First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.

Second, is reasons to prefer:

Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac

It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action

It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another

Third, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving

#### The Aff’s focus on deliberative approaches to public policy makes participation in policy decisions by those without their hands on the levers of power possible

Hickman, 12

[Larry, director of the Center for Dewey Studies and professor of philosophy at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, “Citizen Participation: more or less?” Online, http://www.secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=fi&page=hickman\_28\_6] /Wyo-MB

Progressives such as John Dewey have tended to take a very different view from that of Caplan, Lippmann, and the Roberts Court. In his 1927 book The Public and Its Problems, **Dewey** mounted an energetic response to Lippmann. He **encouraged support for a free and vigorous press whose task would be to make the results of research in the social sciences available to every citizen**. He denied that the “ordinary citizen” lacked sufficient intelligence or interest to participate in public affairs. **And** he **called for greater support for a type of public education that would increase the critical skills that every citizen requires to cut through the web of disinformation that tends to be disseminated by governments, corporations, and other forces seeking to impede full discussion of matters affecting the public good.** If ordinary citizens were as distracted as Lippmann claimed, **Dewey suggested**, they would hardly be amenable to control by the educated elites in any event. And **if experts were cut off from the needs and concerns of the general population, then their databases would dry up**. They and their reports would become increasingly irrelevant. Of course, Dewey was not advocating a pure form of participatory democracy. He recognized that **men and women have different talents,** needs, and interests and that when they associate themselves in groups larger than a mere handful, there is a tendency toward specialization in the various tasks required to support the continued existence of the group. **One of those areas of specialization is the ability to act on behalf of other members of a group**—or what Dewey termed **a public—in ways that its members find acceptable.** In sum, **in order for a public to exist, it must have members who are able to take the lead in articulating its goals and interests and in representing those goals and interests to other publics**. **Dewey was in fact calling for a form of deliberative democracy that would achieve a creative balance between participation and representation. He realized that deliberative democracies cannot function in the absence of experts in various fields** and representatives who take decisions on behalf of a voting public. On one side, while **participation within civic affairs** could hardly be required, it should nevertheless be open **to anyone willing to develop the skills necessary for involvement in the processes of public debate and decision making**. On the other side, **efficient government requires both representatives who are sensitive to public problems and experts who can advise those representatives on technical matters**.

#### Specific policy proposals are key to activism and deliberative democracy.

Walt 1991

(Stephen, Professor at the University of Chicago, *International Studies Quarterly* 35)

A second norm is relevance, a belief that even highly abstract lines of inquiry should be guided by the goal of solving real-world problems. Because the value of a given approach may not be apparent at the beginning–game theory is an obvious example–we cannot insist that a new approach be immediately applicable to a specific research puzzle. On the whole, however, **the belief that scholarship** in security affairs **should be linked to real-world issues has prevented the field from degenerating into self-indulgent intellectualizing**. And from the Golden Age to the present, **security studies has probably had more real-world impact, for good or ill, than most areas of social science**. Finally, **the renaissance of security studies has been guided by a commitment to democratic discourse. Rather than confining discussion of security issues to an elite group of the best and brightest, scholars** in the renaissance **have generally welcomed a more fully informed debate.** To paraphrase Clemenceau, **issues of war and peace are too important to be left solely to insiders with a vested interest in the outcome. The growth of security studies within universities is one sign of broader participation,** along with increased availability of information and more accessible publications for interested citizens. Although this view is by no means universal, the renaissance of security studies has been shaped by the belief that a **well-informed debate is the best way to avoid the disasters that are likely when national policy is monopolized by a few self-interested parties**.

#### You should evaluate ALL epistemology claims through the lens of specificity—you should not grant one epistemological commitment a privileged position because the conditions for knowing are ALWAYS contingent on the specific claim that is made. Drawing inferences from empirical reality is possible EVEN IF there is no possibility for pure certainty.

