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#### To maximize the three hours we have together, three preconditions must be met ---- The affirmative’s failure to advance these 3 pre-requisites undermines debate’s transformative and intellectual potential

1. Two teams oppose sides- the affirmative has the burden of proof to prove a change from the status quo in direction of the resolution and the negative has the burden of rejoinder (conflict-based scenario)

1. Debate should have a voted-on resolution that is established prior the debate (knowledge aspect)

2. Each side has equal times to speaking in the debate (game resources)

Harr et al 8, Rasmus Harr (IT University of Copenhagen, Center for Computer Games Research, Copenhagen, Denmark), Tasha Buch (School of Education, University of Aarhus, Department for Educational Anthropology, Copenhagen, Denmark), Thorkild Hanghøj (University of Southern Denmark, Department of Media Science, Odense, Denmark), “Exploring the discrepancy between educational goals and educational game design,” 2008, http://www.itu.dk/people/rasmusharr/08\_05%20ECGBL\_paper\_final.doc

According to Jan Klabbers, the study of educational games (i.e. simulations and video games) stems from different research traditions (Klabbers 2006). Thus, we need a broad, cross-disciplinary conceptualization of educational games, which can be accepted by different disciplines that all have different criteria for validating knowledge. In order to solve this epistemological problem, Klabbers draws upon the social anthropologist Frederick Barth’s theory on the anthropology of knowledge, which can be used to describe different “traditions of knowledge” (Barth 2002: 3). For Barth, a tradition of knowledge can be defined analytically in relation to a substantive corpus of assertions, a range of media and representations, and a social organisation (Barth 2002). Based upon this framework, Klabbers argues that a game embeds assertions and ideas about the world in three ways: In the rule-base of the game, in the resources of the game, and in the players and their knowledge. Game media of representation include game boards, papers, pencils, multimedia computers etc. Similarly, games are distributed, communicated, employed, and transmitted within particular social institutions – i.e. large organisations or school settings (Klabbers 2006: 71). The three aspects of knowledge (assertions, representations, social organisation) are interconnected and determine each other mutually (Klabbers 2006: 72, Barth 2002: 3). This dynamic resembles Gee’s notion of semiotic domains defined by distinct forms of “content”, literacies, and social practices, which can be designed to engage and manipulate people in certain ways (Gee 2003: 43 ff). The point here is that any tradition of knowledge – i.e. educational games or teaching practices – generates tradition-specific criteria for validating knowledge. In order to understand the relationship between educational games and educational goals, we wish to concentrate on how educational games are played within the formal context of classroom settings. Thus, the knowledge aspects of gaming can be compared with the knowledge aspects of teaching (Jank & Meyer 2006). See table 1 below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge aspect** | **Teaching** | **Gaming** |
| Assertions | Educational goals, content, norms, and values | Conflict-based scenario with roles, rules, and goals |
| Modes of representation | Teacher-pupil dialogue and available learning resources | Realisable resources (depends upon particular game format/genre) |
| Social organisation | Organisation of teaching and learning activities | Realisation of game assertions and resources |

Table 1: Teaching and gaming as dual traditions of knowledge

Obviously, the different knowledge aspects of gaming and teaching are not to be seen as “equal” entities as they are based upon different ontologies and different intentions. Instead, the purpose of the table above is to provide an analytical framework that makes it possible to understand the complex relationship between gaming practices and teaching practices. Thus, the parameters listed in the table may be used to promote further research and discussions on the design and use of educational games. However, for the purpose of this paper, we merely wish to focus on the relationship between educational games and educational goals within the context of classroom settings. We believe that this focus should be a crucial concern for educational game researchers. Thus, there exists an abundance of theory on educational games, but there are relatively few empirical studies of whether or how educational games are able to realise their intended educational goals (Klabbers 2006, Sefton-Green 2006, van Eck 2007).

2.1. A socio-cultural approach to game-based learning

A meta-theory on educational gaming should not be limited a priori to any particular learning theory. Rather, we believe that the choice of learning theory for understanding educational games must depend upon actual research questions, the knowledge aspects of a given game and the educational goals, which the game intends to help the player/pupil to fulfil. As we wish to focus on the players/pupils’ own experience of playing educational games within a formal school setting, we believe that a socio-cultural approach provides a valuable theoretical framework (Linderoth 2004, Hanghøj in press). Thus, in this paper, we will not include perspectives on cognitive an d constructivist learning processes. However, before presenting our assumptions of game-based learning in more detail, we will first describe the faces of knowledge embedded in the educational video game Global Conflicts: Palestine game design and its intended educational goals.

2.2. Global Conflicts: Palestine as an anthropology of knowledge

On the game website, GC: P is described as a 3D role-playing simulation game, “which gives the chance to explore the Israeli-Palestinian conflict first-hand” (http://learning.seriousgames.dk/learn-more.aspx, last visited 28-05-2008). The game is targeted at pupils of the age of 12+ in relation to school subjects such as citizenship, history, and media studies. The game lets the player take on the role as a freelance journalist who is sent on various news assignments by an editor. These consists of doing research in order to write an article by walking around in the 3D environment and “interviewing” different sides of the conflict through the acquisition of “quotes”. The quotes are then used for putting together a newspaper article. Before going out to interview people on each assignment, the player will have to choose which newspaper to write for – an Israeli, a Palestinian, or a European newspaper. Having chosen a news angle the player will experience the difficulty of getting enough information from all sides of the story when researching different sides of the conflict: If the player chooses either the Israeli or Palestinian newspaper, the opposite part will be hesitant to deliver information. Similarly, if the player has chosen the more balanced European newspaper then people from both the Israeli and Palestinian side will be suspicious. When a mission is accomplished, the player calls the editorial office, and by making use of the collected quotes, the player constructs an article with a headline and illustrating pictures. The goal is to accomplish as high a news value in the article as possible. This is done by finding as good quotes as possible.

According to the website of Serious Games Interactive (SGI), the company behind GC: P, the game themes include human rights, terrorism, and the role of media. Furthermore, the game is intended to teach the pupils specific skills and competences in terms of critical thinking in relation to news sources, being able to write an article as well as the appreciation of different perspectives on the ideological conflict. In order to achieve these educational goals, the game is intended to support the pupils’ learning processes through a series of motivating elements by providing a safe, engaging, and realistic environment.

If we look at the knowledge aspects in this educational game, there are certain values embedded in educational intentions of the game and in the actual game design as it is realized in the classroom. Thus, the game is a 3D single-player role-playing game created for use in formal educational environments for teaching citizenship, history, and media. Consequently, the assertions, modes of representation, and the social organization around the game are very much dictated by the formal educational environment of a school, a classroom, pupils, a teacher, and perhaps an IT-room.

2.3. Turning meta-theory into an analytical tool

In order to couple our meta-theory of educational games to the analysis of GC: P, we will apply perspectives from multimodal theory (Kress 2001). Briefly put, multimodal theory seeks to extend the linguistic origins of social semiotics to include sound, visual images and other forms of representation in order to show how different modalities of communication are combined in different kinds of media. This perspective is especially targeted at the design and use of digital media, which plays a large role in contemporary forms of communication and education (Kress 2001, Kress 2005, Jewitt 2008). Thus, multimodal theory is highly relevant for our analysis of the various modalities embedded within the 3D role-playing environment of GC:P..

One of the central assumptions in multimodal theory is that modalities are not equally suited to fulfil particular semiotic purposes. In order to explore the relationship between modality and purpose, Kress adapts Gibson’s notion of “affordance” (Gibson 1979, Kress 2005). Thus, for Kress, affordance refers to “distinct potentials and limitations for representation of the various modes” (Kress 2005: 12). This means that teachers and pupils tend to act differently, when presented with different modalities and their respective affordances. On the other hand, it is not possible to predict exactly how different teachers and pupils will respond to the affordances of different modalities (Prior 2005).

The main point here is that it is possible to understand the educational potential of a video game by performing an empirical analysis that compares the intentions of the game design and the actual realisation of game design. Burn and Carr have presented a model for analysing video games via multimodal theory (Burn 2003). According to this model, it is possible to identify three different areas of motivation for meaning-making processes in relation to game designs. These areas include: ludic motivations (strategy, goals, skills acquisition, exploration, rules), representational motivations (dramatic, narrative, performative aspects) and communal motivations (the game’s generic identity and wider digital culture).

2.4. Choosing a learning theoretical framework

As suggested by GC:P’s self-description, the game intends to facilitate learning processes, which feature an active learner that experiments and explores different perspectives through critical thinking. Thus, we believe that John Dewey’s theory of inquiry-based learning is a suitable theory for describing the intended learning goals and processes of the game (Dewey 1916, 1933). According to Dewey, pupils learn by inquiring into particular problems through a continual construction and re-construction of experience-based forms of knowledge. Inspired by Dewey, James Paul Gee presents this as a four-stage process, where the player: 1) probes a virtual world, 2) forms a hypothesis based upon reflections, 3 reprobes the game world with that hypothesis in mind, and 4) treats the feedback from the game world through rethinking of his/her original hypothesis (Gee 2003: 90).

Analogous to his theory of inquiry-based learning, Dewey used the metaphorical image of a "dramatic rehearsal" to describe how individuals make moral and ethical decisions by a playing through of “various competing possible lines of action" in their mind (Dewey 1922: 190). Thus, when pupils enter the scenario of GC:P, they must explore the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from a journalist's perspective and interview the characters within the game world by playing through and enacting different moral and strategic choices in relation to their journalistic aims and the game characters' assigned norms and values.

3. Empirical study

In this section, we will present GC: P through the lens of a multimodal analysis, which relates the designed intentions of the game scenario to teachers and pupils’ perceptions of the realised game. This analysis does not represent a finished analysis, but consists of selected examples in line with the goal of this paper, which is to explore and discuss the discrepancy between the intentions of educational games and realised educational goals.

3.1. Setup

In this pilot study, GC:P was used in a simple 1 ½ hour set-up with a 9th grade (15-16 years of age), who played the news assignment “Military Raid”. The empirical findings consist of observations from the setup, combined with post-game interviews with the teacher and 8 pupils. The school was a lower secondary Danish public school in the economically well-to-do suburbs North of Copenhagen with a group of pupils that were relatively culturally homogenous. Furthermore, the school has a strong ICT-profile, as ICT is embedded in many activities of the everyday school life.

3.1.1. Building the newspaper article in GC: Palestine

Our empirical findings focus on the article writing and quote-system in GC:P. Thus, we will briefly describe how these work in the game. When a player has finished his or her collection of quotes via the in-game “interviews” the player calls in the article to “the editorial office”. Here there is a shift from the 3D world to a 2D article platform, where the player builds the article using the quotes taken during the interviews. As figure 1 shows the article platform is divided in two parts: An article template in the left of the screen and, to the right side of the screen, three categories with three possible options of which the article is build: headlines, notes and pictures. The headlines present three different political value sets: the Israeli perspective, the Palestinian perspective and the balanced perspective. The player must then choose the right headline that fits with the political angle of the article. Choosing one of three pictures to illustrate the content is optional.

Figure 1: Article template and feedback section in Global Conflicts: Palestine (SGI, 2007) April 2008.

Finally, the player selects three quotes out of the maximum of 15 quotes from the virtual notebook and place these three quotes as ‘head text’, ‘body text’ or ‘sub text’. Each quote is evaluated on its news value (see figure 1, left picture). At the bottom of the right side of the screen information is shown on the status of the article (total news value of the article and an Israeli/Palestinian alignment status on article level) and the status of the player progression (‘intern’, ‘apprentice’ and ‘reporter’-level and an Israeli/Palestinian alignment status on player level). When the article is constructed, the player sends it to the in-game newspaper office by pressing the submit button. Then a piece of evaluating text pops up explaining the editor’s perception of the article and its final placement in the newspaper (see figure 1, right picture).

3.2. Empirical findings

The preliminary analysis of the empirical data from the pilot study is primarily based upon observations and post-game interviews with selected pupils and the teacher, as well as the director of SGI behind GC: P. In the post-game interviews with the pupils, two main analytical themes on the article template emerged. The first theme concerns the structural design of the article template, while the second regards the perception of the quantitative versus qualitative evaluation of the quotes when “writing” the article.

Examining the first point, the pupils found the absence of syntactic coherence between the quotes in the article template to be quite problematic:

Pupil B: “It doesn’t really fit together as an article, and maybe that doesn’t matter, because afterwards you don’t need the article. But when there are three quotes and a picture, and there is no other text… well, I think it was difficult to make it fit together.”

Questioner: “You mean that the quotes didn’t fit in a verbal sense?”

Pupil B: “Yes, if there are three different points of views, and they are not really tied together, if you haven’t played the game yourself, right. If you just saw those three quotes, you would think ’what do these have to do with each other?’ They have something to do with each other, but it is quite difficult to show, when there is no…”

Questioner: [interrupts] “For other people to understand?”

Pupil B: “Yes, exactly.”

(Pupil focus group interview, no. 1, 10/04/2008)

It was a general experience among the pupils that the quotes in the article template were mutually incoherent, and therefore not tied together. Also, the meaning of the quotes was stripped from the context in which they were taken. In this way, it was difficult for the pupils to grasp the overall meaning of the article. Furthermore, many pupils were frustrated that they had no control over the composition of the text. This lack of control meant that they were not able to communicate and make other people understand the work they had been doing within the game. Thus, the pupils were more interested in the article as a product, which could be shown to others, instead of merely using the output for their own evaluation.

This leads us to the second point, which concerns the pupils’ need for qualifying the content of the article with their own personal conceptions of the context in a mission. Here they are asked for comments on the article platform:

Pupil B: “I just think that you should make the judgment yourself instead of the computer.”

Questioner: “Would that be nice if you could do that yourself?”

Pupil B: “It would be more interesting, because concerning this selection, you would discover ’okay, this is good’ or ’oh well, it isn’t, anyway’, then it is one’s own opinion when it is yourself writing the newspaper. And of course you would go after making it your own, but then again, you also wanted the best evaluation.”

Pupil A: “But there are only statements and quotes from the people, you didn’t report anything yourself at all.”

Pupil C: “There could have been some options where you could be able to write something yourself. (…)”

Questioner: “It could have been nice if this option was available?”

Pupil A: “Well, maybe that would have been more journalistic, or more right.”

Pupil C: “It would have been more personal, if you could express your own opinion, you could say.”

(Pupil focus group interview no. 2, 10/04/2008)

As this excerpt suggests, the pupils expressed a need for being able to evaluate the quotes and write the content in the article template themselves. Thus, the game content could be more interested if the pupils were allowed to evaluate and actually write as this would allow them to discover their own limits. Arguably, this feature could also create opportunities for critical thinking and re-construction of knowledge. Instead, the pupils’ response suggests that the players’ current possibilities for recognising his/her knowledge deficiencies are rather blurred.

Furthermore, the pupil’s lacking sense of self-control over the “interviews” with in-game characters and the imitated “writing” process were seen as problematic. Instead, they saw the possibility for actually writing a text within the game design as a motivational and challenging aspect in itself. The pupils also pointed out that more self-control over the text in the article template would add more realism to the journalist role. The teacher supports this interpretation in a separate interview, when describing her reflections on how the pupils’ reacted on playing GC:P.

“The pupils complained that they were able to figure it out in some way, when it [the quote] has a high news value. They were disappointed that it was ‘laid out on the table’. It would have been nice if they had to think for themselves, and then afterwards they could see whether it had news value or not, or more alignment, or what it was.”

