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#### ---Government policy planning is critical to combat global warming --- The affirmative’s individual focus precludes the collective mobilization necessary to avert catastrophe.

Klein 2011

Naomi, award-winning journalist, syndicated columnist, fellow at The Nation Institute and author of the international and New York Times bestseller The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism, Capitalism vs. the Climate, The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/article/164497/capitalism-vs-climate?page=full

It is true that responding to the climate threat requires strong government action at all levels. But real climate solutions are ones that steer these interventions to systematically disperse and devolve power and control to the community level, whether through community-controlled renewable energy, local organic agriculture or transit systems genuinely accountable to their users. Here is where the Heartlanders have good reason to be afraid: arriving at these new systems is going to require shredding the free-market ideology that has dominated the global economy for more than three decades. What follows is a quick-and-dirty look at what a serious climate agenda would mean in the following six arenas: public infrastructure, economic planning, corporate regulation, international trade, consumption and taxation. For hard-right ideologues like those gathered at the Heartland conference, the results are nothing short of intellectually cataclysmic. 1. Reviving and Reinventing the Public Sphere   After years of recycling, carbon offsetting and light bulb changing, it is obvious that individual action will never be an adequate response to the climate crisis. Climate change is a collective problem, and it demands collective action. One of the key areas in which this collective action must take place is big-ticket investments designed to reduce our emissions on a mass scale. That means subways, streetcars and light-rail systems that are not only everywhere but affordable to everyone; energy-efficient affordable housing along those transit lines; smart electrical grids carrying renewable energy; and a massive research effort to ensure that we are using the best methods possible. The private sector is ill suited to providing most of these services because they require large up-front investments and, if they are to be genuinely accessible to all, some very well may not be profitable. They are, however, decidedly in the public interest, which is why they should come from the public sector. Traditionally, battles to protect the public sphere are cast as conflicts between irresponsible leftists who want to spend without limit and practical realists who understand that we are living beyond our economic means. But the gravity of the climate crisis cries out for a radically new conception of realism, as well as a very different understanding of limits. Government budget deficits are not nearly as dangerous as the deficits we have created in vital and complex natural systems. Changing our culture to respect those limits will require all of our collective muscle—to get ourselves off fossil fuels and to shore up communal infrastructure for the coming storms.

#### ---Identity politics as a prerequisite to the search for policy alternatives to fossil fuel production makes effective response to global warming impossible.

Monbiot 2008

George, English Writer and Environmental and Political Activist, 9-4, “Identity Politics in Climate Change Hell,” http://www.celsias.com/article/identity-politics-climate-change-hell/

If you want a glimpse of how the movement against climate change could crumble faster than a summer snowflake, read Ewa Jasiewicz’s article , published on the Guardian’s Comment is Free site. It is a fine example of the **identity politics** that plagued direct action movements during the 1990s, and from which the new generation of activists has so far been mercifully free. Ewa rightly celebrates the leaderless, autonomous model of organising that has made this movement so effective. The two climate camps I have attended – this year and last – were among the most inspiring events I’ve ever witnessed. I am awed by the people who organised them, who managed to create, under extraordinary pressure, safe, functioning, delightful spaces in which we could debate the issues and plan the actions which thrust Heathrow and Kingsnorth into the public eye. Climate camp is a tribute to the anarchist politics that Jasiewicz supports. But in seeking to extrapolate from this experience to a wider social plan, she makes two grave errors. The first is to confuse ends and means. She **claims to want to stop global warming, but** she **makes that task 100 times harder by rejecting all state and corporate solutions**. It seems to me that what she really wants to do is to create an anarchist utopia, and use climate change as an excuse to engineer it. **Stopping runaway climate change must take precedence over every other aim**. Everyone in this movement knows that **there is very little time: the window of opportunity in which we can prevent two degrees of warming is closing fast**. **We have to use all** the **resources** we can lay hands on, **and these must include both governments and corporations**. Or perhaps she intends to build the installations required to turn the energy economy around - wind farms, wave machines, solar thermal plants in the Sahara, new grid connections and public transport systems - herself? Her article is a terryifying example of the ability some people have to put politics first and facts second when confronting the greatest challenge humanity now faces. The facts are as follows. **Runaway climate change is bearing down on us fast. We require a massive political and economic response to prevent it. Governments and corporations, whether we like it or not, currently control both money and power. Unless we manage to mobilise them, we stand a snowball’s chance in climate hell of stopping the collapse of the biosphere**. Jasiewicz would ignore all these inconvenient truths because they conflict with her politics. “Changing our sources of energy without changing our sources of economic and political power”, she asserts, “will not make a difference. Neither coal nor nuclear are the “solution”, we need a revolution.” So **before we are allowed to begin cutting greenhouse gas emissions, we must first overthrow all political structures and replace them with autonomous communities of happy campers. All this must take place within a couple of months, as there is so little time in which we could prevent two degrees of warming. This is magical thinking of the most desperate kind**. **If I were an executive of** E.On or **Exxon, I would be delighted by this political posturing, as it provides a marvellous distraction from our real aims**. To support her argument, Jasiewicz misrepresents what I said at climate camp. She claims that I “confessed not knowing where to turn next to solve the issues of how to generate the changes necessary to shift our sources of energy, production and consumption”. I confessed nothing of the kind. In my book Heat I spell out what is required to bring about a 90% cut in emissions by 2030. Instead I confessed that I don’t know how to solve the problem of capitalism without resorting to totalitarianism. The issue is that capitalism involves lending money at interest. If you lend at 5%, then one of two things must happen. Either the money supply must increase by 5% or the velocity of circulation must increase by 5%. In either case, if this growth is not met by a concomitant increase in the supply of goods and services, it becomes inflationary and the system collapses. But a perpetual increase in the supply of goods and services will eventually destroy the biosphere. So how do we stall this process? Even when usurers were put to death and condemned to perpetual damnation, the practice couldn’t be stamped out. Only the communist states managed it, through the extreme use of the state control Ewa professes to hate. I don’t yet have an answer to this conundrum. Does she? **Yes, let us fight both corporate power and the undemocratic tendencies of the state**. Yes, let us try to crack the problem of capitalism and then fight for a different system. **But let us not confuse this task with the immediate need to stop two degrees of warming, or allow it to interfere with** the **carbon cuts** that have to begin now. Ewa’s second grave error is to imagine that society could be turned into a giant climate camp. Anarchism is a great means of organising a self-elected community of like-minded people. It is a disastrous means of organising a planet. Most anarchists envisage their system as the everyone is to be free from the coercive power of the state, this must apply to the oppressors as well as the oppressed. The richest and most powerful communities on earth - be they geographical communities or communities of interest - will be as unrestrained by external forces as the poorest and weakest. As a friend of mine put it, “when the means by which the oppressed can free themselves from persecution. But **if anarchist utopia arrives, the first thing that will happen is that every Daily Mail reader in the country will pick up a gun and go and kill the nearest hippy.” This is why, though both sides furiously deny it, the outcome of both market fundamentalism and anarchism, if applied universally, is identical**. The anarchists associate with the oppressed, the market fundamentalists with the oppressors. But by eliminating the state, both remove such restraints as prevent the strong from crushing the weak. **Ours is not a choice between government and no government. It is a choice between government and the mafia**. Over the past year I have been working with groups of climate protesters who have changed my view of what could be achieved. Most of them are under 30, and they bring to this issue a clear-headedness and pragmatism that I have never encountered in direct action movements before. They are prepared to take extraordinary risks to try to defend the biosphere from the corporations, governments and social trends which threaten to make it uninhabitable. They do so for one reason only: that they love the world and fear for its future. It would be a tragedy if, through the efforts of people like Ewa, they were to be diverted from this urgent task into the identity politics that have wrecked so many movements.

#### Global warming compounds structural racism --- Only reframing the need for immediate action against global warming as a social justice issue can prevent extinction.

Wise 2010

Tim, anti-racist writers and activist, With Friends Like These, Who Needs Glenn Beck? Racism and White Privilege on the Liberal-Left, http://redroom.com/member/tim-wise/blog/with-friends-like-these-who-needs-glenn-beck-racism-and-white-privilege-on-the-

How many climate change activists, for instance, really **connect the dots between global warming and racism**? Even as **people of color are twice as likely as whites to live in the congested communities that experience the most smog and toxic concentration** thanks to fossil fuel use? Even as **heat waves connected to climate change kill people of color at twice the rate of their white counterparts**? Even as **agricultural disruptions due to warming** - caused disproportionately by the white west - **cost African nations $600 billion annually**? Even as the contribution to fossil fuel emissions by people of color is 20 percent below that of whites, on average? Sadly, these facts are typically subordinated within climate activism to simple "the world is ending" rhetoric, or predictions (accurate though they may be) that unless emissions are brought under control global warming will eventually kill millions. **Fact is, warming is killing a lot of people now, and most of them are black and brown**. **To build a global movement to roll back the ecological catastrophe facing us, environmentalists and clean energy advocates must connect the dots between planetary destruction and the real lives being destroyed currently**, which are disproportionately of color. **To do anything less is not only to engage in a form of racist marginalizing of people of color and their concerns, but is to weaken the fight for survival**.

#### ---Global warming is anthropogenic, the impact is systemic and risks extinction.

Deibel 2007

Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serious the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

#### ---This debate is key --- The debate space is a critical avenue for to reframe climate change as an issue requiring collective policy response.