Wight 7

[Colin, Department of Politics, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, The University of Exeter, Journal of International Relations and Development, “Inside the epistemological cave all bets are off”, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Kratochwil’s attempt to push beyond the epistemological wars by remaining inside the epistemological cave is not as puzzling as it might seem given that **he assumes all meta-theoretical debate to be epistemological.** Thus, for example, he argues that he aims to ‘review some of the issues that meta-theorizing was supposed to address and show how this project of securing knowledge through hierarchization and finding absolute foundations failed’(Kr atochwil 2007: 2). Likewise, he suggests that issues such as incommensurability, reductionism and materialism vs idealism are arcane epistemological concerns (Kratochwil 2007: 2). **But in what sense, for example, is the materialism vs idealism question epistemological**? **As it has developed in IR, this is a debate about whether social outcomes are best explained in terms of material factors or ideational ones**.8 A related debate within philosophy attempts to grasp whether being or ideas ultimately matter. **In either debate, no epistemological issues are involved until a specific claim is made.**9 **We can certainly ask any theorist** who takes a position of either side of this debate **how they know (the epistemological question) their chosen factor is determinate in the last instance**. **But their epistemological response** to this question **is not the same as the claim itself, but rather defends the claim on one or other basis**. And we assess these claims on a number of grounds. **Given that we do not know in advance what the epistemological support for any given claim may be**, then it also follows that **scientists cannot afford to be epistemological dogmatists, pinning their colours to only one epistemological mast.** **Philosophers can trouble themselves with convoluted debates about the relative merits of one particular epistemological stance** over another— empiricism vs rationalism, for example—after all it is their job, **but scientists need to be epistemological opportunists** (Einstein 1949) **using a wide range of** epistemological **supports** **and never knowing in advance which one, or which mix of them, is relevant until a specific claim is made**. In some respects, this might seem to place me close to the position that Kratochwil suggests is absurd. For **is not my position a form of ‘anything goes’?** Well, again agreeing with Kratochwil that we should reject traditional logic and its associated yes or no answers, I will reply both yes and no.10 **Yes, it is an ‘anything goes’ position insofar as I reject outright that we need to commit ourselves to any particular epistemological position in advance of making or judging** particular **knowledge claims**. **I can see no good reason for giving any specific epistemological standpoint a position of a priori privilege**. **But I can also answer no because this position does not mean that we are unable to make informed judgements on the basis of the evidence for the claim**. **The fact that philosophers have been unable to provide secure foundations** for one or other epistemological stance **does not alter the fact that we continue to use these positions to get along in the world**. In this respect, I agree completely with Kratochwil’s claim (2007: 11) that b**oth absolute certainty and absolute doubt are impossible positions to hold, and that we ‘go on’in a situation located somewhere in between**. **It may be philosophically naıve of me to claim that if I wish to know how many cars are parked in my drive, then the easiest way is to probably go and look. But I can do this without needing philosophy to prove empiricism infallible.** Equally, in certain circumstances I might be able to ascertain how many cars are in my drive without looking; if, for example, I know that at time T1 that there were three cars and that one went away at time T2, then, if asked at time T3 (assuming these events are sequential), I have a legitimate case to say ‘two’. Of course, in either case, **I could still be wrong but the point is that the claim** about the existence of a certain number of cars **can justifiably be supported on various epistemological grounds and we do not know in advance which will be the most appropriate**. **Hence the context in which the claim emerges is also an important aspect of its validity**. In both cases, there is no doubt that observation or the process of rational deduction is theoretically laden, but **to say that our concepts help carve up the world in certain ways is not to accept that they either determine the physicality of what exists or can,** in all cases, **stop an object from existing**.

#### The alternative fails, it just adds another voice in the mix, but leaves foundational assumptions unchallenged

Shome, 1996

[Raka, Doctoral candidate at univ of Georgia, “Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An “other” view.” Communication theory, Vol. 6 issue 1, February, 40-59, Accessed Online via Wiley Online Library,] /Wyo-MB

In fact, **even when we do sometimes try to break out of the Eurocen- tric canons informing contemporary academic scholarship by including alternate cultural and racial perspectives in our syllabi, we often do not realize that instead of really breaking free of the canon, all that we do is stretch it, add things to it. But the canon remains the same and unchal- lenged. Our subject positions in relation to the canon remain the same and unchallenged.** Instead of examining how the canon itself is rooted in a larger discourse of colonialism and Western hegemony, we fre- quently use the canon to appropriate “other” voice^.^

**Racism not the root cause of all violence**

**Mertus 99**

(Professor Julie Mertus is the co-director of Ethics, Peace and Global Affairs. She has written widely on human rights and gender, conflict, the Balkans, U.S. foreign policy and U.N. institutions. She is the author or editor of ten books, including Bait and Switch: Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy, named "human rights book of the year" by the American Political Science Association) and, most recently Human Rights Matters: Local Politics and National Human Rights Institutions and The United Nations and Human Rights. Before entering academia, she worked as a researcher, writer and lawyer for several human rights and humanitarian organizations., J.D., Yale Law School; B.S. Cornell University, International Council on Human Rights Policy, “THE ROLE OF RACISM AS A CAUSE OF OR FACTOR IN WARS AND CIVIL CONFLICT”, http://www.ichrp.org/files/papers/167/112\_-\_The\_Role\_of\_Racism\_as\_a\_Cause\_of\_or\_Factor\_in\_Wars\_and\_Civil\_Conflict\_Mertus\_\_Julie\_\_1999.pdf)