(Teacher interview 10/04/2008, our markings)

The teacher would clearly value teaching her pupils critical and independent thinking. She would several times use the phrase “using the brain” during the play session and debriefing with the pupils, which, to her, represents the core of critical thinking. These findings points to a general discussion about quantitative and qualitative approaches to the acquisition of knowledge and cognitive skills. As suggested by an interview, the game designers are fully aware of this discussion:

“If you consider it structurally, then the problem is that an… an interpretation or a good quote is a subjective consideration, which is very difficult to quantify and operationalise. And that is what we try to do. Structurally it will always cause trouble. Because a pupil could think ’I could use this quote in this way’, and if we [Serious Games Interactive] didn’t think it that way, so to say. Or if the pupil has a particular qualification or a special background, which means that he/she is able to see certain things. And you could say that the pupil would get punished for this qualification if it doesn’t fit with the logic of the game.”

(interview with CEO Simon Egenfeldt-Nielsen, SGI 08/04/2008)

Another empirical finding we find worth mentioning is that the actual dialogue between the pupils working in pairs was reduced to pointing at the screen followed by short exclaims. These exclaims would be ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘pick that one’, concerning the dialogue text on which the pupils were to take a stand as they were playing the journalist role. Furthermore, the dialogue between pupils and teacher was mostly reduced to questions about strategies of the journalist role or technical problems. The rich amount of text in dialogues between the journalist and the informants of a mission made the pupils attention cling to the screen as they had to read the text before being able to make a choice.

4. Educational goals versus game elements

In this section, we wish to discuss the discursive modes that are represented in the structural composition of the quote system and the article template. As the empirical findings suggest, the pupils’ learning experience was closely linked with the game representations for selecting quotes and editing the article. Furthermore, the pupils’ lack of control of the composition made it impossible for them to express their own interpretations of what they had grasped as relevant information from the game missions.

In summary, both teachers and pupils’ questioned the lack of a more engaging and self-dependent form of participation in the game, which could involve actual writing –in contrast to mere imitation of journalistic writing. According to the teacher, this would allow the pupils to “think for themselves’”. Based upon the current game design, it is questionable whether the article template and the quote system is able to support critical thinking as it is mainly the game system that decide for the pupils. This point towards a gap between the teacher’s and the pupils’/players’ understanding of critical thinking on one side, and the game designer's promises of critical thinking as one of the educational goals of the game on the other side.

When analyzing GC: P from a multimodal discourse analytical perspective, there appears to be a discrepancy between the “learning discourse” of the game and the actual design stratas of the game (Kress 2001). Thus, the educational goals of the game states that pupil should be able to learn about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, whereas the design is mainly centred on the game elements and game goals, which allow pupils/players to learn and act as a journalist. According to the response from teachers and pupils, the journalist role seems to be stealing the focus from the content of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This discrepancy is supported by the “reward” system of the game, which allows pupils to score points that measure the “trust” of the Israelis and Palestinians.

Furthermore, the game representations raise certain expectations among the pupils, which influence the affordances of the perceived signs within the game environment. Following Burn and Carr’s analytical model described earlier, we will argue that the 3D aesthetics of the role-playing/adventure game genre (representational motivation) promises inquiry-based exploration and challenge within the game world (ludic motivation) (Burn 2003, Dewey 1916). The representational motivations are further linked with the genre-specific expectations (communal motivation) raised by the game design as it both refers to the practices of real-life news journalists and the pupils’ familiarity with video games as such. However, the players’ choices within the game (i.e. having dialogues with different characters, getting qusotes, and creating articles) are basically founded upon the logics of multiple choice. Thus, playing the game creates a discrepancy between the representational/communal motivations and the ludic motivations of the game. This discrepancy was a recurring theme in the post-game interviews, where the pupils were disappointed that they could not produce their own articles – which would fulfil their expectations toward the role of a “journalist”. Thus, the pupils were only able to imitate the process of “writing an article”.

From the game designer’s perspective, this discrepancy makes sense, since, as the quote mentioned in section above illustrates, it is very hard to quantify the “news value” of a quote in a meaningful way. Thus, the individual pupil found it difficult to understand the premises for this quantitative form of evaluation as it is not backed by any arguments or explanations. In this empirical study, it seemed that the pupils’ comprehension of their game experience was mainly focused on: 1) the logic of the game system’s evaluation of the quotes, 2) whether a point-of-view represents one or the other stance, and/or 3) trying to figure out the cohesion between the quotes. However, instead of promoting critical thinking, the actual process of composing the article ends up being a drill-and-practice exercise, where the pupils simply click through the different quotes.

5. Discussion

The aim of this paper is to open a crucial discussion about the discrepancy between the intentions of educational game designs and realised educational goals. Unfortunately, the empirical aspects of this problem seems to be somewhat neglected among educational games researchers, who prefer to spend time discussing exciting new theories or design details within the safe environment of their separate “ghettos”. In order to provide a common ground for this discussion within and across these different ghettos, we propose that Barth’s/Klabbers’ meta-theoretical framework can be used to understand and compare how the knowledge aspects of educational games and educational gaming in terms of assertions, modes of representation and social forms of organisation (Barth 2002, Klabbers 2006, Hanghøj in press).

In our pilot study of GC:P, we found that there was a clear discrepancy between educational game elements versus educational goals, or between “means” and “ends” as Dewey would term it (Dewey 1916). This leads to a broader discussion on whether it is meaningful to use computers for evaluating learning processes. If we look at what areas in which educational games have been commercially successful (i.e. the military, health care, disaster prevention, management, and financial simulations), it seems obvious that video games offer a relevant way of evaluating learning that occurs within closed systems, and where the learning goals are related directly to understanding this system (Klabbers 2006). For more context-dependent learning goals, such as being able to understand the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in critical perspective, it is questionable whether a computer may be able to evaluate pupils’ complex learning experiences in a meaningful way. Still, feedback through continual evaluation of a player’s actions is one of the basic tenets of almost any theory on video games and learning (Gee 2003). Thus, we need further analysis on how or whether the computerised systems of educational computer games should be able to provide this feedback.

GC:P is a game that promises to teach pupils critical thinking. One can ask whether it is possible for pupils to learn critical thinking without having to actively reflect and question their own knowledge and experience (Dewey, 1916). Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the limited dialogue between pupils playing GC:P in pairs are able to realise the well-documented potential of “shared inquiry” through pupils (and teachers’) “exploratory talk” (Wegerif, 2007). Returning to our meta-theoretical framework, we will argue that if an educational game aims to foster critical thinking, then this aim will determine what kind of assertions, modes and representation and learning activities that should be embedded in the game design. In the case of GC:P, it seems unlikely that it is possible to teach and learn critical thinking merely by letting pupils interact with the game environment without actively producing meaningful utterances – i.e. through relevant forms of speaking or writing. On the other hand, we should not rule out the possibility of designing an educational computer game, which is able to combine game activities with pupils’ opportunities for mutual self-expression and evaluation through spoken or written forms of communication. Theoretically, this could improve the ability of an educational computer game design to afford pupils’ critical inquiry and bridge the discrepancy between educational means and ends.

#### First, a limited topic of discussion that provides for equitable ground is key to decision-making and advocacy skills in every and all facets of life ------ even if their position is contestable that’s distinct from it being valuably debatable---this still provides room for flexibility, creativity, and innovation, but targets the discussion to avoid mere statements of fact---T debates also solve any possible turn
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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.

#### Second, political simulations in a game-setting are good for education and decision-making ----- Defined rules, a stable topic, and institutional role playing are key
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**Simulations**, games, and role-play represent a third important set of active teaching and learning approaches. Educational objectives include deepening conceptual understandings of a particular phenomenon, sets of interactions, or socio-political processes by using student interaction to bring **abstract concepts to life**. They provide students with a real or imaginary environment within which to act out a given situation (Crookall 1995; Kaarbo and Lantis 1997; Kaufman 1998; Jefferson 1999; Flynn 2000; Newmann and Twigg 2000; Thomas 2002; Shellman and Turan 2003; Hobbs and Moreno 2004; Wheeler 2006; Kanner 2007; Raymond and Sorensen 2008). The aim is to enable students to **actively experience**, rather than read or hear about, the “constraints and motivations for action (or inaction) experienced by real players” (Smith and Boyer 1996:691), or to think about what they might do in a particular situation that the instructor has dramatized for them. As Sutcliffe (2002:3) emphasizes, “Remote theoretical concepts can be given life by placing them in a situation with which students are familiar.” Such exercises capitalize on the strengths of active learning techniques: creating memorable experiential learning events that tap into multiple senses and emotions by utilizing visual and verbal stimuli. Early examples of simulations scholarship include works by Harold Guetzkow and colleagues, who created the Inter-Nation Simulation (INS) in the 1950s. This work sparked wider interest in political simulations as teaching and research tools. By the 1980s, scholars had accumulated a number of sophisticated simulations of international politics, with names like “Crisis,” “Grand Strategy,” “ICONS,” and “SALT III.” More recent literature on simulations stresses opportunities to reflect dynamics faced in the real world by individual decision makers, by small groups like the US National Security Council, or even global summits organized around international issues, and provides for a focus on contemporary global problems (Lantis et al. 2000; Boyer 2000). Some of the most popular simulations involve modeling international organizations, in particular United Nations and European Union simulations (Van Dyke et al. 2000; McIntosh 2001; Dunn 2002; Zeff 2003; Switky 2004; Chasek 2005). Simulations may be employed in one class meeting, through one week, or even over an entire semester. Alternatively, they may be designed to take place outside of the classroom in local, national, or international competitions. The scholarship on the use of games in international studies sets these approaches apart slightly from simulations. For example, Van Ments (1989:14) argues that **games are structured systems of competitive play** with **specific defined endpoints** or solutions that incorporate the material to be learnt. They are similar to simulations, but contain **specific structures or rules** that dictate **what it means to “win**” the simulated interactions. Games place the participants in positions to make choices that 10 affect outcomes, but do not require that they take on the persona of a real world actor. Examples range from interactive prisoner dilemma exercises to the use of board games in international studies classes (Hart and Simon 1988; Marks 1998; Brauer and Delemeester 2001; Ender 2004; Asal 2005; Ehrhardt 2008) A final subset of this type of approach is the role-play. Like simulations, roleplay places students within a structured environment and asks them to take on a specific role. Role-plays differ from simulations in that rather than having their actions prescribed by a set of well-defined preferences or objectives, role-plays provide more leeway for students to think about how they might act when placed in the position of their slightly less well-defined persona (Sutcliffe 2002). Role-play allows students to create their own interpretation of the roles because of role-play’s less “goal oriented” focus. The primary aim of the role-play is to dramatize for the students the relative positions of the actors involved and/or the challenges facing them (Andrianoff and Levine 2002). This dramatization can be very simple (such as roleplaying a two-person conversation) or complex (such as role-playing numerous actors interconnected within a network). The reality of the scenario and its proximity to a student’s personal experience is also flexible. While few examples of effective roleplay that are clearly distinguished from simulations or games have been published, some recent work has laid out some very useful role-play exercises with clear procedures for use in the **international studies classroom** (Syler et al. 1997; Alden 1999; Johnston 2003; Krain and Shadle 2006; Williams 2006; Belloni 2008). Taken as a whole, the applications and procedures for simulations, games, and role-play are well detailed in the active teaching and learning literature. Experts recommend a set of core considerations that should be taken into account when designing effective simulations (Winham 1991; Smith and Boyer 1996; Lantis 1998; Shaw 2004; 2006; Asal and Blake 2006; Ellington et al. 2006). These include building the simulation design around **specific educational objectives**, carefully selecting the situation or topic to be addressed, establishing the needed roles to be played by both students and instructor, providing clear rules, specific instructions and background material, and having debriefing and assessment plans in place in advance. There are also an increasing number of simulation designs published and disseminated in the discipline, whose procedures can be adopted (or adapted for use) depending upon an instructor’s educational objectives (Beriker and Druckman 1996; Lantis 1996; 1998; Lowry 1999; Boyer 2000; Kille 2002; Shaw 2004; Switky and Aviles 2007; Tessman 2007; Kelle 2008). Finally, there is growing attention in this literature to assessment. Scholars have found that these methods are particularly effective in bridging the gap between academic knowledge and everyday life. Such exercises also lead to **enhanced student interest** in the topic, the development of **empathy**, and **acquisition and retention** of **knowledge**.

#### **Third, the aff’s method destroys argument testing and political solutions ----- decision-making skills become ignored for unaccountable policymaking**

Chandler 9 (David Chandler is Professor of International Relations at the University of Westminster, “Questioning Global Political Activism”, What is Radical Politics Today?, Edited by Jonathan Pugh, pp. 81-2)

