world and traditional Lakota culture, many Native Americans face distinct struggles. As Pickering (2000) states, “Each day, the Lakotas think and do things that make them distinctly Lakota, yet everyday they also experience the far-flung effects of a global economic system” (xii). There are four main areas of work on Pine Ridge and Rosebud, another Lakota reservation. These include wage work, small business and agricultural work, micro-enterprises and household subsistence. For some, public assistance may be the primary or only means of income (Pickering, 2000). Yet, according to some from Pine Ridge, economic growth must come from individuals in the private sector, not from government projects that are doomed to fail (Melmer, 2002). Adding to the overall woes, Pine Ridge has a smaller number of working age residents than in the overall population. In 1990, for instance, almost 50% of those on Pine Ridge were under 16 (Pickering, 2000). Pickering (2000) maintains that, “Lakota small businesses are few and far between. The world economy encourages Lakota enterprises to mirror the characteristics of other businesses in mainstream society to be competitive. At the same time, the local community expects Lakota businesses to behave in a manner that distinguishes them from the mainstream businesses, well-known for mistreating and exploiting Lakota customers” (14). In sum, while the Sioux struggle to find work that will meet their needs, as Lakota as well as members of the world economy, the federal government is committing economic genocide by thwarting their innovative efforts. To significantly reduce a groups’ ability to feed, house, and employ their members most certainly qualifies as “materially or psychologically destroy[ing] or diminish[ing] people’s dignity, happiness, and capacity to fulfill basic material needs” (Staub, 1999, 25). In addition to being genocidal in the ways described above, the government’s actions violate the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 and are thus an illegal intrusion of tribal sovereignty. The U.S government is also in violation of tribal sovereignty, as granted to the Oglala Sioux by the 1868 Fort Laramie treaty. This too can be considered under the rubric of genocide because such interventions substantially impact a group’s sovereign right to govern in the way that they wish. Like the issue of illegal dumping on or near reservation land, the DEA’s involvement in the industrial hemp efforts threatens tribal sovereignty because it increases the amount of government intervention, which can be used as a pretext for still further control. “Native Americans are viewed as irresponsible, the U.S government as their savior” (Brook, 1998, 107). Pickering (2000) states that the Fort Laramie Treaty is an “explicit acknowledgement of the Lakota’s status as a sovereign tribal entity” (4). In regards to treaty making, Churchill (1993) describes two key concepts. First, “there is a doctrine within modern international law known as the ‘right of inherent sovereignty.’ This principle holds that a people constitute a nation simply because ‘since time immemorial,’ it has always done so” (19). Second, “the conventional understanding of international law and custom is that treaty-making and treaty relationships are only entered into between states” (20). The U.S government has thus entered into some 371-treaty relationships with sovereign nations composed of indigenous peoples, all of which they have violated.

#### Poverty has forced Native Americans to make their reservations dumping grounds for our toxic industrial byproducts. Nuclear waste eradicates Native American populations so we can sustain our consumption patterns. This is a direct form of genocide.

**Brook ’98** **(**Daniel, Contributor to Harper’s and Boston Globe, “Environmental Genocide: Native Genocide: Native Americans and Toxic Waste, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 37, No. 1)*

GENOCIDE AGAINST NATIVE AMERICANS continues in modern times with modern techniques. In the past, buffalo were slaughtered or corn crops were burned, thereby threatening local native populations; now the Earth itself is being strangled, thereby threatening all life. The government and large corporations have created toxic, lethal threats to human health. Yet, be- cause "Native Americans live at the **lowest socioeconomic level in the U.S."** (Glass, n.d., 3), they are most at risk for toxic exposure. All poor people and people of color are disadvantaged, although for Indians, these disadvantages are multiplied by dependence on food supplies closely tied to the land and in which [toxic] materials . .. have been shown to accumulate" (ibid.). This essay will discuss the genocide of Native Americans through environmental spoliation and native resistance to it. Although this type of genocide is not (usually) the result of a systematic plan with malicious intent to exterminate Native Americans, it is the consequence of activities that are often carried out on and near the reservations with reckless disregard for the lives of Native Americans.1 One very significant toxic threat to Native Americans comes from governmental and commercial hazardous waste sitings. **Because of the severe poverty** and extraordinary vulnerability **of Native American tribes, their lands have been targeted** by the U.S. government and the large corporations **as permanent areas for much of the poisonous industrial by-products of the dominant society**. "Hoping to take advantage of the devastating chronic unemployment, pervasive poverty and sovereign status of Indian Nations", according to Bradley Angel, writing for the international environmental organization Green- peace, "the waste disposal industry and the U.S. government have embarked on an all-out effort to site incinerators, landfills, nuclear waste storage facilities and similar polluting industries on Tribal land" (Angel 1991, 1). In fact, so enthusiastic is the United States government to dump its most dangerous waste from "the nation's 110 commercial nuclear power plants" (ibid., 16) on the nation's "565 federally recognized tribes" (Aug 1993, 9) that it "has solicited every Indian Tribe, offering millions of dollars if the tribe would host a nuclear waste facility" (Angel 1991, 15; emphasis added). Given the fact that Native Americans tend to be so materially poor, the money offered by the government or the corporations for this "toxic trade" is often more akin to bribery or blackmail than to payment for services rendered.2 In this way, the Mescalero Apache tribe in 1991, for example, became the first tribe (or state) to file an application for a U.S. Energy Department grant "to study the feasibility of building a temporary [sic] storage facility for 15,000 metric tons of highly radioactive spent fuel" (Ak- wesasne Notes 1992, 11). Other Indian tribes, including the Sac, Fox, Yakima, Choctaw, Lower Brule Sioux, Eastern Shawnee, Ponca, Caddo, and the Skull Valley Band of Goshute, have since applied for the$100,000 exploratory grants as well (Angel 1991, 16-17). Indeed, since so many reservations are without major sources of outside revenue, it is not surprising that some tribes have considered proposals to host toxic waste repositories on their reservations. Native Americans, like all other victimized ethnic groups, are not passive populations in the face of destruction from imperialism and paternalism. Rather, they are active agents in the making of their own history. Nearly a century and a half ago, the radical philosopher and political economist Karl Marx realized that people "make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly found, given and transmitted from the past" (Marx 1978, 595). Therefore, tribal governments considering or planning waste facilities", asserts Margaret Crow of California Indian Legal Services, "do so for a number of reasons" (Crow 1994, 598). First, lacking exploitable subterranean natural resources, some tribal governments have sought to employ the land itself as a resource in an attempt to fetch a financial return. Second, since many reservations are rural and remote, other lucrative business opportunities are rarely, if ever, available to them. Third, some reservations are sparsely populated and therefore have surplus land for business activities. And fourth, by establishing waste facilities some tribes would be able to resolve their reservations' own waste disposal problems while simultaneously raising much-needed revenue. As a result, "[a] small number of tribes across the country are actively pursuing commercial hazardous and solid waste facilities"; however, "[t]he risk and benefit analysis performed by most tribes has led to decisions not to engage in commercial waste management" (ibid.). Indeed, Crow reports that by "the end of 1992, there were no commercial waste facilities operating on any Indian reservations" (ibid.), although the example of the Campo Band of Mission Indians provides an interesting and illuminating exception to the trend. The Campo Band undertook a "proactive approach to siting a commercial solid waste landfill and recycling facility near San Diego, California. The Band informed and educated the native community, developed an environmental regulatory infrastructure, solicited companies, required that the applicant company pay for the Band's financial advisors, lawyers, and solid waste industry consultants, and ultimately negotiated a favorable contract" (Haner 1994, 106). Even these extraordinary measures, however, are not enough to protect the tribal land and indigenous people from toxic exposure. Unfortunately, it is a sad but true fact that "virtually every landfill leaks, and every incinerator emits hundreds of toxic chemicals into the air, land and water" (Angel 1991, 3). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency concedes that even if the . . . protective systems work according to plan, the landfills will eventually leak poisons into the environment" (ibid.). Therefore, even if these toxic waste sites are safe for the present generation-a rather dubious proposition at best-they will pose an increasingly greater health and safety risk for all future generations. Native people (and others) will eventually pay the costs of these toxic pollutants with their lives, "costs to which [corporate] executives are conveniently immune" (Parker 1983, 59). In this way, private corporations are able to externalize their costs onto the commons, thereby subsidizing their earnings at the expense of health, safety, and the environment. Sadly, this may not be the worst environmental hazard on tribal lands. Kevin Grover and Jana Walker try "[t]o set the record straight" by claiming that "the bigger problem is not that the waste industry is beating a path to the tribal door [although it is of course doing so]. Rather, it is the unauthorized and illegal dumping occurring on reservations. For most Indian communities the problem of open dumping on tribal lands is of much greater concern than the remote prospect that a commercial waste disposal facility may be sited on a reservation" (Haner 1994, 107).3 There are two major categories of people who illegally dump waste on tribal land. They have been called "midnight dumpers" and "native entrepreneurs." Midnight dumpers are corporations and people who secretly dump their wastes on reservations without the permission of tribal governments. Native entrepreneurs are tribal members who contaminate tribal land, without tribal permission, for private profit or personal convenience. Both midnight dumpers and native entrepreneurs threaten Native American tribes in two significant ways: tribal health and safety, and tribal sovereignty.