Nisbet 2009

Matthew, assistant professor at American University’s School of Communication, a research fellow at AU’s Center for Social Media, and an affiliated researcher at the Center for Climate Change Communication at George Mason University, Communicating Climate Change: Why Frames Matter for Public Engagement, Environment, http://www.environmentmagazine.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/March-April%202009/Nisbet-full.html

U.S. presidents, especially newly elected ones, are often given discretion to pursue their preferred legislative priorities. Yet research shows that presidential popularity is not enough to pass policy initiatives. The efforts of recent administrations to pass health care, welfare, or immigration reforms have depended on generating widespread public support and mobilization while effectively countering the communication efforts of opponents of these reforms.1 When these conditions are not met, as in health care and immigration reforms, presidents have suffered major policy defeats. There is no reason to suspect that climate change policy will be any different, especially given the long history of partisan gridlock in U.S. politics. In the context of two wars and an economic crisis, absent a shift in the polls and a surge in input from a diversity of constituents, it is unlikely over the next four years that a strong majority in Congress will accept the political risks needed to pass meaningful policy actions such as a cap-and-trade bill, carbon tax, or new international climate treaty. More importantly, democratic principles are at stake. Policies to address climate change will bear directly on the future of Americans, impacting their pocketbooks, lifestyles, and local communities. These decisions are therefore too significant to leave to just elected officials and experts; citizens need to be actively involved. Reframing the relevance of climate change in ways that connect to a broader coalition of Americans—and repeatedly communicating these new meanings through a variety of trusted media sources and opinion leaders—can generate the level of public engagement required for policy action. Successfully reframing climate change means remaining true to the underlying science of the issue, while applying research from communication and other fields to tailor messages to the existing attitudes, values, and perceptions of different audiences, making the complex policy debate understandable, relevant, and personally important.2 This approach to public outreach, however, will require a more careful understanding of U.S. citizens’ views of climate change as well as a reexamination of the assumptions that have traditionally informed climate change communication efforts.

### 1NC FW

#### \*\*Interpretation\*\* Debate is a space for mutually exclusive clash over the desirability of eliminating restrictions and increasing federal government incentives for energy production. The affirmative must defend a topical plan text superior to a competitive option or the status quo.

#### ---The resolution is the most predictable & educational place to locate the debate.

Zwarensteyn 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.

#### ---The phrase “The United States federal government should” requires the affirmative to defend material policy change.

Ericson 2003

Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### ---The resolution requires switch-sides debate and is the single best educational tool for developing critical decision-making skills and finding personal meaning in argumentation.

Zwarensteyn 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

As discussed previously, sources of political information matters to how politically pluralistic the general public is. Mutz (2007) and Mutz and Martin (2001) fear the public is selfselecting both the source of their news along with their peer groups preventing the airing and hearing of multiple sides of an argument. This study suggests debate has two supportive roles to help resolve these fears. First, to debate outsiders, the resolution may appear obscure, boring, or isolated from their daily lives. For debaters, however, they must embrace the resolution and soon come to realize a rich complexity of argumentative potential permitting students (or teams and squads) to choose areas of the topic that are intellectually intriguing, competitively beneficial, and/or personally rewarding. The resolution then requires switch-side debating – enabling a depth of argument unrivaled by other high school experiences. Benefits to switchside debates have been offered by Galloway (2007), Harrigan (2008), and Mitchell (2010). Speaking to the intellectual flexibility required of policy debaters, this study concurs how switch side debating enables a range and intensity of argument and how switch-side debating indirectly encourages students to find personal meaning in argumentation. Many debaters interviewed compared their experiences to other high school opportunities and identified a depth of argument in debate unparalleled by civics, government, student councils, other simulation activities, or various service learning opportunities. The competitive necessity to anticipate and research all sides of an argument prior to being in a competitive round encourages a thorough examination of relevant political literature. In a debate rounds, debaters must listen to all of another’s argument, answer the argument at its best intention, consider strategic compromise on argumentation, anticipate the competitive direction of the argument, and directly compare arguments against each other. This practice demands a practice of open political inquiry. As a result of the demand for open inquiry, students are challenged “…to rethink unsubstantiated claims or arguing for positions they personally do not hold, playing devil’s advocate to make sure the full range of positions are well represented or to challenge a too-simple formation that has not grappled with possible objections” (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold, 2007, p. 74). Second, debaters must present multiple sides of an issue. This practice enables hearing legitimacy in opposing argumentation as debaters do not have the luxury to entirely self selecting arguments for presentation or for defense. Thus, debate releases an umbrella of intellectual ideas. Once the ideas are released, debaters can develop personal advocacies and identities through argument. Even after establishing argumentative preferences, students recognized their success was tied to an intellectual flexibility to respond to numerous arguments. This study confirms the work of Galloway (2007) by establishing debate as a dialogical imperative whereby planning, listening, and responding may help establish empathy through seeing the humanity and credibility in one another’s arguments.

#### \*\*Violation\*\* The affirmative does not defend an increase in federal energy production. This is a reason to vote negative.

#### ---Specific, limited resolutions ensure mutual ground which is key to sustainable argumentative clash without sacrificing the potential for creativity or openness.

Steinberg & Freeley 2008

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

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

#### ---The preservation of clash comes before the evaluation of the affirmative --- The impossibility of objective knowledge means the political clash informs the basis for representations, discourse, epistemology and ontology; not the other way around.

Swyngedouw 2009

Erik, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, The Antinomies of the Postpolitical City: In Search of a Democratic Politics of Environmental Production, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Volume 33, Issue 3, pages 601–620

Political struggles are central in shaping alternative or different trajectories of socio-metabolic change and the construction of new and emancipatory urban environmental geographies. All manner of critical social-theoretical analyses have been mobilized to account for these processes. Marxist and post-Marxist perspectives, environmental justice arguments, deconstructionist and poststructural musings, science/technology studies, complexity theory, postcolonial, feminist and Latourian views, among others, have attempted to produce what I would ultimately be tempted to call a ‘sociological’ analysis of urban political-ecological transformations. What they share, despite their different — and often radically opposed — ontological and epistemological claims, is the view that critical social theory will offer an entry into strategies, mechanisms, technologies of resistance, transformation and emancipatory political tactics. In other words, the implicit assumption of this sociological edifice is that ‘the political’ is instituted by the social, that political configurations, arrangements and tactics arise out of the social condition or process or, in other words, that the social colonizes ‘the political’ (Arendt, 1968). The properly political moment is assumed to flow from this ‘sociological’ understanding or analysis of the process. Or in other words, the ‘political’ emerges, both theoretically and practically, from the social process, a process that only knowledge has access to. Put differently, most urban political ecological perspectives assume the political to arise from analysis, but neither theorizes nor operationalizes the properly political within a political ecological analysis. This opens a theoretical and practical gap as the properly political is evacuated from the theoretical considerations that have shaped (urban) political ecology thus far. This ‘retreat of the political’ (Lefort, 1988; Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, 1997) requires urgent attention. This retreat of the properly political as a theoretical and practical object stands in strange contrast to the insistence of urban political ecology that urban socio-environmental conditions and processes are profoundly political ones and that, consequently, the production of different socio-environmental urban trajectories is a decidedly political process. Considering the properly political is indeed all the more urgent as environmental politics increasingly express a postpolitical consensual naturalization of the political. As argued by Swyngedouw (2007a), Žižek (2002 [1992]) and Debruyne (2007), among others, the present consensual vision that the environmental condition presents a clear and present danger that requires urgent techno-managerial re-alignments and a change in the practices of governance and of regulation, also annuls the properly political moment and contributes to what these and other authors have defined as the emergence and consolidation of a postpolitical condition. These will be the key themes I shall develop in this contribution. First, I shall explore what might be meant by the ‘properly’ political. In conversation with, and taking my cue from, political philosophers and theorists like Slavoj Žižek, Jacques Rancière, Alain Badiou, Etienne Balibar, Claude Lefort, David Crouch, Mustafa Dikeç, Chantalle Mouffe and Peter Hallward, I attempt to theorize and re-centre the political as a key moment in political-ecological processes. What these perspectives share is not only the refusal to accept the social as the foundation of the political, but, more profoundly, the view that the absence of a foundation for the social (or, in other words, the ‘social’ being constitutively split, inherently incoherent, ruptured by all manner of tensions and conflicts) calls into being ‘the political’ as the instituting moment of the social (see, e.g., Marchart, 2007; Stavrakakis, 2007). Put differently, it is through the political that ‘society’ comes into being, achieves a certain coherence and ‘sustainability’. Prioritizing ‘the political’ as the foundational gesture that permits ‘the social’ maintains ‘absolutely the separation of science and politics, of analytic description and political prescription’ (Badiou, quoted in Hallward, 2003a: 394). This is not to say, of course, that politics and science are not enmeshed (on the contrary, they are and increasingly so), but rather that unravelling the science/politics imbroglios (as pursued by, among others, critical sociologies of science, science and technology studies, science-discourse analysis and the like) does not in itself permit opening up either the notion or the terrain of the political. The aim of this article, in contrast, is to recover the notion of the political and of the political polis from the debris of contemporary obsessions with governing, management, urban polic(y)ing and its associated technologies (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, 1997).

#### ---Unbridled affirmation makes research impossible and destroys dialogue.

Hanghoj 2008

Thorkild, researcher for the Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, 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).

#### ---Procedural energy policy research is a prerequisite to the affirmative --- Reformist research is critical to inform broader challenges to fossil fuel production.

Lohmann 2012

Larry, FINANCIALIZATION, COMMODIFICATIONAND CARBON:THE CONTRADICTIONS OFNEOLIBERAL CLIMATE POLICY, SOCIALIST REGISTER, http://thecornerhouse.org.uk/sites/thecornerhouse.org.uk/files/Socialist%20Register%20Neoliberal%20Climate%20Policy%20Contradictions.pdf

Scapegoating ideology, however, is as double-edged as its cynical variety, or as the climate commodification process itself. Depending on political circumstances, calls for ‘better regulation’ or ‘crackdowns on corruption’ can intersect fruitfully with the more strategic, long-term campaigns for decommodification of the earth’s carbon-cycling capacity being undertaken by grassroots movements and groups such as Via Campesina, the California Movement for Environmental Justice, and movements in Ecuador, Canada and Nigeria opposing fossil fuel extraction.37 Useful information on patterns of subsidies provided to fossil fuel polluters by the EU ETS, or on the perverse incentives associated with HFC-23 projects, often come from groups clinging to the fetish of reform, and important analyses of the contradictions of the climate commodity from Wall Street consultants who would be horrified at the extent to which their contributions are aiding the understanding of radical movements against the trade. Thus while frank discussion of the consequences of the continuing unfolding of the contradiction between exchange-value and use-value in carbon markets is more politically productive when undertaken with affected publics than with fetish-constrained state officials and technocrats, or in the pages of the financial press, political spaces for breaking the trance that carbon markets have imposed on climate policy can be, and are being, opened at many levels.

