# 1st off

#### Interpretation—the roll of the ballot is that the judge is a policy maker and the affirmative should defend a mandated increase of federal economic engagement toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela

#### They are non-topical because they don’t defend the enactment of a policy by the United States federal government. Topicality is an a-priori voting issue – as judge you are only allowed to affirm those policies within your jurisdiction dictated by the resolution.

Failure to combine historical studies with policy proposals creates serial policy failure and a gap between black studies academics and those facing the most tangible forms of oppression. Thus, the alternative is to use debate as a sight for making political demands upon the state.

Williams 9 (Zachary, Associate Professor of African American History at The University of

AND

division of St. Martin’s Press LLC, pg 1-4) KJS

Africana Cultures and Policy Studies: Scholarship and the Transformation of Public Policy introduces Africana

AND

concerning the role of the historian in the construction of public policy.4

#### Here’s evidence that the resolution is the key stasis point—their interpretation is arbitrary O’Donnell 2004

PhD, director of debate at Mary Washington (Tim, WFU Debaters Research Guide, “Blue helmet blues”, ed. Bauschard & Lacy, <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>)

The answer, I believe, resides deep in the rhetorical tradition in the often

AND

debate from other forms of communication and gives the exchange a directed focus.[[1]](#endnote-1)

#### And, this form of argumentation outweighs

**Shively ‘2K**

(Ruth Lessl, Assistant Prof Political Science – Texas A&M U., Partisan Politics and Political Theory, p. 181-2)

The requirements given thus far are primarily negative. The ambiguists must say "no

AND

. In other words, contestation rests on some basic agreement or harmony.

#### Hijacks education—predictability is the basis of negative strategy which is key to clash and depth of discussion. The impact is rigorous testing of policies which is the only way to truly understand the world.

Zappen ‘4

James, Prof. Language and Literature – Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, “The Rebirth of Dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates, and the Rhetorical Tradition”, p. 35-36)

Finally, Bakhtin describes the Socratic dialogue as a carnivalesque debate between opposing points of

AND

in Soocrates' successive refutations and humiliations of Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles.

#### No ground makes the aff presumptively false

Lasch 95

Christopher, Social Critic and Author, “The Revolt of the Elites and the

AND

activity we may well decide that there is something wrong with our own.

#### Common ground builds bridges to consensus—their critique of debate demonizes a target and then forces us to defend that target, reversing the potential for progress

Levasseur and Carlin 01

David G. Levasseur is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at West Chester University in

AND

evaluate policy positions using an egocentric standard than a common-good standard.

#### Switch side is the only effective training for activism

Coverstone 05

masters in communication from Wake Forest and longtime debate coach  
(Alan H.,

AND

honed their skills in the crucible of high-level contest debating.

#### Turn—claiming this round is key to activism crushes their project

Atchison and Panetta 09

Director of Debate at Trinity University and Director of Debate at the University of Georgia

AND

competition diminishes the additional potential for collaboration, consensus, and coalition building.

#### Individual debate rounds don’t reshape the community Atchison and Panetta, 09

Director of Debate at Trinity University and Director of Debate at the University of Georgia

AND

debate with so few participants is the best strategy for addressing important problems.

There is a topical version of the aff. The aff could mandate a supereme court test casing over lifting the bounty on Assata. This solves the affs offense better than the aff because they could change the institution that allows racism to occur.

# 2nd off

A) By participating in this tournament while knowingly rejecting the resolution, an agreed upon norm, our opponents are acting as civil disobedients.  Though they have the right to challenge rules they believe to be unjust, their request for the ballot is contradictory to the goals of their resistance.

A.D. Woozley 76 (Professor of Moral Philosophy at University of Virginia, “Civil Disobedience and Punishment,” Ethics, Vol. 86, No. 4. (Jul., 1976), pp. 323-331, accessed via JSTOR)

The civil disobedient stands to gain nothing for himself (as the ordinary criminal does

AND

those for whom it is rightly claimed, to demand it for themselves.

B) If you do believe their stance is sincere and/or you agree with it, you should reward their civil disobedience with a loss.  Punishment is key to enlisting the sympathy of the majority and ensuring the movement succeeds.

Cohen 72 – Marshall, University Professor, Emeritus, Professor of Philosophy and Law, Emeritus, and Dean, Emeritus, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences at USC [“Liberalism and Disobedience,” Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 1, No. 3. (Spring, 1972), pp. 283-314, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/2265054.pdf]

It is for this reason that the civil disobedient characteristically notifies government officials of the

AND

at stake, and this is the first objective of the civil disobedient.

# 3rd off

Bereft of values, our society demands images of suffering from others to replenish our moral sentiment. We exchange our pity for their pain, in a process that guarantees the suffering must continue.

Baudrillard in 94 (Jean, September 28, "No Reprieve For Sarejevo")

The problem lies indeed in the nature of our reality. We have got only

AND

undermining the military-industrial complex of old & sinister days. ¶

**Their use of the suffering of others is nothing more than exploitation. They turn suffering into a perverse for of capital to be exchanged for your ballot, vampirically draining the life from those who suffer, and ensuring their suffering continues. We must reject their economy of trauma to prevent further suffering.**

**Baudrillard 96** (Jean Baudrillard The Perfect Crime, 1996, pg 133 – 137,)

Our reality: that is the problem. We have only one, and it

AND

aware of what we are doing -- from evil, never from misfortune.