**This paper examines the role of racism as a cause of or factor in wars and civil conflicts.** “Racism” as understood here is defined broadly to encompass acts and processes of dehumanisation. The conflicts in **Rwanda and Kosovo serve as case studies; the former illustrates a case where the racist nature of the conflict has been clear to most observers, and the latter represents a case where racism plays an important yet overlooked role. Racism did not cause either conflict. Rather, the conflicts were the outcome of political manipulation and enlargement of already existing group classification schemes and social polarisation, a history of real and imagined oppression and deprivation, the absence of the rule of law and democratic structures, and state monopoly over the provision of information. Under such conditions, political élites could use racist ideology as a method of gaining power and, when necessary, waging war.**

#### Perm Do Both: IMPLICIT IN THE NEG'S KRITIK OF WHITENESS IS AN AFRO-PESSIMISM, UNDERSTANDING BLACKNESS ONLY AS IT RELATES TO SOCIAL DEATH, MEANS THE ALTERNATIVE ENGENDERS WORSE FORMS OF RACISM AND ONLY THE PERM CAN SOLVE

Sexton 11

University of California, Irvine (School of Humanities) “The Social Life of Social Death: On Afro-Pessimism and Black Optimism” InTensions Journal, accessed 5-13-2012, WYO/JF

What I find most intriguing about the timbre of the argument of “The Case of Blackness,” and the black optimism it articulates against a certain construal of afro-pessimism, is the way that it works away from a discourse of black pathology only to swerve right back into it as an ascription to those found to be taking up and holding themselves in “the stance of the pathologist” in relation to black folks. x I say this not only because there is, in this version of events, a recourse to psychoanalytic terminology (“fetishization,” “obsession,” “repetition,”), but also because there is at the heart of the matter a rhetorical question that establishes both the bad advice of a wild analysis and a tacit diagnosis affording a certain speaker’s benefit: “So why is it repressed?” The “it” that has been afflicted by the psychopathology of obsessional neurosis is the understanding, which is also to say the celebration, of the ontological priority or previousness of blackness relative to the antiblackness that establishes itself against it, a priority or previousness that is also termed “knowledge of freedom” or, pace Chandler, comprehension of “the constitutive force of the African American subject(s)” (Chandler 2000: 261). [21] What does not occur here is a consideration of the possibility that something might be unfolding in the project or projections of afro-pessimism “knowing full well the danger of a kind of negative reification” associated with its analytical claims to the paradigmatic (Moten 2004: 279). That is to say, it might just be the case that an object lesson in the phenomenology of the thing is a gratuity that folds a new encounter into older habits of thought through a reinscription of (black) pathology that reassigns its cause and relocates its source without ever really getting inside it. xi In a way, what we’re talking about relates not to a disagreement about “unthought positions” (and their de-formation) but to a disagreement, or discrepancy, about “unthought dispositions” (and their in-formation). I would maintain this insofar as the misrecognition at work in the reading of that motley crew listed in the ninth footnote regards, perhaps ironically, the performative dimension or signifying aspect of a “generalized impropriety” so improper as to appear as the same old propriety returning through the back door. xii Without sufficient consideration of the gap between statement and enunciation here, to say nothing of quaint notions like context or audience or historical conjuncture, the discourse of afro-pessimism, even as it approaches otherwise important questions, can only seem like a “tragically neurotic” instance of “certain discourse on the relation between blackness and death” (Moten 2007: 9). xiii [22] Fanon and his interlocutors, or what appear rather as his fateful adherents, would seem to have a problem embracing black social life because they never really come to believe in it, because they cannot acknowledge the social life from which they speak and of which they speak— as negation and impossibility—as their own (Moten 2008: 192). Another way of putting this might be to say that they are caught in a performative contradiction enabled by disavowal. I wonder, however, whether things are even this clear in Fanon and the readings his writing might facilitate. Lewis Sexton Gordon’s sustained engagement finds Fanon situated in an ethical stance grounded in the affirmation of blackness in the historic antiblack world. In a response to the discourse of multiracialism emergent in the late twentieth century United States, for instance, Gordon writes, following Fanon, that “there is no way to reject the thesis that there is something wrong with being black beyond the willingness to ‘be’ black – in terms of convenient fads of playing blackness, but in paying the costs of antiblackness on a global scale. Against the raceless credo, then, racism cannot be rejected without a dialectic in which humanity experiences a blackened world” (Gordon 1997: 67). What is this willingness to ‘be’ black, of choosing to be black affirmatively rather than reluctantly, that Gordon finds as the key ethical moment in Fanon? Elsewhere, in a discussion of Du Bois on the study of black folk, Gordon restates an existential phenomenological conception of the antiblack world developed across his first several books: “Blacks here suffer the phobogenic reality posed by the spirit of racial seriousness. In effect, they more than symbolize or signify various social pathologies—they become them. In our antiblack world, blacks are pathology” (Gordon 2000: 87). This conception would seem to support Moten’s contention that even much radical black studies scholarship sustains the association of blackness with a certain sense of decay and thereby fortifies and extends the interlocutory life of widely accepted political common sense. In fact, it would seem that Gordon deepens the already problematic association to the level of identity. And yet, this is precisely what Gordon argues is the value and insight of Fanon: he fully accepts the definition of himself as pathological as it is imposed by a world that knows itself through that imposition, rather than remaining in a reactive stance that insists on the (temporal, moral, etc.) heterogeneity between a self and an imago originating in culture. Though it may appear counterintuitive, or rather because it is counterintuitive, this acceptance or affirmation is active; it is a willing or willingness, in other words, to pay whatever social costs accrue to being black, to inhabiting blackness, to living a black social life under the shadow of social death. This is not an accommodation to the dictates of the antiblack world. The affirmation of blackness, which is to say an affirmation of pathological being, is a refusal to distance oneself from blackness in a valorization of minor differences that bring one closer to health, to life, or to sociality. Fanon writes in the first chapter of Black Skin, White Masks, “The Black Man and Language”: “A Senegalese who learns Creole to pass for Antillean is a case of alienation. The Antilleans who make a mockery out of him are lacking in judgment” (Fanon 2008: 21). In a world structured by the twin axioms of white superiority and black inferiority, of white existence and black nonexistence, a world structured by a negative categorical imperative— “above all, don’t be black” (Gordon 1997: 63)—in this world, the zero degree of transformation is the turn toward blackness, a turn toward the shame, as it were, that “resides in the idea that ‘I am thought of as less than human’” (Nyong’o 2002: 389). xiv In this we might create a transvaluation of pathology itself, something like an embrace of pathology without pathos.