#### ---Abdication of government political strategies makes political change impossible.

Stevenson 2009

Ruth, PhD, senior lecturer and independent consultant – Graduate School of the Environment @ Centre for Alternative Technology, “Discourse, power, and energy conflicts: understanding Welsh renewable energy planning policy,” *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, Volume 27, pg. 512-526

It could be argued that this result arose from the lack of expertise of the convenors of the TAN 8 in consensual decision making. Indeed, there is now more research and advice on popular participation in policy issues at a community level (eg Kaner et al, 1996; Ostrom, 1995; Paddison, 1999). However, for policy making the state remains the vehicle through which policy goals must be achieved (Rydin, 2003) and it is through the state that global issues such as climate change and sustainable development must be legislated for, and to some extent enacted. It is therefore through this structure that any consensual decision making must be tested. This research indicates that the policy process cannot actually overcome contradictions and conflict. Instead, encompassing them may well be a more fruitful way forward than attempts at consensus. Foucault reinforces the notion that the `field of power' can prove to be positive both for individuals and for the state by allowing both to act (Darier, 1996; Foucault, 1979). Rydin (2003) suggests that actors can be involved in policy making but through `deliberative' policy making rather than aiming for consensus: ``the key to success here is not consensus but building a position based on divergent positions'' (page 69). Deliberative policy making for Rydin involves: particular dialogic mechanisms such as speakers being explicit about their values, understandings, and activities: the need to move back and forth between memories (historical) and aspirations (future); moving between general and the particular; and the adoption of role taking (sometimes someone else's role). There is much to be trialed and tested in these deliberative models, however, a strong state is still required as part of the equation if we are to work in the interests of global equity, at least until the messages about climate change and sustainable development are strong enough to filter through to the local level. It is at the policy level that the usefulness of these various new techniques of deliberative policy making must be tested, and at the heart of this must be an understanding of the power rationalities at work in the process.

#### ---Decision-making skills and engagement with the state energy apparatus prevents energy technocracy and actualizes radical politics.

Hager 1992

Carol J., professor of political science – Bryn Mawr College, “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-70

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list. These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics. Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48 Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishment of a temporary parliamentary commission to study energy policy, which for the first time would draw all concerned participants together in a discussion of both short-term choices and long-term goals of energy policy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49 These commissions gave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernization and technical innovation in energy policy. Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurization devices. With prodding from the energy commission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements. They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection. III. Conclusion The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general. One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at *Systemkritik*.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic. Parliamentary Politics In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry. Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program. This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda. Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators. The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria. Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic. In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56 In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

#### ---The impact outweighs --- deliberative debate models impart skills vital to respond to existential threats.

Lundberg 2010

Christian O. Professor of Communications @ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p. 311

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

#### ---Working within technocratic structure to reform the production process is the only way to hold corporate energy interests accountable for their crimes and democratize American energy policy.

Rahman 2011

K. Sabeel, A.B., Harvard College, 2005; M.Sc., Economics for Development, Oxford University, 2006; M.St., Sociolegal Studies, Oxford University, 2007; J.D. Candidate, Harvard Law School, Class of 2012; Ph.D. Candidate, Government, Harvard University, ENVISIONING THE REGULATORY STATE: TECHNOCRACY, DEMOCRACY, AND INSTITUTIONAL EXPERIMENTATION IN THE 2010 FINANCIAL REFORM AND OIL SPILL STATUTES, http://www.harvardjol.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Rahman\_Note.pdf

These weaknesses of the technocratic model create a fundamental challenge for the modern regulatory state. One response to this challenge might be to abandon the project of regulatory public policy altogether. This is the familiar response from laissez-faire ideologies and anti-government conservatism. Yet the social goals that regulation aims to advance remain vital, even if the technocratic model itself proves problematic. As a society, we still need some form of accountability for the actions of powerful private entities like oil and financial corporations. We also require systems to protect against broad social risks like financial crisis and ecological disaster. In short, we require a form of collective self-rule against crises and social evils. Rather than rejecting the goal of mitigating these challenges, the weaknesses of technocratic regulation drive us towards the need to develop an alternative democratic paradigm of regulation. Indeed, these weaknesses of the technocratic impulse—disparities in interest representation, obfuscation of normative debates, demobilization of engagement—share three key features that suggest the need for and viability of a more democratic framework for regulatory politics. First, each of these weaknesses can be overcome through a more democratic regulatory structure. Second, this turn to democracy need not involve a rejection of expertise; rather, some form of democratic politics can coexist with a role for technical expertise. Third, each of these weaknesses arises out of an effort to rationalize regulatory policy. This rationalization effort aims to protect policymaking from the influence of politics, subsuming questions of values and interests into a more coherent process of regulatory policymaking. This good governance ideal is attractive, but the effort to sterilize policy of politics threatens deeper ideals of democracy, responsiveness, and legitimacy. Further, as critics of the modern regulatory state have noted, the involvement of politics is inescapable; regulatory agencies should be structured not to avoid politics but rather to engage with the reality of political disagreement openly. Instead of focusing on the narrow question of agency discretion and constraint with an eye towards promoting rationality of policymaking, the central question should be bringing the foci of political debate to the forefront and engaging in those debates in a democratic manner. Rather than attempting to sterilize policy of politics, this approach looks for ways to constitute a dynamic political process, one that leaves ample room for the representation and engagement of different values.

#### ---This empirically translates into real world policy change.

Mitchell 2010

Gordon R., Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, Switch-Side Debating Meets Demand-Driven Rhetoric of Science, Rhetoric & Public Affairs, http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/Mitchell2010.pdf

Such findings are consistent with the views of policy analysts advocating the argumentative turn in policy planning. As Majone claims, “Dialectical confrontation between generalists and experts often succeeds in bringing out unstated assumptions, conflicting interpretations of the facts, and the risks posed by new projects.” 54 Frank Fischer goes even further in this context, explicitly appropriating rhetorical scholar Charles Willard’s concept of argumentative “epistemics” to flesh out his vision for policy studies: Uncovering the epistemic dynamics of public controversies would allow for a more enlightened understanding of what is at stake in a particular dispute, making possible a sophisticated evaluation of the various viewpoints and merits of different policy options. In so doing, the differing, often tacitly held contextual perspectives and values could be juxtaposed; the viewpoints and demands of experts, special interest groups, and the wider public could be directly compared; and the dynamics among the participants could be scrutizined. this would by no means sideline or even exclude scientiic assessment; it would only situate it within the framework of a more comprehensive evaluation. 55 As Davis notes, institutional constraints present within the EPA communicative milieu can complicate efforts to provide a full airing of all relevant arguments pertaining to a given regulatory issue. Thus, intercollegiate debaters can play key roles in retrieving and amplifying positions that might otherwise remain sedimented in the policy process. The dynamics entailed in this symbiotic relationship are underscored by deliberative planner John Forester, who observes, “If planners and public administrators are to make democratic political debate and argument possible, they will need strategically located allies to avoid being fully thwarted by the characteristic self-protecting behaviors of the planning organizations and bureaucracies within which they work.” 56 Here, an institution’s need for “strategically located allies” to support deliberative practice constitutes the demand for rhetorically informed expertise, setting up what can be considered a demand-driven rhetoric of science. As an instance of rhetoric of science scholarship, this type of “switch-side public debate” 57 differs both from insular contest tournament debating, where the main focus is on the pedagogical beneit for student participants, and irst-generation rhetoric of science scholarship, where critics concentrated on unmasking the rhetoricity of scientiic artifacts circulating in what many perceived to be purely technical spheres of knowledge production. 58 As a form of demand-driven rhetoric of science, switch-side debating connects directly with the communication ield’s performative tradition of argumentative engagement in public controversy—a dif erent route of theoretical grounding than rhetorical criticism’s tendency to locate its foundations in the English ield’s tradition of literary criticism and textual analysis.

#### ---Resolution based policy debate foster critical thinking skills that empirically undermine the basis for American Exceptionalism.

Zwarensteyn 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

The background of many conversations relating to secondary education concerns the appropriateness of teaching politics. As referenced in chapter two, Daily (2006) and White (2009) stress the importance of early political identity formation. While the American polity recognizes the necessity of a political education both in the home and in the schools, the education received may not be as authentic as perceived. One immense benefit to the policy debate experience may relate to the time and space given to political identity formation (for those without an identity), re-formation (for those with a dissonant identity), or solidification of an existing identity (for those with a consistent identity). Switch-side debating combined with the personal distance from argument, provides a relatively safe space for playing with argumentation. Policy debate participation may uniquely answer White’s (2009) concern regarding the indoctrination of unquestioned patriotism, religiosity, and militarism in American schools. Participation in policy debate forces an intelligent academic defense, unraveling, or navigation through these concerns. Many debaters unlearn their ‘America can do no wrong’ perspective and develop an ability to understand and qualify American policy decisions both at home and abroad. This practice is inherently and genuinely political. As Colby (2008) concurs, political leaning does not compromise one’s political ideology but rather aids in intellectual integrity and clear critical thinking (p. 6). Revisiting Galloway (2007) emphasis on dialogue, debate helps students realize positions outside their own have meaning. This practice opens students up to new intellectual and academic perspectives and values. Overall, this study finds debate may help aid the development of an authentic political identity. “Evaluating competing arguments in this way causes students to think harder about things they have previously taken for granted” (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold, 2007, p. 115).

The rejection of the state in favor of community based decision-making is a disaster for minorities. The federal government is obviously not perfect, but centralized protections against the micro-aggressions of whites is a vitally important in any effort to combat racism.