However, politics is no less important to many of us today. Politics still gives us a sense of social connection and social rootedness and gives meaning to many of our lives. It is just that the nature and practices of this politics are different. We are less likely to engage in the formal politics of representation - of elections and governments - but in post-territorial politics, a politics where there is much less division between the private sphere and the public one and much less division between national, territorial, concerns and global ones. This type of politics is on the one hand ‘global’ but, on the other, highly individualised: it is very much the politics of our everyday lives – the sense of meaning we get from thinking about global warming when we turn off the taps when we brush our teeth, take our rubbish out for recycling or cut back on our car use - we might also do global politics in deriving meaning from the ethical or social value of our work, or in our subscription or support for good causes from Oxfam to Greenpeace and Christian Aid. I want to suggest that when we do ‘politics’ nowadays it is less the ‘old’ politics, of self-interest, political parties, and concern for governmental power, than the ‘new’ politics of global ethical concerns. I further want to suggest that the forms and content of this new global approach to the political are more akin to religious beliefs and practices than to the forms of our social political engagement in the past. Global politics is similar to religious approaches in three vital respects: 1) global post-territorial politics are no longer concerned with power, its’ concerns are free-floating and in many ways, existential, about how we live our lives; 2) global politics revolve around practices with are private and individualised, they are about us as individuals and our ethical choices; 3) the practice of global politics tends to be non-instrumental, we do not subordinate ourselves to collective associations or parties and are more likely to give value to our aspirations, acts, or the fact of our awareness of an issue, as an end in-itself. It is as if we are upholding our goodness or ethicality in the face of an increasingly confusing, problematic and alienating world – our politics in this sense are an expression or voice, in Marx’s words, of ‘the heart in a heartless world’ or ‘the soul of a soulless condition’. The practice of ‘doing politics’ as a form of religiosity is a highly conservative one. As Marx argued, religion was the ‘opium of the people’ - this is politics as a sedative or pacifier: it feeds an illusory view of change at the expense of genuine social engagement and transformation. I want to argue that global ethical politics reflects and institutionalises our sense of disconnection and social atomisation and results in irrational and unaccountable government policy making. I want to illustrate my points by briefly looking at the practices of global ethics in three spheres, those of radical political activism, government policy making and academia. Radical activism People often argue that there is nothing passive or conservative about radical political activist protests, such as the 2003 anti-war march, anti-capitalism and anti-globalisation protests, the huge march to Make Poverty History at the end of 2005, involvement in the World Social Forums or the radical jihad of Al-Qaeda. I disagree; these new forms of protest are highly individualised and personal ones - there is no attempt to build a social or collective movement. It appears that theatrical suicide, demonstrating, badge and bracelet wearing are ethical acts in themselves: personal statements of awareness, rather than attempts to engage politically with society. This is illustrated by the ‘celebration of differences’ at marches, protests and social forums. It is as if people are more concerned with the creation of a sense of community through differences than with any political debate, shared agreement or collective purpose. It seems to me that if someone was really concerned with ending war or with ending poverty or with overthrowing capitalism, that political views and political differences would be quite important. Is war caused by capitalism, by human nature, or by the existence of guns and other weapons? It would seem important to debate reasons, causes and solutions, it would also seem necessary to give those political differences an organisational expression if there was a serious project of social change. Rather than a political engagement with the world, it seems that radical political activism today is a form of social disengagement – expressed in the anti-war marchers’ slogan of ‘Not in My Name’, or the assumption that wearing a plastic bracelet or setting up an internet blog diary is the same as engaging in political debate. In fact, it seems that political activism is a practice which isolates individuals who think that demonstrating a personal commitment or awareness of problems is preferable to engaging with other people who are often dismissed as uncaring or brain-washed by consumerism. The narcissistic aspects of the practice of this type of global politics are expressed clearly by individuals who are obsessed with reducing their carbon footprint, deriving their idealised sense of social connection from an ever increasing awareness of themselves and by giving ‘political’ meaning to every personal action. Global ethics appear to be in demand because they offer us a sense of social connection and meaning while at the same time giving us the freedom to construct the meaning for ourselves, to pick our causes of concern, and enabling us to be free of responsibilities for acting as part of a collective association, for winning an argument or for success at the ballot-box. While the appeal of global ethical politics is an individualistic one, the lack of success or impact of radical activism is also reflected in its rejection of any form of social movement or organisation. Strange as it may seem, **the only people** who are **keener on global ethics** than radical activists **are political elites**. Since the end of the Cold War, global ethics have formed the core of foreign policy and foreign policy has tended to dominate domestic politics. Global ethics are at the centre of debates and discussion over humanitarian intervention, ‘healing the scar of Africa’, the war on terror and the ‘war against climate insecurity’. Tony Blair argued in the Guardian last week that ‘foreign policy is no longer foreign policy’ (Timothy Garten Ash, ‘Like it or Loath it, after 10 years Blair knows exactly what he stands for’, 26 April 2007), this is certainly true. Traditional foreign policy, based on strategic geo-political interests with a clear framework for policy-making, no longer seems so important. The government is down-sizing the old Foreign and Commonwealth Office where people were regional experts, spoke the languages and were engaged for the long-term, and provides more resources to the Department for International Development where its staff are experts in good causes. This shift was clear in the UK’s attempt to develop an Ethical Foreign Policy in the 1990s – an approach which openly claimed to have rejected strategic interests for values and the promotion of Britain’s caring and sharing ‘identity’. Clearly, the projection of foreign policy on the basis of demonstrations of values and identity, rather than an understanding of the needs and interests of people on the ground, leads to ill thought-through and short-termist policy-making, as was seen in the ‘value-based’ interventions from Bosnia to Iraq (see Blair’s recent Foreign Affairs article, ‘A Battle for Global Values’, 86:1 (2007), pp.79–90). Governments have been more than happy to put global ethics at the top of the political agenda for - the same reasons that radical activists have been eager to shift to the global sphere – the freedom from political responsibility that it affords them. Every government and international institution has shifted from strategic and instrumental policy-making based on a clear political programme to the ambitious assertion of global causes – saving the planet, ending poverty, saving Africa, not just ending war but solving the causes of conflict etc – of course, the more ambitious the aim the less anyone can be held to account for success and failure. In fact, the more global the problem is, the more responsibility can be shifted to blame the US or the UN for the failure to translate ethical claims into concrete results. Ethical global questions, where the alleged values of the UN, the UK, the ‘civilised world’, NATO or the EU are on the line in ‘wars of choice’ from the war on terror to the war on global warming lack traditional instrumentality because they are driven less by the traditional interests of Realpolitik than the narcissistic search for meaning or identity. Governments feel the consequences of their lack of social connection, even more than we do as individuals; it undermines any attempt to represent shared interests or cohere political programmes. As Baudrillard suggests, without a connection to the ‘represented’ masses, political leaders are as open to ridicule and exposure as the ‘Emperor with no clothes’ (In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities, New York: Semiotext(e), 1983, for example). It is this lack of shared social goals which makes instrumental policy-making increasingly problematic. As Donald Rumsfeld stated about the war on terror, ‘there are no metrics’ to help assess whether the war is being won or lost. These wars and campaigns, often alleged to be based on the altruistic claim of the needs and interests of others, are demonstrations and performances, based on ethical claims rather than responsible practices and policies. Max Weber once counterposed this type of politics – the ‘ethics of conviction’ – to the ‘ethics of responsibility’ in his lecture on ‘Politics as a Vocation’. The desire to act on the international scene without a clear strategy or purpose has led to highly destabilising interventions from the Balkans to Iraq and to the moralisation of a wide range of issues from war crimes to EU membership requirements. Today more and more people are ‘doing politics’ in their academic work. This is the reason for the boom in International Relations (IR) study and the attraction of other social sciences to the global sphere. I would argue that the attraction of IR for many people has not been IR theory but the desire to practise global ethics. The boom in the IR discipline has coincided with a rejection of Realist theoretical frameworks of power and interests and the sovereignty/anarchy problematic. However, I would argue that this rejection has not been a product of theoretical engagement with Realism but an ethical act of rejection of Realism’s ontological focus. It seems that our ideas and our theories say much more about us than the world we live in. Normative theorists and Constructivists tend to support the global ethical turn arguing that we should not be as concerned with ‘what is’ as with the potential for the emergence of a global ethical community. Constructivists, in particular, focus upon the ethical language which political elites espouse rather than the practices of power. But the most dangerous trends in the discipline today are those frameworks which have taken up Critical Theory and argue that focusing on the world as it exists is conservative problem-solving while the task for critical theorists is to focus on emancipatory alternative forms of living or of thinking about the world. Critical thought then becomes a process of wishful thinking rather than one of engagement, with its advocates arguing that we need to focus on clarifying our own ethical frameworks and biases and positionality, before thinking about or teaching on world affairs. This becomes ‘me-search’ rather than research**.** We have moved a long way from Hedley Bull’s (1995) perspective that, for academic research to be truly radical, we had to put our values to the side to follow where the question or inquiry might lead. The inward-looking and narcissistic trends in academia, where we are more concerned with our reflectivity – the awareness of our own ethics and values – than with engaging with the world, was brought home to me when I asked my IR students which theoretical frameworks they agreed with most. They mostly replied Critical Theory and Constructivism. This is despite the fact that the students thought that states operated on the basis of power and self-interest in a world of anarchy. Their theoretical preferences were based more on what their choices said about them as ethical individuals, than about how theory might be used to understand and engage with the world. Conclusion I have attempted to argue that there is a lot at stake in the radical understanding of engagement in global politics. Politics has become a religious activity, an activity which is no longer socially mediated; it is less and less an activity based on social engagement and the testing of ideas in public debate or in the academy. Doing politics today, whether in radical activism, government policy-making or in academia, seems to bring people into a one-to-one relationship with global issues in the same way religious people have a one-to-one relationship with their God. Politics is increasingly like religion because when we look for meaning we find it inside ourselves rather than in the external consequences of our ‘political’ acts. What matters is the conviction or the act in itself: its connection to the global sphere is one that we increasingly tend to provide idealistically. Another way of expressing this limited sense of our subjectivity is in the popularity of globalisation theory – the idea that instrumentality is no longer possible today because the world is such a complex and interconnected place and therefore there is no way of knowing the consequences of our actions. The more we engage in the new politics where there is an unmediated relationship between us as individuals and global issues, the less we engage instrumentally with the outside world, and the less we engage with our peers and colleagues at the level of political or intellectual debate and organisation.

#### Argument testing through dialogue key to affirming any value—shutting down deliberation devolves into totalitarianism and reinscribes oppression

Morson 4 - Northwestern Professor, Prof. Morson's work ranges over a variety of areas: literary theory (especially narrative); the history of ideas, both Russian and European; a variety of literary genres (especially satire, utopia, and the novel); and his favorite writers -- Chekhov, Gogol, and, above all, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. He is especially interested in the relation of literature to philosophy http://www.flt.uae.ac.ma/elhirech/baktine/0521831059.pdf#page=331

Bakhtin viewed the whole process of “ideological” (in the sense of ideas and values, however unsystematic) development as an endless dialogue. As teachers, we find it difficult to avoid a voice of authority, however much we may think of ours as the rebel’s voice, because our rebelliousness against society at large speaks in the authoritative voice of our subculture.We speak the language and thoughts of academic educators, even when we imagine we are speaking in no jargon at all, and that jargon, inaudible to us, sounds with all the overtones of authority to our students. We are so prone to think of ourselves as fighting oppression that it takes some work to realize that we ourselves may be felt as oppressive and overbearing, and that our own voice may provoke the same reactions that we feel when we hear an authoritative voice with which we disagree. So it is often helpful to think back on the great authoritative oppressors and reconstruct their self-image: helpful, but often painful. I remember, many years ago, when, as a recent student rebel and activist, I taught a course on “The Theme of the Rebel” and discovered, to my considerable chagrin, that many of the great rebels of history were the very same people as the great oppressors. There is a famous exchange between Erasmus and Luther, who hoped to bring the great Dutch humanist over to the Reformation, but Erasmus kept asking Luther how he could be so certain of so many doctrinal points. We must accept a few things to be Christians at all, Erasmus wrote, but surely beyond that there must be room for us highly fallible beings to disagree. Luther would have none of such tentativeness. He knew, he was sure. The Protestant rebels were, for a while, far more intolerant than their orthodox opponents. Often enough, the oppressors are the ones who present themselves and really think of themselves as liberators. Certainty that one knows the root cause of evil: isn’t that itself often the root cause? We know from Tsar Ivan the Terrible’s letters denouncing Prince Kurbsky, a general who escaped to Poland, that Ivan saw himself as someone who had been oppressed by noblemen as a child and pictured himself as the great rebel against traditional authority when he killed masses of people or destroyed whole towns. There is something in the nature of maximal rebellion against authority that produces ever greater intolerance, unless one is very careful. For the skills of fighting or refuting an oppressive power are not those of openness, self-skepticism, or real dialogue. In preparing for my course, I remember my dismay at reading Hitler’s Mein Kampf and discovering that his self-consciousness was precisely that of the rebel speaking in the name of oppressed Germans, and that much of his amazing appeal – otherwise so inexplicable – was to the German sense that they were rebelling victims. In our time, the Serbian Communist and nationalist leader Slobodan Milosevic exploited much the same appeal. Bakhtin surely knew that Communisit totalitarianism, the Gulag, and the unprecedented censorship were constructed by rebels who had come to power. His favorite writer, Dostoevsky, used to emphasize that the worst oppression comes from those who, with the rebellious psychology of “the insulted and humiliated,” have seized power – unless they have somehow cultivated the value of dialogue, as Lenin surely had not, but which Eva, in the essay by Knoeller about teaching The Autobiography of Malcolm X, surely had. Rebels often make the worst tyrants because their word, the voice they hear in their consciousness, has borrowed something crucial from the authoritative word it opposed, and perhaps exaggerated it: the aura of righteous authority. If one’s ideological becoming is understood as a struggle in which one has at last achieved the truth, one is likely to want to impose that truth with maximal authority; and rebels of the next generation may proceed in much the same way, in an ongoing spiral of intolerance.

#### Key to social improvements in every and all facets of life

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*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 pp9-10

If we assume it to be possible without recourse to violence to reach agreement on all the problems implied in the employment of the idea of justice we are granting the possibility of formulating an ideal of man and society, valid for all beings endowed with reason and accepted by what we have called elsewhere the universal audience.14 I think that the only discursive methods available to us stem from techniques that are not demonstrative—that is, conclusive and rational in the narrow sense of the term—but from argumentative techniques which are not conclusive but which may tend to demonstrate the reasonable character of the conceptions put forward. It is this recourse to the rational and reasonable for the realization of the ideal of universal communion that characterizes the age-long endeavor of all philosophies in their aspiration for a city of man in which violence may progressively give way to wisdom.13 Whenever an individual controls the dimensions of" a problem, he or she can solve the problem through a personal decision. For example, if the problem is whether to go to the basketball game tonight, if tickets are not too expensive and if transportation is available, the decision can be made individually. But if a friend's car is needed to get to the game, then that person's decision to furnish the transportation must be obtained. Complex problems, too, are subject to individual decision making. American business offers many examples of small companies that grew into major corporations while still under the individual control of the founder. Some computer companies that began in the 1970s as one-person operations burgeoned into multimillion-dollar corporations with the original inventor still making all the major decisions. And some of the multibillion-dollar leveraged buyouts of the 1980s were put together by daring—some would say greedy—financiers who made the day-to-day and even hour-to-hour decisions individually. When President George H. W. Bush launched Operation Desert Storm, when President Bill Clinton sent troops into Somalia and Haiti and authorized Operation Desert Fox, and when President George W. Bush authorized Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, they each used different methods of decision making, but in each case the ultimate decision was an individual one. In fact, many government decisions can be made only by the president. As Walter Lippmann pointed out, debate is the only satisfactory way the exact issues can be decided: A president, whoever he is, has to find a way of understanding the novel and changing issues which he must, under the Constitution, decide. Broadly speaking ... the president has two ways of making up his mind. The one is to turn to his subordinates—to his chiefs of staff and his cabinet officers and undersecretaries and the like—and to direct them to argue out the issues and to bring him an agreed decision… The other way is to sit like a judge at a hearing where the issues to be decided are debated. After he has heard the debate, after he has examined the evidence, after he has heard the debaters cross-examine one another, after he has questioned them himself he makes his decision… It is a much harder method in that it subjects the president to the stress of feeling the full impact of conflicting views, and then to the strain of making his decision, fully aware of how momentous it Is. But there is no other satisfactory way by which momentous and complex issues can be decided.16 John F. Kennedy used Cabinet sessions and National Security Council meetings to provide debate to illuminate diverse points of view, expose errors, and challenge assumptions before he reached decisions.17 As he gained experience in office, he placed greater emphasis on debate. One historian points out: "One reason for the difference between the Bay of Pigs and the missile crisis was that [the Bay of Pig\*] fiasco instructed Kennedy in the importance of uninhibited debate in advance of major decision."18 All presidents, to varying degrees, encourage debate among their advisors. We may never be called on to render the final decision on great issues of national policy, but we are constantly concerned with decisions important to ourselves for which debate can be applied in similar ways. That is, this debate may take place in our minds as we weigh the pros and cons of the problem, or we may arrange for others to debate the problem for us. Because we all are increasingly involved in the decisions of the campus, community, and society in general, it is in our intelligent self-interest to reach these decisions through reasoned debate.