#### Regardless of size, genocide outweighs all because it makes all their impacts and extinction inevitable.

**Campbell ’01** (Kenneth J., Prof of Political Science & International Relations at the Univ of Delaware, *Genocide and the Global Village*, p. 15-16)

Regardless of where or on how small a scale it begins, the crime of genocide is the complete ideological repudiation of, and a direct murderous assault upon. the prevailing liberal international order. Genocide is fundamentally incompatible with, and destructive of, an open, tolerant. democratic, free market international order. As genocide scholar Herbert Hirsch has explained.   The unwillingness of the world community to take action to end genocide and political massacres is not only immoral but also impractical … [W]ithout some semblance of stability, commerce, travel, and the international and intranational interchange of goods and information are subjected to severe disruptions.3 **Where genocide is permitted to proliferate, the liberal international order cannot long survive**. No group will be safe: every group will wonder when they will be next. **Left unchecked, genocide threat-ens to destroy whatever security, democracy, and prosperity exists in the present international system**. As Roger Smith notes :   Even the most powerful nations - those armed with nuclear weapons may end up in struggles that will lead (accidentally, intentionally. insanely) to the ultimate genocide in which they destroy not only each other. but mankind itself, sewing the fate of the earth forever with a final genocidal effort.4 In this sense, genocide is a grave threat to the very fabric of the international system and must be stopped, even at some risk to lives and treasure.

#### And, genocide is the worst crime imaginable, understanding that genocide is occurring in our country makes us all bystanders with the potential to intervene. Failure to work against genocide on face, without delay, constitutes acceptance and complicity. Genocide is worse than any other impact and you have an a-priori obligation to reject it on-face even if our method has no definitive endpoint

Arne Johan Vetlesen, Department of Philosophy, University of Oslo, July 2000, Journal of Peace Research, “Genocide: A Case for the Responsibility of the Bystander,” p. 520-522

