### 1AC

#### The United States federal government should lessen restrictions on natural gas production in the Environmental Protection Agency’s New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews.

#### Contention 1 is Food

#### **The EPA restrictions will crush the natural gas industry**

ARI 12 – Advanced Resources International Inc. report for the American Petroleum Institute, "Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations, February 2012, "www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic\_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx

Depending on the REC-Set Use Rate scenario assumed, the following impacts from base case levels are projected in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect (through 2015):¶ • Overall **well drilling** for unconventional resources producing natural gas over 2012 - 2015 would be **reduced by** 31% to 52%, amounting to reductions in drilling ranging from 12,700 to 21,400 wells.¶ • 5.8 to 7.0 quadrillion Btu (Quads) of otherwise economic unconventional natural gas would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 9% to **11% reduction**.¶ • 1.0 to 1.8 billion barrels of otherwise economic unconventional liquids would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 21% to 37% reduction.¶ • Federal royalties of $7.0 to $8.5 billion that would otherwise be collected would not be paid in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ • State revenues from severance taxes amounting to $1.9 to $2.3 billion would be delayed beyond the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ Under either scenario of REC equipment availability, a significant slowdown in unconventional resource development **would occur, resulting in less reserve additions, less production, lower royalties to the Federal government and** private landowners, **and l**ower severance tax payments **to state governments**. The **delays in drilling results in delays in production, which result in the delays in** the **economic benefits** associated with that production. This analysis did not attempt to estimate lost jobs associated with reduced drilling, oil and gas supply services, and indirect employment.

#### High natural gas prices make fertilizer production impossible

IECA 3 [Industrial Energy Consumers of America, nonprofit organization created to promote the interests of manufacturing companies for which the availability, use and cost of energy, power or feedstock play a significant role in their ability to compete, July 22 2003, “IMPACT OF THE U.S. NATURAL GAS CRISIS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN NITROGEN FERTILIZER INDUSTRY,” http://www.ieca-us.com/wp-content/uploads/072203Fertilizerbriefing.pdf]

Natural gas is the principal and only economically feasible feedstock raw material used for producing anhydrous ammonia, the building block product for nitrogen fertilizer. The fertilizer industry accounts for approximately three percent of the total natural gas consumed in the United States, while natural gas costs at current price levels account for nearly 90 percent of the cost to produce ammonia. ¶ Natural gas is the primary feedstock in the production of virtually all commercial nitrogen fertilizers in the United States. It is important to be very clear about this: natural gas is not simply an energy source for us; it is the raw material from which nitrogen fertilizers are made. The production process involves a catalytic reaction between ¶ elemental nitrogen derived from the air with hydrogen derived from natural gas. The primary product from this reaction is anhydrous ammonia (NH3). Anhydrous ammonia is used directly as a commercial fertilizer or as the basic building block for producing virtually all other forms of nitrogen fertilizers such as urea, ammonium nitrate and nitrogen solutions, as well as diammonium phosphate and mono-ammonium phosphate.¶ The volatility and high level of U.S. natural gas prices, virtually unprecedented in the history of our country, has resulted in the permanent closure of almost 20 percent of U.S. nitrogen fertilizer capacity and the idling of an additional 25 percent. ¶ By the end of December 2000, the U.S. nitrogen operating rate fell to below 70 percent of capacity. By the end of January 2001, operating rates dropped to an all-time low of only 46 percent. To put this into perspective, the average U.S. operating rate during the 1990s was 92 percent. ¶ During the gas spike in late February and early March of 2003, working capital requirements for one Mid-Western nitrogen manufacturer to buy gas for its operations nearly doubled--an increase of nearly $40 million in one month.2¶ Impact on U.S. Farmers¶ Natural gas prices began to steadily increase during calendar year 2000, rising from an average of $2.36 per MMBtu in January to over $6.00 per MMBtu in December 2000 and to a record $10 per MMBtu in January 2001 (Figure 3). In turn, this forced fertilizer production costs to unprecedented levels. Ammonia production costs, for example, spiked up from approximately $100 per ton to $170 per ton by June 2000, to $220 per ton in December 2000, and to an average of over $350 per ton in January 2001. ¶ The sharp rise in natural gas prices and the resulting curtailment of U.S. fertilizer production also has had a dramatic impact on fertilizer prices throughout the marketing chain and, in particular, at the farm level. Nitrogen prices at the farm level, for example, jumped this year to near-record high levels. According to U.S. Department of Agriculture data, the U.S. average farm-level price for ammonia jumped this spring to $373 per ton compared to an average spring price last year of $250. Similarly, urea prices have climbed from $191 to $261 and UAN prices from $127 to $161 in the same time period. This translates into an increase in cost to a typical Midwest corn farmer of $10 to $15 per acre. It is important to understand that most U.S. nitrogen fertilizer is consumed within a very short time frame in the fall and spring application seasons.

