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### T

#### A. Interpretation: the affirmative must defend the hypothetical enactment of a topical plan by the United States federal government.

#### The United States federal government is the actor defined by the resolution, not individual debaters

**US Gov** Official Website 20**09**

http://www.usa.gov/Agencies/federal.shtml

U.S. Federal Government **The three branches of U.S. government—legislative, judicial, and executive—carry out governmental power and functions.** View a complete diagram (.PDF) of the U.S. government's branches.

#### “Resolved” expresses intent to implement the plan

**Merriam-Webster Dictionary** 19**96** [http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=resolved, downloaded 07/20/03]

“6. **To change or convert by resolution or formal vote**; -- **used only reflexively; as, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole**.”

#### “Should” denotes an expectation of enacting a plan

**American Heritage Dictionary 2K**

[www.dictionary.com]

3 **Used to express** probability or **expectation**

#### B. Violation—the affirmative does not defend the implementation of a topical plan.

#### C. Vote negative

#### 1. Limits—their interpretation kills limits because it creates a strategic incentive to disregard the resolution. If teams can get away with being non-topical, there’s no reason to defend the resolution. Limits are good:

#### A. Decision-making—having a limited topic with equitable ground is necessary to foster decision-making and clash

**Steinberg & Freeley 8** \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp 45-

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007. Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### B. Creativity—thinking “inside the box” forces teams to be creative about their positions and come up with innovative solutions. Absent constraints, debate becomes boring and stale—we link turn all of their offense.

**Intrator 10** (Intrator, David, President of The Creative Organization and musical composer, October 22, 2010, “Thinking Inside The Box: A Professional Creative Dispels A Popular Myth”, Training, http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box) FS

**One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.”** As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, **nothing could be further from the truth. This** a **is** view **shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed** famously **by** the **modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from** a fundamental misconception **of what creativity is**, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is **something weird and wacky.** The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, **creativity is** not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s **about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint**, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of **photographers**. They **create by excluding the great mass what’s before them**, choosing a small frame in which to work. **Within that tiny frame**, literally a box, **they uncover relationships and establish priorities**. **What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem.** You’re the one choosing the frame. And **you alone determine what’s an effective solution**. **This can be quite demanding,** both intellectually and emotionally. **Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities**, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. **But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful**, something **that actually works**. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. **You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.** You can always change the rules, but that also comes with an emotional price. Unlike many other kinds of problems, with creative problems there is no external authority to which you can appeal to determine whether you’re on the right track, whether one set of rules should have priority over another, or whether one box is better than another. There is no correct answer. Better said: There might be a number of correct answers. Or none at all. The responsibility of deciding the right path to take is entirely upon you. That’s a lot of responsibility, and it can be paralyzing. So it’s no wonder that the creative process often stalls after the brainstorming in many organizations. Whereas generating ideas is open-ended, and, in a sense, infinitely hopeful, having to pare those ideas down is restrictive, tedious, and, at times, scary. The good news, however, is that understanding the creative process as problem-solving is ultimately liberating. For one, all of **those** left-brainers **with well-honed rational skills will find themselves** far more creative **than they ever thoug**ht. They’ll discover their talents for organization, abstraction, and clarity are very much what’s required to be a true creative thinker. **Viewing creativity as problem-solving also makes the whole process far less intimidating**, even though it might lose some of its glamour and mystery. Moreover, **since creative problems are open to rational analysis, they can be broken down into smaller components that are easier to address.** Best of all, **the very act of problem-solving, of organizing and trying making sense of things, helps generate new ideas.** Paradoxically, thinking within a box may be one of the most effective brainstorming techniques **there** is. That may be what Charles Eames meant when he added, “I welcome constraints.” **Without some sort of structure to your creative thinking**, you’re just flailing about. For a while you might feel like you’re making progress, generating a great mess of ideas that might hold some potential. But **to turn** those **ideas into something truly innovative, your best bet is to** build your box and **play by the rules** of your own creation.

#### 2. Switch-Side Debate—their interpretation allows teams to only debate one side of an issue. Switch-side debate is good:

#### A. Critical thinking—switching sides forces debaters to assess all possible outcomes of a policy and sharpens their analysis of complex situations

**Harrigan 8** NDT champion, debate coach at UGA (Casey, thesis submitted to Wake Forest Graduate Faculty for Master of Arts in Communication, “A defense of switch side debate”, http://dspace.zsr.wfu.edu/jspui/bitstream/10339/207/1/harrigancd052008, p. 57-59)

Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, is its inducement of critical thinking. Defined as “reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1987, p. 10), critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well. Each and every student, whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert Crawford notes, there are “issues of unsurpassed importance in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people…being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking” (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that “the next Pearl Harbor could be ‘compounded by hydrogen’” (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p. 3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007).In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. As Louis Rene Beres writes, “with such learning, we Americans could prepare…not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet” (2003). Thus, it is not surprising that critical thinking has been called “the highest educational goal of the activity” (Parcher, 1998). While arguing from conviction can foster limited critical thinking skills, the element of switching sides is necessary to sharpen debate’s critical edge and ensure that decisions are made in a reasoned manner instead of being driven by ideology. Debaters trained in SSD are more likely to evaluate both sides of an argument before arriving at a conclusion and are less likely to dismiss potential arguments based on his or her prior beliefs (Muir 1993). In addition, debating both sides teaches “conceptual flexibility,” where decision-makers are more likely to reflect upon the beliefs that are held before coming to a final opinion (Muir, 1993, p. 290). Exposed to many arguments on each side of an issue, debaters learn that public policy is characterized by extraordinary complexity that requires careful consideration before action. Finally, these arguments are confirmed by the preponderance of empirical research demonstrating a link between competitive SSD and critical thinking (Allen, Berkowitz)

#### B. Tolerance—switching sides makes debaters more tolerant of arguments and ideas that are the opposite of their own—their one-sided approach promotes dogmatism

**Muir 93** (Star, Professor of Communication – George Mason U., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 288-289)

The role of **switch-side debate is especially important in the** oral **defense of arguments that foster tolerance** without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. **The forum is** therefore **unique in providing debaters with** attitudes of **tolerance** without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, **debaters are** indeed **exposed to a multivalued world**, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, **the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be** seen as **a means of gaining perspective** without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.'s 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**. 5' 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.

#### C. Activism—only switching sides teaches students to anticipate counter-arguments and build coalitions effectively, which is necessary for sustained activism

**Harrigan 8** - Casey Harrigan, Associate Director of Debate at UGA, Master’s in Communications, Wake Forest U., 2008, “A Defense of Switch Side Debate”, Master’s thesis at Wake Forest, Department of Communication, May, pp.49-50

Third, there is an important question of means. Even the best activist intentions have little practical utility as long as they remain purely cordoned off in the realm of theoretical abstractions. Creating programs of action that seek to produce material changes in the quality of life for suffering people, not mere wishful thinking in the ivory towers of academia, should be the goal of any revolutionary project. Frequently, for strategies for change, the devil lies in the details. It is not possible to simply click one’s ruby red slippers together and wish for alternatives to come into being. Lacking a plausible mechanism to enact reforms, many have criticized critical theory as being a “fatally flawed enterprise” (Jones 1999). For activists, learning the skills to successfully negotiate hazardous political terrain is crucial. They must know when to and when not to compromise, negotiate, and strike political alliances in order to be successful. The pure number of failed movements in the past several decades demonstrates the severity of the risk assumed by groups who do not focus on refining their preferred means of change. Given the importance of strategies for change, SSD is even more crucial. Debaters trained by debating both sides are substantially more likely to be effective advocates than those experienced only in arguing on behalf of their own convictions. For several reasons, SSD instills a series of practices that are essential for a successful activist agenda. First, SSD creates more knowledgeable advocates for public policy issues. As part of the process of learning to argue both sides, debaters are forced to understand the intricacies of multiple sides of the argument considered. Debaters must not only know how to research and speak on behalf of their own personal convictions, but also for the opposite side in order to defend against attacks of that position. Thus, when placed in the position of being required to publicly defend an argument, students trained via SSD are more likely to be able to present and persuasively defend their positions. Second, learning the nuances of all sides of a position greatly strengthens the resulting convictions of debaters, their ability to anticipate opposing arguments, and the effectiveness of their attempts to locate the crux, nexus and loci of arguments. As is noted earlier, conviction is a result, not a prerequisite of debate. Switching sides and experimenting with possible arguments for and against controversial issues, in the end, makes students more likely to ground their beliefs in a reasoned form of critical thinking that is durable and unsusceptible to knee-jerk criticisms. As a result, even though it may appear to be inconsistent with advocacy, SSD “actually created stronger advocates” that are more likely to be successful in achieving their goals (Dybvig and Iverson 2000). Proponents of abandoning SSD and returning to debating from conviction should take note. Undoubtedly, many of their ideas would be beneficial if enacted and deserve the support of activist energies. However, anti-SSD critics seem to have given little thought to the important question of how to translate good ideas into practice. By teaching students to privilege their own personal beliefs prior to a thorough engagement with all sides of an issue, debating from conviction produces activists that are more likely to be politically impotent. By positing that debaters should bring prior beliefs to the table in a rigid manner and assuming that compromising is tantamount to giving in to cooptation, the case of debating from conviction undercuts the tactics necessary for forging effective coalitional politics. Without such broad-based alliances, sustainable political changes will likely be impossible (Best & Kellner 2001).