Most often, in cases of genocide, for every person directly victimized and killed there will be hundreds, thousands, perhaps even millions, who are neither directly targeted as victims nor directly participating as perpetrators. The moral issues raised by genocide, taken as the illegal act par excellance, are not confined to the nexus of agent and victim. Those directly involved in a given instance of genocide will always form a minority, so to speak. The majority to the event will be formed by the contemporary bystanders. Such bystanders are individuals; in their private and professional lives, they will belong to a vast score of groups and collectives, some informal and closely knit, others formal and detached as far as personal and emotional involvement are concerned. In the loose sense intended here, every contemporary citizen cognizant of a specific ongoing instance of genocide, regardless of where in the world, counts as a bystander. Bystanders in this loose sense are cognizant, through TV, radio, newspapers, and other publicly available sources of information, of ongoing genocide somewhere in the world, but they are not - by profession or formal appointment — involved in it. Theirs is a passive role, that of onlookers, although what starts out as a passive stance may, upon decision, convert into active engagement in the events at hand. I shall label this category passive bystanders. This group should be distinguished from bystanders by formal appointment: the latter bystanders have been professionally Engaged as a ‘third party’ to the interaction between the two parties directly involved in acts of genocide. The stance of this third party to an ongoing conflict, even one with genocidal implications, is in principle often seen as one of impartiality and neutrality, typically highlighted by a determined refusal to ‘take sides.’ This manner of principled non-involvement is frequently viewed as highly meritorious (Vetlesen, 1998). A case in point would be UN personnel deployed to monitor a ceasefire between warring parties, or (as was their task in Bosnia) to see to it that the civilians within a UN declared ‘safe area’ are effectively guaranteed ‘peace and security’, as set down in the mandate to establish such areas. By virtue of their assigned physical presence on the scene and the specific tasks given to them, such (groups of) bystanders may be referred to as bystanders by assignment. What does it mean to be a contemporary bystander? To begin with, let us consider this question not from the expected view- point — that of the bystander - but from the two viewpoints provided by the parties directly involved in the event. To put it as simply as possible: From the viewpoint of an agent of genocide, bystanders are persons possessing a potential (one needing to be estimated in every concrete case) to halt his ongoing actions. The perpetrator will fear the bystander to the extent that he [or she] has reason to believe that the bystander will intervene to halt the action already under way, and thereby frustrate the perpetrators goal of eliminating the targeted group, that said, we immediately need to differentiate among the different categories of bystanders introduced above. It is obvious that the more knowledgeable and other wise resourceful the bystander, the more the perpetrator will have reason to fear that the potential for such resistance will translate into action, meaning a more or less direct intervention by military or other means. Deemed efficient to reach the objectives of halting the incipient genocide. Of course, one should distinguish between bystanders who remain inactive and those who become actively engaged. Nonetheless, the point to be stressed is that, in principle, even the most initially passive and remote bystander possesses a potential to cease being a mere onlooker to the events unfolding. Outrage at what comes to pass may prompt the judgement that ‘this simply must be stopped’ and translate into action promoting that aim. But is not halting genocide first and foremost a task, indeed a duty, for the victims themselves? The answer is simple: The sheer fact that genocide is happening shows that the targeted group has not proved itself able to prevent it. This being so, responsibility for halting what is now unfolding cannot rest with the victims alone, it must also be seen to rest with the party not itself affected but which is knowledgeable about -which is more or less literally witnessing — the genocide that is taking place. So whereas for the agent, bystanders represent the potential of resistance, for the victims they may represent the only source of hope left. In ethical terms, this is borne out in the notion of responsibility of Immanuel Levinas (1991), according to which responsibility grows bigger the weaker its addressee. Of course, agents of genocide may be caught more or less in delicto flagrante. But in the age of television - with CNN being able to film and even interview doers as well as victims on the spot, and broadcast live to the entire television-watching world (such as was the case in the concentration camp Omarska in Bosnia in August 1992) (see Gutman, 1993) — physical co-presence to the event at hand is almost rendered superfluous. One need not have been there in order to have known what happened, The same holds for the impact of the day-to-day reporting From the ground by newspaper journalists of indisputable reputation. In order to be knowledgeable about ongoing genocide, it suffices to watch the television news or read the front pages of a daily newspaper. But, to be more precise, what exactly does it mean to act? What is to count as an action? We need to look briefly at the philosophical literature on the notion of action — as well as the notion of agent responsibility following from it - in order to gel a better grasp of the moral issues involved in being a bystander to genocide, whether passive or active. ‘I never forget', says Paul Ricoeur in Oneself as Another, 'to speak of humans as acting and suffering, The moral problem', he continues, ‘is grafted onto the recognition of this essential dissymmetry between the one who acts and the one who undergoes, culminating in the violence of the powerful agent.' To be the 'sufferer' of a given action in Ricoeur's sense need not be negative; either 'the sufferer appears as the beneficiary of esteem or as the victim of disesteem, depending on whether the agent proves to be someone who distributes rewards or punishments'. Since there is to every action an agent and a sufferer (in the sense given), action is interaction, its structure is interpersonal (Ricoeur. 1992:145). But this is not the whole picture. Actions are also omitted, endured, neglected, and the like; and Ricoeur takes these phenomena to remind us that ‘on the level of interaction, just as on that of subjective understanding, not acting is still acting: neglecting, forgetting to do something, is also letting things be done by someone else, sometimes to the point of criminality. (Ricoeur, 1992:157) Ricoeur's systematic objective is to extend the theory of action from acting to suffering beings; again and again he emphasizes that 'every action has its agents and its patients' (1992; 157). Ricoeur's proposed extension certainly sounds plausible. Regrettably, his proposal stops halfway. The vital insight articulated, albeit not developed, in the passages quoted is that not acting is still acting. Brought to bear on the case of genocide as a reported, on going affair, the inaction making a difference is the inaction of the bystander to unfolding genocide. The failure to act when confronted with such action, as is involved in accomplishing genocide, is a failure which carries a message to both the agent and the sufferer: the action may proceed. Knowing, yet still not acting, means-granting acceptance to the action. Such inaction entails letting things be done by someone else - clearly, in the case of acknowledged genocide, 'to the point of criminality', to invoke one of the quotes from Ricoeur. In short, inaction here means complicity; accordingly, it raises the question of responsibility, guilt, and shame on the part of the inactive bystander, by which I mean the bystander who decides to remain inactive. In the view I am advancing, the theory of action is satisfactorily extended only when it is recognized that the structure of action is triadic, not dyadic. It takes

two to act, we are tempted to say — no more and no less. But is an action really the exclusive possession — a private affair — between the two parties immediately affected as agent and sufferer? For one thing, the repercussions of a particular piece of action are bound to reach far beyond the immediate dyadic setting. As Hannah Arendt (1958) famously observed, to act is to initiate, to make a new beginning in the world, to set in motion - and open-endedly so. Only the start of a specific action allows precise localization in space and time, besides our attributing it to a particular agent, as her property and no one else’s. But, as for the repercussions, they evade being traced in any definite manner, to any final and definitive endpoint.

#### And, because of the unique situation of the Lakota, industrial hemp is the perfect crop that can revive the economy of the Pine Ridge reservation.

RobinLash, PhD graduate from the University of Oklahoma college of Law. “Industrial Hemp: The Crop for the Seventh Generation,” American Indian Law Review, Spring 2002 27 Am. Indian L. Rev. 313. Lexis.

Industrial hemp is recognized as one of the most ecologically beneficial and prolific crops that a farmer could choose to cultivate. Instead of stripping the soil of its nutrients as most crops do, hemp tends to improve the soil where it is planted. n188 A 1913 report by the USDA noted that hemp "improves its [soil] physical condition, destroys weeds, and does not exhaust its [soil] fertility." n189 Additionally, hemp is a hardy plant and has been grown successfully over a wide range of different soil types and in many different climates in the United States. n190 Most importantly, because it [\*336] requires virtually no pesticides and less fertilizer than other crops, hemp cultivation is environmentally friendly. n191 Because of the tribes' innate tie with the land, and because cultivating the plant does not require special soil types, expensive machinery, and pesticide, production of hemp by tribes makes sense. Tribes have tried establishing economic development on their lands through various methods. Some tribes focused on bingo and gaming while other tribes tried to attract new private business ventures onto tribal lands by promoting business tax advantages. n192 Even with various incentives, many businesses have not relocated to Indian lands for a variety of reasons. n193 These reasons may include fear or misunderstanding of tribal sovereign immunity, mistrust of tribal government or concerns about political turnover and structural soundness of tribal governments. n194 More often, however, economic development seems to be hindered by more tangible barriers. "Territorial remoteness, inadequate public infrastructure base, capital access barriers, land ownership patterns, and an under-skilled labor and managerial sector . . . stifle Indian Country development and investment." n195 The Lakota, like many other tribes, have plenty of land. n196 They also have sufficient manpower to grow hemp. n197 Production of industrial hemp would not necessitate infrastructure facilities, skilled labor, proximity to cities, or other factors that tend to prohibit economic development. More importantly, [\*337] hemp production means money. Whereas an acre of wheat brings a profit of only $ 25, in Canada, an acre of industrial hemp brings $ 225. n198 Additionally, production of industrial hemp benefits the land and saves environmental resources. Hemp yields several times as much pulp per acre as do trees n199 and is ready to harvest in only seventy to 110 days. n200 Hemp production would bring an end to clear cutting trees for wood pulp. n201 Hemp fibers and hemp oils can be used in place of fossil fuels. n202 This distinction is very important to tribal members who witnessed serious desecration of their own lands over the years through mineral and grazing leases approved by the BIA, with little input from the Indian people who own the land. n203