#### Energy is key

IECA 3 [Industrial Energy Consumers of America, nonprofit organization created to promote the interests of manufacturing companies for which the availability, use and cost of energy, power or feedstock play a significant role in their ability to compete, July 22 2003, “IMPACT OF THE U.S. NATURAL GAS CRISIS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN NITROGEN FERTILIZER INDUSTRY,” http://www.ieca-us.com/wp-content/uploads/072203Fertilizerbriefing.pdf]

High natural gas prices present the most serious threat to the fertilizer sector and to farmers in general, since the energy shocks of the 1970s. The fertilizer industry believes it is imperative that the U.S. develop a comprehensive and balanced energy policy – one that encourages the development of additional supplies and, at the same time, promotes the efficient use of a variety of energy sources and technologies. ¶ The fertilizer industry believes that a balanced and comprehensive energy policy is not only long overdue, but also essential to the long-term viability of this strategic sector. It is also crucial to the American farmer given that almost one-third of U.S. crop production is derived from nitrogen fertilizer.¶ If we are to prevent further decimation of the North American nitrogen fertilizer industry, the U.S. government must enact policies that stabilize the supply/demand balance for natural gas.

#### Fertilizer is critical to solve food crises and prevent starvation

The Fertilizer Institute 9 [Trade Group representing the fertilizer industry, “The U.S. Fertilizer Industry and Climate Change Policy,” April 2 2009, http://www.kochfertilizer.com/pdf/TFI2009ClimateChange.pdf]

Fertilizer nutrients – nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium – are all naturally occurring elements that are “fed” to plants and crops for healthy and abundant food and fiber production. They are currently responsible for 40 to 60 percent of the world’s food supply. Harvest after harvest, fertilizers replenish our soils by replacing the nutrients removed by each season’s crop. Each year, the world’s population grows by 80 million and fertilizers – used in an environmentally sensitive way – are critical to ensuring that our nation’s farmers grow an adequate supply of nutritious food for American and international consumers.¶ As consumers around the world demand improved diets, the global demand for fertilizers is growing rapidly. Under these circumstances, U.S. farmers compete with farmers from around the world for a limited supply of nutrients. For example, over 85 percent of our potash and over 50 percent of the nitrogen used on U.S. farms is now imported from other countries.¶ The United States needs a strong domestic fertilizer industry to ensure this valuable resource is available for a stable food production system. Today, the world’s food supply, as represented by the grain stocks-to-use ratio, is near its lowest level in 35 years. In six of the last seven years, consumption of grains and oilseeds has exceeded production. Many experts believe that we are just one natural disaster or substandard world harvest away from a full-scale food crisis.

