## \*\*\*1NC

### 1NC Framework

#### The USFG is three branches

Black’s Law ‘90 (Dictionary, p. 695)

“[Government] In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.”

#### That means the aff should 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.

#### Prefer, first---Deliberation, the resolution is the most predicable starting point for the debate, transparency in selection solves their offense

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.

#### ---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).

#### AND---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.

#### ---Their claim that personal experience determines the validity of argument is solipsism --- It stifles dialogue and is reductionist --- Our arguments are relevant and bracketing them out destroys efforts for change.

Bridges 2001

David, Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia, The Ethics of Outsider Research, Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 35, No. 3

First, it is argued that only those who have shared in, and have been part of, a particular experience can understand or can properly understand (and perhaps `properly' is particularly heavily loaded here) what it is like. You need to be a woman to understand what it is like to live as a woman; to be disabled to understand what it is like to live as a disabled person etc. Thus Charlton writes of `the innate inability of able-bodied people, regardless of fancy credentials and awards, to understand the disability experience' (Charlton, 1998, p. 128). Charlton's choice of language here is indicative of the rhetorical character which these arguments tend to assume. This arises perhaps from the strength of feeling from which they issue, but it warns of a need for caution in their treatment and acceptance. Even if able-bodied people have this `inability' it is difficult to see in what sense it is `innate'. Are all credentials `fancy' or might some (e.g. those reflecting a sustained, humble and patient attempt to grapple with the issues) be pertinent to that ability? And does Charlton really wish to maintain that there is a single experience which is the experience of disability, whatever solidarity disabled people might feel for each other? The understanding that any of us have of our own conditions or experience is unique and special, though recent work on personal narratives also shows that it is itself multi-layered and inconstant, i.e. that we have and can provide many different understandings even of our own lives (see, for example, Tierney, 1993). Nevertheless, our own understanding has a special status: it provides among other things a data source for others' interpretations of our actions; it stands in a unique relationship to our own experiencing; and no one else can have quite the same understanding. It is also plausible that people who share certain kinds of experience in common stand in a special position in terms of understanding those shared aspects of experience. However, once this argument is applied to such broad categories as `women' or `blacks', it has to deal with some very heterogeneous groups; the different social, personal and situational characteristics that constitute their individuality may well outweigh the shared characteristics; and there may indeed be greater barriers to mutual understanding than there are gateways. These arguments, however, all risk a descent into solipsism: if our individual understanding is so particular, how can we have communication with or any understanding of anyone else? But, granted Wittgenstein's persuasive argument against a private language (Wittgenstein, 1963, perhaps more straightforwardly presented in Rhees, 1970), we cannot in these circumstances even describe or have any real understanding of our own condition in such an isolated world. Rather it is in talking to each other, in participating in a shared language, that we construct the conceptual apparatus that allows us to understand our own situation in relation to others, and this is a construction which involves under- standing differences as well as similarities. Besides, we have good reason to treat with some scepticism accounts provided by individuals of their own experience and by extension accounts provided by members of a particular category or community of people. We know that such accounts can be riddled with special pleading, selective memory, careless error, self-centredness, myopia, prejudice and a good deal more. A lesbian scholar illustrates some of the pressures that can bear, for example, on an insider researcher in her own community: As an insider, the lesbian has an important sensitivity to offer, yet she is also more vulnerable than the non-lesbian researcher, both to the pressure from the heterosexual world--that her studies conform to previous works and describe lesbian reality in terms of its relationship with the outside-- and to pressure from the inside, from within the lesbian community itself--that her studies mirror not the reality of that community but its self-protective ideology. (Kreiger, 1982, p. 108) In other words, while individuals from within a community have access to a particular kind of understanding of their experience, this does not automatically attach special authority (though it might attach special interest) to their own representations of that experience. Moreover, while we might acknowledge the limitations of the under- standing which someone from outside a community (or someone other than the individual who is the focus of the research) can develop, this does not entail that they cannot develop and present an understanding or that such understanding is worthless. Individuals can indeed find benefit in the understandings that others offer of their experience in, for example, a counselling relationship, or when a researcher adopts a supportive role with teachers engaged in reflection on or research into their own practice. Many have echoed the plea of the Scottish poet, Robert Burns (in `To a louse'): O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us To see oursels as others see us!3 --even if they might have been horrified with what such power revealed to them. Russell argued that it was the function of philosophy (and why not research too?) `to suggest many possibilities which enlarge our thoughts and free them from the tyranny of custom . . .It keeps alive our sense of wonder by showing familiar things in an unfamiliar aspect' (Russell, 1912, p. 91). `Making the familiar strange', as Stenhouse called it, often requires the assistance of someone unfamiliar with our own world who can look at our taken-for-granted experience through, precisely, the eye of a stranger. Sparkes (1994) writes very much in these terms in describing his own research, as a white, heterosexual middle- aged male, into the life history of a lesbian PE teacher. He describes his own struggle with the question `is it possible for heterosexual people to undertake research into homosexual populations?' but he concludes that being a `phenomenological stranger' who asks `dumb questions' may be a useful and illuminating experience for the research subject in that they may have to return to first principles in reviewing their story. This could, of course be an elaborate piece of self-justification, but it is interesting that someone like Max Biddulph, who writes from a gay/bisexual stand- point, can quote this conclusion with apparent approval (Biddulph, 1996). People from outside a community clearly can have an understanding of the experience of those who are inside that community. It is almost certainly a different understanding from that of the insiders. Whether it is of any value will depend among other things on the extent to which they have immersed themselves in the world of the other and portrayed it in its richness and complexity; on the empathy and imagination that they have brought to their enquiry and writing; on whether their stories are honest, responsible and critical (Barone, 1992). Nevertheless, this value will also depend on qualities derived from the researchers' exter- nality: their capacity to relate one set of experiences to others (perhaps from their own community); their outsider perspective on the structures which surround and help to define the experience of the community; on the reactions and responses to that community of individuals and groups external to it.4 Finally, it must surely follow that if we hold that a researcher, who (to take the favourable case) seeks honestly, sensitively and with humility to understand and to represent the experience of a community to which he or she does not belong, is incapable of such understanding and representation, then how can he or she understand either that same experience as mediated through the research of someone from that community? The argument which excludes the outsider from under- standing a community through the effort of their own research, a fortiori excludes the outsider from that understanding through the secondary source in the form of the effort of an insider researcher or indeed any other means. Again, the point can only be maintained by insisting that a particular (and itself ill-defined) understanding is the only kind of understanding which is worth having. The epistemological argument (that outsiders cannot understand the experience of a community to which they do not belong) becomes an ethical argument when this is taken to entail the further proposition that they ought not therefore attempt to research that community. I hope to have shown that this argument is based on a false premise. Even if the premise were sound, however, it would not necessarily follow that researchers should be prevented or excluded from attempting to under- stand this experience, unless it could be shown that in so doing they would cause some harm. This is indeed part of the argument emerging from disempowered communities and it is to this that I shall now turn.

#### 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).

#### No offense, their critiques of debate miss the point --- Defending a topic that involves the state for the sake of deliberation is distinct from accepting it, and limiting out some arguments for the sake of that deliberation is a more productive discourse that solves the aff better.