#### 3. Topic Education—their interpretation diverts focus away from the topic. Topic education is good:

#### A. Policy relevance—learning about how theory relates to policy and discussing implementation is crucial to influence real policymakers—without tying advocacy to policy, debate becomes irrelevant

**Nye 09** - Joseph Nye, professor at Harvard University and former dean of the Harvard Kennedy School, 4-13-2009, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/12/AR2009041202260\_pf.html 4-13-09

President Obama has appointed some distinguished academic economists and lawyers to his administration, but few high-ranking political scientists have been named. In fact, the editors of a recent poll of more than 2,700 international relations experts declared that "the walls surrounding the ivory tower have never seemed so high." While important American scholars such as Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski took high-level foreign policy positions in the past, that path has tended to be a one-way street. Not many top-ranked scholars of international relations are going into government, and even fewer return to contribute to academic theory. The 2008 Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) poll, by the Institute for Theory and Practice in International Relations, showed that of the 25 scholars rated as producing the most interesting scholarship during the past five years, only three had ever held policy positions (two in the U.S. government and one in the United Nations). The fault for this growing gap lies not with the government but with the academics. Scholars are paying less attention to questions about how their work relates to the policy world, and in many departments a focus on policy can hurt one's career. Advancement comes faster for those who develop mathematical models, new methodologies or theories expressed in jargon that is unintelligible to policymakers. A survey of articles published over the lifetime of the American Political Science Review found that about one in five dealt with policy prescription or criticism in the first half of the century, while only a handful did so after 1967. Editor Lee Sigelman observed in the journal's centennial issue that "if 'speaking truth to power' and contributing directly to public dialogue about the merits and demerits of various courses of action were still numbered among the functions of the profession, one would not have known it from leafing through its leading journal." As citizens, academics might be considered to have an obligation to help improve on policy ideas when they can. Moreover, such engagement can enhance and enrich academic work, and thus the ability of academics to teach the next generation. As former undersecretary of state David Newsom argued a decade ago, "the growing withdrawal of university scholars behind curtains of theory and modeling would not have wider significance if this trend did not raise questions regarding the preparation of new generations and the future influence of the academic community on public and official perceptions of international issues and events. Teachers plant seeds that shape the thinking of each new generation; this is probably the academic world's most lasting contribution." Yet too often scholars teach theory and methods that are relevant to other academics but not to the majority of the students sitting in the classroom before them. Some academics say that while the growing gap between theory and policy may have costs for policy, it has produced better social science theory, and that this is more important than whether such scholarship is relevant. Also, to some extent, the gap is an inevitable result of the growth and specialization of knowledge. Few people can keep up with their subfields, much less all of social science. But the danger is that academic theorizing will say more and more about less and less. Even when academics supplement their usual trickle-down approach to policy by writing in journals, newspapers or blogs, or by consulting for candidates or public officials, they face many competitors for attention. More than 1,200 think tanks in the United States provide not only ideas but also experts ready to comment or consult at a moment's notice. Some of these new transmission belts serve as translators and additional outlets for academic ideas, but many add a bias provided by their founders and funders. As a group, think tanks are heterogeneous in scope, funding, ideology and location, but universities generally offer a more neutral viewpoint. While pluralism of institutional pathways is good for democracy, the policy process is diminished by the withdrawal of the academic community. The solutions must come via a reappraisal within the academy itself. Departments should give greater weight to real-world relevance and impact in hiring and promoting young scholars. Journals could place greater weight on relevance in evaluating submissions. Studies of specific regions deserve more attention. Universities could facilitate interest in the world by giving junior faculty members greater incentives to participate in it. That should include greater toleration of unpopular policy positions. One could multiply such useful suggestions, but young people should not hold their breath waiting for them to be implemented. If anything, the trends in academic life seem to be headed in the opposite direction.

### K

#### The term “islamophobia” is violent. The concept matters – but should be re-couched to avoid conflating K’s of monotheism with those expressing hate. The alt is the term “anti-Muslim bigotry”

Bloodworth ‘12

James is a political journalist and editor of Left Foot Forward. He has previously written for the Observer, the Independent on Sunday, the Irish Independent, the Huffington Post, Red Pepper and Jacobin – “It’s time to stop using the term ‘Islamophobia’” The Independent – Wednesday, 4 July 2012 – http://blogs.independent.co.uk/2012/07/05/it%E2%80%99s-time-to-stop-using-the-term-%E2%80%98islamophobia%E2%80%99/