# Case

#### Their discourse doesn’t solve structural inequalities---research and policy focus in Latin America are vital---key to prevent poverty and other issues

Pribble et al 09

Jennifer Pribble- Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Richmond; Evelyne Huber- Morehead Alumni Professor of Political Science and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; John D. Stephens- Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Sociology; Director, Center for European Studies, received his B.A. (1970) from Harvard University and his Ph.D. (1976) from Yale University; “Politics, Policies, and Poverty in Latin America”; July 2009; Comparative Politics, Vol. 41, No. 4 (July 2009), pp. 387-407; available on Jstor @ http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/40599215.pdf

This focus on the role of politics- political regime type, parties, and

AND

ideology have an important effect on cross-national variation in Latin American poverty

#### They don’t solve exclusion

Mouffe 1999

Professor of Political Theory at the University of Westminster, 1999 (Chantall, Race

AND

rational" consensus. It is always based on a form of exclusion.

#### Social progress—their project fails without concrete policy guiding it Feaver 2001

Assistant professor of political science at Duke (Peter, “Twenty-first century weapons proliferation”, p. 178)

At the same time, virtually all good theory has implications for policy. Indeed

AND

. Happily, the best work in the proliferation field already does so.

#### The impact is **war**

Hanson 07

Victor Davis Hanson, Professor of Classics at CSU Fullerton, “Why Study War?” City Journal, Summer)

It’s no surprise that civilian Americans tend to lack a basic understanding of military matters

AND

, if we did, we would withdraw as we had from Mogadishu.

#### Making debate a site for activism encourages dangerous elite infiltration and politicizes key training process – their movement will just get co-opted

Coverstone, 95

masters in communication from Wake Forest and longtime debate coach  
(Alan, “An Inward Glance; A Response to Mitchell’s Outward Activist Turn,”<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Coverstone1995China.htm>)  
Second, Mitchell's argument underestimates the risks associated with an outward turn. **Individuals trained** **in** the art and practice of **debate are**, indeed, **well suited to** the task of **enter**ing **the political world**. At some unspecified point in one's training, the same motivation and focus that has consumed Mitchell will also consume most of us. At that point, **political action becomes a proper endeavor**. **However, all of the members of the academic debate community will not reach that point together**. A political outward turn threatens to corrupt the oasis in two ways. **It makes our oasis a target, and it threatens to politicize the training process. As long as debate appears to be focused inwardly, political elites will not feel threatened**. Yet one of Mitchell's primary concerns is recognition of our oasis in the political world. In this world we face well trained information managers. **Sensing a threat from "debate," they will begin to infiltrate our space**. Ready made information will increase and debaters will eat it up. Not yet able to truly discern the relative values of information, **young debaters will** eventually **be influenced** dramatically **by the infiltration of political elites.** Retaining our present anonymity in political life offers a better hope for reinvigorating political discourse. As perhaps the only truly non-partisan space in American political society, academic debate holds the last real possibility for training active political participants. **Nowhere else are people** **allowed**, let alone encouraged, **to test all manner of political ideas**. This is the process through which debaters learn what they believe and why they believe it. In many ways **this** natural evolution is made possible by the isolation of the debate community. An example should help illustrate this idea. Like many young debaters, I learned a great deal about socialism early on. This was not crammed down my throat. Rather, I learned about the issue in the free flow of information that is debate. The intrigue of this, and other outmoded political arguments, was in its relative unfamiliarity. Reading socialist literature avidly, I was ready to take on the world. Yet I only had one side of the story. I was an easy mark for the present political powers. Nevertheless, I decided to fight City Hall. I had received a parking ticket which I felt was unfairly issued. Unable to convince the parking department to see it my way, I went straight to the top. I wrote the Mayor a letter. In this letter, I accused the city of exploitation of its citizens for the purpose of capital accumulation. I presented a strong Marxist critique of parking meters in my town. The mayor's reply was simple and straightforward. He called me a communist. He said I was being silly and should pay the ticket. I was completely embarrassed by the entire exchange. I thought I was ready to start the revolution. In reality, I wasn't even ready to speak to the Mayor. I did learn from the experience, but I did not learn what Gordon might have hoped. I learned to stop reading useless material and to keep my opinions to myself. Do we really want to force students into that type of situation? I wrote the mayor on my own. **Debaters will experiment with political activism on their own**. This is all part of the natural impulse for activism which debate inspires. Yet, in the absence of such individual motivation, an outward turn threatens to short circuit the learning process. Debate should capitalize on its isolation. We can teach our students to examine all sides of an issue and reach individual conclusions before we force them into political exchanges. **To prematurely turn debaters out threatens to undo the positive potential of involvement in debate.**

1. See for example: Snider, Alfred and Maxwell Schnurer. (2002). *Many Sides: Debate Across the Curriculum*, New York International Debate Education Association. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)