Talisse 2005

Robert, philosophy professor at Vanderbilt, Philosophy & Social Criticism, 31.4, “Deliberativist responses to activist challenges” \*note: gendered language in this article refers to arguments made by two specific individuals in an article by Iris Young

These two serious activist challenges may be summarized as follows. First, the activist has claimed that political discussion must always take place within the context of existing institutions that due to structural inequality grant to certain individuals the power to set discussion agendas and constrain the kinds of options open for consideration prior to any actual encounter with their deliberative opponents; the deliberative process is in this sense rigged from the start to favor the status quo and disadvantage the agents of change. Second, the activist has argued that political discussion must always take place by means of antecedent ‘discourses’ or vocabularies which establish the conceptual boundaries of the deliberation and hence may themselves be hegemonic or systematically distorting; the deliberative process is hence subject to the distorting influence of ideology at the most fundamental level, and deliberative democrats do not have the resources by which such distortions can be addressed. As they aim to establish that the deliberativist’s program is inconsistent with her own democratic objectives, this pair of charges is, as Young claims, serious (118). However, I contend that the deliberativist has adequate replies to them both. Part of the response to the first challenge is offered by Young herself. The deliberative democrat does not advocate public political discussion only at the level of state policy, and so does not advocate a program that must accept as given existing institutional settings and contexts for public discussion. Rather, the deliberativist promotes an ideal of democratic politics according to which deliberation occurs at all levels of social association, including households, neighborhoods, local organizations, city boards, and the various institutions of civil society. The longrun aim of the deliberative democrat is to cultivate a more deliberative polity, and the deliberativist claims that this task must begin at more local levels and apart from the state and its policies. We may say that deliberativism promotes a ‘decentered’ (Habermas, 1996: 298) view of public deliberation and a ‘pluralistic’ (Benhabib, 2002: 138) model of the public sphere; in other words, the deliberative democrat envisions a ‘multiple, anonymous, heterogeneous network of many publics and public conversations’ (Benhabib, 1996b: 87). The deliberativist is therefore committed to the creation of ‘an inclusive deliberative setting in which basic social and economic structures can be examined’; these settings ‘for the most part must be outside ongoing settings of official policy discussion’ (115). Although Young characterizes this decentered view of political discourse as requiring that deliberative democrats ‘withdraw’ (115) from ‘existing structural circumstances’ (118), it is unclear that this follows. There certainly is no reason why the deliberativist must choose between engaging arguments within existing deliberative sites and creating new ones that are removed from established institutions. There is no need to accept Young’s dichotomy; the deliberativist holds that work must be done both within existing structures and within new contexts. As Bohman argues, Deliberative politics has no single domain; it includes such diverse activities as formulating and achieving collective goals, making policy decisions and means and ends, resolving conflicts of interest and principle, and solving problems as they emerge in ongoing social life. Public deliberation therefore has to take many forms. (1996: 53) The second challenge requires a detailed response, so let us begin with a closer look at the proposed argument. The activist has moved quickly from the claim that discourses can be systematically distorting to the claim that all political discourse operative in our current contexts is systematically distorting. The conclusion is that properly democratic objectives cannot be pursued by deliberative means. The first thing to note is that, as it stands, the conclusion does not follow from the premises; the argument is enthymematic. What is required is the additional premise that the distorting features of discussion cannot be corrected by further discussion. That discussion cannot rehabilitate itself is a crucial principle in the activist’s case, but is nowhere argued. Moreover, the activist has given no arguments to support the claim that present modes of discussion are distorting, and has offered no analysis of how one might detect such distortions and discern their nature.20 Rather than providing a detailed analysis of the phenomenon of systematic distortion, Young provides (in her own voice) two examples of discourses that she claims are hegemonic. First she considers discussions of poverty that presume the adequacy of labor market analyses; second she cites discussions of pollution that presume that modern economies must be based on the burning of fossil-fuels. In neither case does she make explicit what constitutes the distortion. At most, her examples show that some debates are framed in ways that render certain types of proposals ‘out of bounds’. But surely this is the case in any discussion, and it is not clear that it is in itself always a bad thing or even ‘distorting’. Not all discursive exclusions are distortions because the term ‘distortion’ implies that something is being excluded that should be included. Clearly, then, there are some dialectical exclusions that are entirely appropriate. For example, it is a good thing that current discussions of poverty are often cast in terms that render white supremacist ‘solutions’ out of bounds; it is also good that pollution discourses tend to exclude fringe-religious appeals to the cleansing power of mass prayer. This is not to say that opponents of market analyses of poverty are on par with white supremacists or that Greens are comparable to fringe-religious fanatics; it is rather to press for a deeper analysis of the discursive hegemony that the activist claims undermines deliberative democracy. It is not clear that the requested analysis, were it provided, would support the claim that systematic distortions cannot be addressed and remedied within the processes of continuing discourse. There are good reasons to think that continued discussion among persons who are aware of the potentially hegemonic features of discourse can correct the distorting factors that exist and block the generation of new distortions. As Young notes (116), James Bohman (1996: ch. 3) has proposed a model of deliberation that incorporates concerns about distorted communication and other forms of deliberative inequality within a general theory of deliberative democracy; the recent work of Seyla Benhabib (2002) and Robert Goodin (2003: chs 9–11) aims for similar goals. Hence I conclude that, as it stands, the activist’s second argument is incomplete, and as such the force of the difficulty it raises for deliberative democracy is not yet clear. If the objection is to stick, the activist must first provide a more detailed examination of the hegemonic and distorting properties of discourse; he must then show both that prominent modes of discussion operative in our democracy are distorting in important ways and that further discourse cannot remedy these distortions.

#### We turn the aff but they can’t solve our offense---engaged dialogue about bureaucratic energy policy engages citizens, creates material change, and avoids cooption.

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

They preclude it, reading the same argument on the aff and the neg is dogmatism, we DO switch sides because we discuss both sides of energy policy and we DON’T have to not defend the res in some debates to meet this standard.

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.

The impact is an engaged citizenry which has the capacity and the will power to reign in the worst of ideological extremism

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).

#### Our impact is empirically proven, debating federal policy is key

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.

#### Advocacy skills,

#### ---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

### 1NC Case

#### Pollution outsourcing turn – the US is set to increase coal consumption, but even marginal decreases in its use will result in exports

EIA 2/12

SHORT-TERM ENERGY OUTLOOK- US Energy Information Administration, February 12, 2013, http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/report/coal.cfm

EIA expects coal consumption in the electric power sector to increase over the forecast period, as electricity demand and natural gas prices rise, but still remain significantly lower than the 1,003 million short tons (MMst) averaged during 2000-09. EIA expects that coal consumption in the electric power sector will be 859 MMst in 2013 and 870 MMst in 2014. EIA projects that annual nonpower-sector coal consumption will average more than 65 MMst during the forecast period, similar to the amount of consumption estimated in 2012. EIA estimates that coal production fell by 6.9 percent in 2012. Coal production is expected to decline by an additional 1.2 percent in 2013 because primary and secondary inventory draws and a small increase in coal imports will meet growth in consumption. Coal production is forecast to grow by 2.0 percent in 2014. EIA estimates coal exports totaled a record 124 MMst in 2012. EIA expects exports to total 108 MMst in 2013 and 112 MMst in 2014. Continuing economic weakness in Europe (which takes the most U.S. coal exports), falling international coal prices, and increasing production in other coal-exporting countries are the primary reasons for the expected decline in coal exports. U.S. coal exports could be higher if there are significant supply disruptions from any of the major coal-exporting countries. Coal exports averaged 54 MMst during 2000-09.