Delgado-prof law UC Davis-87

22 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 301 (1987)

Ethereal Scholar: Does Critical Legal Studies Have What Minorities Want, The;

http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/hcrcl22&div=20&g\_sent=1&collection=journals

The CLS critique of legal rules and reasoning is well known. Rules, since they are indeterminate and manipulable, can generate practically any result in a given situation.' 4 Rules invite the savvy to operate near their borders while the uninitiated remain well inside.15 Rights, a special kind of rule, receive particularly harsh criticism from Critical Legal Scholars (Crits).16 Rights legitimize society's unfair power arrangements, acting like pressure valves to allow only so much injustice.17 With much fanfare, the powerful periodically distribute rights as proof that the system is fair and just, and then quietly deny rights through narrow construction, nonenforcement, or delay.'8 Rights, Crits argue, are never promulgated in genuinely important areas such as economic justice. '9 They protect only ephemeral things, like the right to speak or worship. 20 When even these rights become threatening, they are limited.2' For CLS, rights reinforce a soulless, alienating vision of society made up of atomized individuals whose only concern is to protect their own security and property.22 Crits argue that rights are alienating since they force one to look at oneself and others as isolated rights-bearers ("I got my rights") rather than as interdependent members of a community, and make it impossible for us even to imagine what a nonhierarchical society founded on cooperation and love would be like. The CLS critique of rights and rules is the most problematic aspect of the CLS program, and provides few answers for minority scholars and lawyers. 23 We know, from frequent and sad experience, that the mere announcement of a legal right means little. We live in the gap between law on the books and law in action. We have no difficulty imagining a better world; for us, eliminating racism would be a good start. Even if rights and rights-talk paralyze us and induce a false sense of security, as CLS scholars maintain, might they not have a comparable effect on public officials, such as the police? Rights do, at times, give pause to those who would otherwise oppress us; without the law's sanction, these individuals would be more likely to express racist sentiments on the job.24 It is condescending and misguided to assume that the enervating effect of rights talk is experienced by the victims and not the perpetrators of racial mistreatment. Second, CLS scholars are often hazy about what would provide minorities comparable protection if rights no longer existed.25 The CLS positive program, or Utopia, discussed below, 26, is both far from adequate and far off in time. Third, Crits argue that rights separate and alienate the individual from the rest of the human community.27 This may be so for the hard-working Crits who spend much of their lives in their studies and law offices. 28 For minorities, however, rights serve as a rallying point and bring us closer together.29 On the other hand, any distance rights place between us and others may be beneficial; there is at least safety in distance. 30 One explanation for the CLS position on rights may be that the average Crit, a white male teaching at a major law school, has little use for rights.31 Those with whom he comes in contact in his daily life-landlords, employers, public authorities-generally treat him with respect and deference. Rarely is he the victim of coercion, revilement, or contempt. 32 In the mind of the average Crit, rights offer relatively little security, while they promote a shrunken, atrophied, and unsatisfying social existence. 33 Rights transform those governed by them into lone, deformed stick figures vulnerable to pressures emanating from large corporations or faceless bureaucracies. 34 Yet, when Crits are treated insensitively or unfairly, or are coerced into giving up something of value-such as an academic appointment in a tenure battle tinged by anti-Crit bias-they have been as quick as anyone to resort to the language of rights. 35 Their behavior in such situations exemplifies the universal tendency of beleaguered persons and groups to revert to rights-talk. For minorities, however, that rights minimize many forms of coercion is of enormous importance. At the same time, the psychic rewards that Crits believe will result from a rightless interracial "community" are far from our experience. Even if such rewards were achievable, they would necessarily rank lower than simple security on our scale of need. Of course, a utopian community of the sort Crits advocate might provide minorities with both security and psychic satisfaction. As will be shown later, however, that hope is probably ,vain.3 6 In short, the two groups see rights differently. White CLS members see rights as oppressive, alienating and mystifying. For minorities, they are invigorating cloaks of safety that unite us in a common bond. Instead of coming to grips with the different function of rights for the two groups, Crits insist that minorities adopt their viewpoint, labeling disagreement on our part false consciousness 37 or a lack of political sophistication. 2. The CLS Critique of Piecemeal Reform Critical scholars reject the idea of piecemeal reform. Incremental change, they argue, merely postpones the wholesale reformation that must occur to create a decent society.38 Even worse, an unfair social system survives by using piecemeal reform to disguise and legitimize oppression. 39 Those who control the system weaken resistance by pointing to the occasional concession to, or periodic court victory of, a black plaintiff or worker as evidence that the system is fair and just.40 In fact, Crits believe that teaching the common law or using the case method in law school is a disguised means of preaching incrementalism and thereby maintaining the current power structure. 41 To avoid this, CLS scholars urge law professors to abandon the case method, give up the effort to find rationality and order in the case law, and teach in an unabashedly political fashion. 42 The CLS critique of piecemeal reform is familiar, imperialistic and wrong. Minorities know from bitter experience that occasional court victories do not mean the Promised Land is at hand. 43 The critique is imperialistic in that it tells minorities and other oppressed peoples how they should interpret events affecting them.44 A court order directing a housing authority to disburse funds for heating in subsidized housing may postpone the revolution, or it may not. In the meantime, the order keeps a number of poor families warm. This may mean more to them than it does to a comfortable academic working in a warm office. It smacks of paternalism to assert that the possibility of revolution later outweighs the certainty of heat now, unless there is evidence for that possibility. The Crits do not offer such evidence. Indeed, some incremental changes may bring revolutionary changes closer, not push them further away. Not all small reforms induce complacency; some may whet the appetite for further combat. The welfare family may hold a tenants' union meeting in their heated living room. CLS scholars' critique of piecemeal reform often misses these possibilities, and neglects the question of whether total change, when it comes, will be what we want. 3. CLS' Idealism The CLS program is also idealistic. 45 CLS scholars' idealism transforms social reality into a mental construct. 46 Facts become intelligible only through the categories of thought that we bring to experience. Crits argue that the principal impediments to achieving an ideal society are intellectual. People are imprisoned by a destructive system of mental categories that blocks any vision of a better world. 47 Liberal-capitalist ideology so shackles individuals that they willingly accept a truncated existence and believe it to be the best available. Changing the world requires primarily that we begin to think about it differently. 48 To help break the mental chains and clear the way for the creation of a new and better world, Crits practice "trashing"a process by which law and social structures are shown to be contingent, inconsistent and irrationally supportive of the status quo without good reason.4 9 CLS scholars' idealism has a familiar ring to minority ears. We cannot help but be reminded of those fundamentalist preachers who have assured us that our lot will only improve once we "see the light" and are "saved." Are our chains really mental? They may be so for members of privileged groups. They are much less so for minorities. Imagine that the Crits' trashing program succeeded and that all laws were repealed. Would our lot improve? That proposition is open to serious doubt. The forces that hold us back are not largely mental, legal, nor even political. What holds us back is, simply, racism-the myriad of insults, threats, indifference, and other "microaggressions" to which we are continually exposed. 0 Because the Crits are intellectuals, they assign a large role to reason and ideology. Yet reason and ideology do not explain all evil. Telling an individual that he or she harbors racism will not make it go away; telling a black person that a rebuff was racially motivated will not ease its sting. Racism will not go away simply because Crits show that legalisms are indeterminate, that rights are alienating and legitimizing, and that law is a reflection of the interests of the ruling class. Whatever utility these concepts may have in other settings and in attempting to explain the angst of CLS members, 5' they have limited application in helping to understand, much less cure, racism. 4. The CLS Concept of False Consciousness The concept of false consciousness is the final aspect of Crit scholarship that minorities find problematic. 2 Workers and minorities buy into a system that degrades and oppresses them, and vehemently defend that system with a kind of "false honor. ' 53 These groups accept their own subordination because they believe that the constitutional system protects their property against takings by the state, and that it elevates their status above that of the lowest class.54 Thus, oppressed people not only accept the liberal ideology and the mental shackles described in the preceding section, but also embrace it loyally and reject the proffered assistance of revolutionaries. Some CLS writers even argue that the Framers intended false consciousness to exist. While extolling the virtues of freedom, the Framers set out to achieve ideological hegemony for themselves and their class by providing for separate classes and by protecting the property and prerogatives of employers and slave owners. 55 False consciousness rationalizes the lowly status of workers, women, minorities and other oppressed groups.56 According to capitalist-liberal ideology, society consists of individuals who express political preferences through voting and achieve economic results through the marketplace. 7 The system is formally fair; therefore, if one is poor, reviled, hungry, or out of work, it is one's own fault.58 At the same time, the person who occupies a position of power deserves it. In a meritocratic society, the cream rises to the top. The duty of everyone else is to obey. Ideologically achieved domination becomes a self-generating spiral. The masses are persuaded that they are of little merit. Demoralized, they take little interest in elections or in the way political and economic life is run.59 Thus, false consciousness blinds them to the alienation, lack of justice, conflict and unfairness inherent in political life. Civil rights law is subject to particularly scathing criticism. Crits argue that the purpose of civil rights is to reconcile minorities to subordination by convincing us that the system is fair; our lowly status is simply the result of our inferiority. 60 The legal system protects society's investment in the subordination of minorities by assuring everyone that the status quo is inevitable. 61 It accomplishes this by doling out the occasional victory, such as Brown v. Board of Education,62 and by ensuring that most civil rights are formal, rather than substantive. 63 As with the other elements of the negative program, one should begin by asking whether the concept of false consciousness holds true for minorities. Much of what Crits criticize as false consciousness evinces their distrust of liberal legalisms and the elusive promises of court victories. Most of us have already acquired this distrust; society has provided us with more than adequate tutelage. 64 We know from Derrick Bel65 and from personal experience not to place too much reliance on liberal attorneys who say they know exactly what we want. We know, indeed we live, the bogus public-private distinction. 6 Moreover, it is worth questioning the extent to which our current subordination is caused by uncritical absorption of self defeating ideologies, as opposed to other forces. Much more of our current plight is due to other factors: coercion by the dominant group; exclusion from clubs, networks, information, and needed help at crucial times; microaggressions; and the paralysis and hopelessness caused by the majority culture's denial of our pain and reality. (Who among us has not been asked by a white person, naively or almost incredulously, "Do you really, in this day and age, suffer on account of your race?" 67) Ultimately, the CLS false-consciousness analysis raises more questions than it answers. If false consciousness exists and is so powerful, why are only minorities and workers afflicted by it, and not white radicals? Is there not something patronizing in diagnosing an intellectual disease that exclusively afflicts persons of color?6 Is not "false consciousness" an expression, like "incompetent" or "insane," that gives others the authority to treat the victim as if he lacks humanity, autonomy, or will? 69 Is not false consciousness an excuse for white radicals to assert and retain power they would otherwise have to explain and justify? Does not the CLS program create its own false consciousness within the law schools which employ CLS radicals, and ultimately within society at large? Unless coupled with practical action to storm trenches and organize workers, something CLS members have been remarkably slow to do, 70 the CLS reform program allows society to validate myths about free speech and the right to dissent. 