### 2

#### We advocate a strategy of eco-Justice as explained below – we ask for this to be the focus of our pedagogy – the affirmatives attempt trades off with much more effective methods at stopping destruction

Bowers 3 (Can Critical Pedagogy be Greened? [appeared in Educational Studies, Spring, ‘03]

C. A. Bowers, Adjunct Professor of Environmental Studies, University of Oregon, http://www.cabowers.net/pdf/Can%20CP%20be%20Greened.pdf)

Instead of the tendency to represent educational reform in terms of different processes (Dewey’s method of intelligence, Whitehead’s process approach to the creative moment, Doll’s romanticized interpretation of dissipative structures and chaos, Freire’s emphasis on conscientization, and the constructivist theories of learning that are now widespread in teacher education programs and public schools), I would like to suggest on-the-ground reforms that will enable teachers to incorporate local culturally practices in ways that contribute to resisting the spread of hyper-consumerism and the industrial mode of production that it depends upon. Both are a scourge on the environment, the viability of families and communities, and destructive of cultural identities. But first I want to explain the aspects of eco-justice that educational reforms can most effectively address, and how these reforms relate to global issues. In Educating for Eco-Justice and Community (2001) and in a later journal article (2002) I identify four eco-justice issues that have particular relevance to greening the classroom that go far beyond what is learned most environmental education classes. They include: (1) helping students understand the causes, extent, and political strategies necessary for addressing environmental racism; (2) clarifying the nature of the ideological and economic forces that are perpetuating the domination of the South by the North; (3) revitalizing the non-commodified forms of knowledge, skills, and activities within the communities represented by the students in the classroom— thus enabling them to participate in mentoring relationships that will develop their talents and interests, and to experience other community-centered non-monetized relationships and activities that will develop a sense of responsibility for the well-being of the community; and (4) helping students recognize the many ecologically informed changes in individual lifestyles and uses of technology that will help to ensure that future generations will not inherit a degraded environment. Helping students recognize and participate in community alternatives to industrially-based consumerism, as well as to helping them to understand the legitimating role neo-liberal ideology (which is generally mislabeled as “conservatism”), needs to be the focus of educational reform if the rate of environmental degradation is to be reversed. This approach to reform is also vital to helping to preserve the diversity of the world’s cultures. A small segment of the world’s population now consumes many times its rightful share of the Earth’s resources, while the majority of the world’s population sinks further into poverty—which at the same time is being exposed to media images of excessively materialistic lifestyles. These images of material success deepen the plight of the poor by the delegitimating their cultural traditions that previously were the basis of their self-reliance. With few exceptions, public schools and universities in the West promote the ideas and values that equate a consumer/technology dependent lifestyle with success and with becoming modern—and the belief that these values should be spread to the rest of the world. If this process of cultural imperialism is to be reversed, it will be necessary to implement educational reforms that go beyond a process approach to learning. Students need to learn about specific aspects of their own culture, as well as those of other cultures, which are currently left out of the curriculum. And what they need to learn is directly related to reducing their dependence upon consumerism, to enhancing democratic decision-making through an understanding of how new technologies often undermine traditions of intergenerational knowledge that range from the preparation of food to how to preserve the biodivesity of the forest, and to developing an ecological form of consciousness that is aware, as Gregory Bateson put it, that “no part (or culture) can have unilateral control over the whole” (1972, p. 316).

#### Bowers contrasts his Alt to *Kahn’s* Ecopedagogy which is in the 1AC – whose *individuality* crowds *communal* indigenous options, turning the aff.

Ecological Curriculum Theories and Frameworks ‘12

(This website describes a summer course taught by Audrey Dentith, UTSA associate professor of interdisciplinary learning and teaching. She serves as the ongoing organizer and creator of the website. The website describes the curriculum of a class based upon Ecojustice Ed book by Bowers – who is heavily internally quoted in the card below. ¶ C. A. Bowers is Professor of Education in the School of Education at Portland State University. He has written on wide wide range of social, cultural and technogical issues in Education. In recents years his work has focused on issues of Social Ecology and its relationship to schooling. http://ci6123summer12.wikispaces.com/Ecological+Curriculum+Theories+and+an+Eco-Justice+Framework)

Ecopedagogy developed out of the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire and seeks to address both social and ecological concerns. Richard Kahn (2008, p. 11) sees ecopedagogy as “transformative energies, untapped life forces, and other liberatory potentials capable of aiding others in the reconstruction of society on the way to a more peaceful, harmonious, and beautiful world for all creatures great and small. Ecopedagogy is thus a total liberation pedagogy for sustaining life.” Ecopedagogy pairs educators and students in rethinking culture and transcribing knowledge for Ecological change. However, Bowers (2012) asserts that ecopedagogy fails to address some of the root metaphors and dangerous assumptions of Western thinking and is thus plagued by ethnocentrism. Ecopedagogy's focus on "progress" and "individual transformation" leads to a devaluing of the traditions and commons of ind[](http://www.clearingmagazine.org/EducatingforEcoJustice.pdf)igenous cultures. According to Bowers (2007, p. 9), “the language of John Dewey and Paulo Freire brings out how their respective ideas that there is one-true approach to knowledge (experimental inquiry for Dewey, and critical inquiry for Freire) contributes to the limited vocabulary of their worldwide following. Their vocabularies, and the cultural assumptions they are based upon, perpetuate the ethnocentrism, the Social Darwinian thinking of the nineteenth century, and the silences about both the ecological crises-–as well as the way in which many of the world’s cultural commons represent alternatives to today’s environmentally destructive hyper-consumerism.” People need to live within and among their communities in sustainable ways which include dialogue, collaboration, and cooperation. By doing this, “keeping up with the Jones” and competing with neighbors could become a way of the past, reducing the incessant need to have more. Bowers asks (2012, Chapter, 2), if we have time “to develop life-sustaining ecological intelligence?” The answer may lie in the ability of EcoJustice educators to convince and change the prevalent mentality that individualism and the pursuit of self-interest by political means and industrial/capitalist methods are superior to more socially and environmentally friendly mindsets..

### 3

**Next off is Ophuls...nah, not really. But the AFF assumes a sex neutral political subject – their universal class of subjects governs public deliberation and civil society. Women’s material bodies are either assimilated to masculinity or regulated to the privates sphere.**

**Fraser 90**

Nancy Fraser. Rethinking the Public Sphere. Social Text. No 25/26.

Now, let me juxtapose to this sketch of Habermas's account an alternative account that I shall piece together from some recent revisionist historiography. Briefly, scholars like Joan Landes, Mary Ryan, and Geoff Eley contend that Habermas's account idealizes the liberal public sphere. They argue that, despite the rhetoric of publicity and accessibility, that official public sphere rested on, indeed was importantly constituted by, a number of significant exclusions. For Landes, the key axis of exclusion is gender; she argues that the ethos of the new republican public sphere in France was constructed in deliberate opposition to that of a more woman- friendly salon culture that the republicans stigmatized as "artificial," "effeminate," and "aristocratic." Consequently, a new, austere style of public speech and behavior was promoted, a style deemed "rational," "virtuous," and "manly." In this way, masculinist gender constructs were built into the very conception of the republican public sphere, as was a logic that led, at the height of Jacobin rule, to the formal exclusion from political life of women.4 Here the republicans drew on classical traditions that cast femininity and publicity as oxymorons; the depth of such traditions can be gauged in the etymological connection between "public" and "pubic," a graphic trace of the fact that in the ancient world possession of a penis was a requirement for speaking in public. (A similar link is preserved, incidentally, in the etymological connection between "testimony" and "testicle.")5 Extending Landes's argument, Geoff Eley contends that exclusion are operations were essential to liberal public spheres not only in France but also in England and Germany, and that in all these countries gender exclusions were linked to other exclusions rooted in processes of class formation. In all these countries, he claims, the soil that nourished the liberal public sphere was "civil society," the emerging new congeries of voluntary associations that sprung up in what came to be known as "the age of societies." But this network of clubs and associations-philanthropic, civic, professional, and cultural-was anything but accessible to everyone. On the contrary, it was the arena, the training ground, and eventually the power base of a stratum of bourgeois men, who were coming to see themselves as a "universal class" and preparing to assert their fitness to govern. Thus, the elaboration of a distinctive culture of civil society and of an associated public sphere was implicated in the process of bourgeois class formation; its practices and ethos were marker of "distinction" in Pierre Bourdieu's sense,6 ways of defining an emerge elite, setting it off from the older aristocratic elites it was intent on displacing, on the one hand, and from the various popular and plebeian strata it aspired to rule, on the other. This process of distinction, more over, helps explain the exacerbation of sexism characteristic of the liberal public sphere; new gender norms enjoining feminine domesticity and a sharp separation of public and private spheres functioned as key signifier of bourgeois difference from both higher and lower social strata. It is a measure of the eventual success of this bourgeois project that these norms later became hegemonic, sometimes imposed on, sometimes embraced by, broader segments of society.7 Now, there is a remarkable irony here, one that Habermas's account of the rise of the public sphere fails fully to appreciate.s A discourse of publicity touting accessibility, rationality, and the suspension of status hierarchies is itself deployed as a strategy of distinction. Of course, in and of itself, this irony does not fatally compromise the discourse of publicity; that discourse can be, indeed has been, differently deployed in different circumstances and contexts. Nevertheless, it does suggest that the relationship between publicity and status is more complex than Habermas intimates, that declaring a deliberative arena to be a space where extant status distinctions are bracketed and neutralized is not sufficient to make it so.

**The violence on women’s bodies comes first – sexual terrorism permeates all social and political relations**

**Ray in 1997**

A. E. Ray “The Shame of it: gender-based terrorism in the former Yugoslavia and the failureof international human rights law to comprehend the injuries.” The American University Law Review. Vol 46.

In order to reach all of the violence perpetrated against the women of the former Yugoslavia that is not committed by soldiers or other officials of the state, human lights law must move beyond its artificially constructed barriers between "public" and "private" actions: A feminist perspective on human rights would require a rethinking of the notions of imputability and state responsibility and in this sense would challenge the most basic assumptions of international law. If violence against women were considered by the international legal system to be as shocking as violence against people for their political ideas, women would have considerable support in their struggle.... The assumption that underlies all law, including international human rights law, is that the public/private distinction is real: human society, human lives can be separated into two distinct spheres. This division, however, is an ideological construct rationalizing the exclusion of women from the sources of power. 2 6 The international community must recognize that violence against women is always political, regardless of where it occurs, because it affects the way women view themselves and their role in the world, as well as the lives they lead in the so-called public sphere. 2 6 ' When women are silenced within the family, their silence is not restricted to the private realm, but rather affects their voice in the public realm as well, often assuring their silence in any environment. 262 For women in the former Yugoslavia, as well as for all women, extension beyond the various public/private barriers is imperative if human rights law "is to have meaning for women brutalized in less-known theaters of war or in the by-ways of daily life." 63 Because, as currently constructed, human rights laws can reach only individual perpetrators during times of war, one alternative is to reconsider our understanding of what constitutes "war" and what constitutes "peace. " " When it is universally true that no matter where in the world a woman lives or with what culture she identifies, she is at grave risk of being beaten, imprisoned, enslaved, raped, prostituted, physically tortured, and murdered simply because she is a woman, the term "peace" does not describe her existence. 2 5 In addition to being persecuted for being a woman, many women also are persecuted on ethnic, racial, religious, sexual orientation, or other grounds. Therefore, it is crucial that our re-conceptualization of human rights is not limited to violations based on gender." Rather, our definitions of "war" and "peace" in the context of all of the world's persecuted groups should be questioned. Nevertheless, in every culture a common risk factor is being a woman, and to describe the conditions of our lives as "peace" is to deny the effect of sexual terrorism on all women. 6 7 Because we are socialized to think of times of "war" as limited to groups of men fighting over physical territory or land, we do not immediately consider the possibility of "war" outside this narrow definition except in a metaphorical sense, such as in the expression "the war against poverty." However, the physical violence and sex discrimination perpetrated against women because we are women is hardly metaphorical. Despite the fact that its prevalence makes the violence seem natural or inevitable, it is profoundly political in both its purpose and its effect. Further, its exclusion from international human rights law is no accident, but rather part of a system politically constructed to exclude and silence women. 2 6 The appropriation of women's sexuality and women's bodies as representative of men's ownership over women has been central to this "politically constructed reality. 2 6 9 Women's bodies have become the objects through which dominance and even ownership are communicated, as well as the objects through which men's honor is attained or taken away in many cultures.Y Thus, when a man wants to communicate that he is more powerful than a woman, he may beat her. When a man wants to communicate that a woman is his to use as he pleases, he may rape her or prostitute her. The objectification of women is so universal that when one country ruled by men (Serbia) wants to communicate to another country ruled by men (Bosnia-Herzegovina or Croatia) that it is superior and more powerful, it rapes, tortures, and prostitutes the "inferior" country's women. 2 71 The use of the possessive is intentional, for communication among men through the abuse of women is effective only to the extent that the group of men to whom the message is sent believes they have some right of possession over the bodies of the women used. Unless they have some claim of right to what is taken, no injury is experienced. Of course, regardless of whether a group of men sexually terrorizing a group of women is trying to communicate a message to another group of men, the universal sexual victimization of women clearly communicates to all women a message of dominance and ownership over women. As Charlotte Bunch explains, "The physical territory of [the] political struggle [over female subordination] is women's bodies." 7 2

Their quest for ecological subjectivity as a salve for neoliberalism papers over the material presence of the feminine. Sexual difference MUST be the starting point for addressing economic oppression and environmental devastation.

Fermon 1998 (Nicole, “Women on the Global Market: Irigaray and the Democratic State,” Diacritics 28.1 (1998) 120-137)

Best known for her subtle interrogation of philosophy and psychoanalysis, Luce Irigaray clearly also conducts a dialogue with the political, proposing that women's erasure from culture and society invalidates all economies, sexual or political. Because woman has disappeared both figuratively and literally from society [see Sen, "More Than 100 Million Women Are Missing"], Irigaray conceives the contemporary ethical project as a recall to difference rather than equality, to difference between women and men--that is, sexual difference. She characterizes relations between men and women as market relations in which women are commodities, objects, but never subjects of exchange, objects to men but not to themselves: women do not belong to themselves but exist "to keep relationships among men running smoothly" [TS 192]. Women under these conditions require imaginative ways to reconfigure the self, to subvert the melancholy and regression of masculinist economies and envisage a future in which women would not be ashamed of the feminine, would experience it as a positivity worth emulating.

Irigaray contends that after the gains of egalitarian politics are carefully examined, the inclusion of women in the political arena has failed to take into account women's distinct and different position from men, and from each other, as well as perpetuating the fiction of the "neutral" citizen, the ahistorical individual citizen of the nation-state. It is that fiction Irigaray dispels in her critique of liberal democratic politics and its creation, "citizens who are neuter in regard to familial singularity, its laws, and necessary sexual difference" [SG 112] in order to benefit the State and its laws. The subject is male; the citizen is neuter. Who is the female citizen in contemporary society? What is the ethical elaboration of the contractual relations between women and men, and between sexed individuals and the community? How do women imagine a distinct set of rights and responsibilities based on self-definition and autonomy, given the particular strictures of contemporary politics--that is, the market-driven, antidemocratic nature of the current economic national and global forces? Irigaray suggests that "the return of women to collective work, to public places, to social relations, demands linguistic mutations" and profound transformations, an embodied imagination with force and agency in civil life [TD 65].

Irigaray warns that if civil and political participation is construed in overly narrow terms, if focus is on economic or judicial "circuits" alone, we overlook the symbolic organization of power--women risk losing "everything without even being acknowledged" [TD 56]. Instead an interval of recognition can expand the political to include the concerns and activities of real women, lest silence imply consent to sexual neutrality, or more likely, to women's obliteration under men's interests and concerns. Women's insistence on self-definition and wage labor, on love and justly remunerated work, [End Page 120] testifies to the obduracy of women's difference, one that is not likely to disappear. The patriarchal family is still the legal norm, even when certain exceptions are made, while enduring questions regarding women's health and children's physical welfare as priorities beyond market considerations are consigned to legislative obfuscation, still a political afterthought. Instead, in the US the liberal state removes the slender welfare net specific to women and children, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and fails to provide medical coverage to those who are among the most vulnerable of its citizens. Women without access to the legal protection of sex-neutral citizenship, poor working women without language (the money for an effective "mouthpiece" to represent their distress in a court of law), are further disempowered by liberal politics' insistence on sexual neutrality--that is, on repression or amnesia regarding the lived experiences of women.