#### Criticizing local energy production without a global alternative pushes these processes onto other countries with less regulatory capacity

Treuer 2011

Tim, Environmental and reforestation activist currently working on Indonesian Environmental reform, BIMBYism, http://treuer.tumblr.com/post/6965356686/bimbyism

Popular American environmentalism in many was is an metamorphosis of the notion of N.I.M.B.Y. (‘Not In My BackYard’). It’s why garbage transfer stations, sewage treatment centers and coal power plants have so much trouble getting sited. Eventually, those facilities generally do end up getting sited—they have to be put somewhere—except when they do find a home, it’s more often than not in the most marginalized or disenfranchised of communities, ones that lack a strong enough voice to themselves say “NIMBY”. Many of the same groups that once used NIMBY as a rallying cry now decry its results, so-called issues of ‘environmental justice’. The items above tend to be the most commonly given examples of environmental injustice, but I think they are quite far from being the most profound. Though he doesn’t state it as such, Levant makes the case that the oil sands are one such potential example; failing to utilize the resource in Canada for fear it will pollute local waterways would mean Nigeria would have that much more incentive to continue drilling heavy oil, spilling it from leaky pipelines and flaring the natural gas (there are of course intimately tied social justice issues in any example as well). **There’s a lot of heated debate** about offshore drilling in the United States, **and the most prominent detractors tend to be NIMBYist locals and environmental groups**. They both tend to argue that the cost of a spill would be too much to risk, **but even a spill the size of the Deepwater Horizon disaster off the Atlantic Coast would be considerably less harmful to the environment** (probably not a single species would be seriously threatened) **than any development at all in the Western Amazon** (thousands of species could be driven to extinction, most of them currently lacking formal scientific descriptions), where largescale oil exploration is underway. **Now add to that the fact that a spill is far less likely in the United States, and that the response to a disaster would be many times greater than in Brazil or Peru**. Although the talk so far has focused on oil and unsavory processing plants, in my mind, the most heinous example of the negative consequences of NIMBYism (and I may only say this because its something near to my heart at this point) is with timber and forest products. Take the country of Japan, for instance. They are often admired for having the highest percent of intact forest cover among any developed nation. Kudos. What most people don’t realize, however, is that Japan can maintain such high forest cover by importing all of their timber and paper, and thus exporting the environmental costs of forest destruction. That **destruction is outsourced to Third World nations with corrupt governments and ‘weak institutions’** (as I heard some scientists euphemize), like, well, Indonesia (in early centuries, it was the island of Honshu that exported deforestation to island of Hokkaido). Rather than having what would undoubtedly be carefully regulated and monitored timber operations in Japan, the end result is massive, rampant and unsustainable illegal logging in the Malay Archipelago, fueling corruption and leaving behind reduced economic potential for local communities. Given that Indonesia is one of the most biologically diverse places on the planet, I can guarantee you that more species went extinct here than could have possibly gone extinct in Japan. Maybe it’s an uncommon sentiment, but I think every species of animal or plant on Earth has a more or less equal inherent value, and that the same holds true of every human life on the planet, regardless of country of birth. To me, the direct corollary of this belief is that **we should not be halting development or extraction of something currently inescapably vital to humanity simply because we don’t want it done in our country, state, or even backyard—not if the end result is messier extraction with greater environmental or social costs elsewhere in the world. Forget NIMBY, I think for those of us in the developed world, it’s time to embrace BIMBY** (‘B’ for Better).

#### This pollution outsourcing results in warming and kills China’s transition from coal to renewable energy

WP 12

Brad Plumer; 05/01/2012; “How the U.S. could influence China’s coal habits — with exports” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/can-the-united-states-influence-chinas-coal-habits/2012/05/01/gIQAgqUpuT\_blog.html

Coal exports, a favorite topic here at Wonkblog, have become a hot environmental issue of late. Coal use is shrinking in the United States thanks (in part) to cheap natural gas. So coal companies are building terminals in the Pacific Northwest to ship their surplus coal to places like China. Over at Grist, David Roberts has an excellent overview of this story. Large U.S. mining companies such as Arch Coal and Alpha Natural Resources have seen their share prices tumble of late. They’re resting their hopes on six new export terminals in Oregon and Washington, which, once built, will enable the Pacific Northwest to ship more than 150 million tons of coal to Asia. In essence, we’d be exporting our carbon pollution overseas. So, to prevent that, environmentalists are trying to bog these projects down. And they’re gaining momentum: Oregon Gov. John Kitzhaber (D), for one, has called for a full review of the terminals. So here’s a question: Would blocking these export terminals have any impact on the staggering growth in coal use in places such as China? Actually, yes: There’s some evidence that it could matter a fair bit at the margins. At first glance, it may look like the United States couldn’t possibly have much sway over China’s coal-hungry habits. China, after all, has plenty of its own coal, boasting the second-largest reserves in the world. In 2010, the country imported less than 5 percent of the coal it used from overseas. And the United States makes up a tiny sliver of this market — because of how Chinese ports and rail networks are set up, China still gets most of its imported coal from Indonesia and Australia: Still, as a recent and fascinating report (pdf) from the Carnegie Endowment explains, Chinese coal imports are likely to grow enormously in the coming years. For one, Chinese coal use has been growing at a rate of nearly 6 percent each year. And China’s domestic production can’t keep pace, thanks to railroad and shipping bottlenecks from mining centers in Shanxi, Shaanxi and Inner Mongolia provinces. What’s more, the Carnegie report notes, the Chinese government is becoming increasingly sensitive to the ecological damage wrought by domestic coal mining — as well as to the growing number of protests over unsafe mining conditions. According to official statistics, 6,027 Chinese miners died in 2004, though the real number is probably higher. There are real costs to ramping up production in China. As a result, China will likely try to import a growing share of its coal in the coming years. Much of that will likely come from Indonesia and Australia, since China’s import infrastructure is geared toward those two regions. But many analysts expect the United States to play an increasingly crucial role in coming years. (To date, the U.S. has been supplying China with just small amounts of coking coal, which is used for iron and steel production and which is less readily available in China.) And if American coal starts pouring into China, that will help keep prices down. If that happens, Chinese power plants and factories will burn even more coal and use the stuff less efficiently than they otherwise would. Grist’s David Roberts points to a recent paper (pdf) by Thomas M. Power, a former economics professor at the University of Montana, finding that Chinese coal habits are highly sensitive to prices: Opening the Asian import market to dramatic increases in U.S. coal will drive down coal prices in that market. Several empirical studies of energy in China have demonstrated that coal consumption is highly sensitive to cost. One recent study found that a 10 percent reduction in coal cost would result in a 12 percent increase in coal consumption. Another found that over half of the gain in China’s “energy intensity” improvement during the 1990s was a response to prices. In other words, coal exports will mean cheaper coal in Asia, and cheaper coal means more coal will be burned than would otherwise be the case To some extent, U.S. exports are already having an impact. Coal prices in Asia hit a 16-month low recently, thanks to an overflow of coal from the United States and Colombia. And the Pacific Northwest hasn’t even seriously ramped up its exports yet. (India is another possible market for U.S. producers: As the New York Times recently reported, Indian power companies have been trying to import coal from abroad rather than deal with India’s dysfunctional mining industry, but they’ve been deterred in the past by high prices.) Now, the global coal markets are complex and it’s still not clear exactly how important U.S. coal will prove to be for countries like India or China. As Michael Levi of the Council on Foreign Relations points out, a lot depends on whether U.S. coal augments or displaces production from countries like Indonesia. Still, at the margins, supply and demand matters. The point of Thomas Power’s paper is that a deluge of coal from the United States will, in the end, cause Asia to use more coal. Countries like China will have less incentive to develop alternative energy sources or become more efficient. And that, in turn, will mean more heat-trapping greenhouse gases in the atmosphere than there otherwise would be. To put this in perspective, 150 million tons of coal produces about as much carbon dioxide as 60 million cars.

#### Warming causes extinction---outweighs nuclear war

Deibel 7 [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 form 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.

