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Interpretation

The affirmative must defend a specific policy proposal in which the federal government legally mandates an increase in its transportation infrastructure investment in the United States.

The topic is defined by the phrase following the colon – the USFG is the agent

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing, 2k

“The Colon,” http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm

Use a colon [ : ] before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on: [it continues…] If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter:

Should denotes expectation of a plan

American Heritage, 9

“Should” on [dictionary.com](http://dictionary.com) http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should

Used to express probability or expectation: They should arrive at noon.

The USFG is the government in Washington D.C

Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2k http://encarta.msn.com

“The federal government of the United States is centered in Washington DC”

Impacts

1. Switch Side – having a topical affirmative is the only way to ensure teams take both sides of an argument and learn multiple perspectives about the topic – they force overly generic debates

2. Portable Education – plan vs. counter–plan debates are key to take education and translate it into real world action – debates over personal issues fail

Muir ‘93

[Star A, Department of Communications at George Mason University, “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 26, No. 4]

The debate over moral education and values clarification parallels in many ways the controversy over switch-side debate. Where values clarification recognizes no one set of values, debate forces a questioning and exploration of both sides of an issue. Where cognitive-development emphasizes the use of role playing in the inception of moral judgment, debate *requires* an empathy for alternative points of view. Where discussion provides an opportunity for expressions of personal feelings, debate fosters an analytic and explicit approach to value assessment. Freeley describes the activity this way: Educational debate provides an opportunity for students to consider the significant problems in the context of a multivalued orientation. They learn to look at a problem from many points of view. As debaters analyze the potential affirmative cases and the potential negative cases, including the possibility of negative counterplans, they begin to realize the complexity of most contemporary problems and to appreciate the worth of a multivalued orientation; as they debate both sides of a proposition under consideration, they learn not only that most problems of contemporary affairs have more than one side but also that even one side of a proposition embodies a considerable range of values. The comparison between moral education and debate is useful because it contextualizes the process of moral development within an educational setting. Several objections have been raised about the practice of moral education, and these objections have direct relevance to the issue of switch-side debate. A view of debate as a form of moral education can be developed by addressing questions of efficacy, of isolation from the real world, and of relativism. The first issue is one of effectiveness: Do clarification activities achieve the espoused goals? Social coercion and peer pressure, for example, still occur in the group setting, leaving the individual choice of values an indoctrination of sorts.27 Likewise, the focus of clarification exercises is arguably less analytic than expressive, less critical than emotive.28 The expression of individual preferences may be guided by simple reaction rather than by rational criteria. These problems are minimized in the debate setting, especially where advocacy is not aligned with personal belief. Such advocacy requires explicit analysis of values and the decision criteria for evaluating them. In contemporary debate, confronted with a case they believe in, debaters assigned to the negative side have several options: present a morass of arguments to see what arguments "stick," concede the problem and offer a "counterplan" as a better way of solving the problem, or attack the value structure of the affirmative and be more effective in defending a particular hierarchy of values. While the first option is certainly exercised with some frequency, the second and third options are also often used and are of critical importance in the development of cognitive skills associated with moral judgment. For example, in attacking a case that restricts police powers and upholds a personal right to privacy, debaters might question the reasoning of scholars and justices in raising privacy rights to such significant heights (analyzing Griswold v. Connecticut and other landmark cases), offer alternative value structures (social order, drug control), and defend the criteria through which such choices are made (utilitarian vs. deontological premises). Even within the context of a "see what sticks" paradigm, these arguments require debaters to assess and evaluate value structures opposite of their own personal feelings about their right to privacy. Social coercion, or peer pressure to adopt certain value structures, is minimized in such a context because of competitive pressures. Adopting a value just because everyone else does may be the surest way of losing a debate. A second objection to debate as values clarification, consonant with Ehninger's concerns about gamesmanship, is the separation of the educational process from the real world. A significant concern here is how such learning about morality will be used in the rest of a student's life. Some critics question whether moral school knowledge "may be quite separate from living moral experience in a similar way as proficiency in speaking one's native language generally appears quite separate from the knowledge of formal grammar imparted by school.” Edelstein discusses two forms of segmentation: division between realms of school knowledge (e.g., history separated from science) and between school and living experience (institutional learning separate from everyday life). Ehninger's point, that debate becomes a pastime, and that application of these skills to solving real problems is diminished if it is viewed as a game, is largely a reflection on institutional segmentation The melding of different areas of knowledge, however, is a particular benefit of debate, as it addresses topics of considerable importance in a real world setting. Recent college and high school topics include energy policy, prison reform, care for the elderly, trade policy, homelessness, and the right to privacy. These topics are notable because they exceed the knowledge boundaries of particular school subjects, they reach into issues of everyday life, and they are broad enough to force students to address a variety of value appeals. The explosion of "squirrels," or small and specific cases, III the 1960s and 1970s has had the effect of opening up each topic to many different case approaches. National topics are no longer of the one-case variety (as in 1955's "the U.S. should recog nize Red China"). On the privacy topic, for example, cases include search and seizure issues, abortion, sexual privacy, tradeoffs with the first amendment, birth control, information privacy, pornography, and obscenity. *The multiplicity of issues pays special dividends for debaters required to defend both sides of many issues because the value criteria change from round to round and evolve over the year*. The development of flexibility in coping with the intertwining of issues is an essential component in the interconnection of knowledge, and is a major rationale for switch-side debate.]

3. Fairness – lack of negative ground makes it impossible to negate them. They could talk abstractly about the horrors of racism, claims are non-falsifiable and are unanswerable – assign zero truth value for zero falsifiablility

4. Tolerance – We have an external impact to fairness that is insulated from their case—preservation of equal ground and compliance with democratically agreed upon topic norms is crucial to instill an ethic of tolerance and respect for alterity

Muir ‘93

(philosophy and rhetoric 26.4)

Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values—tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question ... inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side.... The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one’s own . . .. Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who: become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted. "While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance. At a societal level, the value of tolerance is more conducive to a fair and open assessment of competing ideas. John Stuart Mill eloquently states the case this way: Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right. ... the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race .... If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of the truth, produced by its collision with error. At an individual level, tolerance is related to moral identity via empathic and critical assessments of differing perspectives. Paul posits a strong relationship between tolerance, empathy, and critical thought. Discussing the function of argument in everyday life, he observes that in order to overcome natural tendencies to reason egocentrically and sociocentrically, individuals must gain the capacity to engage in self-reflective Questioning, to reason dialogically and dialectically, and to "reconstruct alien and opposing belief systems empathically. "Our system of beliefs is, by definition, irrational when we are incapable of abandoning a belief for rational reasons; that is, when we egocentrically associate our beliefs with our own integrity. Paul describes an intimate relationship between private inferential habits, moral practices, and the nature of argumentation. Critical thought and moral identity, he urges, must be predicated on discovering the insights of opposing views and the weakness of our own beliefs. Role playing, he reasons, is a central element of any effort to gain such insight….