Sexual difference is key to any project of self-definition by women. Irigaray insists on the sexual nature of this self-definition, not solely for its obvious procreative necessity, but because the natural world is a source of renewal and fecundity which requires attentive interrogation and respect [SG 15]. This rebirth seems alien to the structure of male politics, which instead seem to provoke disasters (Bhopal, Chernobyl, or the current runaway jungle fires of Indonesia, courtesy of commercial logging, spreading thick pollution to neighboring countries) and untimely death. 1 We talk about social justice and forget its origins in nature and not merely as an engagement between men in abstraction. Irigaray believes that recognition and respect of difference between the sexes is prior to productive and generative relations between women, between men, and between men and women. Sexual difference is universal and allows us to participate in "an immediate natural given, and it is a real and irreducible component of the universal" [ILTY 47]. It is this prior recognition of two, rather than the One that has dominated world politics and thought, which must be acknowledged, along with the possibility of a political economy of abundance, not only that of man-made scarcity then attributed to nature. This melancholic (male) script pays romantic tribute to motherhood in the abstract without due recognition of the relations between real mothers and children, thus failing to properly acknowledge and protect mother or child. Our ability to address the specifics of race, ethnicity, and religious and other differences with respect hinges on our ability to acknowledge and respect the feminine, to see it as a source of invention and possibilities. To do so would of course affect relations between the sexes, "men and women perhaps . . . communicat[ing] for the first time if two different genders are affirmed," it would allow a new configuration rather than continuing the present regime: "the globalization and universalization of culture . . . ungovernable and beyond our control" [SG 120; ILTY 129].

Irigaray's critique of liberal society deals with the structure of power and the means by which this structure can yield surprising and subversive outcomes. Like Rousseau, Hegel, Marx, and Nietszche, Irigaray's meticulous readings of society and culture, of work and love, of language, law, and the just political order, of violence allow an interrogation of identity and its permutations, suggest surprising possibilities. Irigaray's politics defy easy categorization, because although they address concrete problems, identify opponents, point to action appropriate to particular struggles, she presents no [End Page 121] solution or utopian structure, refuses alignments with conventional understandings of woman and femininity. Irigaray remains committed to communitarian ideals, spiritual knowledges and practices, and respect of the natural world. Her inquiry situates the "right to identity" and to "citizenship" as the dual precondition of "true democracy" [ILTY 53]. Irigaray demonstrates that what divides, as a negativity, is also that which can bring us close: "I defend the impossible" [ILTY 9].

Luce Irigaray makes an important intervention regarding central aspects of liberal contract theory that have proved hostile to women and the feminine and that still depict a universal reality, denying or sublating all others. If women become subjects rather than only objects of exchange it will most likely not be because they have first become accepted as men, or as sexually neutral citizens. Women's identity is not a given, and the development of sexuate rights specific to women and men (or rather the discussions, politics, and organization to create such rights) could generate conditions receptive to autonomy, self-definition, and self-love for women. Citizens would be able to engage in meaningful discussions about the economic and legal initiatives of the liberal state vis-à-vis women and men in the wider global financial structures beyond the North Atlantic nation-state, as well as within its boundaries. Irigaray's political critique thus allows for ways to understand and alleviate violence done to all women as a result of global fiscalization and fluid borders, and to address the specific attempts to overcome female poverty through microcredit or similar "philanthropic" schemes of the banking and business sectors. Self-definition and self-love by women are critical to establishing an economy which honors and supports the practices of women, as well as the spiritual and material requirements of a fully embodied existence.

### Case

#### 1 - Turn – Solidarity Seeking Bad - The affirmative’s attempt to gain solidarity with others blends the subject position of the First and Third World’s allowing for a false universalism

**Sue-Im Lee 2007**

"We Are Not the World": Global Village, Universalism, and Karen Tei Yamashita's *Tropic of Orange* *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 53.3 (2007) 501-527

Tropic mulls over precisely this unidirectional logic of the globalist "we" by sharply delineating the material inequalities that obstruct the binding of the First World and Third World into one subject position. In its depiction of Los Angeles, too, the novel focuses on extremely disparate socioeconomic positions and emphasizes the growing fissures that run through the global village discourse. There is an illegal immigrant couple, Bobby and Rafaela, and a white-collar professional couple, Gabriel and Emi. Revealing the highly uneven benefits of globalization in First World's major metropolis, Manzanar and Buzzworm represent the mass of urban homeless. The novel's fragmented form also dramatizes the fracture in the First World's use of global village universalism. Yamashita begins the book with a "HyperContexts," a diagram that shows, in one glance, the division of the narrative into the seven days of the week, with each chapter attending to one day in the life of one of the seven major characters. This disjunctive organization leads to an atomistic sense of each character's life, as each chapter seems to stand on its own with little continuity from the other. Always, there is a sense of impending doom, as various human and natural catastrophes, such as illegal human organ harvesting and sales, cocaine-injected oranges, and major freeway pileups and explosions affect the lives of the characters. All the while, the Tropic of Cancer steadily moves northward, unsettling all rules of space and time. **[End Page 506]** Within this instability and chaos, Yamashita posits her challenge to the global village universalism. In an emblematic scene, Gabriel and Emi are dining in an upscale Japanese restaurant in Los Angeles. Emi, a Japanese American TV producer who delights in spoofing any orthodoxy, including that of political correctness, is speculating on the racial make-up of another diner sitting at a distance. Emi is engaging in her familiar game of unsettling her much more somber boyfriend Gabriel, who, as a Mexican American reporter, feels it his duty to expose and criticize social injustice. A nearby diner takes umbrage at Emi's speculations. Identified only as "a white woman," she remonstrates Emi on the importance of cultural diversity: "I happen to adore the Japanese culture. What can I say? I adore different cultures. I've traveled all over the world. I love living in LA because I can find anything in the world to eat, right here. It's such a meeting place for all sorts of people. A true celebration of an international world" (129). Her model of global village follows an entirely consumerist logic. Contact is entirely reduced to consumption. If you can eat "their" food, travel and sight "them," then you have made contact. As she reifies difference into food matter, she also exemplifies a view of globalization as an exchange in free-floating "cultures" without any material referents or consequences. Further continuing the capitalist logic in which the more choices the consumer has, the healthier the overall state of economy, in the white woman's rationale, the greater the number of different cultures' foods available, the "truer" the celebration of an international world. This unidentified white woman stands as the synecdoche of the First World's imperialist assumption of globalist "we," and Yamashita's mockery turns unabashedly didactic. Emi notes that the woman sports chopsticks as hairpins. She calmly holds up two forks and asks whether the woman would wear these in her hair, or whether she would consider the wearing of food utensils as an unsanitary practice. The woman "blanches" in response (129). In the hands of Emi, the protagonist that Yamashita identifies as approximating her mouthpiece, the white woman's consumerist celebration of a global village and her fetishizing of different cultures are shown to be indefensible, even to herself ("An Interview").[9](http://muse.jhu.edu.er.lib.k-state.edu/journals/modern_fiction_studies/v053/53.3lee.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT9#FOOT9) So who is in this overworked global village? The village is occupied by First World consumers who rationalize their privileged mobility and consumption as responsible acts of global citizens. These First World "villagers," oblivious to their own role in the relations of power, project the consensual participation of *other* fellow villagers, those of "different cultures." Thus, "[a]s 'universal,' the dominant erases the contingencies of time and space, history and location, and with the same gesture elides its operations of domination, projecting **[End Page 507]** instead the appearance of being democratic" (Palumbo-Liu 188). As "my" consumption becomes "our" celebration, the slippage of the subject in the First World's global village universalism demonstrates its unidirectional and imperialist nature. Ernesto Laclau's discussion of nineteenth-century European imperialism highlights the enormity of the slippage. In the work of imperialism, European culture of the nineteenth century circulated as "a particular one, and at the same time the expression . . . of universal human essence," and in the simultaneity of this circulation, the particularity of European culture takes on the ontological status of universality itself: "The crucial issue here is that there was no intellectual means of distinguishing between European particularism and the universal functions that it was supposed to incarnate, given that European universalism had constructed its identity precisely through the cancellation of the logic of incarnation and, as a result, through the universalization of its own particularism" (*Emancipation(s)* 24). Likewise, the white woman's privileged mobility and consumption circulates as evidence and criteria of global village universalism. In constituting a "we" out of "my" experience, the woman's global village universalism performs a unidirectional conscription: she speaks for the millions and billions of others in prescribing the supposed unity and the intimacy.

#### 2. Turn – Indigenous Movements – Giroux’s approach to eco-pedagogy silences local culture movements which hold the key to challenging harmful neo-liberalism

Bowers 3 (Can Critical Pedagogy be Greened? [appeared in Educational Studies, Spring, ‘03]

C. A. Bowers, Adjunct Professor of Environmental Studies, University of Oregon, http://www.cabowers.net/pdf/Can%20CP%20be%20Greened.pdf)

These criticisms of the core assumptions shared by the different critical pedagogy theorists have to be balanced by an equally brief discussion of areas in which I as well as other environmentalists are agreement with them. Mclaren and Giroux are essentially correct in seeing globalization as a continuation of western colonialism. And their criticism that globalization creates poverty while enriching corporate elites, and that the agenda of the WTO to privatize the commons (public water systems and other services—including education) are also to be taken seriously. But these areas of agreement, along with agreement that social justice issues of class, race, and gender remain largely unsolved, is undermined by the core assumptions they share with the modern form of consciousness that equates economic globalization with progress. The critical pedagogy theorists’ commitment to universal prescriptions on such important cultural issues as equating change with progress, the individual as the critical and transforming agent, anthropocentrism, and so forth, puts them on a different pathway of development than is reflected in the sub-title of the book edited by Jerry Mander and Edward Goldsmith, The Case Against the Global Economy and for a Turn Toward the Local (1996). Resistance to globalization, as well as efforts to live less environmentally destructive lives, are taking many forms at the local level—and within different cultures. The Chipko movement in India, the introduction of local currency in communities in North America and Australia, the recovery of small farms where traditional chemical-free agriculture is practiced, the movement toward relying on ecological principles of design of buildings and manufacturing processes, and the revitalization of cultural ceremonies and mutual support practices within communities, are all examples of the local and culturally diverse nature of resistance. Within indigenous cultures in Mexico greater emphasis is being placed on relocating learning within intergenerationally connected communities. And among the Quechua of the Andes, government sponsored schools are being pressured to incorporate into the curriculum the ceremonies and relationships to the chacra that characterize life in the community. In effect, Quechua communities are no longer accepting the idea that the school is the source of modern knowledge that is superior to their own culture-- which goes back thousands of years and has created one of the most diverse varieties of edible plants. Resistance is local among other indigenous cultures in other parts of the world. And it is in these face-to-face, intergenerationally connected cultures that we find the strongest resistance to the new biotechnologies (such as the terminator seed program that Monsanto was forced to abandon), the patenting of local knowledge of medicinal plants, and the pressure to adopt the industrial model of production and consumption.

#### 3. You don’t solve your aff – you perpetuate – Anthropocentrism –

Bowers 3 (Can Critical Pedagogy be Greened? [appeared in Educational Studies, Spring, ‘03]

C. A. Bowers, Adjunct Professor of Environmental Studies, University of Oregon, http://www.cabowers.net/pdf/Can%20CP%20be%20Greened.pdf)

Critical pedagogy is based on an anthropocentric view of human/Nature relationships. While they correctly criticize the industrialization of Nature, they continue to represent the critically reflective individual as the highest expression of life. What is needed is a different set of core assumptions that would enable them to explain, as Gregory Bateson as done so well and as many indigenous cultures have worked out in daily practices, how humans are nested in cultures and cultures are nested in and dependent upon natural systems. This silence on the part of leading critical pedagogy theorists contributes to the widely held view that humans can impose their will on the environment, and that when the environment breaks down experts using an instrumentally based critical reflection will engineer a synthetic replacement. Any attempt to eliminate the anthropocentric basis of critical pedagogy will need to take account of Gregory Bateson’s ecological view of intelligence as well as how nonanthropocentrically based cultures such as the Quechua and the Northern Cree rely upon intergenerational knowledge as the source of self-reliance and as a defense against being subjugated by the forces of modernization. The silence of leading critical pedagogy theorists on the issue of anthropocentrism also prevents them from aligning themselves with Third World cultures that are attempting to resist the Western model of development. McLaren and the others can write about emancipating cultures from domination, and even give interviews in a journal published in a Muslim culture on the importance of adopting the western model of revolutionary socialism, but behind the façade of their rhetoric is a hidden process of colonization to a western way of thinking.

#### 4. Ecopedagogy is too vague to be successful –

#### A) Giroux’s lack of specificity in how the pedagogist should carry out their practice makes his suggestion useless

Bowers 8( Transitions: Educational Reforms that Promote Ecological Intelligence or the Assumptions Underlying Modernity? by C. A. Bowers 2008)

If one reads the writings of Giroux and, more importantly, McLaren, one finds recommendations for educational reforms that are based on a clear understanding of how capitalism is contributing to the development of a world monoculture, and to destroying the sustaining capacity of natural systems. McLaren gets this part correct. Whether the culturally diverse educators of the world will adopt his “green revolutionary critical pedagogy” that is to lead to an ecologically sustainable socialist future is more problematic. The important point is that neither Giroux’s vision of the teacher as a “transformative intellectual”, McLaren’s revolutionary Marxist-oriented critical pedagogy, nor Joel Kovel’s eco-socialist pedagogy (2002) address the specific curriculum reforms that should be undertaken. Their writings contain sweeping generalizations about social justice, the need for overturning oppressive practices—including capitalism. But they fail to explain how to introduce these reforms in the world’s diversity of cultures that range from the Euro-centric to the Muslim, Hindu, and the thousands of indigenous culture that make up the majority of the world’s population. As many of these non-Western cultures are well represented in urban areas across America, Canada, Great Britain, as well as other Western countries, there is a need for these critical pedagogy and eco-socialist theorists to explain how these cultural groups are to be educated to abandon their non-Western forms of consciousness, and to adopt the supposedly emancipated consciousness of Freire, Giroux, and McLaren.