Political language too contains its fair share of semantic bucklers. Almost every politician today is in some sense an advocate of the mysterious “progressive consensus”. And a large number of our representatives are quite keen to stress their party’s courageous plan to “modernise” British institutions – what modernisation means, however, is never quite made clear. Nothing perhaps epitomises the entrance of jargon into the political vernacular, however, as much as the term “Islamophobia”, which has become a standard rebuttal in the armoury of the anti-racist movement in the last decade. The description of a person or an opinion as “Islamophobic” has gained popularity in the last 10 years or so for understandable reasons. In the hope of capitalising on a widespread fear of Islamist terror on the back of 9/11, propagandists of the far-right sought to foster the impression that all Muslims were potential terrorists who constituted a threat to the survival of British society. Encouragingly, the progress made in this country in terms of race relations forced the hand of the far-right to some degree. Today it is overwhelmingly frowned upon to be openly racist or antisemitic, and therefore extremist groups looking to build a following must drop talk of the “inequality of the races” and adopt more subtle language that stresses the supposed incompatibility of foreign and native cultures. Any goose-stepping and talk of racial purity must be saved strictly for the backrooms of pubs on dodgy estates. There has, however, been an unfortunate consequence of all of this. It is now possible to shut down almost any contemporary political debate by blurring the distinction between legitimate criticism of Islam and the anti-Muslim prejudice of the far-right. This is perhaps best expressed by the appearance on the scene of terms like “islamophobic racism” – a further extension of the concept of islamophobia -, which conflate the idea of “race” (the way a person is born) with religion (a set of ideas passed on in the home, the school and the community). Interestingly, the French feminist writer Caroline Fourest makes the claim that the word Islamophobia was originally popularised by the Mullahs during the Iranian revolution, where the term was employed to describe those women who bravely refused to wear the hijab. Also telling is the fact that in 2006 a motion was introduced at the United Nations by the organisation of the Islamic conference which sought to prohibit the defaming of prophets and freedom of expression in the area of religious symbols under the guise of “anti-islamophobia”. Something more appears to be going on here that straightforward anti-racism. For those of us who are averse to religion and abhor prejudice (it is possible, I assure you), it is both insulting as well as dishonest to have it implied that our criticism of monotheism is the equivalent of colour prejudice. As Pascal Bruckner puts it in his book The Tyranny of Guilt, “To speak of islamophobia is to maintain the crudest confusion between a religion, a specific system of belief, and the faithful who adhere to it…Must we then speak of anticapitalist, antiliberal, antisocialist, and anti-Marxist racism?”. The correct definition for the bigotry of the far-right (although I’m open to snappier alternatives) is anti-Muslim bigotry. This will not of course be satisfactory to those who wish to introduce blasphemy laws by the back door, but trying to please such people should never be a major concern for those who value free enquiry anyway. What a change in the terminology would do, however, is provide a clearer distinction between legitimate criticism of so-called revealed truths and the crude prejudices of the far-right. No idea should be off limits when it comes to criticism, and real prejudice should not be confused with the perfectly legitimate examination of doctrine. It would be far better, I think, to leave the abuse of language to big capital and its political representatives.

#### Reject the suffix “phobia” as being able-ist

Lorente ‘10

Javier Rosón Lorente, Casa Árabe e Instituto Internacional de Estudios Árabes y del Mundo Musulmán (2010) "Discrepancies Around the Use of the Term “Islamophobia”," Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 11. Available at: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol8/iss2/11

As mentioned above, there is another order of criticism or discrepancy toward the term Islamophobia, which though fully linked to ethnic, religious and cultural aspects, is in itself used as individual criticism over the use of this terminology. Such is firstly the case of ‘etymological/ terminological criticism.’ From this viewpoint the terms ‘anti-Muslim racism,’ ‘anti- Arab’ or even ‘intolerance against Muslims’ 18 are clearer than the term Islamophobia for various reasons. On the one hand, use of the word ‘phobia’ in the concept is not considered appropriate, as it would imply the existence of a sort of mental illness (phobia: obsessive aversion to someone or something and/or compulsive irrational fear); on the other, the term Islamophobia is not considered ‘ideal,’ for there is no specific rejection of Islam as a religion, but rather a rejection of Muslim individuals or collectives or those defined as such. This kind of criticism even makes an analogy between the word Islamophobia and the word ‘anti-Semitism,’ arguing that from a grammatical standpoint anti-Semitism should signify a prejudice against Semitic peoples in general, even though it is exclusively used to refer to hostility against the Jews. In this regard, the grammatically incorrect Islamophobia would require the 150 years which the term ‘anti-Semitism’ needed to become grammatically acceptable, except that Jews recognize themselves and are recognized as being a single ethnic group, contrary to the case of Muslims.

#### Ableism causes oppression – we should avoid it.

Siebers, 9

(Tobin, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12,)

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed. One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature. As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

#### The prefix of the term also homogenizes “Islam”. That violently essentializes.

Lorente ‘10

Javier Rosón Lorente, Casa Árabe e Instituto Internacional de Estudios Árabes y del Mundo Musulmán (2010) "Discrepancies Around the Use of the Term “Islamophobia”," Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 11. Available at: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol8/iss2/11

Parallel to this, inclusion of the word ‘Islam’ in the word Islamophobia raises another kind of discrepancy: based on an undeniable question, the religious, racial, cultural and ethnic diversity of the groups ‘supposedly’ the object of Islamophobia, the term Islamophobia homogenizes everything associated to Islam and therefore to Muslims. In this homogenization process the diversity of communities and individuals is essentialized, and distinct and differentiated processes are eventually included in a same concept. It is held in turn that widespread use of the term Islamophobia by distinct communities may also essentialize internal plurality

at local, regional, national and international level. Other terms which semantically attempt to approach the national particularities or ‘realities’ (besides the more extended ‘anti-Arab anti-Muslim racism’) are becoming alternative though critical lines vis-à-vis usage of the term Islamophobia. For example ‘Islamfeindichkeit’ in the German context literally means hostility to Islam, or its rejection, but not phobia in the sense of fear, or ‘maurofobia/morofobia’ in the Spanish case.