#### Prioritize starvation impacts – even if suffering is inevitable and valuable extreme and involuntary suffering is not – preserving peoples’ ability to choose to not suffer is a key affirmation of human subjectivity

White 12 Richard White is associate professor of philosophy Creighton University "Levinas, the Philosophy of Suffering, and the Ethics of Compassion" The Heythrop Journal Volume 53, Issue 1, pages 111–123, Published online Sept 27 2011, official publication date: January 2012, Wiley

Levinas's phenomenology of suffering is compelling and to a great extent his account is confirmed by Scarry and Amery who write from very different standpoints. However, we may note one point of concern: Levinas does not dwell on the distinction between suffering that is voluntary and suffering that is not chosen. The fighter who is hurt in the ring may actually suffer more than the innocent person who is beaten, but his suffering is not experienced as a violation because it is chosen as a means to the end of success. This suggests that suffering is not always measured by the sheer amount of physical pain. Likewise, it is more traumatic to be hurt deliberately by others, even though one may suffer exactly the same amount of pain during the course of a physical illness. Of course, Levinas argues that in a sense all pain is experienced as ‘personally directed’, but the fact that someone else has deliberately inflicted this pain on me gives it an even more repellent aspect. As Amery comments: ‘Whoever has succumbed to torture can no longer feel at home in the world. The shame of destruction cannot be erased … That one's fellow man was experienced as the antiman remains in the tortured person as accumulated horror. It blocks the view into a world in which the principle of hope rules’.[30] We would ask Levinas to what extent one can ever speak about suffering in general; perhaps it is possible, but the origin of any given suffering is an essential aspect of it.

The second question is: Can suffering ever be meaningful? As we have already noted, some philosophers, including Nietzsche, exalt the value of suffering because it promotes ‘character’. In Beyond Good and Evil, for example, Nietzsche claims that, ‘profound suffering makes noble’;[31] in The Gay Science, he says that, ‘only great pain is the ultimate liberator of the spirit’;[32] and in Thus Spoke Zarathustra, he describes the sickness of the modern world in trying to eliminate all pain: ‘We have invented happiness’, say the last men, ‘and they blink’.[33] Of course, it may well be the case that some kind of a struggle is necessary for living a flourishing life; and the possibility of a successful struggle also comes with the possibility of failure and the suffering that failure entails. Levinas, however, is more concerned with the most extreme forms of suffering that completely destroy the well-being of people without any possibility of redemption in the future. For example, the suffering of those who are mentally handicapped, who cannot understand their suffering or communicate it to others: ‘One can go further – and doubtless thus arrive at the essential facts of pure pain – by evoking the “pain illnesses” of beings who are psychically deprived, backward, handicapped, in their relational life and in their relationships to the Other, relationships where suffering, without losing anything of its savage malignancy, no longer covers up the totality of the mental and comes across novel lights within new horizons’.[34] How could such pure, unmediated pain finally be recuperated into the context of a meaningful life? Or following Ivan's ruminations in The Brothers Karamazov, how can we reconcile the suffering and the murder of children with the goodness of creation? How could such things ever be ‘for the best?’

In his essay, ‘Useless Suffering’, Levinas focuses on the mountain of suffering that belongs to the 20th century. Such excessive suffering – the torture and destruction of millions of innocent people, the elderly, children, even babies, calls into question the traditional conception of God as supremely powerful and supremely good, and appears to undermine ‘theodicy’ as a lie. And today, when some people even deny that the Holocaust ever happened, it would seem that the suffering of those who endured the Holocaust has become more pointless than ever. Levinas explains: ‘This would be pain in its undiluted malignity, suffering for nothing. It renders impossible and odious every proposal and every thought which would explain it by the sins of those who have suffered or are dead’.[35] This leads him to argue that theodicy as the justification of the other person's pain, is ‘certainly the source of all immorality’.[36] – In the case of the Holocaust, it was the bystanders, and not just the perpetrators, who allowed this great evil to happen, using rationalization and justification which implied that the victims deserved their fate. In this regard, theodicy is not a good thing, but actually an evil and a temptation insofar as it turns us away from the reality of someone else's suffering by framing it within the context of a larger metaphysical order.