71 B. The CLS Positive Program Critical Legal Studies, to date, has devoted much less effort to developing a positive program than to criticizing rules and social structures. 72 In general, the Crits' positive aim is to establish a Utopia in which true community would prevail. 73 Decisionmaking would be decentralized; rules would be set by small groups such as factory workers, farm workers, and students, 74 and would remain subject to constant renegotiation. 75 Hierarchy would not exist; everyone would be equal.76 There would be no need for rights-at least not so many as we recognize today. Instead, everyone would share work, goods and responsibilities. 77 Individuals would benefit from the de-emphasis on individualism in Utopia. In contemporary society, the individual lacks depth and character because of his isolation and lack of commitment to others.7 He may be free in a formal sense, but he is also stunted and barely human. In a non-hierarchical, nonrepressive society, on the other hand, the human personality would flourish. 79 The Crits' positive program would poorly serve the needs of minorities. Some radical theoreticians may indeed be lonely. Most minority lawyers and law professors are not: we have each other. We meet, share experiences, recount horror stories, laugh and cry together. Victimization brings us together, building in us a community. It is much more problematic to accept the invitation, if it is that, to join Crits and other whites in mixed race communities lacking in structure or rules. Two immediate difficulties confront any serious discussion of incorporating minorities into the utopian communities envisioned by the Crits. First, one must be a self who is fully recognized as a member of a community of selves before one can merge into such a community, and certainly before the lines between self and others can safely begin to blur. How can this happen unless society first recognizes us as coequal members, something it has yet to do?80 Second, there are no guarantees that racism would not resurface in the CLS communities. To date, Crits have not articulated a psychological or political theory of the origin of racism or of how it could be eradicated. If racism were to surface in a CLS-style Utopia, there would be no rules, rights, federal statutes, or even courts to counteract it. Even if there were tribunals or people's commissions of some kind, would they be guided by strict scrutiny1 in examining cases of prejudice? Probably not, since the once-oppressed and politically powerless groups would presumably have been empowered by the egalitarian Utopia. Perhaps these difficulties could be overcome. In the meantime, however, the costs of moving to a utopian society would be borne by minorities, since the dismantling of formal structures would initially lead to an increase in racist behavior s2 Ostensibly, the CLS choice of structure for the post-revolutionary community is neutral and based on those arrangements with the greatest potential for humanity. However, that choice 'is not value-free. Utopian society would empower whites, giving them satisfaction currently denied,83 and disempower minorities, making life even less secure than it is today. As a black leader is supposed to have said, "Community don't look like me." II. Informality-The Source of the Trouble Much of the misfit between the CLS program and the aspirations of minorities is due to the informality of the CLS program.84 CLS themes and approaches criticize formal struc-tures such as rights, rules and bureaucracies, while opting for consciously informal processes that rely on good will, intersubjective understanding and community. The CLS positive and negative programs exemplify this informality; they illustrate the Crits' preference for holistic approaches that sweep everything at once into their scope.85 Whatever sense informal, small-scale politics may make for the CLS membership, it is bad news for minorities. Discretionary judgments colored by racism or other forms of prejudice are made possible by replacing rules, guidelines and rights with fluid, informal decisionmaking. In fact, structureless processes affirmatively increase the likelihood of prejudice. CLS theorists have avoided confronting these risks, since CLS lacks a political and psychological theory of racism. CLS theory simply assumes that racism is just another form of class-based oppression, a product of a hierarchal social structure.8 6 The Crits' focus on informality also ignores the influence that rules have on an individual's character and action. A society that enacts rules and provides structures to curb racism announces that racism is unacceptable behavior. By committing ourselves to norms of fairness we become fairer people. By changing the structure, we change the setting in which we act and ultimately change ourselves. If we jettison rules and structures, we risk losing the gains we have made in combatting racism. The psychological-political analysis that follows explains and illustrates the interaction among rules, conduct and character. I outline the principal social scientific theories of racism and then develop a consensus position which explains the circumstances in which most people are likely to behave in a discriminatory fashion. I apply this view to the highly informal Crit program to demonstrate that the CLS program exposes minorities to an increased risk of prejudicial treatment. A. Theories of Race and Racism Most Americans harbor some degree of racial prejudice. 7 Indeed, individuals rarely come to grips with their racist impulses and bring them completely under control.88 Most deal with them through a variety of mechanisms: displacement, denial, rationalization, overcompensation and compromise.8 9 Social scientists have developed a number of overlapping theories to explain the origin of prejudice based on race, ethnicity, sex, or other immutable characteristics." The principal approaches are: psychoanalytic theories, which explain prejudice in terms of unconscious forces and deep-seated syndromes, such as the authoritarian personality;9' socioeconomic theories, which explain prejudice through historical trends, social group clashes and scapegoating; 92 and social-psychological theories, which explain racism by means of social conditioning and ingroup/ out-group categories. 93 It is likely that each of these theories partly explains the multifaceted aspects of racist behavior. On the other hand, racism runs counter to the body of public principles that form our national ethos, including fairness, egalitarianism and humanitarianism. 94 The conflict between racist impulses and the American creed causes many people to act inconsistently-fairly and humanely on one occasion, thoughtlessly or with prejudice on another.95 Racism and racial egalitarianism are thus maintained in equipoise. Americans are influenced by both public and private norms with respect to race. 96 The highly principled public norm exhorts us to treat others in an unprejudiced, evenhanded fashion. 97 The private norms, the standards that guide us during moments of intimacy or familiarity, are much less noble. 98 In private settings, prejudicial behavior and speech are much more likely to appear. The same individual may thus act quite differently on different occasions, depending on whether he sees himself as governed by public or private values. The "situational specificity" 99 of the racist impulse supplies the best means for its control. Most people suppress their prejudices when environmental features remind them that racism will not be tolerated and that the American creed demands a high standard of conduct. Although there are other theories and approaches to racism, 100 the "confrontation" approach-where prejudice is publicly confronted and discouraged through formal structures-is the most widely accepted means of controlling prejudice in the legal and political literature. 1 1 The theory is supported by empirical studies of legal decisionmaking, including reviews of alternative dispute resolution and comparisons between the adversarial and inquisitorial modes of presenting evidence. 102 Little of this will surprise minority readers. We know by a kind of instinct that there are times when our white friends can be trusted and times when they cannot. We know that there are occasions-when the flag is flying, the bands are playing, and public values are foremost in everyone's minds-when we are comparatively safe, and that there are other occasions when we must be careful. The bottom line is that formal public settings are relatively safe for minorities, while informal private settings present risks. To minimize racism, one should structure settings so that public norms are enforced, and prejudice openly confronted and discouraged. Society should avoid creating intimate, unguided settings where highly charged interracial encounters can take place. It remains to be considered what the confrontation theory, and the formality/informality axis generated by that theory, implies for the CLS program. B. Applying the Theory of Race to the CLS Program The confrontation theory helps to explain why the openended features of the CLS program worry minority scholars. For example, the CLS positive program, which calls for small communities that function without written agendas, statutes, rules or rights, 13 would allow for discretionary judgments based on racial prejudice, and contain few of the structural features that confront and check racism. The lack of confrontation mech-anisms would likely ensure the invasion of racism into the community. CLS scholars' rejection of incrementalism also illustrates the dangers of informality. By insisting that everything must change at once, CLS rejects the slow, painstaking process of establishing and refining precedent, replacing that relatively formal process with a mercurial vision of social change with no clear direction and undefined ends. Similar considerations hold true, although not quite so strongly, for CLS scholars' idealism and their use of the concept of false consciousness. The Crits' emphasis on mental constructs reveals their preference for free-form change over the concrete reform accomplished by litigation, labor activism and community organizing. CLS prefers the broad reach of thought to the measured progression that occurs through new jobs, better housing, court victories and school desegregation. C. The Laboratory of Daily Life: Applying the Theory of Race to the CLS Organization and Its Mode of Operation Theories, according to pragmatic philosophy, must be tested by their consequences, and by the ways in which they modify the behavior of their adherents.'04 Thus, one should examine the organizational and personal behavior of the members of the Critical Legal Studies Conference on matters of race in order to determine the possible impact of their theories on minorities, particularly since many members of the Conference believe in the inseparability of politics and daily life. 105 If the Conference's reform program holds promise for minorities, one should find a heightened racial sensitivity among the organization and its members. An examination of the Conference on racial matters does not yield a clear-cut answer to the question. The organization, as is predictable from its theories and program, is highly informal. There are no bylaws, elections, procedures, officers, membership cards or committees. 106 Annual meetings and summer workshops are organized by ad hoc groups who decide that they have something to say. The informality of the structure allows the "white male heavies," most of whom are at Harvard, to wield a disproportionate amount of power. 107 Few women or minorities wield significant influence. 0 8 The record of individual members of the Conference is better than that of the organization itself. At least three of its well-known members wrote powerful and influential articles supporting minority causes. 09 Many Crits welcome minority colleagues on their faculties, and support affirmative action in law school admissions and appointments." 0 Yet few Crits took an active role in the aftermath of an incident in which the competence of a leading black scholar was challenged by students and colleagues."' In addition, there have been sporadic reports of racist language and stereotyping in Crits' scholarship, 1 2 and of rude treatment of minority panelists by Crits." 3 One would conclude that the Conference's record on racial justice matters is good, but not outstanding-perhaps 3.4 on a 4.0 point scale. If racism manifests itself among CLS members, it is frightening to imagine what would occur in a similarly unstructured group with a less progressively-minded membership. III. Beyond CLS-Toward a Radical Minority Social-Legal Agenda It is axiomatic that any social reform program that minorities would find appealing would be based on the express need for understanding and coping with racism. It is not enough to subsume racism under some other category, such as class struggle, that fails to understand racism's subtlety and complexity. The program should incorporate some variant of the confrontation approach to containing racism. 1 4 The new society, and its transitional predecessor, would create structures for detecting and punishing racism and for reminding community members that such conduct will not be tolerated. Because of these structures, such a society would be relatively formal. Any society consciously designed to promote minority wellbeing must initially include a strong central authority founded on a healthy skepticism both of human nature and of the possibilities of change through appeals to idealism. Tempering romanticism with watchfulness, it would instead effect change through appeals to citizens' self-interest by arguing that power and resource realignments benefit everyone. The need for centralized authority stems from the necessity for counter-coercive measures on behalf of minorities. One cannot rely on local authority to redistribute power and physical resources because it is too close to the community and unlikely to upset the status quo. The further authority is from the community, the better. Our principal worry is not the abuse of corporate or bureaucratic power (CLS' foe), but rather the simple next-door, one-on-one microaggressions by whites." 6 It is a sad truth that, even today, many minorities find success and relative relief from racism only in highly structured, rule-bound environments such as the Army." 7 Group membership may force Crits and other majority-group members to reflect on politics and the nature of the common good, but unless such reflection is accompanied by formal barriers against racism, it is meaningless.