5. Group–Think – Forsaking tradition rules and policy analysis bases all actions in person faith – sounds a lot like Iraq

Kamiya ‘5

(<http://dir.salon.com/story/books/review/2005/10/07/packer/index1.html?pn=1>)

In Packer's account, Wolfowitz is a fascinating, fatally flawed figure, an idealist who failed to take actions in support of his ideals. As Dick Cheney's undersecretary of defense for policy, Wolfowitz went along with Bush I's decision not to oust Saddam at the end of the first Gulf War. But he was haunted by that choice, and determined to rectify it. "More than Perle, Feith, and the neoconservatives in his department -- certainly more than Rumsfeld and Cheney -- Wolfowitz cared," Packer writes. "For him Iraq was personal." Packer holds Wolfowitz largely responsible for the Bush administration's failure to put enough troops into Iraq, and to plan for the aftermath. The leading light of the neoconservatives was Richard Perle, whom Packer describes as the Iraq war's "impresario, with one degree of separation from everyone who mattered." A partisan of Israel's hard-line Likud Party and a protégé of neocon Democrat Scoop Jackson, Perle recruited two other staunch advocates of Israel, Douglas Feith and Elliott Abrams, to work for Jackson and hawkish Democrat Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Packer writes, "When I half jokingly suggested that the Iraq War began in Scoop Jackson's office, Perle said, 'There's an element of that.'" In 1985, Perle had met and become friends with an Iraqi exile named Ahmad Chalabi. "By the time of the PNAC letter in January 1998, Perle knew exactly how Saddam could be overthrown: Put Ahmad Chalabi at the head of an army of Iraqi insurgents and back him with American military power and cash." Packer describes how the Bush administration began taking steps to invade Iraq almost immediately after 9/11. (Packer notes that, as former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill recounted, Bush officials were talking about removing Saddam almost as soon as Bush took office in January 2001.) This is familiar territory, but as usual Packer provides some unusual insights. He notes that Bush and Wolfowitz, in particular, bonded: "They believed in the existence of evil, and they had messianic notions of what America should do about it." In March 2002, Bush interrupted a meeting between Condoleezza Rice and three senators to say, "Fuck Saddam. We're taking him out." As plans for war raced ahead, a secret new unit was being set up in the Pentagon, overseen by Douglas Feith and his deputy, William Luti, who was such a maniacal hawk that his colleagues called him "Uber-Luti." (At a staff meeting, Luti once called retired Gen. Anthony Zinni a traitor for questioning the Iraq war.) The secret unit was called the Office of Special Plans, and it was charged with planning for Iraq. Packer's account of this office is chilling. Its main purpose was to cook up intelligence to justify the war, which was then "stovepiped" directly to Dick Cheney's neocon chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby (who has now been linked to the Valerie Plame scandal). Its cryptic name as well as its opposition to the traditional intelligence agencies, which had failed to deliver the goods on Saddam, reflected the views of its director, Abram Shulsky, a former Perle aide, housemate of Wolfowitz's at Cornell, and student of the Chicago classics professor Leo Strauss. Strauss, around whom a virtual cult had gathered, had famously discussed esoteric and hidden meanings in great works, and Shulsky wrapped himself in the lofty mantle of his former professor to justify the secret and "innovative" approach of the OSP. In fact, besides feeding bogus intelligence from Iraqi exile sources into the rapacious craw of the White House, the OSP was nothing but a spin machine to prepare the way to war: No actual "planning" was done. According to [Lt. Col. Karen Kwiatkowski,](http://www.salon.com/opinion/feature/2004/03/10/osp_moveon/index.html) the "crafting and approval of the exact words to use when discussing Iraq, WMD, and terrorism were, for most of us, the only known functions of OSP and Mr. Shulsky." (Kwiatkowski later recalled a bit of advice she got from a high-level civil servant: "If I wanted to be successful here," she wrote, "I'd better remember not to say anything positive about the Palestinians.") The OSP also recruited several Middle East experts, including Harold Rhode, a protégé of the Princeton Arabist Bernard Lewis. Rhode, whose keen grasp of regional realities was reflected in his musing that one way to transform the Middle East would be to change the Farsi alphabet in Iran to Roman, was an ardent proponent, like other neocons, of installing Ahmad Chalabi as prime minister -- thus restoring Shiites to power. "Shiite power was the key to the whole neoconservative vision for Iraq," Packer notes. "The convergence of ideas, interests, and affections between certain American Jews and Iraqi Shia was one of the more curious subplots of the Iraq War ... the Shia and the Jews, oppressed minorities in the region, could do business, and ... traditional Iraqi Shiism (as opposed to the theocratic, totalitarian kind that had Perhaps the most morally shocking revelation in "The Assassins' Gate" is that the real reason the Bush administration did not plan for the aftermath of the war was that such planning might have prevented the war from taking place. One example of this was the administration's rejection of an offer of help from a coalition of heavyweight bipartisan policy groups. Leslie Gelb, president of the bipartisan Council on Foreign Relations, had offered to assist the administration in its postwar planning: He proposed that his group and two other respected think tanks, the Heritage Foundation and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, prepare a study. "'This is just what we need," Rice said. 'We'll be too busy to do it ourselves.' But she didn't want the involvement of Heritage, which had been critical of the idea of an Iraq war. 'Do AEI instead.'" Representatives of the think tanks duly met with National Security Council head Condoleezza Rice and her deputy Stephen Hadley. "John Hamre of CSIS went in expecting to pitch the idea to Rice, but the meeting was odd from the start: Rice seemed attentive only to [AEI president Chris] DeMuth, and it was as if the White House was trying to sell something to the American Enterprise Institute rather than the other way around. When Gelb, on speakerphone from New York, began to describe his concept, DeMuth cut him off. 'Wait a minute. What's all this planning and thinking about postwar Iraq?' He turned to Rice. 'This is nation building, and you said you were against that. In the campaign you said it, the president has said it. Does he know you're doing this? Does Karl Rove know?' "Without AEI, Rice couldn't sign on. Two weeks later, Hadley called Gelb to tell him what Gelb already knew: 'We're not going to go ahead with it.' Gelb later explained, 'They thought all those things would get in the way of going to war.'" In effect, the far-right AEI was running the White House's Iraq policy -- and the AEI's war-at-all-costs imperatives drove the Pentagon, too. "'The senior leadership of the Pentagon was very worried about the realities of the postconflict phase being known,' a Defense official said, 'because if you are Feith or you are Wolfowitz, your primary concern is to achieve the war

This makes endless Iraq’s inevitable – neoconservative domination ensures our destruction

Kellner ‘3

(Douglas, an Orwellian nightmare: Critical reflections on the Bush Administration, <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/orwelliannightmare.pdf>)