#### Allowing Alex White Plume to grow hemp is the first place we can act to change our entire policy toward Native Americans and provides a partial solution to the problem of hundreds of years of genocide, massacres and destruction

Jeremy Briggs is Editor of HEMPhasis magazine, February 2004, “Wahupta Ska Pejuta,” Hemphasis. http://www.hemphasis.net/0101wsp.htm

In 1493, Pope Alexander VI issued a directive, a "Papal Bull", stating that the Indians are barbarous nations. He commanded that they be subjugated and be brought to the faith. Also known as the Doctrine of Discovery, it gave Europeans the moral right to "discover" (claim) Indian lands. In the process, 60 million Indians were wiped out before 1976, through disease, starvation, and murder. This is a number roughly equal to the deaths occurring on all sides during World Wars I and II. In today's world we go to war to prevent genocide. We point to Stalin and Hitler as the ultimate personifications of evil. We could as easily turn the finger at ourselves. The Americans of the 19th Century set out to destroy the Plains Indians and their way of life for good, starting with the intentional destruction of the buffalo and proceeding to the massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890; one of the most evil acts ever done to one people by another. After about 350 Lakota men, women and children were murdered at Wounded Knee, the Land Allotment Act was passed, taking away the Lakota's identity: the Black Hills. After their lands were stolen, the Lakota were told to become farmers. Now, over 100 years later, they are trying to be hemp farmers. Incalculable damage has been done, with minimal healing. Consider this: the Papal Bull has never been rescinded. It's time we Americans change our policies towards the American Indians, starting by allowing Alex White Plume to grow industrial hemp: a solution to this ongoing struggle. Alex is joined in his struggle by his Brothers Percy and Gerald, his sisters Rita, Alta, and Ramona, his sons Lance Martin, Johnny Joe, and Alex Jr., his daughters Boogie Shoes, Rosebud, and Jessica, and his wife, Debra. Alex has 12 grandkids, and his siblings have 44 offspring, many with their own children. Many of his children and grandchildren fall into the Seventh Generation (a generation is roughly 15 years, it is based on the age at which a woman can become conceive) since Wounded Knee. The Seventh Generation that was prophesied to bring back the old ways, by restoring the ancient religious practices and honor upon which the Lakota pride themselves. **Hemp could play a role in this because it is Mother Earth's most versatile and useful crop. It could replace the buffalo by providing food, clothing, shelter and fuel; not to mention homes, and could help raise wealth**.

#### Evaluating by THC level would solve for the hemp problem – this would change current hemp law

Steve Woodward, October 14, 2007, The Sunday Oregonian, “Hemp: The little weed that could It's nutritious, delicious and at least as strong as wood. So why the continuing stigma?”, Lexis, JLK

The hemp Shapiro uses contains extremely low levels of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, or THC, the psychoactive ingredient in Cannabis sativa, the umbrella Latin name for hemp and marijuana. While marijuana's THC content can reach 30 percent, according to federal data, industrial hemp contains less than 1 percent. The Canadian and European governments require hemp's THC content to be even lower: less than 0.3 percent. But the 1970 Controlled Substances Act doesn't take THC levels into account. The act simply lists Cannabis sativa --marijuana and hemp --as a Schedule 1 drug, meaning it's highly dangerous with no medical value.

#### State institutions inevitable – our education is valuable teaches us to direct that opposition to those levers of power

Lawrence **Grossburg**, University of Illinois, We Gotta Get Outta This Place, **1992**, p. 391-393

**The Left needs institutions which can operate within the systems of governance, understanding that such institutions are the mediating structures by which power is actively realized.** It is often **by directing opposition against specific institutions** that **power can be challenged.** The Left has assumed from some time now that, since it has so little access to the apparatuses of agency, its only alternative is to seek a public voice in the media through tactical protests. **The Left** does in fact need more visibility, but it also **needs greater access to the entire range of apparatuses of decision making and power**. Otherwise, the Left has nothing but its own self-righteousness. **It is not individuals who have produced** starvation and the other **social disgraces** of our world, **although it is individuals who must take responsibility for eliminating them. But to do so, they must act within organizations, and within the system of organizations which in fact have the capacity** (as well as the moral responsibility) **to fight them.** Without such organizations, the only models of political commit­ment are self-interest and charity. Charity suggests that we act on behalf of others who cannot act on their own behalf. But we are all precariously caught in the circuits of global capitalism, and every­one’s position is increasingly precarious and uncertain. It will not take much to change the position of any individual in the United States, as the experience of many of the homeless, the elderly and the “fallen” middle class demonstrates. Nor are there any guarantees about the future of any single nation. We can imagine ourselves involved in a politics where acting for another is always acting for oneself as well, a politics in which everyone struggles with the resources they have to make their lives (and the world) better, since the two are so intimately tied together! For example, we need to think of affirmation action as in everyone’s best interests, because of the possibilities it opens. We need to think with what Axelos has described as a “planetary thought” which “would be a coherent thought—but not a rationalizing and ‘rationalist’ inflection; it would be a fragmentary thought of the open totality—for what we can grasp are fragments unveiled on the horizon of the totality. Such a politics will not begin by distinguishing between the local and the global (and certainly not by valorizing one over the other) for the ways in which the former are incorporated into the latter preclude the luxury of such choices. **Resistance is always a local struggle, even when** (as in parts of the ecology movement) **it is imagined to connect into its global structures of articulation**: Think globally, act locally. Opposition is predicated precisely on locating the points of articulation between them, the points at which the global becomes local, and the local opens up onto the global. Since the meaning of these terms has to be understood in the context of any particular struggle, one is always acting both globally and locally: Think globally, act appropriately! Fight locally because that is the scene of action, but aim for the global because that is the scene of agency. “Local struggles directly target national and international axioms, at the precise point of their insertion into the field of imma­nence. This requires the imagination and construction of forms of unity, commonality and social agency which do not deny differences. Without such commonality, politics is too easily reduced to a ques­tion of individual rights (i.e., in the terms of classical utility theory); difference ends up “trumping” politics, bringing it to an end. The struggle against the disciplined mobilization of everyday life can only be built on affective commonalities, a shared “responsible yearning: a yearning out towards something more and something better than this and this place now.” The Left, after all, is defined by its common commitment to principles of justice, equality and democ­racy (although these might conflict) in economic, political and cultural life. It is based on the hope, perhaps even the illusion, that such things are possible. **The construction of an affective commonal­ity attempts to mobilize people in a common struggle, despite the fact that they have no common identity or character, recognizing that they are the only force capable of providing a new historical and oppositional agency. It strives to organize minorities into a new majority.**

### A2: Kritik

1. The story of the reservation is the story of the management of an entire indigenous population. The USFG’s approach towards the control of the land of the natives has been one of biopolitical regulation and oppression.