But Levinas does not claim that all suffering is meaningless. As we have already noted, he claims that even though the suffering of the other cannot be made meaningful from my perspective, my own suffering can have meaning if I suffer for the other and thereby respond to her suffering: ‘In this perspective a radical difference develops between suffering in the other, which for me is unpardonable and solicits me and calls me, and suffering in me, my own adventure of suffering, whose constitutional or congenital uselessness can take on a meaning, the only meaning to which suffering is susceptible, in becoming a suffering for the suffering – be it inexorable – of someone else’.[37] This is the perspective that Levinas intimated earlier in his essay, ‘Transcendence and Evil’, the inter-human region of being that exists insofar as I am bound to acknowledge the suffering of the Other and his claims upon me. According to Levinas: ‘It is this attention to the Other which, across the cruelties of our century – despite these cruelties, because of these cruelties – can be affirmed as the very bond of human subjectivity, even to the point of being raised to a supreme ethical principle – the only one which it is not possible to contest – a principle which can go so far as to command the hopes and practical discipline of vast human groups’.[38] This is the breakthrough of the Good, which inaugurates subjectivity; for I am summoned to responsibility by the face of the Other which commands my obedience now.

At one point in his essay, ‘Useless Suffering’, Levinas elaborates his position on the possibility of useful suffering, in terms of compassion, which other thinkers, including Schopenhauer, Rousseau, Nussbaum and a long line of Buddhist writers, have also viewed as the key to morality. According to Martha Nussbaum, for example, compassion is fundamental and it must be cultivated because it is the basic social emotion.[39] Levinas himself puts it this way: ‘Must not humanity now, in a faith more difficult than ever, in a faith without theodicy, continue Sacred History; a history which now demands even more of the resources of the self in each one, and appeals to its suffering inspired by the suffering of the other person, to its compassion which is a non-useless suffering (or love), which is no longer suffering “for nothing”, and which straightaway has a meaning?’[40] – In this passage, Levinas is claiming that my own suffering only becomes meaningful when it is suffering which is for the other person. But how would this be possible? One response is to say that by cultivating an awareness of the suffering of others, and by using my moral imagination to identify with their plight, I can develop my natural compassion, and in this way I could become more responsive to the needs of other people. Also, by facing up to my own suffering – and not just ignoring it – I can learn to be more aware of the sufferings of others, and in this way I will be more available to help them. Something like this would be the Buddhist position on suffering which we will briefly consider in the final section of this paper. But is this what Levinas has in mind in the passage just quoted?

#### We must prioritize global food crises – there is a political responsibility to reverse the current focus on the local which prevents global solidarity

Johansen 9 (Emily, lecturer in the Department of Global Studies as well as the Department of English and Film Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, “The Political Allure of the Local: Food and Cosmopolitanism in Timothy Taylor’s Stanley Park and Ruth L. Ozeki’s My Year of Meats”, Issue 2, http://www.politicsandculture.org/2010/10/27/the-political-allure-of-the-local-food-and-cosmopolitanism-in-timothy-taylor%E2%80%99s-stanley-park-and-ruth-l-ozeki%E2%80%99s-my-year-of-meats/)

RECENT DEBATES SURROUNDING SUSTAINABLE FOOD PRODUCTION, distribution and consumption have been articulated around the idea that the more local these processes are, the better – an idea most clearly (and publicly) put forth in Alisa Smith’s and J.B. MacKinnon’s best-selling The 100-Mile Diet but also taken up in, among other texts, Barbara Kingsolver’s Animal, Vegetable, Miracle and Michael Pollan’s The Omnivore’s Dilemma. Yet this idea – that local food is a more sustainable environmental choice that has positive economic repercussions for local food producers and communities – has often and all too easily become synonymous with the idea that the global is something to be wary of, an apolitical zone dominated by the values of neoliberal capitalism. These two ideas set up a dichotomy, then, in which the local is inherently the site of responsible political action and the global is inherently the site of irresponsible corporate greed. This fetishization of the local at the expense of the global sets up an untenable binary that suggests, at best, a highly romanticized yet anachronistic longing for an imagined past where the global did not intrude on daily lives or, at worst, a model for political action that invalidates necessary solidarity-building with others throughout the world, promoting a chauvinistic view of international relations – both at the macro level of the nation-state and the micro level of the individual. This focus on the local is perhaps particularly galling coming from citizens of Euro-American nation-states as it suggests that these citizens have no ethical or political responsibility in the situation of citizens of other places.