After the collapse of the Baath regime in April 2003, the Bush administration began threatening Syria and there have been reports that the neo-conservatives in the administration have planned five more wars (see Clark 2003). The Bush administration policy of Terror War raises the possibility that Orwell's 1984 might provide the template for the new millennium, as the world is plunged into endless wars, as freedom and democracy are being snuffed out in the name of freedom, as language loses meaning, and as history is constantly revised (just as Bush and his scribes constantly rewrote his own personal history). There is thus the danger that Orwell’s dark grim dystopia may replace the (ideological) utopia of the “information society,” the “new economy,” and a prosperous and democratic globalization that had been the dominant ideology and vision of the past decade. Questions arise: Will the Bush administration Terror War lead the world to apocalypse and ruin through constant war and the erection of totalitarian police states over the façade of fragile democracy? Or can more multilateral and global solutions be found to the dangers of terrorism that will strengthen democracy and increase the chances for peace and security? There is indeed a danger that Terror War will be a force of historical regression, and the motor of destruction of the global economy, liberal polity, and democracy itself, all to be replaced by an aggressive militarism and totalitarian police state. It could well be that Orwell will be the prophet of a coming New Barbarism with endless war, state repression, and enforced control of thought and discourse, and that George W. Bush and his minions are the architects of an Orwellian future. It could also be the case, however, that the Taliban, bin Laden, Al Qaeda, Saddam Hussein, and the Bush administration represent obsolete and reactionary forces that will be swept away by the inexorable forces of globalization and liberal democracy. The opposing sides in the current Terror War of the Bush administration reactionaries and Al Qaeda could be perceived as representing complementary poles of an atavistic and premodern version of Islam and nihilistic terrorism confronted by reactionary rightwing conservatism and militarism.12 In this scenario, both poles can be perceived as disruptive and regressive forces in a global world that need to be overcome to create genuine historical progress. If this is the case, Terror War would be a momentary interlude in which two obsolete historical forces battle it out, ultimately to be replaced by more sane and democratic globalizing forces. This is, of course, an optimistic scenario and probably, for the foreseeable future, progressive forces will be forced to confront intense battles between the opposing forces of Islamic terrorism and rightwing militarism. Yet if democracy and the human species are to survive, global movements against militarism and for social justice, ecology, and peace must emerge to combat and replace the atavistic forces of the present. As a new millennium unfolds, the human race has regressed into a New Barbarism unforeseeable prior to September 11. If civilization is to survive, individuals must perceive their enemies and organize to fight for a better future. And now is the time for liberals, conservatives and those who believe in truth in politics to demand straight talk from the Bush administration and other politicians, and for the media and critics of the politics of lying to take the Bush administration to task for its Big Lies. As the history of recent totalitarian regimes demonstrates, systematic deception and lying rots the very fabric of a political society, and if U.S. democracy is to find new life and a vigorous future there must be public commitments to truth and public rejection of the politics of lying. To conclude: as a response to the September 11 terror attacks, the Bush administration has answered with an intensified militarism that threatens to generate an era of Terror War, a new arms race, accelerated military violence, U.S. support of authoritarian regimes, an assault on human rights, constant threats to democracy, and destabilizing of the world economy. The Bush regime also provides political favors to its largest corporate and other supporters, unleashing unrestrained Wild West capitalism, exemplified in the Enron scandals, and a form of capitalist cronyism whereby Bush administration family and friends are provided with government favors, while social welfare programs, environmental legislation, and protection of rights and freedoms are curtailed.Consequently, I would argue that Bush administration unilateralist militarism is not the way to fight international terrorism, but is rather the road to an Orwellian nightmare in which democracy and freedom will be in dire peril and the future of the human species will be in question. These are frightening times and it is essential that all citizens become informed about the fateful conflicts of the present, gain clear understanding of what is at stake, and realize that they must oppose at once international terrorism, Bushian militarism, and an Orwellian police-state in order to preserve democracy and a life worthy of a human being.

Turns the Aff

1. Debate skill – they promote a model where the team with the “right” argument wins, not the team with the best argumentative skills

Muir, 93 Department of Communications at George Mason

(Star A., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate,” Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 26, No. 4. Gale Academic Onefile)

The game of debate / The emphasis on method—focusing on the technique of debate as an educational end—is characteristic of the defense of debating both sides of a resolution. Interscholastic debate, many scholars reason, is different from "real world" disputation; it lacks the purposes or functions of a senate speech, a public demonstration, or a legal plea.- Debate is designed to train students to construct arguments, to locate weaknesses in reasoning, to organize ideas, and to present and defend ideas effectively, not to convert the judge to a particular belief. As such, it is intended to teach debaters to see both sides of an issue and to become proficient in the exposition of argument independent of moral or ethical convictions.^ The debaters are to present the best case possible given the issues they have to work with.'\* The definition of debate thus shapes a conception of its role in the development of the individual, Windes reaffirms the value of such procedural training in his view of the activity: / Academic debating is a generic term for oral contests in argumentation, held according to established rules, the purpose being to present both sides of a controversy so effectively that a decision may be reached—not on which side was right or wrong but on which side did the better job of arguing. Academic debating is gamesmanship applied to argumentation, not the trivial and amusing gamesmanship often thought of, but sober, realistic, important gamesmanship.^ /

2. Backlash – This turns their audience against them – change necessarily fails

**Underwood** summarizing 2k (psychology of communication, [www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshtml/psy/hovland3.html](http://www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshtml/psy/hovland3.html))

Whether or not you should include arguments for and against your case depends very much on your audience. If you know that they already agree with you, a one-sided argument is quite acceptable. If they are opposed to your point of view, then a one-sided message will actually be less effective, being dismissed as biased. Even if your audience don't know much about the subject, but do know that there are counterarguments (even if they don't know what they are) will lead them to reject your views as biased. Hovland's investigations into mass propaganda used to change soldiers' attitudes also suggests that the intelligence of the receivers is an important factor, a two-sided argument tending to be more persuasive with the more intelligent audience.

# Anthro

The horrific experiences of the disposable populations of Katrina is nothing new. The human heritage is one of pure destruction. From our birth we domesticated and slaughtered our non-human brothers and sisters immediately followed by an eradication of the Neanderthals, and today we continue that legacy through an ongoing extermination of all life on Earth, both human and non-human of all races and genders.

Tarik Kochi and Noam Ordan ‘8 \*a lecturer in the School of Law @ Queen’s University, Northern Ireland.

\*\*a linguist and translator, conducts research in Translation Studies at Bar Ilan University, Israel.

[Borderlands VOLUME 7 NUMBER 3, 2008, An Argument for the Global Suicide of Humanity]