#### B) That means their method prioritizes observations without pragmatic strategy ---- continues to re-entrench the squo

Bryant 12 (Levi, Critique of the Academic Left, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/)

I must be in a mood today– half irritated, half amused –because I find myself ranting. Of course, that’s not entirely unusual. So this afternoon I came across a post by a friend quoting something discussing the environmental movement that pushed all the right button. As the post read,¶ For mainstream environmentalism– conservationism, green consumerism, and resource management –humans are conceptually separated out of nature and mythically placed in privileged positions of authority and control over ecological communities and their nonhuman constituents. What emerges is the fiction of a marketplace of ‘raw materials’ and ‘resources’ through which human-centered wants, constructed as needs, might be satisfied. The mainstream narratives are replete with such metaphors [carbon trading!]. Natural complexity,, mutuality, and diversity are rendered virtually meaningless given discursive parameters that reduce nature to discrete units of exchange measuring extractive capacities. Jeff Shantz, “Green Syndicalism”¶ While finding elements this description perplexing– I can’t say that I see many environmentalists treating nature and culture as distinct or suggesting that we’re sovereigns of nature –I do agree that we conceive much of our relationship to the natural world in economic terms (not a surprise that capitalism is today a universal). This, however, is not what bothers me about this passage.¶ What I wonder is just what we’re supposed to do even if all of this is true? What, given existing conditions, are we to do if all of this is right? At least green consumerism, conservation, resource management, and things like carbon trading are engaging in activities that are making real differences. From this passage– and maybe the entire text would disabuse me of this conclusion –it sounds like we are to reject all of these interventions because they remain tied to a capitalist model of production that the author (and myself) find abhorrent. The idea seems to be that if we endorse these things we are tainting our hands and would therefore do well to reject them altogether.¶ The problem as I see it is that this is the worst sort of abstraction (in the Marxist sense) and wishful thinking. Within a Marxo-Hegelian context, a thought is abstract when it ignores all of the mediations in which a thing is embedded. For example, I understand a robust tree abstractly when I attribute its robustness, say, to its genetics alone, ignoring the complex relations to its soil, the air, sunshine, rainfall, etc., that also allowed it to grow robustly in this way. This is the sort of critique we’re always leveling against the neoliberals. They are abstract thinkers. In their doxa that individuals are entirely responsible for themselves and that they completely make themselves by pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, neoliberals ignore all the mediations belonging to the social and material context in which human beings develop that play a role in determining the vectors of their life. They ignore, for example, that George W. Bush grew up in a family that was highly connected to the world of business and government and that this gave him opportunities that someone living in a remote region of Alaska in a very different material infrastructure and set of family relations does not have. To think concretely is to engage in a cartography of these mediations, a mapping of these networks, from circumstance to circumstance (what I call an “onto-cartography”). It is to map assemblages, networks, or ecologies in the constitution of entities.¶ Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignoring how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park:

The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this:¶

Phase 1: Collect Underpants¶ Phase 2: ?¶ Phase 3: Profit!¶ They even have a catchy song to go with their work:¶

Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows:

¶ Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique¶ Phase 2: ?¶ Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation!¶

Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing?¶ But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done!¶ But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.¶ What are your proposals? How will you meet these problems? How will you navigate the existing mediations or semiotic and material features of infrastructure? Marx and Lenin had proposals. Do you? Have you even explored the cartography of the problem? Today we are so intellectually bankrupt on these points that we even have theorists speaking of events and acts and talking about a return to the old socialist party systems, ignoring the horror they generated, their failures, and not even proposing ways of avoiding the repetition of these horrors in a new system of organization. Who among our critical theorists is thinking seriously about how to build a distribution and production system that is responsive to the needs of global consumption, avoiding the problems of planned economy, ie., who is doing this in a way that gets notice in our circles? Who is addressing the problems of micro-fascism that arise with party systems (there’s a reason that it was the Negri & Hardt contingent, not the Badiou contingent that has been the heart of the occupy movement). At least the ecologists are thinking about these things in these terms because, well, they think ecologically. Sadly we need something more, a melding of the ecologists, the Marxists, and the anarchists. We’re not getting it yet though, as far as I can tell. Indeed, folks seem attracted to yet another critical paradigm, Laruelle.¶ I would love, just for a moment, to hear a radical environmentalist talk about his ideal high school that would be academically sound. How would he provide for the energy needs of that school? How would he meet building codes in an environmentally sound way? How would she provide food for the students? What would be her plan for waste disposal? And most importantly, how would she navigate the school board, the state legislature, the federal government, and all the families of these students? What is your plan? What is your alternative? I think there are alternatives. I saw one that approached an alternative in Rotterdam. If you want to make a truly revolutionary contribution, this is where you should start. Why should anyone even bother listening to you if you aren’t proposing real plans? But we haven’t even gotten to that point. Instead we’re like underpants gnomes, saying “revolution is the answer!” without addressing any of the infrastructural questions of just how revolution is to be produced, what alternatives it would offer, and how we would concretely go about building those alternatives. Masturbation.¶ “Underpants gnome” deserves to be a category in critical theory; a sort of synonym for self-congratulatory masturbation. We need less critique not because critique isn’t important or necessary– it is –but because we know the critiques, we know the problems. We’re intoxicated with critique because it’s easy and safe. We best every opponent with critique. We occupy a position of moral superiority with critique. But do we really do anything with critique? What we need today, more than ever, is composition or carpentry. Everyone knows something is wrong. Everyone knows this system is destructive and stacked against them. Even the Tea Party knows something is wrong with the economic system, despite having the wrong economic theory. None of us, however, are proposing alternatives. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

#### 5. Turn – Counter hegemonies – their uncritical acceptance of marginalized voices undermines any value of their pedagogy

**Gur-Ze’ev** **98**

(Ilan, (Haifa University) “Toward a non-repressive critical pedagogy.” No date. Accessed 1/19/11.

<http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/Critpe39.html>)

From this perspective, the consensus reached by the reflective subject taking part in the dialogue offered by Critical Pedagogy is naive, especially in light of its declared anti-intellectualism on the one hand and its pronounced glorification of “feelings”, “experience”, and self-evident knowledge of the group on the other. Critical Pedagogy, in its different versions, claims to inhere and overcome the foundationalism and transcendentalism of the Enlightenment’s emancipatory and  ethnocentric arrogance, as exemplified by ideology critique, psychoanalysis, or traditional metaphysics. Marginalized feminist knowledge, like the marginalized, neglected, and ridiculed knowledge of the Brazilian farmers, as presented by Freire or Weiler, is represented as legitimate and relevant knowledge, in contrast to its representation as the hegemonic instrument of representation and education. This knowledge is portrayed as a relevant, legitimate and superior alternative to hegemonic education and the knowledge this represents in the center. It is said to represent an identity that is desirable and promises to function “successfully”. However, neither the truth value of the marginalized collective memory nor knowledge is cardinal here. “Truth” is replaced by knowledge whose supreme criterion is its self-evidence, namely the potential productivity of its creative violence, while the dialogue in which adorers of “difference” take part is implicitly represented as one of the desired productions of this violence. My argument is that the marginalized and repressed self-evident knowledge has no superiority over the self-evident knowledge of the oppressors. Relying on the knowledge of the weak, controlled, and marginalized groups, their memory and their conscious interests, is no less naive and dangerous than relying on hegemonic knowledge. This is because the critique of Western transcendentalism, foundationalism, and ethnocentrism declines into uncritical acceptance of marginalized knowledge, which becomes foundationalistic and ethnocentric in presenting “the truth”, “the facts”, or “the real interests of the group” - even if conceived as valid only  for the group concerned. This position cannot avoid vulgar realism and naive positivism based on “facts” of self-evident knowledge ultimately realized against the self-evidence of other groups.

#### 6 - Turn – Strict Rationality –

#### the spoken and rational are the only methods considered appropriate by Giroux – no possibility for emancipation

**Gur-Ze’ev** **98**

(Ilan, (Haifa University) “Toward a non-repressive critical pedagogy.” No date. Accessed 1/19/11.

<http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/Critpe39.html>)

This can be exemplified by the issue of dialogue as a manifestation of Critical Education. The Critical Pedagogies of Freire, Giroux, Shor, and Burbules are constituted on education for a critical dialogue between educators and educated that is committed to demolishing hierarchies and power relations,(60)  within which students are empowered (ideally) to the degree of being able to decipher the hidden codes, power relations, and manipulations that build and represent reality, knowledge, and identities. Basically, this concept of dialogue is part of the modernistic emancipatory project. The subject taking part in such an anti-violent dialogue is supposed to be rational and solidarian to the degree of being able to reconstruct reality and understand it within the process of the dialogue, even if the “understanding” here is not conceived as “objective truth” or a representation of “the thing in itself and for itself”. This conception consensus is deconstructed by postmodern critique and is negated by Critical Theory’s understanding of our historical situation. According to this argument, in our historical situation, even as an ideal, there is no place for such a subject whose assumed existence preconditions Critical Pedagogy’s concept of dialogue. That is one reason why Critical Theory has no room for such an optimistic emancipatory concept. In these versions of Critical Pedagogy even the hermeneutic dimension, to which praxis education is implicitly committed, is not represented as it is: a project whose foundations and practice are both within the framework of high culture as in the philosophy of Hans Gadamer, but as an open possibility of the given reality.

#### A) the fossil fuel economy revolutionized modernity into the highest living standards ever – transition away would take humanity with it

Goklany 12/20 (Indur M. Goklany has worked with federal and state governments, think tanks, and the private sector for 40 years and written extensively on the interactions between globalization, economic development, environmental quality, technological change, climate change, risk analysis, and human well-being. He has published in Nature, the Lancet, Energy & Environment, and other journals. He is the author of several books, including The Improving State of the World: Why We’re Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet and The Precautionary Principle: A Critical Appraisal of Environmental Risk Assessment, “Humanity Unbound How Fossil Fuels Saved Humanity from Nature and Nature from Humanity”, <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa715.pdf>, December 20, 2012)

Until the last quarter of a millennium, mankind depended on living nature for all its food and clothing, most of its energy, and much of its material and medicines. She dictated mankind’s numbers, well-being, and living standards. But she has never been constant. She would smile on some, but not on others. Her smiles, always temporary, would inevitably be replaced by frowns. Her Malthusian checks—hunger, famine, disease, or conflict—ensured that there was little or no progress in the human condition. Many people did not even survive into their 20s, populations grew very slowly, and living standards were generally constrained to subsistence levels. Gradually, with the accumulation of human capital, exchange of ideas, and hard work, mankind started to commandeer more land to meet its needs and develop technologies that, in some cases, amplified Nature’s bounty but, in other cases, bypassed her altogether. These led to higher food production, better health, longer lifespans, and larger populations with better living standards, which then reinforced human capital and the exchange of ideas, which begat yet more and better technologies. Thus was the cycle of progress born and set in motion. The cycle had been moving forward in fits and starts before fossil fuels—ancient nature’s bequest to humanity—became ubiquitous. 121 But fossil fuels assured progress. The cycle accelerated. Mankind’s dependence on nature declined. It became less vulnerable to weather, climate, disease, and other sources of natural disasters. The Malthusian bonds that held mankind and its well-being in check started to stretch, until they were burst asunder. Today, fossil fuels are responsible for at least 60 percent of mankind’s food. They also provide 81 percent of mankind’s energy supply, while nature supplies only 10 percent. Sixty percent of the fiber used globally for clothing and other textiles are synthetic, coming mainly from fossil fuels. Much (thirty percent) of the remaining—so-called natural fiber, relies heavily on fossil fuel– based fertilizers and pesticides. With respect to materials, although global estimates are unavailable, nature provides only 5 percent of U.S. materials (by weight). But even this 5 percent, just like the remaining 95 percent, cannot be processed, transported and used without energy inputs. Without fossil fuels, humanity would be unable to feed itself, and what food there was would be costlier. There would be more hunger. There would be insufficient energy and materials available to sustain the economy at more than a fraction of its current level. Public health would suffer, living standards would plummet, human well-being would be drastically diminished, and the population would crash. In the absence of the technologies that depend directly or indirectly on fossil fuels, humanity would have had to expand cropland by another 150 percent to meet the current demand for food. Even more land would have had to be annexed to satisfy existing requirements for energy, materials, clothing, and other textiles using nature’s products. Not only have these fossil fuel–dependent technologies ensured that humanity’s progress and well-being are no longer hostage to nature’s whims, but they saved nature herself from being devastated by the demands of a rapidly expanding and increasingly voracious human population. Progress today depends on technological change; economic development; trade in goods, services and ideas; and human capital. But technology is the product of ideas, and fossil fuels have been vital for the generation of ideas. Specifically, fossil fuels have helped give us—and not just the rich amongst us—illumination, which expands our time; machines that preserve our level of energy; better health and longer life expectancies; faster and more voluminous trade in goods and ideas; more rapid communications within a wider network; and a much larger population. Reinforcing each other, they increased the stock of human capital and created more opportunities for exchanging ideas, which spawned even more ideas and technologies. And today humanity’s numbers, well-being, and living standards have never been higher. In summary, although fossil fuels did not initiate the cycle of progress and are imperfect, they are critical for maintaining the current level of progress. It may be possible to replace fossil fuels in the future. Nuclear energy is waiting in the wings but, as the high subsidies and mandates for renewables attest, renewables are unable to sustain themselves today. Perhaps, with help from fossil fuels, new ideas will foster technologies that will enable a natural transition away from such fuels.

#### B) it’s the only one capable of meeting the demands of globalization

Goklany 12/20 (Indur M. Goklany has worked with federal and state governments, think tanks, and the private sector for 40 years and written extensively on the interactions between globalization, economic development, environmental quality, technological change, climate change, risk analysis, and human well-being. He has published in Nature, the Lancet, Energy & Environment, and other journals. He is the author of several books, including The Improving State of the World: Why We’re Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet and The Precautionary Principle: A Critical Appraisal of Environmental Risk Assessment, “Humanity Unbound How Fossil Fuels Saved Humanity from Nature and Nature from Humanity”, <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa715.pdf>, December 20, 2012)

The collective demand for land to meet humanity’s demands for food, fuel, and other products of living nature is—and always has been—the single most important threat to ecosystems and biodiversity. 63 Fossil fuel– dependent technologies have kept that demand for land in check. This positive aspect of the impact of fossil fuels on the environment has been ignored in most popular narratives, which instead emphasize fossil fuels’ potential detrimental effects, including air, water, and solid-waste pollution, as well as any climate change associated with the use and production of these fuels. Because of this oversight, and thus lacking balance, these studies generally conclude that fossil fuels have been an environmental disaster. To obtain a notion of the magnitude of the environmental benefits of fossil fuels, consider just the effect of fertilizers and pesticides on the amount of habitat saved from conversion to cropland because fossil fuels were used to meet current food demands. The Haber-Bosch process, by itself, is responsible for feeding 48 percent of global population and pesticides have reduced losses from pests for a range of food-related crops by 26–40 percent. Together, these two sets of technologies might therefore be responsible for feeding approximately 60 percent of the world’s population, assuming that pesticides that are not manufactured with significant fossil fuel inputs would be half as effective as those that require fossil fuels. Therefore, had fossil fuels not been used, the world would have needed to increase the global amount of cropland by an additional 150 percent. 64 This means that to maintain the current level of food production, at least another 2.3 billion hectares of habitat would have had to be converted to cropland. This is equivalent to the total land area of the United States, Canada, and India combined. Considering the threats posed to ecosystems and biodiversity from the existing conversion of 1.5 billion hectares of habitat to cropland, the effect of increasing that to 3.8 billion hectares is inestimable. 65 The above calculation underestimates the additional habitat that would have to be converted to cropland because it assumes that the additional 2 billion hectares of cropland would be as productive as the current 1.5 billion hectares—an unlikely proposition since the most productive areas are probably already under cultivation. Moreover, even if the same level of production could have been maintained, eschewing the use of today’s first-best technologies to produce fertilizers or pesticides would necessarily have meant higher food prices. That would have added to the 925 million people that the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates are already chronically hungry worldwide.

# 2NC

### K

**The impact is Extinction**

**Warren and Cady 94**—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

Recognizing sexual difference as the starting point is key to environmental movements and challenging neoliberal institutions

Fermon 1998 (Nicole, “Women on the Global Market: Irigaray and the Democratic State,” Diacritics 28.1 (1998) 120-137)

Irigaray reminds us that recognition of others requires a prior gesture of love toward the self and assumes a woman who is free, who can speak and deliberate, who "uses" this freedom. That is, it assumes a woman in the process of coming into being [ILTY 107]. Not surprisingly, the possibility of self-love in woman also allows for love more generally, especially of daughters and mothers, women with each other. In "Body against body: In Relation to the Mother," Irigaray calls it, "with lots of quotation marks ""secondary homosexuality""" [SG 20]. Why not primary homosexuality? Is this condescension and homophobia? Is it the equivalent of freeing the incestuous love for the mother to express itself as it will? Another extravagance to explain difficult intergenerational relations? Despite the considerable obstacles of universalist and capitalist liberal democratic politics and, not incidentally, of obdurate patriarchal relations, Irigaray presents women's relationship as open to dialogue, to intersubjective exchanges. Irigaray's linguistic research proposes that where men eliminate differences, for women differences instead "express a space between, a space that is generally positively valorized" [ILTY 86]. Is this utopian? Not if politics concerns the needs and desires of real persons, and is an attempt to think and do "the possible" by mostly conventional means. Not if politics is of interest to women. Irigaray presents "meditations," plans and projects toward "felicity." It is this theorizing which allows us to believe that the global future can be regulated to include rules that protect working people: with rights and laws about fair labor standards, child labor prohibition, social security, consumer and environmental standards, food and drug standards.