Powell, 2006 (Dana E, “Technologies of Existence: The indigenous environmental justice movement,” Development (2006) 49, 125–132. doi:10.1057/palgrave.development.1100287)

A similar history runs through Native America, as this 'Fourth World' population was a target of regulation, management, and biological speculation from the moment of Contact, over 500 years ago. Indigenous populations worldwide have experienced the effects of biopower, especially in terms of the management and extraction of natural resources (including bodies and, more recently, genetic information), but in the Americas the situation is geo-historically particular, given the sweeping catastrophe of disease, decimating what some have estimated to be 95 per cent of the pre-Contact population. Another particularity of the North American situation is that, over the long history of occupation since 1492, tribal populations have been alternately exterminated, removed, recombined, relocated, and politically reorganized by state institutions, often under the guise of care and patrimony. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, tribes as populations were regulated and made to live through land enclosures, creating spatial patterns of security, on frontier lands considered undesirable to European colonists. This desirability was, however, based on the visible alone; the resources that laid beneath the surface of the often barren, dry reservations would emerge in the 20th century as some of the most coveted commodities on earth

1. The USFG has maintained its policy of management of natives while trivializing indigenous knowledge in favor of colonialist narratives that assert the primacy of Western thought – only tribal sovereignty can overcome the perception of reservations as politically and economically exploitable areas.

Robyn 2 (Linda, the assistant professor in the Criminal Justice Department at Northern Arizona University, 2002. “Indigenous Knowledge and Technology: Creating Environmental Justice in the Twenty-First Century”. The American Indian Quarterly, 26.2 (2002), p. 198.

Specifically within the United States, loss of power and autonomy through the process of colonialism relegated Indigenous peoples to a position on the lower end of the hierarchical scale in U.S. society. The legacy of fifteenth-century European colonial domination placed Indigenous knowledge in the categories of primitive, simple, "not knowledge," or folklore. It comes as no surprise then that through the process of colonization Indigenous knowledge and perspectives have been ignored and denigrated by the vast majority of social, physical, biological and agricultural scientists, and governments using colonial powers to exploit Indigenous resources. Colonization is more than just a convenient economic domination of one group by another. In its present-day form, colonization continues to undermine the political, military, social, psycho-culture, value systems, and knowledge base of the colonized and imposes on them the values and culture of the colonizer. For the sake of economic control—the main impetus behind any colonization—the colonizer must constantly devise new means of oppressing the colonized. 8  Colonialism continues today, but with different foreign powers than in the past, that is, banks, corporations, speculators, governments, and various development agencies. Today Indigenous peoples are on the frontline of contemporary colonial struggles. They are sitting on resources the rest of the world wants at the lowest possible cost. Their territories are still considered frontier lands, un-owned, underutilized, and, therefore, open to exploitation. Because Indigenous populations are small, politically weak, and usually physically isolated, their vast environmental knowledge base is, for the most part, denigrated by these new colonizers, making Indigenous populations easy targets as resource colonies. Central to the concept of resource colonization is, as John Bodley emphasizes in his work, *Victims of Progress,* "that the prior ownership rights and interests of the aboriginal inhabitants are totally ignored as irrelevant by both the state and the invading individuals." [9](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_indian_quarterly/v026/26.2robyn.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT9)

The story of the reservation is the story of the management of an entire indigenous population. The USFG’s approach towards the control of the land of the natives has been one of biopolitical regulation and oppression.

Dana E **Powell**, 20**06**, “Technologies of Existence: The indigenous environmental justice movement,” Development (2006) 49, 125–132. doi:10.1057/palgrave.development.1100287
A similar history runs through Native America, as this 'Fourth World' population was a target of regulation, management, and biological speculation from the moment of Contact, over 500 years ago. Indigenous populations worldwide have experienced the effects of biopower, especially in terms of the management and extraction of natural resources (including bodies and, more recently, genetic information), but in the Americas the situation is geo-historically particular, given the sweeping catastrophe of disease, decimating what some have estimated to be 95 per cent of the pre-Contact population. Another particularity of the North American situation is that, over the long history of occupation since 1492, tribal populations have been alternately exterminated, removed, recombined, relocated, and politically reorganized by state institutions, often under the guise of care and patrimony. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, tribes as populations were regulated and made to live through land enclosures, creating spatial patterns of security, on frontier lands considered undesirable to European colonists. This desirability was, however, based on the visible alone; the resources that laid beneath the surface of the often barren, dry reservations would emerge in the 20th century as some of the most coveted commodities on earth

The USFG has maintained its policy of management of natives while trivializing indigenous knowledge in favor of colonialist narratives that assert the primacy of Western thought – only tribal sovereignty can overcome the perception of reservations as politically and economically exploitable areas.

**Linda Robyn,** the assistant professor in the Criminal Justice Department at Northern Arizona University, **2002.** “Indigenous Knowledge and Technology: Creating Environmental Justice in the Twenty-First Century”. *The American Indian Quarterly, 26.2 (2002), p. 198.*

Specifically within the United States, loss of power and autonomy through the process of colonialism relegated Indigenous peoples to a position on the lower end of the hierarchical scale in U.S. society. The legacy of fifteenth-century European colonial domination placed Indigenous knowledge in the categories of primitive, simple, "not knowledge," or folklore. It comes as no surprise then that through the process of colonization Indigenous knowledge and perspectives have been ignored and denigrated by the vast majority of social, physical, biological and agricultural scientists, and governments using colonial powers to exploit Indigenous resources. Colonization is more than just a convenient economic domination of one group by another. In its present-day form, colonization continues to undermine the political, military, social, psycho-culture, value systems, and knowledge base of the colonized and imposes on them the values and culture of the colonizer. For the sake of economic control—the main impetus behind any colonization—the colonizer must constantly devise new means of oppressing the colonized. 8  Colonialism continues today, but with different foreign powers than in the past, that is, banks, corporations, speculators, governments, and various development agencies. Today Indigenous peoples are on the frontline of contemporary colonial struggles. They are sitting on resources the rest of the world wants at the lowest possible cost. Their territories are still considered frontier lands, un-owned, underutilized, and, therefore, open to exploitation. Because Indigenous populations are small, politically weak, and usually physically isolated, their vast environmental knowledge base is, for the most part, denigrated by these new colonizers, making Indigenous populations easy targets as resource colonies. Central to the concept of resource colonization is, as John Bodley emphasizes in his work, *Victims of Progress,* "that the prior ownership rights and interests of the aboriginal inhabitants are totally ignored as irrelevant by both the state and the invading individuals." [9](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_indian_quarterly/v026/26.2robyn.html#FOOT9)

#### Root causes don’t exist – MUST focus first on proximate causes

Thompson 3 (William, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of International Relations at Indiana University,“A Streetcar Named Sarajevo: Catalysts, Multiple Causation Chains, and Rivalry Structures,” International Studies Quarterly, 47(3))

Richard Ned Lebow (2000–2001) has recently invoked what might be called a streetcar interpretation of systemic war and change. According to him, all our structural theories in world politics both over determine and underdetermine the explanation of the most important events such as World War I, World War II, or the end of the Cold War. Not only do structural theories tend to fixate on one cause or stream of causation, they are inherently incomplete because the influence of structural causes cannot be known without also identifying the necessary role of catalysts. As long as we ignore the precipitants that actually encourage actors to act, we cannot make accurate generalizations about the relationships between more remote causation and the outcomes that we are trying to explain. Nor can we test the accuracy of such generalizations without accompanying data on the presence or absence of catalysts. In the absence of an appropriate catalyst (or a ‘‘streetcar’’ that failed to arrive), wars might never have happened. Concrete information on their presence (‘‘streetcars’’ that did arrive) might alter our understanding of the explanatory significance of other variables. But since catalysts and contingencies are so difficult to handle theoretically and empirically, perhaps we should focus instead on probing the theoretical role of contingencies via the development of ‘‘what if ’’ scenarios.