Within the picture many paint of humanity, events such as the Holocaust are considered as an exception, an aberration. The Holocaust is often portrayed as an example of ‘evil’, a moment of hatred, madness and cruelty (cf. the differing accounts of ‘evil’ given in Neiman, 2004). The event is also treated as one through which humanity might comprehend its own weakness and draw strength, via the resolve that such actions will never happen again. However, **if we take seriously the differing ways in which the Holocaust was ‘evil’**, **then one must surely include along side it the almost uncountable numbers of genocides that have occurred throughout human history**. Hence, if we are to think of the content of the ‘human heritage’, then this must include the annihilation of indigenous peoples and their cultures across the globe and the manner in which their beliefs, behaviours and social practices have been erased from what the people of the ‘West’ generally consider to be the content of a human heritage. Again the history of colonialism is telling here. It reminds us exactly how normal, regular and mundane acts of annihilation of different forms of human life and culture have been throughout human history. Indeed the history of colonialism, in its various guises, points to the fact that so many of our legal institutions and forms of ethical life (i.e. nation-states which pride themselves on protecting human rights through the rule of law) have been founded upon colonial violence, war and the appropriation of other peoples’ land (Schmitt, 2003; Benjamin, 1986). Further, the history of colonialism highlights the central function of ‘race war’ that often underlies human social organisation and many of its legal and ethical systems of thought (Foucault, 2003). This history of modern colonialism thus presents a key to understanding that events such as the Holocaust are not an aberration and exception but are closer to the norm, and sadly, ***lie at the heart of any heritage of humanity***. After all, all too often the European colonisation of the globe was justified by arguments that indigenous inhabitants were racially ‘inferior’ and in some instances that they were closer to ‘apes’ than to humans (Diamond, 2006). Such violence justified by an erroneous view of ‘race’ is in many ways merely an extension of an underlying attitude of speciesism involving a long history of killing and enslavement of non-human species by humans. Such a connection between the two histories of inter-human violence (via the mythical notion of differing human ‘races’) and interspecies violence, is well expressed in Isaac Bashevis Singer’s comment that whereas humans consider themselves “the crown of creation”, for animals “all people are Nazis” and **animal life is “an eternal Treblinka”** (Singer, 1968, p.750). Certainly many organisms use ‘force’ to survive and thrive at the expense of their others. Humans are not special in this regard. However humans, due to a particular form of self-awareness and ability to plan for the future, have the capacity to carry out highly organised forms of violence and destruction (i.e. the Holocaust; the massacre and enslavement of indigenous peoples by Europeans) and the capacity to develop forms of social organisation and communal life in which harm and violence are organised and regulated. It is perhaps this capacity for reflection upon the merits of harm and violence (the moral reflection upon the good and bad of violence) which gives humans a ‘special’ place within the food chain. Nonetheless, with these capacities come responsibility and our proposal of global suicide is directed at bringing into full view the issue of human moral responsibility. When taking a wider view of history, one which focuses on the relationship of humans towards other species, it becomes clear that the human heritage – and the propagation of itself as a thing of value – has occurred on the back of seemingly endless acts of violence, destruction, killing and genocide. While this cannot be verified, perhaps **‘human’** history and **progress** **begins with the genocide of the Neanderthals and never loses a step thereafter**. It only takes a short glimpse at the list of all the sufferings caused by humanity for one to begin to question whether this species deserves to continue into the future. The list of human-made disasters is ever-growing after all: suffering caused to animals in the name of science or human health, not to mention the cosmetic, food and textile industries; damage to the environment by polluting the earth and its stratosphere; deforesting and overuse of natural resources; and of course, inflicting suffering on fellow human beings all over the globe, from killing to economic exploitation to abusing minorities, individually and collectively. In light of such a list it becomes difficult to hold onto any assumption that the human species possesses any special or higher value over other species. Indeed, if humans at any point did possess such a value, because of higher cognitive powers, or even because of a special status granted by God, then humanity has surely devalued itself through its actions and has forfeited its claim to any special place within the cosmos. In our development from higher predator to semi-conscious destroyer we have perhaps undermined all that is good in ourselves and have left behind a heritage best exemplified by the images of the gas chamber and the incinerator. We draw attention to this darker and pessimistic view of the human heritage not for dramatic reasons but to throw into question the stability of a modern humanism which sees itself as inherently ‘good’ and which presents the action of cosmic colonisation as a solution to environmental catastrophe. **Rather than presenting a solution it would seem that an ideology of modern humanism is itself a greater part of the problem**, and as part of the problem it cannot overcome itself purely with itself. If this is so, what perhaps needs to occur is the attempt to let go of any one-sided and privileged value of the ‘human’ as it relates to moral activity. That is, perhaps it is modern humanism itself that must be negated and supplemented by a utopian antihumanism and moral action re-conceived through this relational or dialectical standpoint in thought.

Transportation infrastructure instrumentalizes the environment for solely human ends—This reinforces our separation from the ecological systems in which we participate, ensuring catastrophic collapse.

 Duyser ‘10

Mitchell Duyser. Master of Architecture at University of Cincinnati. April 2010. “Hybrid Landscapes: Territories of Shared Ecological and Infrastructural Value”. Masters Thesis.Pages 3-7.

The construct of modern human life is built upon an invisible foundation. Not invisible as in undetectable, but invisible as in hidden and forgotten. Representative of the infrastructure that enables civilization, this foundation is formed from the human and ecological systems that support the continued expansion of modern society. Often unnoticed, this myriad of pipes, wires, rivers, and oil ﬁelds is pushed out of the collective conscious and awareness. So dependent have we become on these systems, minor disruptions in their functionality can threaten civilization itself. As exempliﬁed byevents like the 2007 Minneapolis bridge disaster1, and more abstract issues like climate change, these systems are approaching the point of widespread failure. Such threats of disaster are currently the only events capable of bringing infrastructure to the surface of everyday experience, and will occur with increasing frequency unless widespread societal action is taken. Humans need to change how they interact with the rest of the world, speciﬁcally focusing onthe technologies that enable civilization, and the collectively held societal perspective of the environment. Civilization can no longer afford to forget about the systems that enable existence, nor can it assume that such infrastructures will be available indeﬁnitely. Infrastructure has traditionally been intentionally and methodically hidden from view, buried underground, and moved to the outskirts of town. Allowing humans to live free of concern for how necessities are acquired, organized, and distributed. The infrastructure that is exposed, such as power lines, roads, and cellular towers, are rendered invisible by their ubiquity, subsumed by the contemporary urban landscape. Throughout modern time, infrastructure has served to insulate human activity from its effects on the rest of the planet. “Away” was a place anywhere but here, removed from inﬂuence over problems like water quality and climate change. The unavoidable truth however, that this isolation is not physical but psychological, has been slowly revealing itself over the past ﬁfty years. Book’s like Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring, published in 1962, and movies like Al Gore’s An Inconvenient Truth, (2006) have helped illuminate the previously “invisible” systems binding civilization to the rhythms of the planet. We can now attribute much of the current environmental ﬂuxus to the ignorance of our participation in global and local ecology. Today, truly no place exists that has not experienced the impacts of humanity.2 This ignorance or rather, willingness to overlook man’s interaction with the environment is not a recent societal or cultural development. Our actions and reasoning are deeply rooted in the classical tradition, dating back to the founding myths of Christianity and ancient Greece. Perpetuated and augmented through the Enlightenment and Industrialization, western culture has been left with a fractured view of nature. One that idolizes and romanticizes the “virgin wilderness” while simultaneously working feverishly to exploit every available natural resource in the name of societal and economic progress. Romanticism values nature for its aesthetic and sentimental appeal, while Industrialization’s commoditization of the environment makes it subservient to human needs and desires. The assimilation of these views has led to the perception of nature-as-beauty, allowing for the consumption of less beautiful landscapes with disregard for ecological consequences. 3 New conceptualizations of nature must recognize the presence of complex and emergent systems, where the whole behaves in a way that cannot be understood through the isolation of individual parts.4 Work in the ﬁeld of biomimicry, championed by the biologist Janine Benyus and the architect William McDonough, is already moving towards this end. Both call for a new industrial organization that looks to nature to provide speciﬁc technologies as well as methodologies for production that displace consumption and disposal with nutrient cycles that are endlessly renewable and detoxifying for the environment.5 6 An architecture responsive to a redeﬁned conception of ”nature” must address both the physical and cultural relationships humans have with their environment. Such an architecture must visually and functionally integrate the previously disparate activities of civilization and nature.Infrastructural solutions can no longer come through human ingenuity alone, but through mentorship and comprehension of the complex systems already existing in nature. This use of biomimicry allows environmental design to evolve beyond the current sustainability movement where simply being “less bad” is still good enough.7 Concepts like the USGBC’s LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) system, and other supposedly “green” building practices do nothing to change the fundamental relationship humans have with the planet. They function under the dated and false assumption of humanity as a separate system from the rest of nature. Polluting and consuming at a slightly slower rate is not a thoughtful means of reintegrating civilization with ecology.