#### Warming compounds structural inequality – this also ruins their ability to access personal experience claims because they’re never actualized when those that need to galvanize political support are dying from high sea level rise

Claussen 6 (Eileen, October 5, “Climate Change: The State of The Question and The Search For The Answer”, President of the PEW center for climate change, http://www.pewclimate.org/press\_ room/speech\_transcripts/stjohns2of2.cfm)

Yes, developing countries need to do their part, but there is no denying that the developed world, including the United States, has a moral and ethical responsibility to act first. We also have a responsibility to help developing nations adapt to a warming world. No matter what we do, some amount of global warming already is built into the climate system. There will be impacts; there already are impacts. And it is people living in poverty in the developing world who will face the most serious consequences. So it really comes down, again, to a question of responsibility. What is our responsibility? And it is not just our responsibility to our fellow man (or woman). There is also our responsibility to the natural world, to the earth

#### US Coal is comparatively better – clean coal is being developed and demonstrated now

WVVA 2/21/13 “Clean coal technology could be closer to reality” <http://www.wvva.com/story/21302692/2013/02/21/clean-coal-technology-could-be-closer-to-reality>)

COLUMBUS, Ohio (WVVA) - Researchers at Ohio State University may be a step closer to making clean-coal technology a reality. For more than 200 hours, a combustion unit at Ohio State was able to produce heat from coal while capturing 99 percent of the carbon dioxide produced in the reaction. Simply put, researchers found a way to release the heat from the coal without burning it -- through a carefully-controlled reaction. State coal leaders welcomed the news. "This is a big step forward," said WV Coal Association President Bill Raney. "I think they can get the funding and they are working with some utilities down in the southeast. So if this works then this is another step forward."

#### **Solves your terminal impacts – no more environmental externalities**

David 2/19/13 (J, staffwriter, “Clean Coal Finally a Reality?” <http://www.enn.com/pollution/article/45613>)

Combustion is the main mechanism used to harness energy from coal. All existing coal burning processes consume oxygen to produce heat. The downside, however, is that it also produces a large amount of pollutants, such as nitrogen and sulfur oxides, which are difficult to contain and are harmful to the environment. OSU researchers found a way to harness the energy from coal through what they call Coal-Direct Chemical Looping (CDCL). CDCL mixes tiny iron oxide beads to carry oxygen to spur the chemical reaction with coal, which is grounded into a fine powder. This mixture is then heated to high temperatures, where the materials react with each other. Carbon from the coal binds with the oxygen from the iron oxide to produce heat and almost pure carbon dioxide that rises to the top of the chamber where it is then captured. The excess heat harvested in this process produces water vapor to power steam-turbines to generate electricity. Researchers reported that each unit can produce about 25 thermal kilowatts. Pure carbon dioxide is separated and recycled, the iron beads are exposed to air inside the reactor becoming re-oxidized, allowing the beads to be re-generated almost indefinitely and the coal ash is removed and disposed of safely. Coal-Direct Chemical Looping exceeds all the goals that the Department of Energy (DOE) has set in place for the development of clean energy from coal. Based on current tests the team at Ohio State University is confident that they will continue to exceed the requirements set by the DOE. OSU is preparing for their larger-scale pilot plant which is under construction at the U.S department of Energy's National Carbon Capture Center in Wilsonville, AL. Set to begin operations in late 2013, the plant will produce up to 250 kilowatts using CDCL.

#### But regulatory requirements for pollution and carbon reduction don’t exist in other counties

Park 1998

Rozelia, Indiana University School of Law, An Examination of International Environmental Racism Through the Lens of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes, Vol. 5: Iss. 2, Article 14, http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol5/iss2/14

**Increased public opposition** to hazardous waste siting, scarcity of disposal facilities, and stricter environmental rules **lead to increased disposal costs. Thus, developed nations are looking for easier and less costly means of disposing of their waste.' Therefore, corporations follow the "path of least resistance", which means that corporations export their waste overseas to countries with less stringent environmental standards and lower disposal prices**. 47 By exporting their waste, "corporations can avoid the tougher measures necessary to cut down on the use of harmful chemicals and to reduce waste production at home." 4 Until recently there was little incentive to slow waste production and none at all to discontinue shipping hazardous waste to other countries.

#### ---Criticism of energy production without material alternatives fail --- Alienates impoverished minorities and labor movements from leftist activism by denying employment opportunities.

Jones 2009

Van, attorney, founder and president of the Oakland, California-based organization Green for All, founder and at the time director of the Ella Baker Center for Human Rights, an organization focusing on the problem of police brutality and the over-incarceration of California youth, Special Advisor for Green Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation at the White House Council on Environmental Equality, Antiracism and Environmental Justice in an Age of Neoliberalism: An Interview with Van Jones, Anoop Mirpuri, Keith P. Feldman and Georgia M. Roberts, Antipode, Vol. 41 No. 3

So there are going to be some Leftists on one side, God bless them, that will have some impact and they’ll be a part of this overall process of developing a hopefully pro-democracy movement that can defeat these authoritarians and put us back on the path towards some kind of sanity in foreign policy, if we ever had any sanity there. Hopefully, they’ll play some role, but I don’t see them doing very much. I see them talking a lot, to each other, and I don’t see them putting forward actionable programs that engage broad bands of people at the levels where people are suffering social injustices and lack of equity and opportunity, the ecological crises and cancer clusters as an epidemic environmental health concern. We can try and picket outside of an incinerator, but then somebody comes out and says, “You’re going to cost me my job. Where am I going to work?” And then we’re stuck, and we’ve been stuck there for almost 40 years. And then you can’t escape the spiritual crisis, the deepening despair, and the hopelessness, and the frustration, and the apathy. My view is that I’m happy to be wrong. I’m happy to be attacked from the Left for this, because I don’t think that the Left is engaged with the US working class anyway. I’m happy to go forward and say we’re picking sides in this fight among capitalists, we’re going with the little green Davids against the big gray Goliaths on this one. We actually think that the world would be better off if the government was on their side than on the side of the extractors and exploiters and warmongers. We’re going to insist in that deal that we’re going to get living-wage union jobs out of it, that we get opportunities for ownership and wealth creation for people out of it, and that the health benefits don’t just benefit the wealthy suburb that can afford solar but that also find their way to benefit the communities that they come from. Is that in and of itself an anti-capitalist agenda? No. Does it reinforce some of the delusions and illusions of the market? It certainly does. But does it put us in a posture where we’re able to make unusual and unlikely alliances across racial justice, mainstream white environmentalists, the progressive wing of US capital, the progressive labor unions like the electrical workers that are going to be responsible for installing solar, and to create a new center of gravity in US politics

 that is more favorable to democratic forces than authoritarian forces? It just absolutely has that potential.

## \*\*\*2NC

### \*\*\*Framework

### ROB

---They can read an affirmative that uses their personal relationship to energy production while also calling for a material chance of the energy infrastructure rather than just a critique of status quo production---a topical version of our social location would be to replace coal fire plants in institutions such as the university of Kentucky with financial incentives for solar power

Hitt 2012

Mary Anne, Grist Guest Contributor, Moving the Kentucky Wildcats Beyond Coal, http://grist.org/article/moving-the-kentucky-wildcats-beyond-coal/

Kentucky can do better than this, and UK can lead the way. Every corner of the state – from farmlands to cities – has the potential to become major players in clean energy, one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the U.S. today. By tapping into Kentucky’s clean energy resources and building existing momentum, we can curb energy costs and get the state’s economy back on track. Moving Kentucky towards a clean energy future will create new, much needed jobs for working families — not to mention the thousands of graduating UK students each year. Two wonderful Kentucky-based organizations are working to chart this course to a clean energy future — Kentuckians For The Commonwealth and the Mountain Association for Community Economic Development. On the UK campus, students are taking the lead in calling for clean energy because they know there are better options for the Bluegrass State. UK is home to an outdated coal plant that doesn’t have modern pollution controls, and those coal boilers are creating air pollution that threatens the health of students and the local community. The students are calling on the university to retire its coal boilers and start investing in clean energy solutions. Students are also calling upon UK to include coal in the list of harmful industries, along with big tobacco and alcohol, that UK Athletics currently refuses to take money from. This is an especially hot issue on campus right now thanks to the opening of a new dorm for basketball players called the “Wildcat Coal Lodge” that was partially funded by the coal industry. Around the nation, colleges and universities are kicking coal off their campuses. Already one-third of universities with coal plants have committed stop burning coal on campus, thanks in large part to student led initiatives as part of the Sierra Student Coalition’s Campuses Beyond Coal campaign.