#### Food can create the possibilities for shared meanings through we which we can engage with others

Greene and Cramer 11 (Carlnita P, PhD, is an Associate Professor in the Communication and Journalism Department at the University of New Mexico and Janet M, PhD, is an Associate Professor in the Communication and Journalism Department at the University of New Mexico, “Beyond mere sustenance: Food as communication/Communication as food”, <http://www.peterlang.com/download/extract/58293/extract_310963.pdf>)

Broadly defined, communication is the process by which we understand the world and our attempts to convey that understanding to others through both verbal and nonverbal language. In this way, we can view food as a form of communication because it is a nonverbal means by which we share meanings with others. As Roland Barthes has written, food is a system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of usages, situations, and behavior. Information about food must be gathered wherever it can be found: by direct observation in the economy, in techniques, usages and advertising; and by indirect observation in the mental life of a given society. (cited in Counihan and Van Esterik, 2008, p. 29)

Paralleling Barthes, scholars such as Claude Levi-Strauss (1983) and Mary Douglas have asserted that we can view food as adhering to the same practices as language because food is a code that can be seen to express patterns about social relationships (cited in Counihan and Van Esterik, 2008, p. 44). Spurlock (2009), in ―Performing and Sustaining (Agri)Culture and Place: The Cultivation of Environmental Subjectivity on the Piedmont Farm Tour‖ also proposes that: ―Because of their ability to signify, mediate, contest, and represent ‗nature‘ and ‗culture,‘ foodways are deeply rhetorical and performative‖ (p. 6).

A primary reason that we should view food as a form of communication is because it is directly linked to both ritual and culture, where ritual is defined as ―the voluntary performance of appropriately patterned behavior to symbolically effect or participate in the serious life‖ (Rothenbuhler, 1998, p. 27). Nowhere can this serious life be viewed more closely than in rituals involving food. It is at the center of our most important events such as birthdays, weddings, funerals, and holidays. Food not only is a part of rituals, but also there are several festivals solely focused on particular food items such as the Gilroy Garlic Festival or the Hilton Apple Fest. Within ritual contexts, food often acts symbolically by representing or ―standing in‖ for expressions such as life, love, grief, or happiness. Even within our daily experiences, the ways that we eat and dine with others can be categorized as ritualistic because they involve repetition, expected behaviors, and roles for both the participants and the food (Rothenbuhler, 1998). Therefore, if food is used ritually, it also can be viewed as a form of culture even in its ―ordinary‖ state.

Following Williams‘ (1958) work, if we view food as a common facet of our daily lives, and we see culture as ―ordinary,‖ then certainly food is a means by which we create cultures. In Food is Culture, Montanari (2006) asserts this perspective by claiming: ―Food is culture when it is produced…when it is prepared…when it is eaten…‖ (pp. xi-xii, italics in original). That is to say, throughout every step of our encounters with food, we shape it in one way or another whether it is through selections of certain foods versus others, cooking processes, and/or the ways in which we consume it. Spurlock (2009) also maintains: ―Through its absences and presences in everyday life, food and foodways highlight the moral, aesthetic, and ethical concerns of a given cultural milieu‖ (p. 7). Moreover, food acts as a conveyor of culture precisely because we use it as means of communication.

In his foundational work, Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society, Carey (1992) argues: ―communication is a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed‖ (p. 23). If we follow Carey‘s (1992) argument, then surely food is one of the most readily-available symbols that we have at our disposal, which can be viewed from both the perspectives of communication and culture. In other words, we often use food to communicate with others and as a means of demonstrating personal identity, group affiliation and disassociation, and other social categories, such as socioeconomic class. In this sense, ―food is a product and mirror of the organization of society…, a prism that absorbs and reflects a host of cultural phenomena‖ (Counihan, 1999, p. 6). Food functions symbolically as a communicative practice by which we create, manage, and share meanings with others.