#### Engaging the state is critical to the ability of citizens to break into the project of solving global challenges: Engagement relies on an existing internationalist state and refocuses its energies through citizen participation in national institutions that solve for war as well as environmental and social challenges-TURNS THE AFFIRMATIVE

Sassen 2009

[Columbia University, istheauthorof TheGlobalCity (2ndedn, Princeton, 2001), Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages (Princeton, 2008) and A Sociology of Globalisation (Norton,2007), among others, 2009, The Potential for a Progressive State?, uwyo//amp]

Using state power for a new global politics These post-1980s trends towards a greater interaction of national andglobal dynamics are not part of some unidirectional historical progres-sion. There have been times in the past when they may have been as strong in certain aspects as they are today (Sassen, 2008a: chapter 3). But the current positioning of national states is distinctive precisely because 270 Saskia Sassen the national state has become the most powerful complex organizational entity in the world, and because it is a resource that citizens, confined largely to the national, can aim at governing and using to develop novelpolitical agendas. It is this mix of the national and the global that is so full of potential. The national state is one particular form of state: at the other end of this variable the state can be conceived of as a technical administrative capability that could escape the historic bounds of narrow nationalisms that have marked the state historically, or colonialism as the only form of internationalism that states have enacted. Stripping the state of the particularity of this historical legacy gives me more analytic freedom in conceptualising these processes and opens up the possibility of the denationalised state.As particular components of national states become the institutional home for the operation of some of the dynamics that are central to glob-alisation they undergo change that is difficult to register or name. In my own work I have found useful the notion of an incipient denation-alising of specific components of national states, i.e. components that function as such institutional homes. The question for research then becomes what is actually ‘national’ in some of the institutional compo-nents of states linked to the implementation and regulation of economic globalisation. The hypothesis here would be that some components of national institutions, even though formally national, are not national in the sense in which we have constructed the meaning of that term overthe last hundred years.This partial, often highly specialised or at least particularised, dena-tionalisation can also take place in domains other than that of economic globalisation, notably the more recent developments in the humanrights regime which allow national courts to sue foreign firms and dictators, or which grant undocumented immigrants certain rights. Denationalisation is, thus, multivalent: it endogenises global agendas of many different types of actors, not only corporate firms and financial markets, but also human rights and environmental objectives. Those confined to the national can use national state institutions as a bridge into global politics. This is one kind of radical politics, and only one kind, that would use the capacities of hopefully increasingly denationalized states. The existence and the strengthening of global civil society organ-isations becomes strategic in this context. In all of this lie the possibilities of moving towards new types of joint global action by denationalized states–coalitions of the willing focused not on war but on environmental and social justice projects.