### The truth

#### The burden of proof for proving God exists shouldn’t be higher than winning any other argument- cumulative evidence can prove God exists

**Nash, former Western Kentucky University philosophy professor and department head, 88**

(Ronald, WKU professor and department head for 27 years, *Faith and Reason*, 1988, pg 115, mss)

If we accept the relevance of Evans' analogy between proofs in the kinds of court cases he describes and proofs for such religious claims as "God exists," several important points follow. For one thing, as Evans notes, "**good evidence** for religious faith **will not be some kind of absolute proof** that some philosophers seem to seek. Rather, **it will be evidence which is** **sufficient to satisfy a reasonable person.**"19 Though such proofs are perfectly appropriate for their subject matter, they will seldom result in universal acceptance. "**Must an argument be universally accepted to be a proof?** Accepted by all sane people who consider it? Frequently something like this standard seems to be presupposed in these discussions. . . . **Such a concept** **of proof seems impossibly high**. **It** also **seems unfair, since this is not the** **standard of proof we require for nonreligious areas."**20 **Juries in court cases** **are not required to seek proof beyond all possible doubt, only beyond a** **reasonable doubt.** **Furthermore**, Evans notes, "**the case for religious faith will not be based** **on a single argument** functioning as a proof, **but upon the total evidence** available from every region of human experience."21 Rem B. Edwards makes a similar claim when he writes, Giving philosophical proof is very similar to what a lawyer does in a courtroom. The philosopher "builds up a case." He explains as best he can why he believes what he does and why he rejects the chief alternatives to his position, and he is always willing to examine and reexamine the elements out of which his case is built. Many lines of converging evidence must be put together into a coherent case. . . . Many complex elements enter into the case for belief in God. Often the diverse "proofs" are compared, quite correctly, to strands or fibers in a rope, none of which does the work of the whole rope, yet some of which must do some work if the rope is to have any strength at all.22 **The case for God's existence should be cumulative. There is nothing wrong** **with reaching a decision based on a cumulative argument**. After all, Evans states "**one bit of evidence against a criminal may not be enough to convict** him. The same may be said of a second or third bit, or any number of bits, when taken in isolation. **If each bit does have some force, however, then all** **of the bits taken together may be more than enough** to convict the accused and send him off to prison."" Our judgment in such matters, then, is seldom the result of one argument or piece of evidence.

**God does exists—3 reasons**

**1. Cosmological evidence**

**Craig, Talbot School of Theology philosophy research professor, 4**

(Dr. William Lane, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Birmingham (England), Th.D. under from the University of Munich, "Does God Exist?" 2004, delveintojesus.com/Articles/64/Does-God-Exist.aspx, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

1. **God makes sense of the origin of the universe**. Have you ever asked yourself where the universe came from? Why everything exists instead of just nothing? Typically atheists have said the universe is just eternal, and that's all. But surely this is unreasonable. Just think about it a minute. If the universe never had a beginning, that means that the number of past events in the history of the universe is infinite. But mathematicians recognize that the existence of an actually infinite number of things leads to self-contradictions. For example, what is infinity minus infinity? Well, mathematically, you get self-contradictory answers. This shows that infinity is just an idea in your mind, not something that exists in reality. David Hilbert, perhaps the greatest mathematician of the twentieth century, states, The infinite is nowhere to be found in reality. It neither exists in nature nor provides a legitimate basis for rational thought. The role that remains for the infinite to play is solely that of an idea.1 But that entails that since past events are not just ideas, but are real, the number of past events must be finite. Therefore, the series of past events can't go back forever; rather **the universe must have begun to exist**. **This conclusion has been confirmed by** remarkable discoveries in **astronomy and astrophysics**. In one of the most startling developments of modern science, **we** now **have** pretty **strong evidence** that **the universe is not eternal** in the past **but had an absolute** **beginning** about 13 billion years ago in a cataclysmic event known as the Big Bang. What makes **the Big Bang** so startling is that it **represents the** **origin of the universe from literally nothing**. For all matter and energy, even physical space and time themselves, came into being at the Big Bang. As the physicist P. C. W. Davies explains, "the coming into being of the universe, as discussed in modern science . . . is not just a matter of imposing some sort of organization . . . upon a previous incoherent state, but literally the coming-into-being of all physical things from nothing."2 Of course, alternative theories have been crafted over the years to try to avoid this absolute beginning, but none of these theories has commended itself to the scientific community as more plausible than the Big Bang theory. In fact, in 2003 Arvind Borde, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin were able to prove that any universe which is, on average, in a state of cosmic expansion cannot be eternal in the past but must have an absolute beginning. Vilenkin pulls no punches: It is said that an argument is what convinces reasonable men and a proof is what it takes to convince even an unreasonable man. With the proof now in place, cosmologists can no longer hide behind the possibility of a past-eternal universe. There is no escape, they have to face the problem of a cosmic beginning.3 That problem was nicely captured by Anthony Kenny of Oxford University. He writes, "A proponent of the Big Bang theory, at least if he is an atheist, must believe that the universe came from nothing and by nothing."4 But surely that doesn't make sense! Out of nothing, nothing comes. So why does the universe exist instead of just nothing? Where did it come from? There must have been a cause which brought the universe into being. We can summarize our argument thus far as follows: **Whatever begins to exist has a cause. The universe began to exist. Therefore, the universe has a cause.** Given the truth of the two premises, **the conclusion necessarily follows**. From the very nature of the case, **this cause must be an uncaused, changeless, timeless, and immaterial being** which created the universe. **It must be uncaused because** we've seen that **there cannot be an infinite regress of causes. It must be timeless and** therefore **changeless** at least without the universe **because it created time.** **Because it** also **created space, it must transcend space** as well and therefore be immaterial, not physical. Moreover, I would argue, it must also be personal. For how else could a timeless cause give rise to a temporal effect like the universe? If the cause were a mechanically operating set of necessary and sufficient conditions, then the cause could never exist without the effect. For example, the cause of water's freezing is the temperature's being below 0 Centigrade. If the temperature were below 0 from eternity past, then any water that was around would be frozen from eternity. It would be impossible for the water to begin to freeze just a finite time ago. So if the cause is permanently present, then the effect should be permanently present as well. The only way for the cause to be timeless and the effect to begin in time is for the cause to be a personal agent who freely chooses to create an effect in time without any prior determining conditions. For example, a man sitting from eternity could freely will to stand up. Thus, we are brought, not merely to a transcendent cause of the universe, but to its personal Creator. Isn't it incredible that **the big bang** theory thus **confirms what the Christian theist has always believed**: that in the beginning **God created the universe**? Now I put it to you: **which makes more sense: that the Christian theist is right or that the universe popped into being uncaused out of nothing**? I, at least, have no trouble assessing these alternatives!