Perhaps one of the most common ways that we utilize food is in the construction of our personal identities. As Brillat-Savarin (2000) claims in The Physiology of Taste, ―Tell me what kind of food you eat, and I will tell you what kind of man you are‖ (p. 3). In other words, we regularly define ―who we are‖ according to both the foods that we eat and those that we refrain from consuming. For example, a person may identify as a ―vegan,‖ a ―carnivore,‖ an ―omnivore,‖ or simply as a ―foodie.‖ We have a direct, visceral connection to food, and it is often linked to emotion and memory or serves as a source of comfort for some people.

#### Life has intrinsic and objective value achieved through subjective pleasures---its preservation should be an a priori goal

Amien **Kacou 8** WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: **there is pleasure in all consciousness** of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, **it is simply the very experience of liking things**, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, **there are many things the experience of which we like**. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, **what they are is irrelevant** in an inquiry on **a priori value**—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation.

Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and **only in living**, therefore, **a priori**, life ought to be **continuously (and indefinitely) pursued** at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good.

#### Contention 2 is Our Advocacy is Good

#### Academic debate over energy policy facilitates deliberation and more effective decision-making---otherwise special interests poison neutrality

Mitchell 10 (Gordon R, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, where he also directs the William Pitt Debating Union, “SWITCH-SIDE DEBATING MEETS DEMAND-DRIVEN RHETORIC OF SCIENCE”, <http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/Mitchell2010.pdf>)

Yet the picture grows more complex when one considers what is happening over at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), where environmental scientist Ibrahim Goodwin is collaborating with John W. Davis on a **project that uses switch-side debating to clean up air and water**. In April 2008, that initiative brought top intercollegiate debaters from four universities to Washington, D.C., for a series of debates on the topic of water quality, held for an audience of EPA subject matter experts working on interstate river pollution and bottled water issues. An April 2009 follow-up event in Huntington Beach, California, featured another debate weighing the relative merits of monitoring versus remediation as beach pollution strategies. “We use nationally ranked intercollegiate debate programs to research and present the arguments, both pro and con, devoid of special interest in the outcome,” explains Davis. “In doing so, agency **representatives** now **remain** squarely **within the decision-making role** thereby **neutralizing overzealous advocacy that can inhibit learned discourse**.”7

The intelligence community and EPA debating initiatives vary quite a bit simply by virtue of the contrasting policy objectives pursued by their sponsoring agencies (foreign policy versus environmental protection). Significant process-level differences mark off the respective initiatives as well; the former project entails largely one-way interactions designed to sluice insight from “open sources” to intelligence analysts working in classified environments and producing largely secret assessments. In contrast, the EPA’s debating initiative is conducted through public forums in a policy process required by law to be transparent. This granularity troubles Greene and Hicks’s deterministic framing of switch-side debate as an ideologically smooth and consistent cultural technology. In an alternative approach, **this essay positions debate as a malleable method of decision making, one utilized by different actors in myriad ways to pursue various purposes**. By bringing forth the texture inherent in the associated messy “mangle of practice,”8 **such an approach has potential to deepen our understanding of debate as a** dynamic and contingent, rather than static**, form of rhetorical performance**.

Juxtaposition of the intelligence community and EPA debating initiatives illuminates additional avenues of inquiry that take overlapping elements of the two projects as points of departure. Both tackle complex, multifaceted, and technical topics that do not lend themselves to reductionist, formal analysis, and both tap into the creative energy latent in what Protagoras of Abdera called dissoi logoi, the process of learning about a controversial or unresolved issue by airing opposing viewpoints.9 In short, these institutions are employing debate as a tool of deliberation, seeking outside expertise to help accomplish their aims. Such trends provide an occasion to revisit a presumption commonly held among theorists of deliberative democracy—that debate and deliberation are fundamentally opposed practices—as the intelligence community’s Analytic Outreach program and the EPA’s debating initiatives represent examples where **debating exercises are designed to** facilitate, not frustrate**, deliberative goals**.