### 2NC

### Clash/Racism (!) --- 2nc Education

#### ---Collapse of political clash is the basis for modern racism --- Creates isolated political groups organized by their disconnection with those who disagree cementing discriminatory structures.

Zizek 2000

Slavoj, The Political and its Disavowals, The Ticklish Subject, http://anselmocarranco.tripod.com/id46.html

When this dimension of the impossible is effectively precluded, the political (the space of litigation in which the excluded can protest the wrong/injustice done to them) foreclosed from the symbolic returns in the Real, in the guise of new forms of racism: this ‘postmodern racism’ emerges as the ultimate consequence of the post-political suspension of the political, the reduction of the State to a mere police-agent servicing the (consensually established) needs of market forces and multiculturalist tolerant humanitarianism: the ‘foreigner’ whose status is never properly ‘regulated’ is the indivisible remainder of the transformation of the democratic political struggle into the post-political procedure of negotiation and multiculturalist policing. Instead of the political subject ‘working class’ demanding its universal rights, we get, on the one hand, the multiplicity of particular social strata or groups, each with its problems (the dwindling need for manual workers, etc.) and, on the other, the immigrant, ever more prevented from politicizing his predicament of exclusion [9].

#### ---Only an evaluation of policy consequences challenges structural racism --- It’s impossible to address legal inequality without an in-depth interrogation of policy structure.

Bracey 2006

Christopher A., Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 13-18

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328#n281) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### **---Debating renewable energy policy is exposes racial discrimination in government fossil fuel production contracting and is key to economic justice.**

Hoerner & Robinson 2009

J., Nia, Just Climate Policy —Just Racial Policy, excerpted from a comprehensive report enitled “A Climate of Change” published by the EJCC Initiative, http://urbanhabitat.org/files/Hoerner-Robinson.Climate.16-2-8.pdf

Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to ﬁve times as many people as comparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. Switching just one percent of total electricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renew able sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by three to four percent. Combat Racism for Health and Efficiency Racism, both institutionalized and individual, is a driver of sprawl, ineﬃcient housing, and irrational transportation policy. The senseless and wasteful energy, transportation, and housing policies that drive up energy use and greenhouse gas emissions also damage the physical, environmental and economic health of the African American community. Because racism causes bad climate policy, the two problems cannot be solved separately. Historically and currently, struggles of relatively powerless people to be free from environmental burdens have been catalysts for essential breakthroughs in environmental policy that beneﬁt everyone. Climate Justice: The Time is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances be forged and traditional movements be transformed. Global warming ampliﬁes nearly all existing inequalities and injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus, it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the ﬁght to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice.

#### ---They can’t solve our offense --- Only policy focus creates material change.

Hinson et al 2011

Workbook developed by Sandra Hinson, Richard Healey and Nathaniel Weisenberg at the Grassroots Policy Project. DeAngelo Bester, National People’s Action and Charlene Sinclair, Union Theological Seminary, also contributed to this workbook, Race, Power and Policy: Dismantling Structural Racism, http://www.strategicpractice.org/system/files/race\_power\_policy\_workbook.pdf

It is important for racial justice organizations to be proactive in developing policies that begin to dismantle the system of structural racism. Organizations cannot passively assume that legislators will introduce polices that have positive racial impacts (even when they want to do something positive). Advancing a racial justice policy agenda should be a central component of racial justice organizing efforts. As a key aspect of strategy development that we will explore in a follow-up session, groups can develop tools for assessing current opportunities for advancing elements of a racial justice agenda. To get us started, let’s talk about some criteria that organizations can use when developing policies that will have a positive racial impact.

### A2 State is Racist --- 2nc Framework

#### ---Their categorical rejection of state structure as racist is a self-fulfilling prophecy that ignores numerous other empirically successful sovereign organizational strategies that don’t require the extermination of minorities.

Dean 2006

Jodi, Is the state racist by nature?, http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i\_cite/2006/03/is\_the\_state\_ra.html#more

I don't think so. Overall, I think Old reads the state as such as fascist--rooted in an racial identity that seeks to establish its (impossible) unity through the violent annihilation of difference. This isn't convincing to me because there are, in fact, multicultural states and constitutions that seek promote or preserve different ethnicities. And, I don't read all claims made in terms of the inhabitants of a state (of its citizenry or people) as necessarily racialized or racializing, though they can be. Yet, I have a number of more specific problems with Old's view. First, I don't think there is such a beast as the modern state. As I understand it, there have been different kinds of states. The fact that there are different states recognized within the UN, say, or part of the international arena, does not mean that the states are states in the same way; it does not mean that, the efforts of hegemons to the contrary, all states are based in nations; nor does it mean that all nations are totalities or even wanna-be totalities. This suggests, then, that there is not one form or nature of the state that even could be considered racist. Second, and consequently, it seems important here to consider differences among state forms and histories. China, for example, didn't take its structure from religious-race wars. Anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggle impacted the state forms that arose in their wake. Third, the ability to wage total war and annihilate other races doesn't seem to me to characterize the structure or goals of most states. If so, then we would find the vast majority to be failure as states. Now, maybe they are failures, but surely for other reasons. Contemporary international relations theorists Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes (in their chapter to the book Empire's New Clothes) can help this discussion. Rejecting the all too limited Westphalian model of states, they point out that the sovereignty narrative is state-centric: Many social processes--such as the internationalization of capital or modernity--and relations--such as those of gender, class, race, or colonialism--transcend state boundaries in complex and significant ways. Indeed, reflection on the past three hundred or so years--since Westphalia--indicates that the dominant political form has in any case been the imperial state and empire rather than the sovereign state. Laffey and Weldes also take up the Eurocentricism of Westphalian sovereignty, rejecting the idea that the territorial state arose in Europe and was imposed on the rest of the world. Why? Because this model neglects the persistent and integral relations between Europe and the non-European world and their joint role in generating the characteristic social forms of modernity, including the state itself. As Fernando Coronil observes, for example: "Since the European conquest of the Americans, the West and its peripheries have been mutually constituted through processes of imperial transculturation and capital accumulation that continue, in different forms, in the present." They also observe the limitation of a state centered approach to analyzing state violence (a point relevant to Old's claim regarding total war) European states have used foreign military and security manpower. Recruiting local soldiers and police forces from within colonized territories was integral to imperial relations between Europe and non-Europe throughout the period marked by the so-called Westphalian sovereign state, as the British empire in India attests...the sovereignty narrative obscures the international constitution of state power, a routine practice in the history of imperial relations.

#### ---Racist fantasies are an inevitable function of enjoyment --- Even if the state is racist, it’s the only institution that can mediate the violent fantasies of civil society that are worse.

Myers 2003

Tony, former lecturer at the University of Stirling. He is the author of Upgrade Your English Essay (Arnold, 2002) and numerous articles on postmodernism, psychoanalysis and politicsSlavoj Zizek, pg 107-108

Of course, as fantasies cannot ultimately coexist peacefully, particularly when they are ethnic fantasies, this ethic can only ever be an intermediate solution. For the present, Zizek has a more practical solution to the problem of racism, one which draws on his own experience in Slovenia. Surprisingly for a revolutionary, Zizek argues that we should support the state in opposition to civil society. By 'state' Zizek here means to refer to the institutions of government, whereas 'civil society' designates, in its wildest sense, the people of a nation or non-governmental groups. While Zizek might aspire to a nation based purely on the consensual will of civil society, he contends that, in the light of the currently existing racist fantasies of much of civil society, this is just not possible. If he finds this in Slovenia, where he argues that civil society is basically right-wing, Zizek also sees it, for example, in the United States: In America, after the Oklahoma bombing, they suddenly discovered that there are hundreds of thousands of jerks. Civil society is not this nice, social movement, but a network of moral majority conservatives and nationalist pressure groups, against abortion, for religious education in schools. A real pressure from below. (Lovink 1995) For Zizek is the state that should act as a buffer between the fantasies of different groups, mitigating the worst effects of thoses fantasies. If civil society were allowed to rule unrestrained, much of the world would succumb to racist violence. It is only the forces of the state which keep it in check. In the long term, Zizek argues that in order to avoid a clash of fantasies we have to learn to "traverse the fantasy" (what lacan terms "traversing the fantôme). It means that we have to acknowledge that fantasy merely functions to screen the abyss or inconsistency in the Other. In "traversing" or "going through" the fantasy "all we have to do is experience how there is nothing 'behind' it, and how fantasy masks precisely this 'nothing'". (The Sublime Object of Ideology) The subject of racism, be it a Jew, a Muslim, a Latino, an African-American, gay or lesbian, Chinese, is a fantasy figure, someone who embodies the void of the Other.