Thus,we offer a new pedagogy which interrogates the speciesist assumptions underpinning the 1AC’s speciesist examination of the underpinnings of the disposable populations as seen through the transportation infrastructure employed during the Hurricane Katrina evacuation.

Their response to Hurricane Katrina is a way of shielding anthropocentric culture – this is immoral and error replication – we agree that race and Katrina may be intertwined, but they have the wrong starting point. Interrogation of humanism is a pre-requisite.

**Irvine 06** Leslie Irvine, Ph.D. in sociology and teaches at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her research examines relationships between people and companion animals, animal sheltering, and animals in disasters “Animals in Disasters: Issues for Animal Liberation Activism and Policy”

Because institutional thinking can only frame problems selectively, the proffered solutions often fall short of addressing the problems as experienced by those outside the institution’s purview. In other words, institutional thinking overlooks relevant aspects of the situation or circumstances that are salient for those experiencing the problem. As Loseke (2001) argues, institutional formulations may not capture the complexities of lived experience. This failure leads to “discursive disjunctions” between incompatible systems of meaning (Chase 1995, 123). An example appeared in Hurricane Katrina, when rescuers forced people to leave their companion animals. Residents faced the choice between leaving animals they considered family members and risking their own lives. Because of institutional thinking, new problems may emerge later, through the cracks of the “organizationally embedded” solutions (Gubrium 1992; see also 1987). As I explain later, disaster myths about dogs in the aftermath of Hurricane Charley offer a good illustration of this. In addition to the pitfalls of institutional thinking, the disaster response system, at least as currently practiced through the command and control model, reveals thoroughgoing speciesism and a paternalistic attitude about the right to use force and violence. To be sure, the command and control model should not be singled out for accusations of speciesism; our entire anthropocentric culture is to blame. The point I focus on here concerns the speciesist assumptions that direct emergency responders to save human lives first, and often at the expense of animal lives. Coupled with this, the use of state-sanctioned force and the threat and reality of violence poses an intriguing paradox for animal rights activists. For example, following Hurricane Katrina, the lack of government response required subsequent animal rescuers to engage in tactics such as breaking and entering, which are denounced when engaged in by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). For a deeper exploration of these and other issues, I turn now to the case studies. Case Studies Case #1: Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans, Louisiana The unprecedented catastrophe of Hurricane Katrina highlights numerous issues related to animal liberation and welfare. Although many stages in the response could provide critical and analytical points of departure, I limit the discussion to an aspect with which I have first-hand experience: the housing of companion dogs rescued from New Orleans (see Irvine forthcoming). Along with three staff members from a local humane society at which I volunteer, I assisted for a week in the overwhelming task of caring for the more than 2000 dogs housed at the Lamar-Dixon Expo Center in Gonzales, Louisiana (about 60 miles northwest of New Orleans). The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) leased Lamar-Dixon as the primary staging area for the New Orleans animal response. At that time, Lamar-Dixon was the largest functioning animal shelter in the United States. Conditions in the field were extremely taxing, and I succumbed to heat exhaustion during my stay. Among the many insights that the experience afforded me, two stand out as particularly relevant for this paper. The priority placed on human lives, a basic tenet of disaster response, essentially created a second disaster, in the form of the overwhelming numbers of homeless animals needing rescue, housing, and veterinary care. The more basic issue however, and the one that has not entered the conversation about legislating animals into disaster response plans, is the speciesism implicit in the belief that companion animals are a basic entitlement. Having one or more dogs, cats, or both is practically a birthright, regardless of the hazards to which people might expose the animals. The Event Katrina made landfall on August 29, 2005. It is widely known that in the flooding that followed, many of the residents who evacuated New Orleans left their companion animals behind. Many people did so because they were going to motels that would not accept animals. Others, rescued in boats, helicopters, and emergency vehicles, report that responders insisted that they would only take people. Some residents were forced, under threat of arrest, to abandon their dogs and cats. Evacuees who went to emergency shelters had to find alternative arrangements for their animals, as most shelters do not accept non-human animals. In many emergencies, some animal shelters will house companion animals temporarily. As I explain below, this practice worked well during Hurricane Charley in 2004. However, Katrina’s floodwaters destroyed the Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in New Orleans. Residents who managed to bring their dogs and cats to the Convention Center were forced to leave them behind when they evacuated that facility, simply because animals are not permitted on public transportation. Numerous media accounts depict National Guardsmen simply letting dogs and cats run free as their guardians watched helplessly. One of the most famous—and heartbreaking—images from the disaster depicts the little white dog named “Snowball” being torn from a boy’s arms by a police officer as the boy boarded a bus to leave the Superdome. Video showed the boy so upset that he vomited. The officer separated the dog and boy to uphold the policy that prohibits animals on public transportation. Evacuees reported being told that their animals would be rescued later, and some thought they could soon return for their animals themselves. As is now widely known, some residents have never returned. As Katrina approached, animal response teams from all over the country were staging near Baton Rouge. However, police and military blockades prohibited animal rescuers from entering New Orleans for six days following the flood. Once rescue teams could enter the city, rescuers caught and transported animals to Lamar-Dixon, where they received veterinary examinations and treatment, decontamination baths (if needed), and 24-hour care, albeit at the most basic level. The vast majority of the animals housed at Lamar-Dixon were dogs. They received food, water, and a clean kennel every day, but walks were a luxury available only if we had additional volunteers. The minimal paperwork taped to the kennels told the location of rescue. The record of one especially sad dog described her rescue from a house where the other two dogs had died, most likely of heat, thirst, and starvation. Most of the dogs were mixed breeds, and most had nice dispositions, especially considering what they had endured. All were thin. Many were sick. Many had mange and diarrhea. Most male dogs were intact, and numerous females were in heat. For security reasons, the Lamar-Dixon management insisted that the lights remain on in the facility overnight. Consequently, the animals had no natural day and night. The relentless heat and humidity took a toll on the dogs as well as the volunteers. Volunteers worked around the clock, as vehicles continually arrived with rescued animals. The greatest number of animals arrived after dark, once the curfew in New Orleans forced rescue teams to leave the city. When I first arrived, the facility was terribly overcrowded because the state veterinarian would not allow dogs to be transferred to shelters outside Louisiana. Within the week, however, dogs who had been unclaimed since the flood could be transferred out of state, while newly rescued animals had to remain within Louisiana for a designated time to allow guardians a chance to locate them. After a transfer of dogs, the newly empty kennels gave volunteers momentary false hope. Just moments after a truckload of dogs departed for other shelters, new ones arrived by the dozens from the streets and rooftops of New Orleans. Discussion The overwhelming numbers of homeless animals after Katrina highlighted the speciesist assumptions in the disaster response. Emergency responders make human lives their first priority. Fire fighters, police officers, and other first responders will not rescue a dog or cat instead of a human being. **This policy draws a line between different kinds of life, and assumes that the lives on the human side of the line are more valuable.** The debate about the relative value of lives is, I believe, misguided. The speciesism inherent in the construction of a human-animal boundary assumes that rescue cannot be reinvented in such a way that can spare the lives of animals and humans. The policy of putting humans first inhibits thinking about disaster response “outside the box,” as it were. If disaster response policy were examined with an eye to eliminating speciesist assumptions, small changes could improve the situation for people and animals. For example, in a conversation I had with a veterinarian volunteer about six months after Katrina, I learned that Red Cross responders are not permitted to carry dog and cat food in their vehicles. This particular veterinarian had traveled through New Orleans in Red Cross vehicles several times as part of his service, during a time early in the response when travel in the city was restricted to emergency vehicles. He pointed out the need for dog and cat food at his site, and requested that the Red Cross bring some on their next trip. The responders told him that they were prohibited from carrying animal feed or animals. The veterinarian explained that the food was human-grade, securely packaged, and unlikely to cause any contamination of any sort. The rule prevailed. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of dogs and cats starved because emergency vehicles were reserved for human needs. Only once animal response teams were allowed in the city could food be made available to stranded and stray animals. In the rescue efforts, animal response teams broke into evacuated homes, smashing doors and windows and using the same tactics that the ALF uses to rescue farmed and lab animals. In both cases, the rescuers offered the same justification for their actions, claiming that the animals were suffering and that saving them trumped any rights to property. However, in the Katrina response, the state had in effect granted permission for rescuers to engage in breaking and entering. Companion animals have a different status than those confined in labs and on farms (as demonstrated by their inclusion in the PETS Acts). Moreover, the public, once aware of the plight of the abandoned dogs and cats, supported the rescue effort. The violence was state sanctioned to compensate for the government’s incompetence in the response. In contrast, ALF actions are on behalf of animals who are generally invisible to and forgotten by the public. To protect corporate interests, the government portrays ALF activists as terrorists rather than rescuers. The significant point is that the cases are similar in the most important respects, highlighting the arbitrariness of the laws that demonize liberation as terrorism. The Katrina response can potentially inform people about what liberation is and why it is necessary. During the response to Katrina, charges of racism surfaced regularly in the media, but the Katrina response also demonstrated rampant speciesism, and the links between the two forms of discrimination became real as dogs from poor, predominantly African American parishes crowded into Lamar-Dixon. Although steps such as challenging the human-animal boundary on the response end could improve the situation for animals, there are additional speciesist assumptions at work on a more basic level in the practice of keeping dogs and cats as companions. In the interest of full disclosure, I will admit that my cat and dog companions surround me as I write this. Nevertheless, I believe that, in a morally just world, we would not reproduce other species to keep for our companionship. Before we humans reach that stage of moral maturity, we must ask serious questions about the risks to which we expose companion animals when we keep them in our homes. Most of the animals at Lamar-Dixon came from parishes in which heavy flooding was anticipated early on in the incident. These parishes were also mostly lower-income areas, where residents had few resources to evacuate on their own. Because the practice of keeping animals as companions is taken for granted, regardless of the hazards to which people might expose the animals, thousands of dogs and cats were abandoned when their human guardians were rescued. This raises a political minefield of a question: should people who have few resources to insure their own safety also put animals at risk? The question smacks of middle-class privilege, and I want to be clear that I am not saying the poor are incapable of caring for animals. Rather, I want to raise the issue that incorporating animals into disaster response is a positive step, but more basic steps in educating people about responsible guardianship might go further to reduce the hazards that animals face in future disasters. “Responsible” guardianship must go beyond simply providing food, water, and shelter. It must involve acknowledging a lifelong commitment, and fighting against threats to that commitment. The experience of losing a companion animal in Hurricane Katrina should have compelled New Orleans residents, particularly African-Americans, to activism on behalf of animals. However, most people seem content to believe that the government has allegedly solved the problem of animals in disasters. Time will most likely reveal that exclusively human interests once again prevail.