**2. Anthropic principle**

**Craig, Talbot School of Theology philosophy research professor, 98**

(Dr. William Lane, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Birmingham (England), Th.D. under from the University of Munich, debate with Edwin Curley, Transcript, 2-5-1998, sitemaker.umich.edu/emcurley/files/opening.html, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

Number 2: **God makes sense of the complex order in the universe**. During the last 30 years, **scientists have discovered** that **the existence of intelligent life depends upon a delicate and complex balance of initial conditions** simply given in the Big Bang itself. We now know that **life-prohibiting universes are vastly more probable than** any **life-permitting universe** like ours. How much more probable? 12. Well, the answer is that th**e chances that the universe should be life-permitting are so infinitesimal as to be incomprehensible and incalculable.** For example, Stephen **Hawking** has **estimated** that **if the rate of the universe's expansion** one second after the Big Bang **had been smaller by even one part in a hundred thousand million million, the universe would have re-collapsed into a hot fireball**. [5] P.C.W. Davies has calculated that **the odds against the initial conditions being suitable for** star formation (without which **planets** could not exist) **is one followed by a thousand billion billion zeroes, at least**. [6] John Barrow and Frank Tippler estimate that **a change in the strength of gravity** or of the weak force **by only one part in 10 raised to the 100th power would have prevented a life-permitting universe.** [7] **There are around 50 such** constants and **quantities present** in the Big Bang **which must be fine-tuned in this way if the universe is to permit life.** And **it's not just each quantity** which must be finely tuned; **their ratios to each other must** also **be exquisitely** **finely tuned**. So **improbability is multiplied by improbability by improbability until our minds are reeling in incomprehensible numbers.** 13. **There is no physical reason why these** constants and **quantities should posses the values they do**. The one-time agnostic physicist P.C. W. Davies comments, "Through my scientific work I have come to believe more and more strongly that the physical universe is put together with an ingenuity so astonishing that I cannot accept it merely as a brute fact." [8] Similarly, Fred Hoyle remarks, "A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super-intellect has monkeyed with physics." [9] Robert Jastrow, **the head of NASA's** Goddard **Institute for Space Studies, calls this the most powerful evidence for the existence of God ever to come out of science.** [10] 14. So, once again, **the view** that **Christian theists have** always **held**, that there is an intelligent designer of the universe, **seems to make much more sense than the atheistic interpretation that the universe**, when it **popped into being, uncaused, out of nothing, just happened to be, by chance, fine-tuned for intelligent life with an incomprehensible precision and delicacy**.

**3. Universality of a belief in the afterlife**

**D'Souza, former Hoover Institution fellow, 9**

(Dinesh, former Robert and Karen Rishwain Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford, currently the President of The King's College in New York City, *Life After Death: The Evidence,* Regnery Publishing, p.39-42) RKB

