Off 1 – Extra T

Interpretation—the resolution requires them to defend enactment of a topical USFG policy.

Ericson 3 Jon, 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 AND the future action that you propose.

Violation – the 1AC is extra topical – they have advantages which are not direct consequences of the enactment of the plan

Vote negative:

They unlimit the topic by allowing any number of unpredictable and extra topical advantages —failure to adhere to the communal topic leaves one side unprepared, resulting in shallow and un-educational debate—a balanced controversy is key to decision-making skills.

Steinberg and Freeley 8 – Justin 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, p. 43-45

Debate is a means of settling AND be outlined in the following discussion.

Fairness is a voting issue – topicality tells the negative what they should and should not be prepared to debate. Even if they win impact turns to topicality if we win their aff is unpredictable it’s not a fair test of the issue to allow them to weight the 1AC as offense.

Off 2 – Gangnam Style

The first Link is The Biological fallacy. The 1ac conflates 'life' with 'organism' - makes collapse of the ecosphere inevitable, turning the aff.

Rowe 96 — Stan Rowe, Professor Emeritus at the University of Saskatchewan, 1996 (“From Shallow To Deep Ecological Philosophy,” *Trumpeter*, Volume 13, Number 1, Available Online at fhttp://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/278/413, Accessed 07-26-2011)

Organisms can be “alive” AND the very roots of evolutionary creativity.

The next link is Daesin - human extinction is terminally inevitable, and there is no 'authentic relationship with Being' they forstall an encounter with Otherness. Ontology is not the primary question for this round, ethics is.

Clark 10

(Nigel, Senior Lecturer in Geography @ Open University, UK, *Parallax*, Vol. 16, No. 1, Open Research Online, “Ex-Orbitant Generosity: Gifts of Love in a Cold Cosmos,” http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/13534640903478809, Pg. 80-95)

In this way, **desire or AND If not us, then who?**

**The affirmative buys into the logic of civilization, assuming that we exist ‘separate’ from the world – the result is ecocide - mass extinctions and exploitation of the Earth’s resources.**

**The Dark Mountain 9** (Uncivilization, The Dark Mountain Manifesto, http://dark-mountain.net/about/manifesto/, 2009)

The myth of progress is founded AND horrors on which our lifestyles depend.

**Our alternative is an ethics of infinite hospitality, to recognize that the Other is beyond comprehension and to fling ourselves without fear at its 'mercy'– this is the only moral imperative.**

Introna 10

(Lucas, Professor of Organization, Technology, and Ethics @ Lancaster University, *AI & Soc*, 2010, Vol. 25, “The ‘Measure of a Man’ and the Ethos of Hospitality: Towards an Ethical Dwelling with Technology,” Pg. 93-102)

**Instead of creating value systems in AND** ). **Is** such a community **possible**?

Off 3 – Grammar of Judgment

The 1AC criticism is conditioned upon a predetermined yardstick to measure the value of their critique. The affirmative judges their strategy against the criteria established by their impact calculus. Specifically, the imperative to determine so-called proper forms of technology.

This imperative to operate along a yardstick to measure politics is complicit with disciplinary regimes that prevent transformative politics.

Pavlich 2005 (George, Professor of Sociology University of Alberta, Law and Critique (2005) 16: 95–112)

Critique and criticism are thus elemental AND immediate (judgemental) past.23

Is this a judgment against judgment? Perhaps, But We Do NOT Offer External Criteria Against Which to Judge the 1AC. We Instead Test the 1AC’s Coherence—Discerning an Implicit Double Turn:

They deploy normative utilitarian judgment against judgments of utilitarian normativity.

Judgment is not the only alternative. Critique’s Etymology Opens Up the possibility to judge but also to separate, discern, select, and decide.

“Divide the 1AC Into Two Piles.

Welcome the 1AC’s Imperative to Overcome the Limitations of Status Quo Approaches to Ontology and open ourselves to new ways of ontological being in the world. Set Aside the 1AC Impact Calculus as Justification for their Advocacy.”

Pavlich Continues:

This predicament provides unique opportunities for AND *move beyond judgemental grammars of critique.*

The experiences suppressed by the status quo are their own justification.

Suspending Judgment on 1AC Criteria Builds Affective Capacities for Political Engagement.

Leet 2002 Gender Modified\*(Martin Leet, Research Fellow in International Studies at The University of Queensland; “After-effects of Knowledge: Dogmatic Retreats and Sceptical Adventures” Critical Horizons 3:2)

As with respect to natureAND to become  detached from one’s surroundings.

Pre-determined research methods shut down the radical possibilities of our encounters.

We instead invite the “Unexpected and Unpredictable: Learning from Being Lost”\*\*

Pearce 2008 (Jenny Pearce, International Centre for Participation Studies/Department of Peace Studies at University of Bradford; “We Make Progress Because We are Lost: Critical Reflections on Co Producing Knowledge as a Methodology for Researching Non governmental Public Action” eprints.ncrm.ac.uk)

Co-production of knowledge is AND those who can best use them.