What if these rules also include distinct rights for women and men, as well as for children, rights applicable in civic, religious, economic, and political circumstances, perhaps through the nation-state, whose role has certainly not been exhausted? The World Trade Organization, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other legislators of the universal marketplace will be critical to this discussion, if they can be convinced to expand their base of expertise to include local democratic initiatives. Yet this requires preparation in the realm of thought and of organizing, through workers' and citizens' movements

and through the creative work of women on behalf of distinctive innovations and initiatives. Above all, Irigaray's project questions the easy acceptance of institutions, of the hierarchy and authority of existing forms of economies inimical to women. This project necessitates a deeper interest in relations between women, for if "the feminine has never been defined except as the inverse, indeed the underside, of the masculine" [TS 158], then we must be attentive to women's understanding of each other in creating a form of politics distinctly "ours."

**Postmodernism reduces the body to a blank slate helplessly inscribed by the molar forces of the collective. In positing its general accounts of the phenomenological body, it covers up and makes logically impossible an account of the sexual body, and this makes women’s political exploitation inevitable.**

**Cahill 2001** [Ann, *Rethinking Rape*, pp. 65-68]

**While postmodern theory was virtually unanimous in its dethroning of scientific knowledge as the arbiter of objective truth, there was hardly the same degree of agreement when it came to producing various accounts of the significance and quality of the human body. Many postmodern theorists**, most notably Foucault, **noted that the body, far from being a “natural” and therefore politically innocent entity, is marked indelibly by the political discourses that surround it**. Through this marking, this inscription, certain types of beings, particular kinds of subjects, are produced. This description of the body as a privileged site of the forces of power emphasized the complex workings of socialization and threatened the modern model of both power and resistance by locating power not in an easily identifiable, single source, which could be resisted by means of a self-conscious and willful subject. If the body itself, its behaviors and comportments, is constructed in accordance with a given (although constantly shifting) set of power relations, then no one body, no one person, can be understood as outside of or free from the tenacious influence of those relations. In other instances, most notably the phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the body was taken not primarily as a product of socialization, but rather as the condition of possibility for any human agency at all. The “lived body” was posited as the object of philosophical inquiry, whose mandate was to articulate the structures and implications of embodiment for the human subject. Psychoanalysis represented yet another strand of postmodern thought, a strand that constituted the body as a reflection and expression of interior dynamics and struggles. The body is, again, no mere matter, no “natural” substance, but rather a particular incarnation of a complex and intersecting group of desires. According to Elizabeth Grosz, “What psychoanalytic theory makes clear is that the body is literally written on, inscribed, by desire and signification, at the anatomical, physiological and neurological levels. The body is in no sense naturally or innately psychical, sexual, or sexed. It is indeterminate and indeterminable outside its social constitution as a body of a particular type” (1994, 60). **Few of these particularly postmodern theories of the body were primarily interested in the sexual differentiation of bodies, in the sense that they were seeking, for the most part, to produce a general theory of the body. While feminist theory found in phenomenology, psychoanalysis, and Foucauldian genealogy useful methodological tools, most of these theories were found lacking in relation to the question of feminine or female bodies, usually by virtue of their failure to account for bodily experiences or dynamics that were specific to women. The mistake committed by modern political theories of (implicitly or explicitly) accepting the masculine/male body as the norm, thereby positing the feminine/female body as exception or aberration, seemed to have been doomed to repetition. Because the feminine/female body is not taken as the generically human body—or, to put it another way, because the allegedly generic human form is always implicitly masculine—such embodied experiences as pregnancy or menstruation are not perceived as relevant to questions of subjectivity or being. These experiences may speak of women's subjectivity (mostly to limit or deny it), but not of human subjectivity itself. The exclusion of such distinctively female experiences, of course, means that the resulting theory itself is not universal, but speaks only of the particularly male body**. Feminist analyses such as Iris Marion Young's discussion of pregnant embodiment (1990, 160–74) seek to demonstrate that the exclusion of the feminine/female body serves to maintain certain distinctions and dichotomies (self/ other) which in turn participate in the exclusion of women from social and political activities. **Another major problem with postmodern theories of the body for feminist purposes is that they construct the body as purely pliable, the blank slate on which political discourses or psychosexual drives wrote their narratives. This emphasis on the function of the body in service to either interior or exterior impulses seemed to deny, or at least dismiss, the significance of the materiality of the body. The body as matter was again posited as passive and inert: a familiar residue of the modern body/mind split. Yet feminist theory maintained a healthy suspicion of the dualism of such thinking and of the persistent definition of materiality (perhaps taking the place of dethroned nature?), notoriously associated with the feminine, as the inactive, limitlessly malleable stuff of human existence. To construct materiality in this way was to render embodied sexual difference purely fictional, purely constructed, making an articulation of specifically feminine or female ways of being logically impossible**.

According to Carol Bigwood, **While we should applaud poststructuralism's criticism of metaphysical foundationalism, as well as its attempt to free gender from our modern conceptions of a biological fixed body, the postmodern disembodied body, which privileges culture over nature and the body, reinforces the same** phallocentric metaphysical structures **that have contributed to the** domination of women **and nature.** (1991, 60) **Here again we see that the move away from sexual difference—that is, the rendering of sexual difference as wholly malleable, artificial—effectively undermines the grounds for feminist inquiry by positing the class of “women” (formerly defined, much to women's disadvantage, in strictly biological terms) as illusory. The body, it would seem, even when distinctively disembodied, continues to thwart feminist attempts to develop women's agency.**

**Pedagogy can never be successful unless men acknowledge their privilege – Civilized oppression becomes the process of oppression through normalized everyday life. The active ignores of their privilege only reifies patriarchy and locks women into positions subjugation**

 **Noble and Pease in 2011**

Carolyn noble and bob pease. Interrogating male privilege in the human services and social work education” Women in Welfare Education collective.

Harvey (1999) used the term "civilised oppression" to describe the way in which processes of oppression are normalised in everyday life including work. Because civilised oppression is also embedded in cultural norms and bureaucratic institutions, many of these practices are habituated and unconscious. Many of the injustices people suffer are a result of the attitudes and practices of ordinary people going about their daily lives not aware of how their assumptions of superiority impact on the lives of others. Such people do not understand themselves as having unearned privilege. Nor do they see themselves as oppressing others. Civilised oppression can be used to describe many of the specific uses of privilege by men as they do gender in workplaces. In making men's privilege more visible, we will also make civilised oppression more recognisable. However, there has been very little interrogation of the processes by which this is done and whether men can act in ways that challenge the patriarchal relations embedded in organisations. Very few organisations in Australia recognise that women's exclusion from senior management is a structural and cultural problem that requires transformation of the culture of the workplace (Noble and Moore 2006). Historically we know that when gender inequalities are acknowledged they tend to be discussed more in terms of women's disadvantage rather than male advantage and privilege. Even many profeminist writers who recognise gender inequality do not theorise male privilege (Carbado 2001). So rather than talking in terms of women's lack of resources, we should talk about men's surplus of resources (Connell 2006). Eveline (2004) has drawn attention to "male advantage" in contrast to "women's disadvantage", pointing out that focusing solely on women's disadvantages and ignoring male privilege normalises and legitimises masculinist standards. It is the taken for granted norms of hegemonic masculinity that reproduces men's power in organisations, the classroom (Hearn and Collinson 2006) and life generally (Harvey (1999). According to Acker (1998), Martin (2004), Ruxton (2004), Flood and Pease (2005), Hearn and Collinson (2006) and Connell (2006), men come into educational institutions and the workforce with an unfair advantage attached to their status as men in a patriarchal culture. That is, men seem to have an unmarked status, a status and privilege not recognised by those who have it. Acker (1998) calls this factor "doing gender". Martin (2001) names this as men "mobilizing masculinities", McIntosh (2002) named this advantage an "invisible knapsack" of privilege, while Flood and Pease (2005) refer to this phenomenon as "doing privilege". In this analysis, this invisible package of unearned assets associated with male privilege can be cashed in on a daily basis;

 from choosing jobs, work conditions, having access to credit, and being free to act in uninhibited ways with confidence because of their position as central actors on the cultural turf. By exercising their prerogatives in everyday interactions, men as the privileged group can easily ignore or not see how others, especially women, are denied the same opportunities. Messerschmidt (2000) argues that the privileging of males in the workplace has to do with the intersection of cultural and structural factors that are reproduced and constrained by individual actors who exercise varying degrees of power attached to them by their structural position in the gender division. Men, and by implication women, unconsciously know what the established order is and act in partnership to keep it in place. That is, women and men live their lives trying to attain certain valued aspirations associated with these structural scripts resulting in a gender division that has both a subjective and instrumental dimension. Talking specifically about men, Messerschmidt (2000) argues that masculinity is "what men do under specific constraints and varying degrees of power" (p. 53). Gender is thus a series of accomplishments done in specific situations. Messershmidt acknowledges that these 'accomplishments' are shaped by structural constraints. Acker (1998), Sinclair (2005) Martin (2001, 2004) and Fenstermaker and West (2002) argue that as most men have few other social contexts to define their identity than by the paid work they do, it is not surprising that men do gender as they do work. While the argument that work provides a key site in which male workers and managers actually mobilise masculinities, Martin (2001) argues that men are only vaguely, if at all, aware of working in concert with each other to keep women out. This may explain why men continue to see gender issues as pertaining to women (not themselves) and seem to have little awareness of the ways in which their behaviour and norms operate to exclude women from male domains such as senior management positions (Noble and Moore 2006). The same "knapsack of privilege" is carried by men into the educational sector and thereby the classrooms (Hall 2007). Williams (1992) names the phenomenon the "glass escalator". What these scholars are arguing is that it is not women's failure which results in equality remaining an elusive goal. Rather, the invisibility of male privilege is so deeply ingrained as to be unconscious (at worst) or semi-conscious (at best), but nevertheless all pervasive, resulting in masculine regimes as the norm. Consequently, all behaviour is measured or compared with the male script and entrenched in the ideological working of Western patriarchal culture. Men's behaviour in organisations is a sum total of this phenomenon. It is feasible to argue that the culture of patriarchy sustains a workplace culture with both surface and deep prejudices against women's place in senior leadership positions and that this 'doing gender' or 'doing male privilege' continually acts against and prevents women from making a valuable contribution to work in senior positions and having access to their rewards.

**C. Any struggle against oppression that aims to address only particular instances or engages in reformist politics fails to expose and challenge male domination. We must seek a politics of consciousness raising and revolution, joining together in connections among women for women, without which there can be no freedom, dignity, or autonomy.**

**Radicalesbians 1970** [Radicalesbians, “The Woman Identified Woman” http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/wlm/womid/]

But why is it that women have related to and through men? **By virtue of having been brought up in a male society, we have internalized the male culture's definition of ourselves. That definition consigns us to sexual and family functions, and excludes us from defining and shaping the terms of our lives.** In exchange for our psychic servicing and for performing society's non-profit-making functions, **the man confers on us just one thing: the slave status which makes us legitimate in the eyes of the society in which we live. This is called "femininity"** or "being a real woman" in our cultural lingo. We are authentic, legitimate, real to the extent that we are the property of some man whose name we bear. **To be a woman who belongs to no man is to be invisible, pathetic, inauthentic, unreal.** He confirms his image of us - of what we have to be in order to be acceptable by him - but not our real selves; he confirms our womanhood-as he defines it, in relation to him- but cannot confirm our personhood, our own selves as absolutes. **As long as we are dependent on the male culture for this definition. for this approval, we cannot be free. The consequence of internalizing this role is an enormous reservoir of self-hate.** This is not to say the self-hate is recognized or accepted as such; indeed most women would deny it. It may be experienced as discomfort with her role, as feeling empty, as numbness, as restlessness, as a paralyzing anxiety at the center. Alternatively, it may be expressed in shrill defensiveness of the glory and destiny of her role. But it does exist, often beneath the edge of her consciousness, poisoning her existence, keeping her alienated from herself, her own needs, and rendering her a stranger to other women. **They try to escape by identifying with the oppressor**, living through him, gaining status and identity from his ego, his power, his accomplishments. And by not identifying with other "empty vessels" like themselves. **Women resist relating on all levels to other women who will reflect their own oppression, their own secondary status, their own self-hate.** For to confront another woman is finally to confront one's self-the self we have gone to such lengths to avoid. And in that mirror we know we cannot really respect and love that which we have been made to be. **As the source of self-hate and the lack of real self are rooted in our male-given identity, we must create a new sense of self.** As long as we cling to the idea of "being a woman, '' we will sense some conflict with that incipient self, that sense of I, that sense of a whole person. It is very difficult to realize and accept that being "feminine" and being a whole person are irreconcilable. **Only women can give to each other a new sense of self. That identity we have to develop with reference to ourselves, and not in relation to men. This consciousness is the revolutionary force from which all else will follow**, for ours is an organic revolution. For this we must be available and supportive to one another, five our commitment and our love, give the emotional support necessary to sustain this movement. **Our energies must flow toward our sisters, not backward toward our oppressors. As long as woman's liberation tries to free women without facing the basic heterosexual structure that binds us in one-to-one relationship with our oppressors, tremendous energies will continue to flow into trying to straighten up each particular relationship with a man**, into finding how to get better sex, how to turn his head around-into trying to make the "new man" out of him, in the delusion that this will allow us to be the "new woman. " **This obviously** splits our energiesand commitments**, leaving us unable to be committed to the construction of the** new patterns which will liberate us.

**It is the primacy of women relating to women, of women creating a new consciousness of and with each other**, which is at the heart of women's liberation, and the basis for the cultural revolution. **Together we must find, reinforce, and validate our authentic selves. As we do this, we confirm in each other that struggling,** incipient sense of pride and strength, the divisive barriers begin to melt, **we feel this growing solidarity with our sisters**. We see ourselves as prime, find our centers inside of ourselves. We find receding the sense of alienation, of being cut off, of being behind a locked window, of being unable to get out what we know is inside. **We feel a real-ness, feel at last we are coinciding with ourselves. With that real self, with that consciousness, we begin a revolution to end the imposition of all coercive identifications, and to achieve maximum autonomy in human expression.**

**Butler locates agency at the site of culture which denies the tenacious realism of sexual difference.**

**Stone 2006** [Allison, *Luce Irigaray and the philosophy of sexual difference*, pp. 54-55]

Since my exposition of the elements of Butler’s theory must be somewhat complicated, an anticipatory summary of my conclusions may help. I will argue that, in each area, Butler does not in fact improve upon Irigaray so decisively as to supersede her later thought. Firstly, Butler ultimately still believes that bodies acquire agency only through being moulded by cultural norms; this view that bodily agency derives from that of culture reproduces the hierarchical privileging of the cultural over the bodily. (Although Butler revises her account of bodies in *Bodies that Matter* to try to solve this problem, the same problem reappears in her revised account.) Secondly, her idea that element of culture undergo constant reinterpretation and change denies the tenacity and unconscious rootedness of ideas of sexual difference, which Irigaray’s account of patriarchal culture, despite its overgeneralization, highlights. Thirdly, Butler’s politics of subversion falls prey to a dilemma: either (as in Gender Trouble) she prove insufficient normative grounds to consider subversion desirable, or (as in recent work such as Precarious Life) she justifies subversion with reference to her theory that bodies are socially formed—but this joins her politics inseparably to her ultimately hierarchical conception of the relation between culture and bodies. I will conclude, in Sections IV and V, that we can revise Butler’s theory of sex and gender to relieve it of these problems, by basing it on a conception of active and multiple bodily forces. This realist revision of Butler’s theory, though, raises a freh question: why should we affirm the existence of natural bodily multiplicity, rather than duality, as Irigaray holds? Finally, Butler’s theory of gender not only fails to surpass Irigaray’s later philosophy, but is also forces our attention back to Irigaray’s later philosophy and onto her deper reasons for postulating natural sexual duality.