# Case

1.) Racializing Katrina perpetuates racist stereotypes and further harms oppressed groups

Cathy **Young**, January 8th, 20**06** (contributing editor at Reason magazine, her column appears in The Boston Globe, “Katrina wasn’t really about race,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/01/18/opinion/18iht-edyoung.html?_r=0> >:)

Ironically, the focus on African-Americans as victims also ended up perpetuating some racist stereotypes - such as tales of rape, murder and other lawlessness among Katrina refugees. The new data on the demographics of Katrina deaths probably won't change entrenched popular perception (especially with much of the media ignoring the story). Meanwhile, the Bring New Orleans Back Commission says that rebuilding should be permitted in all of the city, even in heavily damaged, flood-prone neighborhoods below water level. One likely reason for the controversial recommendation is that proposals to abandon these neighborhoods, which are mostly black, have been angrily denounced as ethnic cleansing targeting African-Americans. Thus, race-based paranoia may end up putting many black citizens of New Orleans in harm's way - literally.

2.) Their critique fails and gets coopted by market and state action – post-Katrina news coverage proves

Douglas **Kellner**, May 20**07** ("third generation" critical theorist in the tradition of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, or Frankfurt School, “The Katrina Hurricane Spectacle and Crisis of the Bush Presidency,” <http://cretscmhd.psych.ucla.edu/nola/volunteer/EmpiricalStudies/The%20Katrina%20hurricane%20spectacle%20and%20crisis%20of%20the%20bush%20presidency.pdf> >:) [We disagree with Gendered Language]

After praising CNN and cable coverage of Hurricane Katrina, media critic Nikki Finke (2005) describes how the U.S. corporate media returned to their conservative agenda some weeks into the tragedy: For the first 120 hours after Hurricane Katrina, TV journalists were let off their leashes by their mogul owners, the result of a rare conjoining of flawless timing (summer’s biggest vacation week) and foulest tragedy (America’s worst natural disaster). All of a sudden, broadcasters narrated disturbing images of the poor, the minority, the aged, the sick and the dead, and discussed complex issues like poverty, race, class, infirmity and ecology that never make it on the air in this swift-boat/anti-gay-marriage/Michael Jackson media-sideshow era. So began a perfect storm of controversy. Contrary to the scripture so often quoted in these areas of Louisiana and Mississippi, the TV newscasters knew the truth, but the truth did not set them free. Because once the crisis point had passed, most TV journalists went back to business-as-usual, their choke chains yanked by no-longer-inattentive parentcompany bosses who, fearful of fallout from fingering Dubya for the FEMA fuckups, decided yet again to sacrifice community need for corporate greed. Too quickly, Katrina’s wake was spun into a web of deceit by the Bush administration, then disseminated by the Big Media boys’ club. (Karl Rove spent the post-hurricane weekend conjuring up ways to shift blame.)