#### Voting for the team that presents the best scholarship is all well and good but debate has rules – the aff affirms and the neg negates it and if both of our scholarships are good that’s a reason to vote aff

#### Switch-side debate fosters tolerance and empathy toward others --- their framework inevitably degrades into dogmatism and bigotry

Muir 93 (Star, Professor of Communication – George Mason U., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 288-289)

The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.'s Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values— tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one's own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. 5' The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance.

#### -- can’t advocate the plan – steals all the aff ground, allows tiny impossible to beat PICs and proves the Aff true

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### Methodologies are always imperfect – endorsing multiple epistemological frameworks can correct the blindspots of each

Stern and Druckman 00 (Paul, National Research Council and Daniel, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution – George Mason University, International Studies Review, Spring, p. 62-63)

Using several distinct research approaches or sources of information in conjunction is a valuable strategy for developing generic knowledge. This strategy is particularly useful for meeting the challenges of measurement and inference. The nature of historical phenomena makes controlled experimentation—the analytic technique best suited to making strong inferences about causes and effects—practically impossible with real-life situations. Making inferences requires using experimentation in simulated conditions and various other methods, each of which has its own advantages and limitations, but none of which can alone provide the level of certainty desired about what works and under what conditions. We conclude that debates between advocates of different research methods (for example, the quantitative-qualitative debate) are unproductive except in the context of a search for ways in which different methods can complement each other. Because there is no single best way to develop knowledge, the search for generic knowledge about international conflict resolution should adopt an epistemological strategy of triangulation, sometimes called “**critical** **multiplism**.”53 That is, it should use multiple perspectives, sources of data, constructs, interpretive frameworks, and modes of analysis to address specific questions on the presumption that research approaches that rely on certain perspectives can act as **partial correctives** for the limitations of approaches that rely on different ones. An underlying assumption is that robust findings (those that hold across studies that vary along several dimensions) engender more confidence than replicated findings (a traditional scientific ideal, but not practicable in international relations research outside the laboratory). When different data sources or methods converge on a single answer, one can have increased confidence in the result. When they do not converge, one can interpret and take into account the known biases in each research approach. A continuing critical dialogue among analysts using different perspectives, methods, and data could lead to an understanding that better approximates international relations than the results coming from any single study, method, or data source.

#### Debate is insulated --- individual rounds have no impact inside or outside the community

Atchison and Panetta 5 (Jarrod, PhD Candidate – U Georgia, and Ed, Professor of Communication – U Georgia, “Activism in Debate: Parody, Promise, and Problems”, NCA Paper)

A quick glance through most squads’ backfiles reveals arguments that might sound ridiculous to the average person such as Malthus, Spark, and Wipeout. However, all three of these arguments have been used to win debates. Why has the debate community been so tolerant of these types of arguments? We believe that the answer to that question is that for much of its existence, the debate community has had a strong norm against censoring arguments while simultaneously presuming a strong insulation from the communities that support it. If an administrator asked what topic is being debated, directors are quick to point to the timely resolution and recite some of the major affirmative cases. When a director reports on a successful season they can strategically leave out the fact that a final round that was won on extinction good. The debate community has been quick to defend the use of these arguments because every idea should undergo rigorous testing and if the idea is truly awful then it should be easily defeated. Although this approach to intercollegiate debate arguments has been accepted for many years, we believe the recent push trend toward alternative argument approaches warrants reconsideration of intercollegiate debate’s status as an insulated activity. In an era of tightened budgets, directors are increasingly pressured to defend the benefits of intercollegiate debate. This is occurring at a time when debate is becoming more and more publicized. The two C.S.T.V. documentaries and the increase use of video and audio recording by debate programs have combined with college newspapers, blogs, and internet list serves to challenge the presumption that debate is an insulated activity. Argument choices, on the other hand, have moved further and further toward the exotic. The norm against restricting arguments has expanded to include actions that performance artists have deemed resistance, but would not be covered by even liberal interpretations of academic freedom. The presumption of insulation, however, has remained the same. Some people still believe that what takes place in an individual debate has no bearing on anyone else inside or outside the debate community. There has been little community wide response that demonstrates that directors, coaches, or debaters are concerned that argument choices may negatively impact their or other programs. The norm of argument freedom has become so strong that all an individual debater needs to win is that they are making an argument to engage in a behavior in a debate. It does not take a very experienced argument scholar to recognize that there are few behaviors that cannot be construed as making an argument. As we have written elsewhere, we believe that the combination of intentionally provocative argument choices and the increased politicization of debate risks the continued institutional support of intercollegiate debate.

#### case turns their impact

Rothbard 73 (Murray, Dean of Austrian School, Head of Mises Institute, For A New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto, <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#p263>)