### Fairness link

#### ---The ineffective deliberations from their interpretation result in cashless debates were we go for give back the land and never discuss energy, the lack of depth trades off with argumentative training that forces us to go deeper, this is the only internal link to creating material change, Mitchell evidence proves our argument, switch side debates over EPA emission policy resulted in new laws, we need to know how to speak the language of policy makers

McClean 2001

David E., “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Am. Phil. Conf., www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces *theoretical hallucinations*"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

### Fairness first !

They result in worse exclusion, personal conviction over deliberative switch side models is the logic that all of their impact cards critique.

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.

### Fiat works

#### ---Fiat solves the turn and the aff better --- Its act of imagining impossible but unquestionably reasonable government policy change changes the political coordinates of institutional structure making the impossible possible.

Swyngedouw 2011

Eric, Interrogating post-democratization: Reclaiming egalitarian political spaces, Political Geography (2011), doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.08.001

Second, attention needs to turn to the modalities of repoliticization. Re-politicizing space as an intervention in the state of the situation that transforms and transgresses the symbolic orders of the existing condition marks a shift from the old to a new situation, one that cannot any longer be thought of in terms of the old symbolic framings. For Zizek, such a political act does not start ‘from the art of the possible, but from the art of the impossible’ (Zizek, 1999). Proper politics is thus about practices that lie beyond the symbolic order of the police; about demands that cannot be symbolized within the frame of reference of the police and, therefore, would necessitate transformation in and of the police to permit symbolization to occur. Yet, these are demands and claims that are eminently sensible and feasible when the frame of the symbolic order is shifted, when the parallax gap between what is (the constituted symbolic order of the police) and what can be (the reconstituted symbolic order made possible through a shift in vantage points, one that starts from the partisan universalizing principle of equality). This is the democratic political process through which equality is asserted and that requires the transformation of socio-physical space and the institution of a radically different partition of the sensible (Zizek,1999). The form of politicization predicated upon universalizing egalibertarian demands cuts directly through the radical politics that characterize many contemporary forms of resistance. This could be glimpsed in the democratizing outbursts in the streets of Tunis, Athens or Madrid in 2011. It is also the sort of demand expressed when undocumented and other immigrants in Europe or the US claim their egalibertarian place.

### A2---no lever or power

#### ---their state bad claims are all reasons to try to change the state, its inevitable, lack of participation just cedes power to the GOP in a worse way that the SQ

Zizek 2007

Slavoj, Resistance is Surrender: What to Do about Capitalism?, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v29/n22/slavoj-zizek/resistance-is-surrender

These positions are not presented as a way of avoiding some ‘true’ radical Left politics – what they are trying to get around is, indeed, the lack of such a position. This defeat of the Left is not the whole story of the last thirty years, however. There is another, no less surprising, lesson to be learned from the Chinese Communists’ presiding over arguably the most explosive development of capitalism in history, and from the growth of West European Third Way social democracy. It is, in short: we can do it better. In the UK, the Thatcher revolution was, at the time, chaotic and impulsive, marked by unpredictable contingencies. It was Tony Blair who was able to institutionalise it, or, in Hegel’s terms, to raise (what first appeared as) a contingency, a historical accident, into a necessity. Thatcher wasn’t a Thatcherite, she was merely herself; it was Blair (more than Major) who truly gave form to Thatcherism. The response of some critics on the postmodern Left to this predicament is to call for a new politics of resistance. Those who still insist on fighting state power, let alone seizing it, are accused of remaining stuck within the ‘old paradigm’: the task today, their critics say, is to resist state power by withdrawing from its terrain and creating new spaces outside its control. This is, of course, the obverse of accepting the triumph of capitalism. The politics of resistance is nothing but the moralising supplement to a Third Way Left. Simon Critchley’s recent book, Infinitely Demanding, is an almost perfect embodiment of this position.[\*] For Critchley, the liberal-democratic state is here to stay. Attempts to abolish the state failed miserably; consequently, the new politics has to be located at a distance from it: anti-war movements, ecological organisations, groups protesting against racist or sexist abuses, and other forms of local self-organisation. It must be a politics of resistance to the state, of bombarding the state with impossible demands, of denouncing the limitations of state mechanisms. The main argument for conducting the politics of resistance at a distance from the state hinges on the ethical dimension of the ‘infinitely demanding’ call for justice: no state can heed this call, since its ultimate goal is the ‘real-political’ one of ensuring its own reproduction (its economic growth, public safety, etc). ‘Of course,’ Critchley writes, history is habitually written by the people with the guns and sticks and one cannot expect to defeat them with mocking satire and feather dusters. Yet, as the history of ultra-leftist active nihilism eloquently shows, one is lost the moment one picks up the guns and sticks. Anarchic political resistance should not seek to mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty it opposes. So what should, say, the US Democrats do? Stop competing for state power and withdraw to the interstices of the state, leaving state power to the Republicans and start a campaign of anarchic resistance to it? And what would Critchley do if he were facing an adversary like Hitler? Surely in such a case one should ‘mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty’ one opposes? Shouldn’t the Left draw a distinction between the circumstances in which one would resort to violence in confronting the state, and those in which all one can and should do is use ‘mocking satire and feather dusters’? The ambiguity of Critchley’s position resides in a strange non sequitur: if the state is here to stay, if it is impossible to abolish it (or capitalism), why retreat from it? Why not act with(in) the state? Why not accept the basic premise of the Third Way? Why limit oneself to a politics which, as Critchley puts it, ‘calls the state into question and calls the established order to account, not in order to do away with the state, desirable though that might well be in some utopian sense, but in order to better it or attenuate its malicious effect’? These words simply demonstrate that today’s liberal-democratic state and the dream of an ‘infinitely demanding’ anarchic politics exist in a relationship of mutual parasitism: anarchic agents do the ethical thinking, and the state does the work of running and regulating society. Critchley’s anarchic ethico-political agent acts like a superego, comfortably bombarding the state with demands; and the more the state tries to satisfy these demands, the more guilty it is seen to be. In compliance with this logic, the anarchic agents focus their protest not on open dictatorships, but on the hypocrisy of liberal democracies, who are accused of betraying their own professed principles. The big demonstrations in London and Washington against the US attack on Iraq a few years ago offer an exemplary case of this strange symbiotic relationship between power and resistance. Their paradoxical outcome was that both sides were satisfied. The protesters saved their beautiful souls: they made it clear that they don’t agree with the government’s policy on Iraq. Those in power calmly accepted it, even profited from it: not only did the protests in no way prevent the already-made decision to attack Iraq; they also served to legitimise it. Thus George Bush’s reaction to mass demonstrations protesting his visit to London, in effect: ‘You see, this is what we are fighting for, so that what people are doing here – protesting against their government policy – will be possible also in Iraq!’ It is striking that the course on which Hugo Chávez has embarked since 2006 is the exact opposite of the one chosen by the postmodern Left: far from resisting state power, he grabbed it (first by an attempted coup, then democratically), ruthlessly using the Venezuelan state apparatuses to promote his goals. Furthermore, he is militarising the barrios, and organising the training of armed units there. And, the ultimate scare: now that he is feeling the economic effects of capital’s ‘resistance’ to his rule (temporary shortages of some goods in the state-subsidised supermarkets), he has announced plans to consolidate the 24 parties that support him into a single party. Even some of his allies are sceptical about this move: will it come at the expense of the popular movements that have given the Venezuelan revolution its élan? However, this choice, though risky, should be fully endorsed: the task is to make the new party function not as a typical state socialist (or Peronist) party, but as a vehicle for the mobilisation of new forms of politics (like the grass roots slum committees). What should we say to someone like Chávez? ‘No, do not grab state power, just withdraw, leave the state and the current situation in place’? Chávez is often dismissed as a clown – but wouldn’t such a withdrawal just reduce him to a version of Subcomandante Marcos, whom many Mexican leftists now refer to as ‘Subcomediante Marcos’? Today, it is the great capitalists – Bill Gates, corporate polluters, fox hunters – who ‘resist’ the state.