3.) Focus on evacuation infrastructure masks the structural issues of racism and poverty in New Orleans – ignores the root of the problem

Neil **deMause**, July/August 20**06** (columnist for Metro NY and a regular contributor to Extra! and the Village Voice, “Katrina’s Vanishing Victims,” <http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=2933> >:)

It doesn't help that poverty is a complicated, multifaceted issue—"frankly, it's a story that's not very good on television," notes Deggans—at a time when staffing cutbacks have left most newspapers unable to devote reporters to any but the simplest topics. "I would be amazed if anybody but the biggest papers had anybody whose beat was poverty," says Deggans. "And for sure none of the TV networks do." The media's strongest coverage of Katrina and the poor, ultimately, came where they were on the most familiar ground: FEMA's bungled response to the emergency, culminating in widespread coverage of the "what did the president know and when did he know it?" angle when videotapes emerged revealing that Bush was warned of the likelihood of disaster well before the storm hit (MSNBC, 3/1/06; CNN, 3/2/06; USA Today, 3/1/06). Yet while the investigation of the failures of emergency response was important, it fell well short of the promise that media would finally confront the realities of poverty in the U.S. What Slate's Jack Shafer had written during the height of the storm (8/31/05) remained true months later: "I don't recall any reporter exploring the class issue directly by getting a paycheck-to-paycheck victim to explain that he couldn't risk leaving because if he lost his furniture and appliances, his pots and pans, his bedding and clothes, to Katrina or looters, he'd have no way to replace them. . . . What I wouldn't pay to hear a Fox anchor ask, 'Say, Bob, why are these African-Americans so poor to begin with?'"

4.) Discussion of race fails in the context of Katrina – doesn’t motivate political action and hurts social justice initiatives

Adolph L. Reed 2005 (Adolph L,Adolph L. Reed Jr. is professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, “The Real Divide” <http://www.progressive.org/mag_reed1105> )

Before the “yes, buts” begin, I am not claiming that systemic inequalities in the United States are not significantly racialized. The evidence of racial disparities is far too great for any sane or honest person to deny, and they largely emerge from a history of discrimination and racial injustice. Nor am I saying that we should overlook that fact in the interest of some idealized nonracial or post-racial politics. Let me be blunter than I’ve ever been in print about what I am saying: As a political strategy, exposing racism is wrongheaded and at best an utter waste of time. It is the political equivalent of an appendix: a useless vestige of an earlier evolutionary moment that’s usually innocuous but can flare up and become harmful. There are two reasons for this judgment. One is that the language of race and racism is too imprecise to describe effectively even how patterns of injustice and inequality are racialized in a post-Jim Crow world. “Racism” can cover everything from individual prejudice and bigotry, unself-conscious perception of racial stereotypes, concerted group action to exclude or subordinate, or the results of ostensibly neutral market forces. It can be a one-word description and explanation of patterns of unequal distribution of income and wealth, services and opportunities, police brutality, a stockbroker’s inability to get a cab, neighborhood dislocation and gentrification, poverty, unfair criticism of black or Latino athletes, or being denied admission to a boutique. Because the category is so porous, it doesn’t really explain anything. Indeed, it is an alternative to explanation. Exposing racism apparently makes those who do it feel good about themselves. Doing so is cathartic, though safely so, in the same way that proclaiming one’s patriotism is in other circles. It is a summary, concluding judgment rather than a preliminary to a concrete argument. It doesn’t allow for politically significant distinctions; in fact, as a strategy, exposing racism requires subordinating the discrete features of a political situation to the overarching goal of asserting the persistence and power of racism as an abstraction. This leads to the second reason for my harsh judgment. Many liberals gravitate to the language of racism not simply because it makes them feel righteous but also because it doesn’t carry any political warrant beyond exhorting people not to be racist. In fact, it often is exactly the opposite of a call to action. Such formulations as “racism is our national disease” or similar pieties imply that racism is a natural condition. Further, it implies that most whites inevitably and immutably oppose blacks and therefore can’t be expected to align with them around common political goals. This view dovetails nicely with Democrats’ contention that the only way to win elections is to reject a social justice agenda that is stigmatized by association with blacks and appeal to an upper-income white constituency concerned exclusively with issues like abortion rights and the deficit. Upper-status liberals are more likely to have relatively secure, rewarding jobs, access to health care, adequate housing, and prospects for providing for the kids’ education, and are much less likely to be in danger of seeing their nineteen-year-old go off to Iraq. They tend, therefore, to have a higher threshold of tolerance for political compromises in the name of electing this year’s sorry pro-corporate Democrat. Acknowledging racism—and, of course, being pro-choice—is one of the few ways many of them can distinguish themselves from their Republican co-workers and relatives. As the appendix analogy suggests, insistence on understanding inequality in racial terms is a vestige of an earlier political style. The race line persists partly out of habit and partly because it connects with the material interests of those who would be race relations technicians. In this sense, race is not an alternative to class. The tendency to insist on the primacy of race itself stems from a class perspective. For roughly a generation it seemed reasonable to expect that defining inequalities in racial terms would provoke some, albeit inadequate, remedial response from the federal government. But that’s no longer the case; nor has it been for quite some time. That approach presumed a federal government that was concerned at least not to appear racially unjust. Such a government no longer exists. A key marker of the right’s victory in national politics is that the discussion of race now largely serves as a way to reinforce a message to whites that the public sector is there merely to help some combination of black, poor, and loser. Liberals have legitimized this perspective through their own racial bad faith. For many whites, the discussion of race also reinforces the idea that cutting public spending is justifiably aimed at weaning a lazy black underclass off the dole or—in the supposedly benign, liberal Democratic version—teaching them “personal responsibility.” .
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3. Structure – the critical assessment of policy debate is key to its benefits

Muir, 93,

[Star A, Department of Communications at George Mason University, “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol. 26, No. 4]

Firm moral commitment to a value system, however, along with a sense of moral identity, is founded in reflexive assessments of multiple perspectives. Switch-side debate is not simply a matter of speaking persuasively or organizing ideas clearly (although it does involve these), but of understanding and mobilizing arguments to make an effective case. Proponents of debating both sides observe that the debaters should prepare the best possible case they can, given the facts and information available to them. This process, at its core, involves critical assessment and evaluation of arguments; it is a process of critical-thinking not available with many traditional teaching methods. We must progressively learn to recognize how often the concepts of others are discredited by the concepts we use to justify ourselves to ourselves. We must come to see how often our claims are compelling· only when expressed in Slur own egocentric view. We can do this if we learn the art of using concepts without living in them. This is possible only when the intellectual act of stepping outside of our own systems of belief has become second nature, a routine and ordinary responsibility of everyday living. Neither academic schooling nor socialization has yet addressed this moral responsibility, but switch-side debating fosters this type of role playing and generates reasoned moral positions based in part on values of tolerance and fairness .

4. Other Mediums – solve their education args – only policy debate solves ours

Atchison & Panetta ‘9\*Director of Debate at Trinity University and \*\*Director of Debate at the University of Georgia

If the debate community is serious about generating community change, then it is more likely to occur outside a traditional competitive debate. When a team loses a debate because the judge decides that it is better for the community for the other team to win, then they have sacrificed two potential advocates for change within the community. Creating change through wins generates backlash through losses. Some proponents are comfortable with generating backlash and argue that the reaction is evidence that the issue is being discussed. /From our perspective, the discussion that results from these hostile situations is not a productive one where participants seek to work together for a common goal. Instead of giving up on hope for change and agitating for wins regardless of who is left behind, it seems more reasonable that the debate community should try the method of public argument that we teach in an effort to generate a discussion of necessary community changes. Simply put, debate competitions do not represent the best environment for community change because it is a competition for a win and only one team can win any given debate, whereas addressing systemic century-long community problems requires a tremendous effort by a great number of people.