Many libertarians are uncomfortable with foreign policy matters and prefer to spend their energies either on fundamental questions of libertarian theory or on such "domestic" concerns as the free market or privatizing postal service or garbage disposal. Yet an attack on war or a warlike foreign policy is of **crucial importance** to libertarians. There are two important reasons. One has become a cliche, but is all too true nevertheless: the **overriding importance** of preventing a nuclear holocaust. To all the long-standing reasons, moral and economic, against an interventionist foreign policy has now been added the imminent, ever-present threat of world destruction. If the world should be destroyed, **all the other problems** and all the other isms—socialism, capitalism, liberalism, or **libertarianism—would be of** **no importance whatsoever**. The other reason is that, apart from the nuclear menace, war, in the words of the libertarian Randolph Bourne, "is the health of the [p. 278] State." War has always been the occasion of a great — and usually permanent — acceleration and intensification of State power over society. War is the great excuse for mobilizing all the energies and resources of the nation, in the name of patriotic rhetoric, under the aegis and dictation of the State apparatus. It is in war that the State really comes into its own: swelling in power, in number, in pride, in absolute dominion over the economy and the society. Society becomes a herd, seeking to kill its alleged enemies, rooting out and suppressing all dissent from the official war effort, happily betraying truth for the supposed public interest. Society becomes an armed camp, with the values and the morals — as the libertarian Albert Jay Nock once phrased it — of an "army on the march."It is particularly ironic that war always enables the State to rally the energies of its citizens under the slogan of helping it to defend the country against some bestial outside menace. For the root myth that enables the State to wax fat off war is the canard that war is a defense by the State of its subjects. The facts, however, are precisely the reverse. For if war is the health of the State, it is also its greatest danger. A State can only "die" by defeat in war or by revolution. In war, therefore, the State frantically mobilizes its subjects to fight for it against another State, under the pretext that it is fighting to defend them.[8](http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#note14.8)In the history of the United States, war has generally been the main occasion for the often permanent intensification of the power of the State over society. In the War of 1812 against Great Britain, as we have indicated above, the modern inflationary fractional-reserve banking system first came into being on a large scale, as did protective tariffs, internal federal taxation, and a standing army and navy. And a direct consequence of the wartime inflation was the reestablishment of a central bank, the Second Bank of the United States. Virtually all of these statist policies and institutions continued permanently after the war was over. The Civil War and its virtual one-party system led to the permanent establishment of a neomercantilist policy of Big Government and the subsidizing of various big business interests through protective tariffs, huge land grants and other subsidies to railroads, federal excise taxation, and a federally controlled banking system. It also brought the first imposition of federal conscription and an income tax, setting dangerous precedents [p. 279] for the future. World War I brought the decisive and fateful turn from a relatively free and laissez-faire economy to the present system of corporate state monopoly at home and permanent global intervention abroad. The collectivist economic mobilization during the war, headed by War Industries Board Chairman Bernard Baruch, fulfilled the emerging dream of big business leaders and progressive intellectuals for a cartelized and monopolized economy planned by the federal government in cozy collaboration with big business leadership. And it was precisely this wartime collectivism that nurtured and developed a nationwide labor movement that would eagerly take its place as junior partner in the new corporate State economy. This temporary collectivism, furthermore, served as a permanent beacon and model for big business leaders and corporatist politicians as the kind of perman ent peacetime economy that they would like to impose on the United States. As food czar, Secretary of Commerce, and later as President, Herbert C. Hoover helped bring this continuing monopolized statist economy into being, and the vision was fulfilled in a recrudescence of wartime agencies and even wartime personnel by Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.[9](http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#note14.9) World War I also brought a permanent Wilsonian global intervention abroad, the fastening of the newly imposed Federal Reserve System and a permanent income tax on society, high federal budgets, massive conscription, and intimate connections between economic boom, war contracts, and loans to Western nations.

#### Only a synthesis of the “legitimate” and “delegitimized” can create meaningful social change.

Celeste **Condit and** John **Lucaites**, professor of Communication at UGA and professor of Communication at Indiana University, 19**90** (“Reconstructing <Equality>: Culturetypal And Counter-Cultural Rhetorics In The Martyred Black Vision,” in Communication Monographs, Vol. 57, March, p. 6)

This formulation rests on a view that portrays significant rhetors as those able to realign material life experiences and cultural symbols through the artful use of the available means of persuasion.3 In what follows we will demonstrate this perspective by first identifying <equality> as one of the central ideographic commitments in the public discourse of both Malcolm X and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and then by analyzing the symbolic, cultural resources each used to give meaning to that commitment.4 Finally, we will argue that in the American experience, <equality> functions as a rhetoric of control, and the only way to transcend the restrictions structured by such an ideology is through a dualistic discourse which acts independently on both sides of a discursive paradox: One voice, generally lacking legitimacy and maintaining a shadowy profile, reworks the public vocabulary by transforming life-experiences into characterizations and narratives that reshape existing ideographs; another voice, legitimate and even popular, revivifies those ideographs central to the process of social change. In the end, the “audience” may affirm one speaker and castigate another, but the public vocabulary that is created (and articulated by subsequent rhetors) is a synthesis of both. It is in this context, we will conclude, that the tension created by King’s culturetypal rhetoric and Malcolm X’s counter-cultural rhetoric functioned to produce a revised and emancipatory conception of cultural equality.

#### Rejecting traditional analysis guarantees the sector will be dominated by the most conservative policymakers

Olav. F. **Knudsen**, Prof @ Södertörn Univ College, **‘1** [*Security Dialogue* 32.3, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization,” p. 366]

A final danger in focusing on the state is that of building the illusion that states have impenetrable walls, that they have an inside and an outside, and that nothing ever passes through. Wolfers’s billiard balls have contributed to this misconception. But the state concepts we should use **are in no need of** such an illusion. Whoever criticizes the field for such sins in the past needs to **go back to the literature**. Of course, we must continue to be open to a frank and unbiased assessment of the transnational politics which significantly in- fluence almost every issue on the domestic political agenda. The first decade of my own research was spent studying these phenomena – and I disavow none of my conclusions about the state’s limitations. Yet I am not ashamed to talk of a domestic political agenda. Anyone with a little knowledge of Euro- pean politics knows that Danish politics is not Swedish politics is not German politics is not British politics. Nor would I hesitate for a moment to talk of the role of the state in transnational politics, where it is an important actor, though only one among many other competing ones. In the world of transnational relations, the exploitation of states by interest groups – by their assumption of roles as representatives of states or by convincing state representatives to argue their case and defend their narrow interests – is a significant class of phenomena, today as much as yesterday. Towards a Renewal of the Empirical Foundation for Security Studies Fundamentally, the sum of the foregoing list of sins blamed on the Copen- hagen school amounts to a lack of attention paid to just that ‘reality’ of security which Ole Wæver consciously chose to leave aside a decade ago in order to pursue the politics of securitization instead. I cannot claim that he is void of interest in the empirical aspects of security because much of the 1997 book is devoted to empirical concerns. However, the attention to agenda-setting – confirmed in his most recent work – draws attention away from the important issues we need to work on more closely if we want to contribute to a better understanding of European **security as it is** currently developing**.** That inevitably requires a more **consistent** interest in security policy in the making – not just in the development of alternative security policies. The dan- ger here is that, as alternative policies are likely to fail grandly on the political arena, crucial decisions may be made in the ‘**traditional’ sector of security** policymaking, **unheeded by any but the most uncritical minds.**

#### No text to the alt is a reason to reject the team – it makes the neg a moving target and skews aff strategy, makes it impossible for us to be aff because we can’t pin them down to the alt and they can shift its meaning to get out of our best offense –reject the team for fairness and ground – and floating piks are an independent reason to reject the team because they steal all of the aff.

#### -historical oversimplification. though there is continuity between different white projects failure to recognize, and productively cooperate with alternative white racial formations makes their method counterproductive.