### A2 Debate = Coal Good --- 2nc Framework

#### ---They’re wrong --- Their depiction of the coal industry as a monolithic power is incoherent and not an accurate depiction of the debate community.

Zive 2012

Joshua, a senior counsel at *Bracewell & Giuliani* with an eclectic background in legislative and regulatory advocacy, Posted as JZHawk, http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?topic=3573.msg7412;topicseen#msg7412

2.  I certainly would not want to claim that the energy industry has anything but excellent advocates doing their energy work, but it is important to not view the staus quo too simplistically.  The environmental community and companies invested in alternatives have been extraordinarily effective, and well-funded, in DC in recent years.  The notion that the oil and coal lobbies have gotten what they have wanted is simply not true.  Also, there are significant fissures and tensions within the energy industry that make monolithic depictions inaccurate.  Some of the interesting interactions right now are how the large players have differential stakes in coal vs. natural gas. Vs. nuclear vs. alternatives, for example.   Put simply there is no such thing as a fossil fuel lobby anymore, if there ever was such a creature.

### Debate doesn’t exclude identity

#### ---Reject their demands for discussion about identity as policing --- The distinction between privileged and underprivileged identity should not be the basis of scholarly assessments.

Innes 2009

Robert Alexander, member of Cowessess First Nation and an assistant professor in the Department of Native Studies at the University of Saskatchewan, "Wait a Second. Who Are You Anyways?", American Indian Quarterly, 33.4

Insider scholars, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, challenge the research conducted by outsiders for its colonial nature, which ignores, silences, [End Page 441] and/or diminishes insider perspectives.3 This critique originated with African American scholars in the 1960s and led to an emergence of what Robert Merton describes as the "Insider doctrine," namely, that members of a particular group should research their own group.4 Feminists, for example, advocate that women should research women's issues. As Sherna Gluck and Daphine Patai state, it should be "by, for, and about women."5 The result of these assertions has been the development and implementation of research methods designed for insider researchers, which, in turn, has generated discussion among scholars. Specifically, scholars have questioned what actually constitutes insider research, the validity of the data obtained by insiders, and to what degree the insiders are, in fact, insiders. Over thirty years ago sociologist Robert Merton addressed the research conducted by insiders. According to Merton, the central notion of the insider doctrine—that only members of a particular group possess the ability to undertake research of their group—is "solipsistic." The solipsism of the insider doctrine, Merton believes, "can be put in the vernacular with no great loss in meaning: you have to be one to understand one."6 For Merton, a major shortcoming of this exclusiveness is that it leads to fragmentation, for groups necessarily contain additional subgroups: Thus, if only whites can understand whites, and blacks, blacks, and only men can understand men, and women, women, this gives rise to the paradox which severely limits both premises: for it then turns out, by assumption, that some Insiders are excluded from understanding other Insiders with white women being condemned not to understand white men, and black men, not to understand black women, and so through the various combinations of status subsets.7 The issue of insider research validity has also garnered much discussion among scholars. Insider researchers' bias has been a frequent target due to alleged close ties to the research group. Insiders' close ties have led some scholars to point out "the dangers of over-rapport." Over-rapport occurs when a researcher closely identifies with the research group's perspectives and fails to approach research situations in a critical manner.8 That is, as John L. Aguilar states, "the conduct of research from home often inhibits the perception of structures and patterns of social and cultural life.… [T]oo much is too familiar to be noticed or to arouse the curiosity essential to research."9 Insider researchers' close relationship with the researched group means that significant observation can "easily be overlooked, including many taken-for granted assumptions about social behavior and the blindness to common, everyday activities; these are hazards of intimate familiarity."10 Scholars have additionally argued that insider researchers, unlike outsiders, are more likely to have difficulty "intellectually and emotively" distancing themselves from the research group.11 In contrast to insider researchers, outsider researchers see themselves as being better equipped to provide objective accounts of the research population. Merton cites Georg Simmel, who states that an outsider or stranger to the research group is "freer, practically and theoretically. . . . [H]e surveys conditions with less prejudice; his criteria for them are more general and more objective ideals; he is not tied down in his action by habit, piety, and precedent." Merton adds, "It is the stranger, too, who finds what is familiar to the group significantly unfamiliar and so is prompted to raise questions for inquiry less apt to be raised at all by Insiders."12 While insider researchers have to contend with obstacles that prevent them from probing into some areas, outsider research "involves a comparative orientation in which contrast promotes both perception and curiosity. The researcher undergoes a kind of heuristic culture shock that operates through curiosity as an impetus to understanding."13 These views emphasize the idea that "only outsiders can conduct valid research on a given group; only outsiders, it is held, possess the needed objectivity and emotional distance … [and that] insiders invariably present their group in an unrealistically favorable light."14 Some feminists have become critical of the insider research favored by many feminist scholars. Melissa Gilbert's research experience led her to question the feminist research methodology: "The fact that I was not doing my research in the 'Third World' or in any other country, and yet felt like an 'outsider' suggests that we need to question the assumptions underlying much of 'feminist' methodology." For Gilbert, "the insider/outsider dichotomy is not useful because the very act of conducting research places an 'insider' in an 'outsider' position."15 Other insider researchers like Gilbert have found that simply being a member of the researched community does not guarantee insider status. Class, gender, sexuality, nationality, age, education, ethnicity, race, culture, [End Page 443] level of familiarity, physical appearance, types of clothing, and lingering distrust of research could all prevent insider researchers from obtaining the trust and credibility necessary for gaining access to research participants.16 Insider researchers have also identified physical appearance as a barrier to gain insider status with some research participants. These researchers found that, like outsider researchers, they went through a period in which they and the research participants had to negotiate their relationship, a period whereby the researcher had to gain the confidence of his or her participants.17 These researchers reached the same conclusion set out by Merton many years ago: "We are all, of course, both insiders and outsiders, members of some groups and, sometimes derivatively, not of others; occupants of certain statuses which thereby exclude us from occupying other cognate statuses."18 Unlike Gilbert, however, these recent scholars maintain that their status as an insider was not completely undermined by factors that made them an outsider. They were aware or were made aware of these differences and had to navigate their way in a research relationship to enhance their insider status so that their research participants accepted them and their differences.

#### ---Authenticity tests shut down debate --- It’s strategically a disaster for minority politics.

Subotnik 1998

Professor of Law, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center, 7 Cornell J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 681