But what about the larger atheist claim that religions are a kind of ersatz science, not only lacking scientific objectivity, but also making competing claims that cancel each other out? Let's test this by taking short excursion through history and examining what different cultures believe about the afterlife. We are not doing comparative religion, an idea that many Christians despise for a reason given by the priest and author Ronald Knox. "the study of comparative religions," Knox wrote, "is the best way to become comparatively religious." Here, however, we are doing something quite different. We are not trying to affirm religious diversity or to proclaim all religions equally valid; rather, we are testing a set of atheist claims about the religions of the world against the empirical reality of what the religions of the world actually believe. **One of the most striking things about the afterlife is that belief in it is absolutely universal.** This point is clearly established in Alan Segal's magisterial study Life after Death. Segal shows that **every culture, from the dawn of [hu]mankind, has espoused some concept of continued existence. Early civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, India, and the Americas all held the belief that there is some sort of life beyond the grave.** Segal recognizes, of course, that not every individual in those cultures expected to have life after death. In fact, most early cultures made provision only for the future life of the ruling aristocracy. The peasants and ordinary people were not considered important enough to warrant consideration for the afterlife. In Egypt, for example, it took the labor of thousands to build the three pyramids at Giza. The Egyptians sought to preserve the bodies of their pharaohs, wrapping them in bandages and sometimes burying them in several coffins, one inside the other. Masks were usually attached to the head to preserve the identity of the person. Excavations in Sumer have shown that members of the ruling class were buried in tombs containing an extraordinary selection of objects, including jewelry, crowns, games, weapons, and eating utensils. Servants were occasionally buried with their masters to serve in the next life. These facts refute the idea that ancient religion was merely a tool for elites to reconcile the common people to their lot by promising them a wonderful existence in the next life. In reality, ancient cultures only attended to the postmortem prospects of their pharaohs and rulers. "the inequalities of life," theologian John Hick writes, "were assumed to continue in the next." **The universality of belief in an afterlife is astonishing, because life after death is not one of those empirically obvious beliefs that one would expect every society from the dawn of [hu]mankind to share. No one is surprised at the universal belief in mountains** or **rainstorms or animals, because such things are undeniably present** to our senses. **But it is an entirely different matter when all cultures in history** right down to the present **jointly proclaim a proposition that seems impossible to confirm through experience. This is a striking convergence of views that demands explanation**. Of course it is easy to downplay the universality of belief in life after death by saying that it merely reflects primitive explanations of nature. But anthropologists insist that it does not make sense to understand the religious beliefs of prehistoric and preliterate societies in this way. Consider the belief of many ancient peoples that the skies are patrolled by a multitude of gods. Today it seems irresistible to view this as a poor attempt to answer the questions, "Why does the sun rise?" or "why does it rain?" But it is not obvious that these questions stimulated the curiosity of ancient man. In fact, it takes a particularly sophisticated type of mind to consider the rising of the sun and the falling of the rain to require some sort of convincing explanation. Only when you presume that nature is rationally intelligible and governed without exception by lawful processes do such questions even make sense. There is no reason to think that any of those cultures made such assumptions. The atheist is anachronistically projecting the modern inquiring mindset onto ancient peoples. I am not saying that ancient peoples were stupid or that they did not seek to explain natural phenomena. They did. But as we find from anthropological literature, they sought explanations at a different level than the ones that satisfy us today. Consider the belief of an African tribal chieftain that the gods must be angry when a famine or illness ravages the community, so that shamans are required to perform rites of propitiation. From the atheist point of view, what could be a more obvious case of bad science! Perhaps we need to bring in biologist Richard Dawkins to explain to the chief that the illness is caused by a particularly venomous type of insect. But the African chief would not likely be impressed. His argument would be something like, "Of course I know that the insects are doing this, but my questions is why this is happening now to my people. Why is my tribe being weakened while other tribes have not been ravaged?" The chief would not be denying a natural explanation; rather, he would be denying that a natural explanation is complete or adequate. The scientist is telling him "how," but what the chief really wants to know is "why." Anthropologist Pascal Boyer writes that "when people find supernatural causes, it is not because they have ignored the work of mechanical and biological causes but because they are asking questions that go beyond these causes." In other words, **the roots of humanity's religious impulse are** not in scientific ignorance but **in** what Rudolf Otto called **the "sense of the numinous." This is a sense that there is something** terrible and **awe-inspiring and sublime about existence that seems to derive from another kind of reality**. Death, in this view, links together two dimensions of life. Ancestors are revered for their wisdom, in part because they are now part of this other dimension and have, as it were, the full perspective on things. So **life after death is part of an** emerging **intuition on the part of human beings that there are two kinds of reality: the world that we live in, and another, more permanent, "world behind the world."** Our world is dependent and somehow less real than that other world, and religious feelings and rituals are a human way of trying to connect with that deeper reality.

[Matt note: gender-modified]

**AND- The best evidence is for the Christian God and worldview—4 reasons**

**1. Science- numerous double-blind studies on prayer prove**

**Hensley, theologian, 3**

(Elizabeth, "The Scientific Study of Prayer Under Controlled Conditions," 2003, www.proofgodexists.org/scientific\_study\_of\_prayer\_under.htm, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