This outweighs

1. Portability – debate skills are portable and empirically allow real-world impact

Hall ‘8 – Masters in Communication Studies from Wake Forest and Special Projects Manager with the Offices of Al and Tipper Gore (“[eDebate] Mmm Lentils, Chikpeas, and Mohair,” 7-11-2008, www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2008-July/075330.html)

As someone who has (at least temporarily) left debate to do public policy-related research, I think Andy overlooks the benefits of the \*process\* of policy debate and its connection to his call for "political agency in the real world." Ross and others have made this point many times, but it is worth briefly reiterating: switch sides public policy debate enables activism by teaching a research and decision making process that is applicable outside of the insulated debate community. While debates do not directly change public policy (after all, Mohammed Ali Hammadi still roams the streets of Beirut), the skills of debate teach debaters how to help with "activist" causes once they leave debate. For example, policy debaters are taught the skills of researching a topic both quickly (finding one or two politics cards in 3 minutes) and in depth (consider that hundreds of high school debaters around the country are currently attempting to exhaust the debate over global warming and alternative energy). Debaters learn a number of other useful skills, from word economy to prioritization of the best arguments. But most importantly, the process of reflecting on this research and considering both sides of a public policy issue teaches the participants of debate a decision making process that is applicable to the rest of their life. / Many, many traditional policy debaters have taken these skills and translated them into work at think tanks, law firms, universities, corporations, journalism, and other sectors. NDT Champion Larry Tribe has produced groundbreaking societal change through the law just to cite one example. Glenn Greenwald is one of the most popular progressive bloggers whose research acumen is obvious. Real change has been produced by these individuals (and many others), and it continues to be. / The real question should be: how do alternative models of debate promote any of these skills/process, or if they don't (since they often base their existence on a criticism of these aspects of policy debate), what do they offer to activism outside of debate? It is somewhat noble to claim that the structures of debate are changed by alternative models (though this is often not the case), but unless you expect the actual channels of power like Congress to be similarly changed, what impact does non-traditional non-policy debate have on the "real world"? / To return to the thrust of Andy's original post, there are few activities I would rather see public money be spent on than training high school and college students in traditional, switch sides policy debate.

2. Turns the Aff – debate is key to social progress

McClean ‘1 Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Molloy College, New York

(David E., “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm)

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." / Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. / Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" / The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

3. Malcolm X Proves – it produces more effective advocacy.

Branham, Professor of Rhetoric at Bates College ‘95 (Robert, “I Was Gone on Debating’: Malcom X’s Prison Debates and Public confrontation”, Argumentation and Advocacy, Winter, Volume 31, Number 3, page 117)

As Malcolm X sought new outlets for his heightened political consciousness, he turned to the weekly formal debates sponsored by the inmate team. "My reading had my mind like steam under pressure," he recounted; "Some way, I had to start telling the white man about himself to his face. I decided to do this by putting my name down to debate" (1965b, p. 184). Malcolm X's prison debate experience allowed him to bring his newly acquired historical knowledge and critical ideology to bear on a wide variety of social issues. "*Whichever side of the selected subject was assigned to me, I'd track down and study everything* I could find on it," wrote Malcolm X. "I'd put myself in my opponent's place and decide how I'd try to win if I had the other side; and then I'd figure out a way to knock down those points" (1965b, p. 184). Preparation for each debate included four or five practice sessions.

4. Gang Violence – debate reduces it – real world impact

Bellon 2K Department of Communication at Georgia State

(Joe, Argumentation & Advocacy, Vol. 36 Issue 3, p161, “A Research-Based Justification for Debate Across the Curriculum.” Winter 2000, EBSCO)

Because debate experience is so effective in helping students achieve positive goals, the preventative value of the activity did not receive a great deal of scholarly attention before the last fifteen years. With the creation of urban debate leagues in Atlanta, New York, Tuscaloosa, and Detroit, the debate community has been flooded with anecdotal reports describing a connection between forensic experience and reduced violence. Many coaches described situations where debate transformed students from gang members and trouble-makers into successful and cooperative students. Increasingly, scholars are proving that these reports represent an underlying and demonstrable relationship between increased debate skills and decreased physical violence. / In 1976, Boone and Montare hypothesized that language skills are related to aggression. In their study, "high language proficiency was associated with low physical aggressive behavior" in minority populations (856). They concluded that "relatively higher levels of language proficiency may function more effectively and efficiently as inhibitors (or perhaps neutralizers) of overt physical aggressive behavior" (856). This relationship is fairly intuitive: when we feel capable of responding to a situation verbally, we are less likely to feel pressured to respond physically. Infante and Wigley (1986) note that this relationship emphasizes the need for those in the communication discipline to act "because [the communication discipline] is particularly able to remedy argumentative skill deficiencies and therefore could be instrumental in reducing the amount of... violence in society" (62). There is also reason to believe that debate develops the specific argumentation skills needed to prevent violence. Neer (1994) describes "a consensus... among many argument theorists regarding the value of argument within an interpersonal relationship" (17). His recommendation for ideal argumentative style reads like a description of debate practice: / [F]lexible arguers will actively seek alternative points of view on an issue, hold multiple opinions on an issue, and examine viewpoints to which they are either unfamiliar or opposed when arguing the content of an issue (19). / Because competitive debaters must alternately argue both "sides" of the topic in any given tournament, there is a powerful incentive for them to become flexible arguers. In any given debate round, students may be called on to affirm or negate a particular political perspective. Above all, debate teaches students to understand how others think--even those others with whom they strongly disagree. / The key to understanding how debate helps prevent violence involves the distinction between argumentativeness (or assertiveness) and verbal aggression. This distinction was described by Infante and Wigley: / The locus of attack may be used for distinguishing argument from verbal aggression (Infante and Rancer, 1982). Argument involves presenting and defending positions on controversial issues while attacking the positions taken by others on the issues. Verbal aggression, on the other hand, denotes attacking the self-concept of another person instead of, or in addition to, the person's position on a topic of communication (61). / While argumentativeness can have many positive benefits, there is broad agreement among scholars that verbal aggression is inherently damaging. Furthermore, verbal aggression tends to create more verbal aggression and, ultimately, physical violence. Infante, et al (1984) specifically studied the relationship between argumentation skills and verbal aggression among students. Their research provides an excellent description of the communication-violence dynamic: /The individuals in an argument realize that they need to attack and defend positions. After an argument begins, the person who lacks skill in arguing is unable to refute the opponent's position. That person then satisfies the need to attack by attacking verbally the object closest to the opponent's position, the opponent. The need to defend is similarly corrupted. Since the unskillful arguer is unable to defend his or her position but still wishes to, he or she sets up a defense around the closest thing to the position, self. The opponent's attacks on position are then perceived as personal attacks and the individual feels justified responding in kind (76). / Thus, improved argument skills can prevent verbal aggression not only by preventing students from being verbally aggressive, but also by preventing them from responding to verbal aggression in kind--creating a positive feedback loop that can impact the entire school community.