Having traced a major strand in the development of CRT, we turn now to the strands' effect on the relationships of CRATs with each other and with outsiders. As the foregoing material suggests, **the central** CRT **message is not simply that minorities are being treated unfairly**, or even that individuals out there are in pain - assertions for which there are data to serve as grist for the academic mill - **but that the minority scholar himself or herself hurts and hurts badly**. An important problem that concerns the very definition of the scholarly enterprise now comes into focus. **What can an academic** trained to [\*694] question and to doubt n72 **possibly say to Patricia Williams when effectively she announces, "I hurt bad"?** n73 **"No, you don't hurt"? "You shouldn't hurt"?** "Other people hurt too"? Or, most dangerously - and perhaps most tellingly - "What do you expect when you keep shooting yourself in the foot?" If the majority were perceived as having the well- being of minority groups in mind, these responses might be acceptable, even welcomed. And they might lead to real conversation. But, **writes Williams, the failure by those "cushioned within the invisible privileges of race and power**... to incorporate a sense of precarious connection as a part of our **lives is... ultimately obliterating**." n74 "Precarious." "Obliterating." **These words will clearly invite responses only from fools and sociopaths; they will, by effectively precluding objection, disconcert and disunite others**. **"I hurt," in academic discourse, has three broad though interrelated effects**. First, **it demands priority from the reader's conscience. It is for this reason that law review editors, waiving usual standards, have privileged a long trail of undisciplined - even silly** n75 **- destructive and, above all, self-destructive arti** [\*695] **cles.** n76 **Second, by emphasizing the emotional bond between those who hurt in a similar way, "I hurt" discourages fellow sufferers from abstracting themselves from their pain in order to gain perspective on their condition**. n77 [\*696] **Last, as we have seen, it precludes the possibility of open and structured conversation with others**. n78 [\*697] **It is because of this conversation-stopping effect** of what they insensitively call "first-person agony stories" **that Farber and Sherry deplore their use.** "The norms of academic civility hamper readers from challenging the accuracy of the researcher's account; it would be rather difficult, for example, to criticize a law review article by questioning the author's emotional stability or veracity." n79 Perhaps, a better practice would be to put the scholar's experience on the table, along with other relevant material, but to subject that experience to the same level of scrutiny. If **through the foregoing rhetorical strategies CRATs succeeded in limiting academic debate**, why do they not have greater influence on public policy? **Discouraging white legal scholars from entering the national conversation about race**, n80 I suggest, **has generated a kind of cynicism in white audiences** which, in turn, has had precisely the reverse effect of that ostensibly desired by CRATs. **It drives the American public to the right and ensures that anything CRT offers is reflexively rejected.** In the absence of scholarly work by white males in the area of race, of course, it is difficult to be sure what reasons they would give for not having rallied behind CRT. Two things, however, are certain. First, **the kinds of issues** raised by Williams **are too important** in their implications  [\*698]  for American life **to be confined to communities of color.** If the lives of minorities are heavily constrained, if not fully defined, by the thoughts and actions of the majority elements in society, **it would seem to be of great importance that white thinkers and doers participate in open discourse** to bring about change. Second, given the lack of engagement of CRT by the community of legal scholars as a whole, the discourse that should be taking place at the highest scholarly levels has, by default, been displaced to faculty offices and, more generally, the streets and the airwaves.

### Karl Rove

#### No risk of their “karl rove” offense

English et al 2007

Eric English, Stephen Llano, Gordon R. Mitchell, Catherine E. Morrison, John Rief and Carly Woods, Communications—University of Pittsburg “Debate as a Weapon of Mass Destruction,” Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, Volume 4, Number 2, June, http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/EnglishDAWG.pdf

It is our position, however, that rather than acting as a cultural technology expanding American exceptionalism, switch-side debating originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes. Several prominent voices reshaping the national dialogue on homeland security have come from the academic debate community and draw on its animating spirit of critical inquiry. For example, Georgetown University law professor Neal Katyal served as lead plaintiff ’s counsel in Hamdan , which challenged post-9/11 enemy combat defini- tions.12 The foundation for Katyal’s winning argument in Hamdan was laid some four years before, when he collaborated with former intercollegiate debate champion Laurence Tribe on an influential Yale Law Journal addressing a similar topic.13 Tribe won the National Debate Tournament in 1961 while competing as an undergraduate debater for Harvard University. Thirty years later, Katyal represented Dartmouth College at the same tournament and finished third. The imprint of this debate training is evident in Tribe and Katyal’s contemporary public interventions, which are characterized by meticulous research, sound argumentation, and a staunch commitment to democratic principles. Katyal’s reflection on his early days of debating at Loyola High School in Chicago’s North Shore provides a vivid illustration. ‘‘I came in as a shy freshman with dreams of going to medical school. Then Loyola’s debate team opened my eyes to a different world: one of argumentation and policy.’’ As Katyal recounts, ‘‘the most important preparation for my career came from my experiences as a member of Loyola’s debate team.’’14 The success of former debaters like Katyal, Tribe, and others in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security points to the efficacy of academic debate as a training ground for future advocates of progressive change. Moreover, a robust understanding of the switch-side technique and the classical liberalism which underpins it would help prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies. For buried within an inner-city debater’s files is a secret threat to absolutism: the refusal to be classified as ‘‘with us or against us,’’ the embracing of intellectual experimentation in an age of orthodoxy, and reflexivity in the face of fundamentalism. But by now, the irony of our story should be apparent \*the more effectively academic debating practice can be focused toward these ends, the greater the proclivity of McCarthy’s ideological heirs to brand the activity as a ‘‘weapon of mass destruction.’’

### A2 Speed Bad --- 2nc Framework

#### ---No Link --- We’re super slow.

#### ---Speed is Self-Correcting --- Nobody speaks so fast that it hurts communication and if they did they would lose speaker points and the round --- Even the fastest debaters have to remain comprehensible in order to succeed.

#### ---Speed increases education and critical thinking.

Speice & Lyle 2003

Patrick and Jim “traditional policy debate: now more than ever” Oceans Policy Adrift http://www.wfu.edu/Student-organizations/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/SpeiceLyle2003htm.htm

Second, policy debate teaches debaters how to make these decisions quickly (Coverstone, 1995). In the midst of a debate there is not time to sit back and contemplate what decision to make, if, at the very most, a debater has only eight to ten minutes (if they wish to utilize all of their preparation time) to make a decision and stick with it. This need for decision is magnified as the debates occur at faster speeds of presentation. Debaters have to be focused on the arguments being offered, have to be able to understand them very quickly, and they have to be able to discern which arguments are of the greatest significance for the round. The decisions that are made might not be the best, but debaters are able to make a decision in seconds and then present the reasons for that decision. This occurs in the constructives, rebuttals, and cross-examinations. This ability to make a choice instantaneously is probably the most significant of skills that the policy debate model offers.

#### ---Rapid fire simplification promotes effective communication and doesn’t trade off with substantive analysis.

Doremus 2000

Holly, Professor of law at UC Davis, Winter, 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11

A. Telling Political Stories It is not difficult to understand why the complex strands of each of the three discourses of nature have been reduced in the political context to a handful of shorthand stories. In the political arena, the most nuanced discourse tends to be simplified in this way. Political argument is better suited to soundbite-sized stories, brief accounts that evoke striking images intended to communicate larger points, than to multifaceted discussion. [\*42] It is easy to condemn the tendency of political debate to simplify arguments. Political rhetoric certainly can camouflage complexity, encourage people to overlook important principles, and distort issues. n191 Sound-bites can substitute for, or even obscure, principled analysis. But these brief stories can also serve a valuable, and valid, political function. Stories, particularly familiar ones, are well suited to quick, effective communication. Every teacher knows the power of a good rhetorical image to communicate a subtle concept. Stories also can invoke intuitions that may otherwise be overlooked because they are not readily accessible through reason alone. n192 Furthermore, the emotional power of stories can spur listeners to action in ways that abstract rational argument, no matter how logically compelling, typically does not. n193

## \*\*\*1NR

### \*\*\*Pollution Outsourcing DA

### 1NR Impact Overview

#### More evidence – Warming compounds every instance of structural inequality – those that economically marginized and dependent on coal companies will be affected first

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.