Howard **WINANT** Sociology @ UCSB **’97** Behind Blue Eyes: Contemporary White Racial Politics http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/whitness.html

In a quiet office at a Washington think tank, a balding white man with a Ph.D composes a tract on the biologically-determined intellectual inferiority of blacks. Out on a Brooklyn street, as black demonstrators march through a segregated white enclave, white residents yell racist epithets. In a suburban Virginia church, an evangelical Protestant minister preaches to a largely white, overwhelmingly middle-class audience. At an urban college campus in California, whites and blacks, Latinos and Asians, sit side-by-side in the overcrowded classroom, and in their own separate groups in the cafeteria. As they drive home to their segregated neighborhoods, they pump the same high-volume hip-hop sounds through their car speakers. A few miles up the interstate, neo-Nazis train at a private ranch. A few miles the other way, a multiracial garment workers' union is being organized; a majority of the workers in the bargaining unit are Asians and Latinos, but there are some whites. Among the organizers, one of the most effective is a young white woman who speaks good Spanish. How can we make sense of the highly variable "whiteness" of these rather emblematic characters? How does the contemporary US racial order locate white identities? Indeed, how viable is white identity? Is whiteness merely the absence of "color," **the sign of "privilege**"? Is it, in other words, **a purely negative signifier**? Or is it possible to view white identities more positively, to **see whiteness in terms of "difference**" perhaps, but **not in terms of racial domination, supremacy, or hierarchy**? In this essay I look at US racial politics and culture as they shape the status of whites. In other words, I begin from the premise that it is no longer possible to assume a "normalized" whiteness, whose invisibility and relatively monolithic character signify immunity from political or cultural challenge. An alternative perspective is demanded, one which begins from a recognition of white racial dualism. My discussion of this theme, in the next section of this essay, is an extension to whites of the Duboisian idea that in a racist society the "color line" fractures the self, that it imposes a sort of schizophrenia on the bearers of racialized identities, which forces them to see themselves simultaneously from within and without. Du Bois of course intended this analysis to explain problems of black politics and culture at the turn of the 20th century; it was a time when few publically questioned the normalization of whiteness. I extrapolate his idea to whites at the end of the 20th century; today, I suggest, whiteness has been deeply fissured by the racial conflicts of the post-civil rights period. Since the 1960s contemporary racial discourse has been unable to function as a logic of racial superiority and justified exclusion. Therefore it has been forced into rearticulations, representations, reinterpretations of the meaning of race and, perforce, of whiteness. In the following section of this paper I analyze the new politicization of whiteness which has taken shape particularly in the post-civil rights era -- the period since the ambiguous victory of the civil rights movement in the mid-1960s. Here we discuss the reasons why, contrary to the racially egalitarian thrust of the civil rights "revolution," the significance of white identity was reinterpreted and repoliticized -- largely in a reactionary direction -- in the wake of the 1960s. I identify several factors contributing to this shift: the erosion of traditional ethnicities, the decline of class-based politics, and the elaboration of right-wing racial ideologies able to rearticulate some of the 1960s movement demands in a discourse of conservatism and "color-blindness." Next, I analyze the range of white racial projects that the contemporary politics of racial dualism generates. My account of racial projects, as developed in earlier work, focuses on the relationship between representation and structure. Therefore in this investigation I look for distinct views on the meaning of whiteness. How do these interpretations link to political positions, policies, and programs? I discuss a series of racial projects that span the political continuum, and develop some critical perspectives on the "left" or "progressive" projects. In the final section, I focus on the future of whiteness in the US, and sketch out some elements of what a potential anti-racist politics for whites might look like. Whiteness as Racial Dualism Once, US society was a nearly monolithic racial hierarchy, in which everyone knew "his" place. Today, nobody knows where he or she fits in the US racial order. Thirty years after the enactment of civil rights legislation, agreement about the continuing existence of racial subordination has vanished. The meaning of race has been deeply problematized. Why? Because the legacy of centuries of white supremacy lives on in the present, despite the partial victories of the 1960s. Because the idea of "equality," it turned out, could be reinterpreted, rearticulated, reinserted in the business-as-usual framework of US politics and culture. Because that framework is extremely resilient and able to absorb political challenges, even fundamental and radic

al ones. Because the outlawing of formal discrimination, which was a crucial and immediate objective of the 1960s movements, did not mean that informal racist practices would be eradicated, or indeed even that anti-discrimination laws would be seriously enforced. And yet it would be inaccurate to say that the movement failed. In virtually every area of social life, the impact of the postwar racial mobilizations is plain to see (Jaynes and Williams 1989). Although in some sectors, like housing desegregation, massive efforts to transform an entrenched and complex pattern of racial discrimination were largely (though not entirely) defeated (Massey and Denton 1993), in other areas -- for example the desegregation of the armed forces (Moskos 1988, Butler 1980) -- really remarkable change occurred. More relevant to this article, white racial attitudes shifted drmatically in the postwar period. As the definitive work on the subject put it: [S]egregation of and discrimination against black people were supported as principles by a majority of white Americans in the early 1940s, and no doubt in the preceding decades. By the early 1970s, however, support for overt discrimination in employment had nearly vanished..., and in most other public spheres of life -- public accommodations, public transportation, and even public schools -- the proportion of the white population insisting on segregation in principle was both small and shrinking (Schuman et al 1985, 193; emphasis original). "In principle." In practice, however, research demonstrates a continuing [W]hite reluctance to accept the implementation of policies intended to change race relations; reluctance on the part of whites to enter social settings (e.g., schools) in which blacks are the majority; continuing discriminatory behavior by whites, especially in areas involving close personal contact; conflicting beliefs of whites with regard to the values of equality and individualism...(Jaynes and Williams, eds. 1989, 116). So, monolithic white supremacy is over, yet in a more concealed way, white power and privilege live on. The overt politics of racial subordination has been destroyed, yet it is still very possible to "play the racial card" in the political arena. Racially-defined minorities are no longer subject to legal segregation, but they have not been relieved of the burdens of discrimination, even by laws supposedly intended to do so. Whites are no longer the official "ruling race," yet they still enjoy many of the privileges descended from the time when they were. In this situation the old recipes for racial equality, which involved creation of a "color-blind" society, have been transformed into formulas for the maintenance of racial inequality. The old programs for eliminating white racial privilege are now suspected of creating nonwhite racial privilege. The welfare state, once seen as the instrument for overcoming poverty and social injustice, is now accused of fomenting these very ills. Therefore, not only blacks (and other racially-identified minorities), but also whites, now experience a division in their racial identities. On the one hand, whites inherit the legacy of white supremacy, from which they continue to benefit. But on the other hand, they are **subject to the moral and political challenges** posed to that inheritance by the partial but real successes of the black movement (and affiliated movements). These movements advanced a countertradition to white supremacy, one which envisioned a radicalized, inclusive, participatory democracy, a substantively egalitarian economy, and a nonracial state. They deeply affected whites as well as blacks, exposing and denouncing often unconscious beliefs in white supremacy, and demanding new and more respectful forms of behavior in relation to nonwhites. Just as the movements partially reformed white supremacist institutions, so they partially transformed white racial consciousness. Obviously, they did not destroy the deep structures of white privilege, but they did make counterclaims on behalf of the racially excluded and subordinated. As a result, white identities have been displaced and refigured: they are now contradictory, as well as confused and anxiety ridden, to an unprecedented extent. It is this situation which can be described as white racial dualism.[1]