# Framework

#### t/s case- Increased political engagement amongst citizens is a prerequisite to empathizing with others and broadening our personal perspectives

Glover 10

[Robert, Professor of Political Science at University of Connecticut, Philosophy and Social Criticism, “Games without Frontiers?: Democratic Engagement, Agonistic Pluralism, and the Question of Exclusion”, Vol. 36, p. asp uwyo//amp]

As was noted at the outset of this piece, recent democratic theory has extensively focusedon the question of how to restore active citizen participation in political decision-making while both increasing the frequency and changing the character of political engagement. As Bohmanand Rehg note, this trend emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, driven widely-held beliefs that government was increasingly beyond the control of citizens and leftist political activism which had generated new interest in participatory models of self-government. 6 Early efforts at revitalizing citizen engagement took the form of broad-based proposals for participatory models of citizen engagement. 7 Participatory democracy seeks political engagement modeled less onpursuit of self-interest and more on face-to-face interaction which seeks commonality, sharedinterests, and consensus. 8 Participatory theorists such as Jane Mansbridge argued against the pervasive trend in Western political systems to view conflicting interests as an inevitable fact,blocking potential avenues for non-adversarial political engagement. 9 For participatory democrats, notions of community and shared values lie latent within our political systems,obscured beneath political institutions encouraging only aggregation of individual demands or 5 self-interested tradeoffs. 10 If the spaces of politics could be opened to facilitate greater citizen interaction, these long dormant trends of empathizing with one’s fellows and enlarging one’s perspectives could be recovered.

## Policymaking good

#### Policy debate is a prerequisite to the solvency of their claims- absent this the aff becomes an individualistic fetish concerned only with our internal awareness of problems while allowing us to not take responsibility for our actions should we organize and achieve social change

Chandler 2009

 [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 uwyo//amp]

People often argue that there is nothing passive or conservative about radical political activist protests, such as the 2003 anti-war march, Questioning Global Political Activism 79 anti-capitalism and anti-globalisation protests, the huge march to MakePoverty 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 them-selves: 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 creationof 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, 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 wasa serious project of social change.Rather than a political engagement with the world, it seems that radi-cal political activism today is a form of social disengagement – expressedin the anti-war marchers’ slogan of ‘Not in My Name’, or the assump-tion that wearing a plastic bracelet or setting up an internet blog diary isthe same as engaging in political debate. In fact, it seems that polit-ical activism is a practice which isolates individuals who think thatdemonstrating a personal commitment or awareness of problems is preferable to engaging with other people who are often dismissed as uncaring or brainwashed by consumerism. The narcissistic aspects of the practice of this type of global politics are expressed clearly by indi-viduals who are obsessed with reducing their carbon footprint, derivingtheir idealised sense of social connection from an ever-increasing aware-ness of themselves and by giving political meaning to every personalaction.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 thefreedom to construct the meaning for ourselves, to pick our causes of concern, and enabling us to be free of responsibilities for acting as partof a collective association, for winning an argument or for success at the ballot-box.Whiletheappealofglobalethicalpoliticsisanindividualisticone, the lack of success or impact of radical activism is also reflected inits rejection of any form of social movement or organization.