#### Clean coal spills over – DOE will push it to replace traditional use

Koprowski 2/20/13 (Gene J., staffwriter, “Coal: the cleanest energy source there is?” <http://www.foxnews.com/science/2013/02/20/coal-cleanest-energy-source-there-is/>)

Can Coal Ever Be 'Clean'? Some environmentalists are skeptical of the technology, and of the idea of clean coal in general. “Claiming that coal is clean because it could be clean -- if a new technically unproven and economically dubious technology might be adopted -- is like someone claiming that belladonna is not poisonous because there is a new unproven safe pill under development,” wrote Donald Brown at liberal think tank Climate Progress. Yet the federal Department of Energy believes that the process can create 20 megawatts to 50 megawatts by 2020, said Jared Ciferno, the agency’s director of coal and power-production research and development, in a statement. The government plans to continue to support the project, as well as the concept of "clean coal" in general. Meanwhile, Fan is exploring the possibility of establishing a start-up company and licensing the process to utilities, and has the potential to patent 35 different parts of the process. Other scientists and experts are enthused about the prospects for this technology. Yan Feng with Argonne National Laboratory's Environmental Science Division, Climate Research Section, called it “an advancement in chemical engineering. “It is very important that we act on CO2 capturing and sequestration as well as emission controls of other warming agents like tropospheric ozone and black carbon." Adds a spokesman for Kingsport, Tenn.-based Eastman Chemical Company, a global Fortune 250 chemical manufacturer that works in clean energy, “researchers continue to uncover innovative ways to use coal efficiently/sustainably.” Concludes Dawei Wang, a research associate at OSU, the technology's potential benefits even go beyond the environment and issues like sustainability. "The plant could really promote our energy independence. Not only can we use America's natural resources such as Ohio coal, but we can keep our air clean and spur the economy with jobs,” he said.

#### Chinese development of renewable energy solves the case – it displaces coal GLOBALLY

Paul Denlinger 10, consultant specializing in the China market who is based in Hong Kong, 7/20/10, “Why China Has To Dominate Green Tech,” http://www.forbes.com/sites/china/2010/07/20/why-china-has-to-dominate-green-tech/

. This has opened a window of opportunity for the Chinese government to finance, and for Chinese technology companies to develop, then manufacture these new green products. But just making these technologies is not enough; they need to be competitive against traditional fossil fuels. When it comes to the amount of energy released when coal or oil is burned, the new green technologies are still way behind. This means that, at least in the early stages of adoption, Chinese businesses will still be reliant on coal and oil to bridge that energy chasm before the new energy technologies become economically competitive. Much depends on how much the Chinese government is willing to spend to promote and incentivize these new technologies, first in China, then overseas. Because of China’s growing energy demands, we are in a race for survival. The 21st century will be remembered as the resurgent coal and oil century, or as the century humanity transitioned to green technologies for energy consumption. While China is investing heavily now in green tech, it is still consuming ever larger amounts of coal and oil to drive its economic growth. Right now, we all depend on China’s success to make the transition to green energy this century. For all practical purposes, we’re all in the same boat.

#### 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.

#### And our focus on climate security is critical to galvanize movements to oppose use of coal

Trombetta 2008

Maria Julia, Environmental security and climate change: analyzing the discourse, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 21:4, 585-602

How can these developments be read through the lens of the framework previously elaborated? Can this be considered as a securitization which is transforming security practices? The renewal of the debate on climate change and security appears as an attempt to transform it into an existential threat, requiring urgent measures. It has mobilized political action, emergency measures and even attempts to institutionalize the debate at an international level. So far the securitization of climate has succeeded in persuading even the reluctant Bush administration to undertake discussion on emissions reduction. It has also contributed to the formulation of the Bali Roadmap to set a strategy for the postKyoto period. The UN Security Council, at the initiative of the UK, discussed the potential impact of climate change on peace and security for the first time ever (UK Mission to the UN 2007). The most impressive results have been within the EU, since it has contributed to the EU developing a common energy policy—an issue that has previously been delayed for decades. Traditionally energy issues have been considered a prerogative of member states and security of supply has been considered a national security issue. The EU Commission is promoting a nonantagonistic approach that relies on liberalization and cooperation to promote a common energy policy and to secure energy supply and climate stability. The impact of this strategy is evident in the reaction to the Ukrainian gas crisis in 2006. When Russia cut the gas supply to Ukraine, due to their dispute over gas prices, the amount of gas transiting through Ukraine and destined for European countries fell dramatically (Jon Stern 2006). Despite the rapid solution of the crisis it was considered a wakeup call which prompted a significant debate on energy security. Within NATO the point was discussed in terms of new roles for the alliance, including the possibility of military involvement to patrol the supply routes, suggesting an antagonistic approach (Shea 2006), but within the EU the crisis provided an opportunity to expedite the development of a common energy policy. The common energy policy set ambitious targets, mobilizing consensus through the double lever of climate security and energy security. In January 2007 the Commission presented the ‘Energy and Climate package’ (Commission of the European Communities 2007). It included a Strategic Energy Review which focused on both internal and external aspects of EU energy policy. In March 2007, EU leaders approved the plan, agreeing on a binding target of 20 per cent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by the EU by 2020, compared to 1990 levels. Central to the agreement was the recognition that energy and environment should go hand in hand. The plan committed member states to raising the European share of renewable energy to 20 per cent, increasing energy efficiency, completing the internal market for electricity and gas, and the development of a common external energy policy. Although the focus is on the EU interest and security, the means to achieve them are market mechanisms, promotion of liberal order and multilateralism. Thus far appeals to climate security have mobilized actions even if the emergency measures have not exceeded the ordinary policy debate. Hence these appeals can be considered as proper securitization rather than failed securitizing moves.9 The securitization of climate change has avoided the identification of enemies and has involved actors other than states, both in the securitizing moves and in the security provisions.

### 1NR Link Wall

#### And local resistance alone is the link

Park 1998

Rozelia, Indiana University School of Law, An Examination of International Environmental Racism Through the Lens of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes, Vol. 5: Iss. 2, Article 14, http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol5/iss2/14

**Increased public opposition** to hazardous waste siting, scarcity of disposal facilities, and stricter environmental rules **lead to increased disposal costs. Thus, developed nations are looking for easier and less costly means of disposing of their waste.' Therefore, corporations follow the "path of least resistance", which means that corporations export their waste overseas to countries with less stringent environmental standards and lower disposal prices**. 47 By exporting their waste, "corporations can avoid the tougher measures necessary to cut down on the use of harmful chemicals and to reduce waste production at home." 4 Until recently there was little incentive to slow waste production and none at all to discontinue shipping hazardous waste to other countries.

#### The link is empirically proven in the context of coal

Henn 2007

Jamie, co-coordinator of 350.org, an international global warming campaign, In 2007, he co-organized Step It Up, a campaign that pulled together over 2,000 climate rallies across the United States to push for strong climate action at the federal level, Not In My Country: Outsourcing Pollution, http://itsgettinghotinhere.org/2007/09/15/not-in-my-country-outsourcing-pollution/

**When we close a coal plant down in the United States are we actually just opening a new one up in the developing world? A number of recent articles and reports suggest that while we may be making strides in the U**nited **S**tates **to transition away from coal, our efforts to curb global warming pollution are being nullified overseas**. In one case, as Beth Daley reported earlier this summer in the Boston Globe, a coal fired power plant that was disassembled in Massachusetts was sent piece by piece to be reconstructed in Guatemala. The plant was needed to power a textile factory that made clothing for, you guessed it, the U.S. market.

#### This link alone turns their environmental justice and disposability claims

Bullard 2008

Robert D., Ware Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center, POVERTY, POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM: STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES, http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html

Environmental Reparations. **The call for environmental and economic justice does not stop at the U.S. borders but extends to communities and nations that have been the "victims" of economic exploitation via the export of hazardous wastes, toxic products, "dirty" industries, indigenous resource extraction, and nonsustainable development practices**. **Much of the world does not get to share in the benefits of the U**nited **S**tates' high standard of living. **From energy consumption to the production and export of tobacco, pesticides, and other chemicals, more and more of the world's peoples are sharing the health and environmental burden of the United States' wasteful throw-away culture. Hazardous wastes and "dirty" industries have followed the "path of least resistance."** Poor people and poor nations are given a false choice of "no jobs and no development" versus "risky low-paying jobs and pollution."

####