### Roberts/kahn

**Kahn cites Friere as a way to create a way of counter-hegemoncy**

Misiaszek ‘10

Misiaszek, Greg W, University of California - Los Angeles¶ Review: Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement by Richard Kahn¶ InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 6(2) – 2010 – http://escholarship.org/uc/item/59w987tj#page-1

Kahn’s book helps define and develop through theories and subsequent praxis, as the title suggests, a critical pedagogy and ecoliteracy to combat the current planetary crisis. Kahn, a Freirean himself, stresses ecopedagogy to be “concerned with the larger hidden curriculum of unsustainable life and look to how social movements and a democratic public sphere are proffering vital knowledge about and against it” (p. 22). 3 Environmentally ill actions need to be deconstructed and reconstructed to determine what is being done to the Earth, why it is being done, who it benefits, and who or what is negatively impacted. These are the most essential questions of ecopedagogy because, as education cannot be apolitical (Freire, 1998), traditional environmental education is political. Without any benefits, acts of devastation would not occur because there would be no reason and subsequently no motivation for them. These “benefits” are a contested terrain in themselves because there is little doubt that a family needs certain resources for basic needs such as shelter, warmth, and nutrition; however, the deforestation of large areas of land for corporate farming to maximize profit is on the other end of the spectrum. Kahn develops foundations of analysis for pedagogies which determine the social and environmental injustices between who benefits and who/what4 are negatively impacted.

**Kahn’s ecopedagogy is rooted in Freire**

Journal of Sustainability Education ‘10

May 9th, 2010 – http://www.jsedimensions.org/wordpress/tags/ecopedagogy/

Beth Pollock provides the historical roots and inspiration of Kahn’s Ecopedagogy in Freire and Illich, giving us a good pre-view of what to expect in the book. She finds Kahn’s call for a new kind of pedagogy, founded in these greater thinkers, timely as we work towards establishing educational processes that provide the necessary literacy to face ecological and sustainability issues now and in the future.

**This reinforces the very modernism the aff attempts to criticize**

Keesing-Styles ‘3

(Linda Keesing-Styles, Programme Leader, Early Childhood Teacher Education, School of Education, UNITEC, Radical Pedagogy, “The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Teacher Education.”)

Feminist critique is not the only voice heard in the debate over critical pedagogy. Bowers (1987: 127) has examined the work of Freire and his followers and, while acknowledging the significant contribution made by Freire, Bowers argues that his pedagogy “is based on Western assumptions about man, freedom, progress, and the authority of the rational process”. Further, Bowers suggests that Freire’s pedagogy contributes to a modernizing way of thinking, and thus runs the risk of reinforcing Western values and assumptions. “The problem with Freire’s position is not that he advocates critical reflection but that he makes it the only legitimate source of knowledge and authority” (p. 129). And even more potentially dangerous is the use of dialogue as a tool for emancipation. Bowers contends that the mode of thought implicated in dialogue “shifts the locus of authority from that of community and tradition to the individual who unifies thought and action in a new praxis” (p. 129). This analysis clearly indicates a conflict between the intent of Freirean pedagogy and what Bowers perceives as the potential outcome.

### Case - neolib

**Asking teachers to be transformative individuals is fails – too vague – ends up fostering cultural destruction**

Bowers 3 (Can Critical Pedagogy be Greened? [appeared in Educational Studies, Spring, ‘03]

C. A. Bowers, Adjunct Professor of Environmental Studies, University of Oregon, http://www.cabowers.net/pdf/Can%20CP%20be%20Greened.pdf)

Ironically, it is the university-based theorists who have had no direct experience with the resistance movements within indigenous cultures, and the theorist in Third World universities who have studied under supposedly radical western professors who view these cultures as backward—and in need of emancipation, that are giving support to globalization even as they criticize it. The double bind in the thinking of these theorists is that their core western cultural assumptions prevent them from contributing to the different expressions of resistance taking place at the local level. Calling on teachers to be transformative intellectual, which is the main messianic message of Freire, McLaren, Giroux, and lessor known advocates of critical pedagogy such as Ira Shor and Svi Shapiro, is too abstract and thus disconnected from the solutions that various local groups, here and in other cultures, as trying to work out in the face of corporate pressures to commodify all aspects of daily life.

**xx Neoliberalism is a term that has been co-opted by the left – allowing countries to have and respond to economic incentives solves poverty – we control global uniqueness and turn their Santos evidence**

**Worstall 10** [Tim, “More on this neo-liberalism thing”, Adam Smith Institute, March 7] //khirn

Neo-liberalism gets blamed for a lot of things: that bankers couldn't see a housing bubble for example. It's also been said that the insistence that the poor countries of the world do the same things to get rich that we did to get rich - trade, get governments out of the way, try to create wealth, these sorts of things - was neo-liberalism conspiring to keep them poor. As we all know, China moved marketwards from a near insane communism and has been growing explosively since. India moved marketwards from a near insane Fabianism and has been growing explosively since....but what about Africa? It would be fair to say that this neo-liberalism thing got there a little later. Mid 1990s sounds about right, so, how's it been [working](http://www.columbia.edu/~xs23/papers/pdfs/Africa_Paper_VX3.2.pdf)? The conventional wisdom that Africa is not reducing poverty is wrong..... we estimate income distributions, poverty rates, and inequality and welfare indices for African countries for the period 1970‐2006. We show that: African poverty is falling and is falling rapidly. .... The growth spurt that began in 1995 decreased African income inequality instead of increasing it.  African poverty reduction is remarkably general: it cannot be explained by a large country, or even by a single set of countries possessing some beneficial geographical or historical characteristic. All classes of countries, including those with disadvantageous geography and history, experience reductions in poverty. In particular, poverty fell for both landlocked as well as coastal countries; for mineral‐rich as well as mineral‐poor countries; for countries with favorable or with unfavorable agriculture; for countries regardless of colonial origin; and for countries with below‐ or above median slave exports per capita during the African slave trade. How amazing: our melanin enhanced brethren are indeed our brethren, they react to and take advantage of economic incentives just as we do. Allowed the freedom to create, innovate and create wealth, wealth they create. Whatever ordure dumped upon them from that great height in the past by near insane economic policies and the thugs and crooks that have ruled them, peace, easy taxes and the tolerable administration of justice have been doing their thing. Or as those desiring that near a billion people escape poverty and join us in enjoying the fruits of the bourgeois lifestyle should perhaps be saying, neo-liberalism is dead: long live neo-liberalism.

### Case – ff

**Key to fertilizer, pesticide, machinery- collapse of global agricultural results in global structural violence**

Goklany 12/20 (Indur M. Goklany has worked with federal and state governments, think tanks, and the private sector for 40 years and written extensively on the interactions between globalization, economic development, environmental quality, technological change, climate change, risk analysis, and human well-being. He has published in Nature, the Lancet, Energy & Environment, and other journals. He is the author of several books, including The Improving State of the World: Why We’re Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet and The Precautionary Principle: A Critical Appraisal of Environmental Risk Assessment, “Humanity Unbound How Fossil Fuels Saved Humanity from Nature and Nature from Humanity”, <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa715.pdf>, December 20, 2012)

Fossil Fuels and the Reduced Dependence on Living Nature Before humanity extricated itself from the restraints that kept its growth and wellbeing in check, it had to develop technologies to reduce its dependence on the direct or indirect products of recent photosynthesis. This was enabled by technologies that either amplified nature’s bounty or bypassed it altogether for a wide variety of products (and services), 23 supplemented by devices or practices that would store today’s products for future use when nature, sooner or later, would fail to deliver. Food. Every activity requires energy. Even human inactivity requires a minimum level of energy to keep basic bodily functions going. 24 The amount of energy needed to sustain this inactivity is called the basal metabolic rate (BMR). It takes food to replace this energy. Insufficient food, which is defined in terms of the BMR, makes populations more susceptible to infections and other diseases, which, ironically, raises the body’s demands for more energy (that is, food). Societies where food supplies are inadequate have high rates of infant and maternal mortality, poor health, and low life expectancies. Thus, consuming sufficient food is the first step to human survival and, beyond that, good health. 25 Increasing food supplies, therefore, was critical to raising humanity’s numbers and well-being. This was initiated with the development of agriculture. Over subsequent millennia, humanity increased the amount of land used for crops and pasture (Figure 2) while also improving agricultural practices to increase yields from both crops and livestock (Figure 3). As shown in Figure 4, the increase in population and improvements in human well-being and living standards commenced before the world started to use fossil fuels in significant amounts. By 1900, an estimated 850 million hectares of cropland were being cultivated to feed a global population of about 1.7 billion people. Since then, although population has quadrupled and the world is much better fed, cropland only increased 80 percent. This was possible because of the technological augmentation of nature’s bounty resulting from tremendous improvements in the productivity of virtually every segment of the food and agricultural sector, from the farmer’s field to the consumer’s fork. Many of these productivity increases were driven directly or indirectly by fossil fuels. 26 Agricultural yields on the farm are driven by fertilizers, pesticides, water, and farm machinery. Each of these inputs depends to some extent on fossil fuels. Fossil fuels provide both the raw materials and the energy for the manufacture of fertilizers and pesticides; farm machinery is generally run on diesel or another fossil fuel; and irrigation, where it is employed, often requires large amounts of energy to operate pumps to move water. To gauge the contribution of fossil fuels to agricultural production, consider that a comprehensive review of fertilizer performance in the Agronomy Journal concluded that the “average percentage of yield attributable to fertilizer generally ranged from about 40 to 60% in the USA and England and tended to be much higher in the tropics.” 27 Another study in Nature Geosciences estimated that, in 2008, fertilizer made from synthetic nitrogen was responsible for feeding 48 percent of the world’s population

n. 28 As one can see in Figure 3, the acceleration in yields increased around the 1920s, which followed the commercialization of nitrogen fertilizers manufactured via the Haber-Bosch process. This energy-intensive process fixes nitrogen from the air by reacting it under extremely high pressure with hydrogen (obtained from natural gas), generally over an iron catalyst. In recognition of its potential contribution to feeding humanity, the co-inventor of this process, Fritz Haber, received the 1918 Nobel Prize for Chemistry, 29 despite the fact that the same process prolonged World War I by allowing Germany to manufacture explosives and ammunitions even after the British Navy had blockaded its access to Chilean saltpeter, which until then had been critical for its manufacture. (Fritz Haber also pioneered Germany’s wartime poison-gas effort.) 30 The distinguished plant scientist, E. C. Oerke, using data for 2001–03, estimates that 50 to 77 percent of the world’s wheat, rice, corn, potatoes, and soybean crops would be lost to pests in the absence of pesticides. Pesticides have reduced these losses to 26–40 percent. 31 Irrigated lands, with average crop yields 3.6 times higher than rain-fed areas, are responsible for a disproportionately high share of production relative to their acreage. 32 Where irrigation is not accomplished entirely through gravity, it can be a very energy-intensive operation. 33 Similarly, the manufacture and operation of farm machinery requires energy. And in today’s world, energy for the most part means fossil fuels (see below). Beyond increasing yields on the farm, fossil fuels have increased food availability in other ways. The food and agricultural system depends on trade within and between countries to move agricultural inputs to farms and farm outputs to markets. In particular, trade allows food surpluses to be moved to areas experiencing food deficits. But transporting these inputs and outputs in the quantities needed and with the speed necessary for such trade to be an integral part of the global food system depends on relatively cheap fossil fuels. 34 About one-third of the food that is produced is lost or wasted in the food supply chain between the farm and eventual consumption. 35 These losses would have been much higher but for spoilage-reducing technologies such as refrigeration, rapid transport, containers, and plastic packaging. 36 But refrigeration and rapid transport are energy-intensive: plastic, which is ubiquitous in food packaging and storage, is made from petroleum or natural gas, and virtually every container, whether it is made of clay, glass, metal, cardboard, or wood, requires energy to make and shape. These technologies are often overlooked partly because loss and waste are not included in familiar agricultural statistics such as crop yields or production figures. Nevertheless, lower losses and waste increase available food supplies and the overall efficiency of the food and agricultural system. Additional CO2 in the atmosphere should also contribute to higher food production. 37 Although there are uncertainties related to the quantitative relationship between higher yields and higher CO2 concentrations, there is no doubt that the latter increases yield. 38 This is unsurprising since CO2 is plant food, a fact established over two centuries ago by Nicolas Théodore de Saussure in his pioneering book, Recherches Chimiques sur la Végétation. 39 Moreover, because the health of the population has improved, the amount of food needed to maintain a healthy weight for each individual has declined. This is because additional food is needed to replace the nutrients lost because of sickness, with some illnesses (e.g., water-borne diseases) reducing them more than others. 40 Mechanical and electrical appliances have also reduced the demand for human effort, which translates into reduced demand for food. One may get a sense of the cumulative contribution of these technologies to the world food supply if one considers that between 1961 and 2007, global population more than doubled from 3.1 billion to 6.7 billion and food supplies per person increased by 27 percent, yet the total amount of cropland increased by only 11 percent. 41 In effect, in 2007, the global food and agricultural system delivered, on average, two and a half times as much food per acre of cropland as in 1961. New and improved technologies, coupled with greater penetration of existing technologies since 1961, account for 60 percent of total global food supplies. Had the productivity of this sector not improved since 1961, the world would have needed to cultivate another 2.2 billion hectares of cropland in 2007 to produce the same amount of food. This is equivalent to the combined land area of South America and the European Union. Much of this can be attributed directly or indirectly to fossil fuels. However, the full effects of fossil fuels may be even greater because the above calculation does not account for the pre-1961 yield increases from various fossil fuel–dependent technologies identified above. As indicated in Figure 3, the developed world had already captured some of these increases by 1960.

**Adaption checks all impacts- development is key to reversing**

Goklany 12/20 (Indur M. Goklany has worked with federal and state governments, think tanks, and the private sector for 40 years and written extensively on the interactions between globalization, economic development, environmental quality, technological change, climate change, risk analysis, and human well-being. He has published in Nature, the Lancet, Energy & Environment, and other journals. He is the author of several books, including The Improving State of the World: Why We’re Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet and The Precautionary Principle: A Critical Appraisal of Environmental Risk Assessment, “Humanity Unbound How Fossil Fuels Saved Humanity from Nature and Nature from Humanity”, <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa715.pdf>, December 20, 2012)

This hypothesis postulates that initially societies opt for economic and technological development over environmental quality because it enables them to escape from poverty and improve their quality of life by making both needs and wants (e.g., food, education, health, homes, comfort, leisure, and material goods) more affordable. But once basic needs are met, over time members of society perceive that environmental deterioration compromises their quality of life and they start to address their environmental problems. Being wealthier and having access to greater human capital, they are now better able to afford and employ cleaner technologies. Consequently, environmental deterioration can be halted and then reversed. Under this hypothesis, technological change and economic development may initially be the causes of negative environmental effects, but eventually they work together to effect an “environmental transition,” after

which technological change and economic development become the solutions to reducing these effects.