### ssd

---SSD allows us to TEST ideas and experiment with arguments---the static fixedness under their interpretation cannot result in the same educational benefits

Koehle 2010

Joe, Phd candidate in communications at Kansas, former West Georgia debater, http://mccfblog.org/actr/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Koehle\_Paper\_ACTR-editedPDF.pdf.

Much like criticism of the sophists has persisted throughout time; **criticism of switch side debate has been a constant feature** since the advent of tournament-style debating. Harrigan documents how numerous these criticisms have been in the last century, explaining that Page 15 Koehle 15 complaints about the mode of debate are as old as the activity itself (9). **The most famous controversy** over modern switch side debate occurred in 1954, **when the U.S. military academies** and the Nebraska teachers‟ colleges **decided to boycott the resolution**: “Resolved: That the United States should extend diplomatic relations to the communist government of China.” The schools that boycotted the topic argued that it was ethically and educationally indefensible to defend a recognition of communists, and even went so far as to argue that “a pro-recognition stand by men wearing the country‟s uniforms would lead to misunderstanding on the part of our friends and to distortion by our enemies” (English et al. 221). Switch side debate was on the defensive, and debate coaches of the time were engaged in virulent debate over the how to debate. The controversy made the national news when the journalist Edward Murrow became involved and opined on the issue in front of millions of TV viewers. English et al. even go so far as to credit **the “debate about debate” with helping accelerate the implosion of the famous red- baiting Senator Joseph McCarthy** (222). The debate about debate fell back out of the national spotlight after the high-profile incident over the China resolution, but it never ended in the debate community itself. The tenor of **the debate reached a fever pitch when outright accusations of modern sophistry** (the bad kind) **were published** in the Spring 1983 edition of the National Forensic Journal, **when** **Bernard K. Duffy** wrote, “The Ethics of Argumentation in Intercollegiate Debate: A Conservative Appraisal.” Echoing the old Platonic argument against sophistic practice, **Duffy argued that switch side debate has ignored ethical considerations** in the pursuit of teaching cheap techniques for victory (66). The 1990‟s saw a divergence of criticisms into two different camps. The first camp was comprised of traditional critics who argued that debate instruction and practice promoted form over substance. For example, a coach from Boston College lamented that absent a change, “Debate instructors and their students will become the sophists of our age, susceptible to the traditional indictments elucidated by Isocrates and others” (Herbeck). Dale Bertelstein published a response to the previously cited article by Muir about switch side debate that launched into an extended discussion of debate and sophistry. This article continued the practice of coaches and communications scholars developing and applying the Platonic critique of the sophists to contemporary debate practices. Alongside this traditional criticism **a newer set of critiques of switch side debate emerged.** Armed with the language of Foucauldian criticism, Critical Legal Studies, and critiques of normativity and statism, many people who were uncomfortable with the debate tradition of arguing in favor of government action began to question the reason why one should ever be obliged to advocate government action. They began **to argue that switch side debate was a mode of debate that unnecessarily constrained people to the hegemony of debating the given topic.** These newer criticisms of switch side debate gained even more traction after the year 2000, with several skilled teams using these arguments to avoid having to debate one side of the topic. William Spanos, a professor of English at SUNY Binghamton decided to link the ethos of switch side debate to that of neo-conservatism after observing a debate tournament, saying that “the arrogant neocons who now saturate the government of the Bush…learned their „disinterested‟ argumentative skills in the high school and college debate societies and that, accordingly, they have become masters at disarming the just causes of the oppressed.” (Spanos 467) **Contemporary policy debate is now under attack from all sides**, caught in its own dissoi logoi. Given the variety of assaults upon switch side debate by both sides of the political spectrum, **how can switch side debate be justified**? Supporters of switch side debate have made many arguments justifying the value of the practice that are not related to any defense of sophist Page 17 Koehle 17 techniques. I will only briefly describe them so as to not muddle the issue, but they are worthy of at least a cursory mention. The first defense is the most pragmatic reason of all: **Mandating people debate both sides of a topic is most fair to participants** **because it helps mitigate the potential for a topic that is biased towards one side**. More theoretical justifications are given, however. Supporters of switch side debate have argued that **encouraging students to play the devil‟s advocate creates a sense of self-reflexivity that is crucial to promoting tolerance and preventing dogmatism** (Muir 287). Others have attempted to justify switch side debate in educational terms and advocacy terms, explaining that it is a path to diversifying a student‟s knowledge by encouraging them to seek out paths they may have avoided otherwise, which in turn creates better public advocates (Dybvig and Iversen). In fact, **contemporary policy debate and its reliance upon switching sides creates an oasis of argumentation free from the demands of advocacy, allowing students to test out ideas and become more well-rounded advocates** as they leave the classroom and enter the polis (Coverstone). Finally, **debate empowers individuals to become critical thinkers capable of making sound decisions** (Mitchell, “Pedagogical Possibilities”, 41).

#### ---Switch side debate empirically improves policymaking --- EPA water policy.

Mitchell 2010

Gordon R., Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, Switch-Side Debating Meets Demand-Driven Rhetoric of Science, Rhetoric & Public Affairs, http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/Mitchell2010.pdf

Yet the picture grows more complex when one considers what is happening over at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), where environmental scientist Ibrahim Goodwin is collaborating with John W. Davis on a project that uses switch-side debating to clean up air and water. In April 2008, that initiative brought top intercollegiate debaters from four universities to Washington, D.C., for a series of debates on the topic of water quality, held for an audience of EPA subject matter experts working on interstate river pollution and bottled water issues. An April 2009 follow-up event in Huntington Beach, California, featured another debate weighing the relative merits of monitoring versus remediation as beach pollution strategies. “We use nationally ranked intercollegiate debate programs to research and present the arguments, both pro and con, devoid of special interest in the outcome,” explains Davis. “In doing so, agency representatives now remain squarely within the decision-making role thereby neutralizing overzealous advocacy that can inhibit learned discourse.”

#### ---Doesn’t turn us into Karl Rove---being able to see BOTH sides of an issue allows us to find the flaws and inconsistencies with racist, exeptionalist arguments, we can wade through bad arguments when we are forced to make them, that’s Zwarsteyn.

#### ---Rejecting switch side debate makes exclusion covert without improving the quality of debates.

Day 1966

Dennis, Assistant professor and director of forensics @ U. of Wisconsin, Madison, *central states speech journal,* “The Ethics of Democratic Debate” v17 p8

The ethic suggested here is similar to another ethical position which is widely accepted. Most readily acknowledge an ethical responsibility to oppose overt attempts to silence debate or suppress the expression of minority and unpopular views, even when such attempts are made in the name of personal conviction. Most fail, however, to recognize the more subtle and dangerous form of suppression which takes place in the name of personal conviction: an individual’s failure to give effective expression to an argument which is not otherwise being effectively expressed, because the argument is in opposition to his personal conviction on a problem. The act of suppression is no less harmful to the decision-making process because it is covert instead of overt. The social effects are the same: decision based on incomplete debate. The covert suppression of argument and information is as ethically culpable as is overt suppression. And personal conviction is no justification for either. Covert suppression is the greater threat to democratic processes because it is clandestine and is more difficult to overcome because of the ego involvement that usually accompanies personal conviction.

#### ---we don’t link to this offense because we affirm the resolution sometimes, since we negate when we are negative we see both sides of the issue, the only team that doesn’t operate within this paradigm is the aff

### 1NR

### 2nc Impact Overview --- 2nc Nuclear Power DA

#### ---Warming turns and outweighs case.

#### A. Warming will cause it extinction-That’s Diebel. Questions of justice are impossible in a world of runaway climate change.

#### B. Extinction comes first --- Destruction of the physical environment eliminates the other itself and precludes the affirmatives education or analysis.

Wapner 2003

Paul, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University. “Leftist Criticism of "Nature" Environmental Protection in a Postmodern Age,” Dissent Winter http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist.

#### C. Global warming compounds structural racism --- Only reframing the need for immediate action against global warming as a social justice issue can prevent extinction--- **Wise 2010** from the 1nc

#### D. Err Negative --- Warming compounds every instance of structural inequality.

Hoerner & Robinson 2009

J., Nia, Just Climate Policy —Just Racial Policy, excerpted from a comprehensive report enitled “A Climate of Change” published by the EJCC Initiative, http://urbanhabitat.org/files/Hoerner-Robinson.Climate.16-2-8.pdf

Climate Justice: The Time is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances be forged and traditional movements be transformed. Global warming ampliﬁes nearly all existing inequalities and injustices **that are already unsustainable become catastrophic**. Thus, it is essential to recognize **that all justice is climate justice** and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the ﬁght to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice.

#### Turns their identity arguments --- It’s a question of strategic emphasis and adaptation to the audience that creates the conditions for survival that enable identity creation in the first place.

Brayton 2012

Ed, blogger behind Dispatches from the Culture Wars on the Freethought Blogs Network, and the host of Culture Wars, Why Framing Matters, Climate Change Edition, http://freethoughtblogs.com/dispatches/2012/06/07/why-framing-matters-climate-change-edition/

None of this requires being dishonest. It just requires speaking to people in a language they are likely to be open to, making the case on grounds that appeal to them rather than trigger an emotional, kneejerk reaction. That’s how effective coalitions are formed and it’s how people change their minds. We can sit on opposite sides of a wall screaming at each other and calling the other side crazy, stupid and dangerous, and for a lot of people we’d be right to do so. But if we want to actually change the minds of some of them, there’s a better strategy.

### Link

#### ---The affirmative is empirically ineffective at mobilizing change --- The only two countries to take substantive energy reform did so because of security and economic justifications not ideological equality.

Nordhaus & Shellenberger 2011

Ted, Michael, The Long Death of Environmentalism, http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/2011/02/the\_long\_death\_of\_environmenta.shtml

Third, the most successful actions will not be justified for environmental reasons. The only two countries to significantly decarbonize their energy supplies -- France and Sweden -- did so for energy security reasons in response to oil price shocks, not for environmental reasons. Many conservatives who are skeptical of claims made by climate campaigners believe it's a bad idea to send half a trillion or so a year abroad for foreign imported oil, which brings with it a whole host of threats to national and energy security. Others simply see three million current air pollution deaths a year as a far higher priority. We should put shared solutions at the center of our politics, not our view of the science.

#### we have several links:

#### Trade off- focusing on individual rather than the top down policy planning makes combatting climate change impossible. Only government reform can regulate big business from runaway emissions. – that’s Klein

#### Identity- shaping discussions of warming through identity makes any solution impossible- Climate change is based on long term patterns on a macro scale- not individual experience. identity politics makes conclusion of Warmings existence impossible, and solutions based on local, not -Monboit

#### ---Fails & makes action on warming harder --- Individual perspectives on global environmental threats are incoherent & a bad basis for policy.

Wilson 2008

Harlan, Department of Politics at Oberlin College, Is Environmental Authority Possible?, for presentation at the Western Political Science Association meetings, http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/2/3/7/8/4/pages237844/p237844-1.php

When Young, with Christian Hunold, wrote about the environmental injustice of hazardous siting cases, which certainly are visible and measurable in local and particular terms [Young and Hunold, 1998], they did acknowledge the need to balance scientific discourse with situated knowledge and narratives so as to recognize both types of discourse. They argue that science must not trump expressions of different voices in a democracy; narratives of injustice and exclusion matter as much as the ecological and geological dimensions. [Young and Hunold 1998: 14, 21-25] But the case of climate change is more difficult. The effects are not visible and because events cannot easily be related to patterns. Moreover, Young’s approach to “science vs situated knowledge” is too binary. The science of climate change needs personal advocates, those who “experience the science” and can try to communicate their experiences to those who cannot possibly replicate them in their lives. Indisputably, global warming is in part an environmental justice issue. Its causes and consequences are both effects of power inequalities, and any solutions to global warming involve serious justice issues. But what would it mean to represent global climate change itself as taking place solely on the level of particular experiences and social location? Lay individuals, including people in groups, experience weather events, not patterns. Global climate change, however, is not mainly about experiences of discrete weather events. It is about long-term climate patterns not always directly measurable through temperature changes and certainly not predictive or even explanatory of particular events. Glaciology and habitat changes constitute perhaps the best sources of evidence, better than climatological evidence often skewed by historically selective observations and uncertain measurements. Katrina, however terrible and unjust a phenomenon, does not “prove” the existence of global warming any more than the abnormally snowy winter (in some places) of 2008 disproves it. In the face of public opinion, fueled by the climate skeptics, that pounces on any cold snap or snowstorm as a reason for skepticism, we should be wary of epistemic approaches that privilege direct, unmediated experience over wider and longer perspectives.

#### Conservative Language --- Warming Links

#### ---Leftist discourse must be abandoned in order to mobilize conservative activism against warming.

Schottland 2010

Taj, a member of the College of the Atlantic delegation to the Copenhagen Climate Negotiations, Climate Security: How to Frame a Winning Argument, http://itsgettinghotinhere.org/2010/02/20/climate-security-how-to-frame-a-winning-argument/

My overarching suggestion is to know your audience and then use language that appeals directly to them. Don’t use the language of a liberal when targeting a “family-values” conservative. Use their language: discuss values, respect, and family importance. When talking with a conservative war veteran, talk in terms of national security. But always remember, the words you would naturally choose to talk about climate change are words that would convince you. You don’t need convincing. A conservative will not be swayed by arguments that would sway you. Identify the values of your audience, and target those values relentlessly. We must stop using arguments designed by and for liberals and begin using language that fits within the framework of our target audience. Only then will we gain broader public support. Finally, we will not develop an overall messaging campaign overnight. It is not realistic. It will take time, but that is ok. Our messaging campaign will commence when we begin using more effective language. Our new phrases will slowly gain popular momentum. Conservatives will listen to us because our arguments will no longer be “liberal” arguments. We will be using language that fits within their framework. It is time that our voices are heard by the people who need to hear them.

#### “Challenging Assumptions” --- Warming Links

#### ---Challenging fundamental assumptions threatens group values and decreases the effectiveness of anti-warming mobilization.

Roberts 2012

David, staff writer for Grist, Once again, with feeling: More science will not cure climate skepticism, http://grist.org/climate-skeptics/once-again-with-feeling-more-science-will-not-cure-climate-skepticism/

How might that be done? Kahan gestures at an answer: As citizens understandably tend to conform their beliefs about societal risk to beliefs that predominate among their peers, communicators should endeavor to create a deliberative climate in which accepting the best available science does not threaten any group’s values. Effective strategies include use of culturally diverse communicators, whose affinity with different communities enhances their credibility, and information-framing techniques that invest policy solutions with resonances congenial to diverse groups. Perfecting such techniques through a new science of science communication is a public good of singular importance. [my emphasis] This can be crudely summed up as, “to change conservatives’ minds on climate, get other conservatives to talk to them in a language they understand.”

#### This Debate Key Ext --- Warming Links

#### ---Debating and advocating action against global warming shapes and impacts policy discussion even if we don’t have our hands on the levels of power.

Hoerner & Robinson 2008

J. Andrew, Nia, A Climate of Change: African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy for the U.S., Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative, http://www.wholecommunities.org/pdf/Climate%20of%20Change\_Final\_6-29-08.pdf

We are at a crucial moment in the ﬁght against climate change. There is a signiﬁcant likelihood of passing federal climate legislation within years, if not months. We must be a voice for just climate policies because, as this paper has shown, only just policies will be eﬀective. Climate change cannot be truly solved, either domestically or internationally, without policies that address racial and economic inequities. When faced with the challenge of changing history’s course and the planet’s temperature while opposed by some of the world’s largest corporations, many of us struggle with a sense of futility and hopelessness. We ask whether it makes sense to worry about such large aﬀairs, when, as individuals and as a community we often do not have the resources to waste on ﬁghts we seemingly cannot win. But there are reasons to believe that, with determined and united action, this particular ﬁght can be won: • The need is urgent. The scientiﬁc community is essentially unanimous in its assertion that prompt and eﬀective action is needed to avert catastrophe. • The people are with us. Polling results show a substantial majority of people in the U.S. believe global warming is real and that additional action should be taken to prevent it. • The problem is solvable. Policies and technologies to cut global warming with a net economic beneﬁt are known and established. • The time to act is now. Majorities in both houses of Congress and all three major presidential candidates have pledged to take strong action to reduce global warming. For the ﬁrst time, a solution to global warming appears to be on the horizon. Our energy must be concentrated on assuring that a just solution is adopted. In this ﬁght, every voice is needed, and every voice could be the deciding voice. Whether you are a high school student or a U.S. Senator, there are speciﬁc, concrete steps that you can take to put the U.S. on a path to achieving positive and signiﬁcant legislation for climate justice.

#### Policy Planning --- Warming Links

#### ---Planned federal government energy policy dialogue is key to address poverty and climate change.

Wirth 2003

Timothy E., President of the United Nations Foundation and a former U.S. Senator from Colorado. C. Boyden Gray is a partner at Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering and served as Counsel to former President George H.W. Bush. John D. Podesta is Visiting Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center and served as Chief of Staª to former President Bill Clinton, The Future of Energy policy, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 82 No. 4, http://www.cerium.ca/IMG/pdf/Jeudi\_apres\_midi\_-\_The\_future\_of\_Energy\_Policy.pdf

Energy is fundamental to U.S. domestic prosperity and national security. In fact, the complex ties between energy and U.S. national interests have drawn tighter over time. The advent of globalization, the growing gap between rich and poor, the war on terrorism, and the need to safeguard the earth’s environment are all intertwined with energy concerns. The profound changes of recent decades and the pressing challenges of the twenty-ﬁrst century warrant recognizing energy’s central role in America’s future and the need for much more ambitious and creative approaches. Yet the current debate about U.S. energy policy is mainly about tax breaks for expanded production, access to public lands, and nuances of electricity regulation—di⁄cult issues all, but inadequate for the larger challenges the United States faces. The staleness of the policy dialogue reﬂects a failure to recognize the importance of energy to the issues it aªects: defense and homeland security, the economy, and the environment. What is needed is a purposeful, strategic energy policy, not a grab bag drawn from interest-group wish lists. U.S. energy policies to date have failed to address three great challenges. The ﬁrst is the danger to political and economic security posed by the world’s dependence on oil. Next is the risk to the global environment from climate change, caused primarily by the combustion of fossil fuels. Finally, the lack of access by the world’s poor to modern energy services, agricultural opportunities, and other basics needed for economic advancement is a deep concern. None of these problems of dependence, climate change, or poverty can be solved overnight, but aggressive goals and practical short-term initiatives can jump-start the move to clean and secure energy practices. The key challenges can be overcome with a blend of carefully targeted policy interventions that build on the power of the market, public private partnerships in ﬁnancing and technology development, and, perhaps most important, the development of a political coalition that abandons traditional assumptions and brings together energy interests that have so far engaged only in conﬂict. Turning this ambitious, long-term agenda into reality requires a sober assessment of the United States’ critical energy challenges and the interests that can be mobilized for the necessary political change.