**There have been over a hundred experiments done of the effect of prayer** on various life forms. **Experiments** with people **showed** that **prayer positively affected high blood pressure, wounds, heart attacks, headaches and anxiety**. In many cases we can suspect a psychosomatic reason for these improvements, but not all. **Some of these** experiments **were** done in a **double blind** manner. That means that **neither the doctor nor the subjects knew who was being prayed for,** and who wasn't. **That can rule out the placebo effect**. Subjects didn't get better just because the doctors thought they would and somehow subconsciously communicated that belief to their patients. To quote from Dr. Larry Dossey MD's book: "Healing Words" The subjects in these studies also included water, enzymes, bacteria, fungi, yeast, red blood cells, cancer cells, pacemaker cells, seeds, plants, algae, moth larvae, mice and chicks; and among the processes that had been influenced were the activity of enzymes, the growth rates of leukemic white blood cells, mutation rates of bacteria, germination and growth rates of various seeds, the firing rate of pacemaker cells, healing rate of wounds, the size of goiters and tumors, the time required to awaken from anesthesia, autonomic effects such as electrodermal activity of the skin, rates of hemolysis of red blood cells, and hemoglobin levels. It did not seem to matter whether the praying person was in the presence of the organism being prayed for, or was miles away. Objects locked in lead lined rooms and "cages" designed to block all known forms of electromagnetic energy were still affected. **In one study** by researcher Daniel P. Wirth the effects of prayer on wound healing were studied. This was a double blind study. Forty-four **subjects were deliberately wounded** with full skin thickness surgical wounds. **They were not told they were going to be prayed for.** None of the patients were told they were receiving any kind of a healing treatment at all. They were told to insert the arm with the wound on it through a hole in the wall for five minutes. The reason for this unusual exercise was explained to them to be for the purpose of measuring the "biopotentials" from the surgical site with a "noncontact device." Little did they know that the "noncontact device" was actually a person praying for their wounds. With twenty-two of the subjects she was in the room praying, and with twenty-two of the subjects she was not in the room praying. Several times during the study, doctors double blinded as to which patient was in what group, traced the wounds on transparent acetate sheets. Then **an independent technician, also double blinded, would digitize the tracings** into a computer **for data collection**. By day eight **the wound sizes of the prayed for subjects were significantly smaller than the non-prayed for subjects**. On day sixteen the result was measured again. By then **thirteen of the prayed for wounds were completely healed as opposed to none of the non-prayed for wounds**.

**2. Unique prophetic accuracy**

**Morris, former Virginia tech engineering professor and department chair, 95**

(Henry Morris, former civil engineering professor at Rice, University of Louisiana at Lafayette civil engineering chair, and Southern Illinois University applied science professor, and Martin Clark, pastor, “How do we Know the Bible is True,” 1995, http://www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-t003.html, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

**How do we know the Bible is true?**

There have been hundreds of books written on the subject of the evidences of the divine inspiration of the Bible, and these evidences are many and varied. Most people today, unfortunately, have not read any of these books. In fact, few have even read the Bible itself! Thus, many people tend to go along with the popular delusion that the Bible is full of mistakes and is no longer relevant to our modern world. Nevertheless the Bible writers claimed repeatedly that they were transmitting the very Word of God, infallible and authoritative in the highest degree. This is an amazing thing for any writer to say, and if the forty or so men who wrote the Scriptures were wrong in these claims, then they must have been lying, or insane, or both. But, on the other hand, if the greatest and most influential book of the ages, containing the most beautiful literature and the most perfect moral code ever devised, was written by deceiving fanatics, then what hope is there for ever finding meaning and purpose in this world? If one will seriously investigate these Biblical evidences, he will find that their claims of divine inspiration (stated over 3,000 times, in various ways) were amply justified. Fulfilled Prophecies The **remarkable evidence of fulfilled prophecy is** just **one case in point. Hundreds of Bible prophecies have been fulfilled, specifically and meticulously**, often **long after the prophetic writer had passed away**. For example, Daniel the prophet predicted in about 538 BC (Daniel 9:24-27) that Christ would come as Israel's promised Savior and Prince 483 years after the Persian emperor would give the Jews authority to rebuild Jerusalem, which was then in ruins. This was clearly and definitely fulfilled, hundreds of years later. **There are extensive prophecies dealing with** individual **nations** and **cities and** with the course of **history in general, all of which have been literally fulfilled.** More than 300 prophecies were fulfilled by Christ Himself at His first coming. Other prophecies deal with the spread of Christianity, as well as various false religions, and many other subjects. **There is no other book, ancient or modern, like this. The vague, and** usually **erroneous, prophecies of** people like Jeanne Dixon, **Nostradamus**, Edgar Cayce, **and others** like them **are not in the same category at all, and neither are other religious books such as the Koran, the Confucian Analects, and similar religious writings. Only the Bible manifests this remarkable prophetic evidence, and it does so on such a tremendous scale as to render completely absurd any explanation other than divine revelation.**

**3. Archeological evidence**

**Morris, former Virginia tech engineering professor and department chair, 95** (Henry Morris, former civil engineering professor at Rice, University of Louisiana at Lafayette civil engineering chair, and Southern Illinois University applied science professor, and Martin Clark, pastor, “How do we Know the Bible is True,” 1995, http://www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-t003.html, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

Unique Historical Accuracy **The historical accuracy of the Scriptures is likewise in a class by itself**, far superior to the written records of Egypt, Assyria, and other early nations. **Archeological confirmations of the Biblical record have been almost innumerable** in the last century. **Dr. Nelson Glueck**, probably **the greatest modern authority on Israeli archeology, has said: "No archeological discovery has ever controverted a Biblical reference. Scores of archeological findings have been made which confirm in clear outline or in exact detail historical statements in the Bible**. And, by the same token, proper evaluation of Biblical descriptions has often led to amazing discoveries."

**4. Scientific accuracy of the Bible**

**Morris, former Virginia tech engineering professor and department chair, 95**

(Henry Morris, former civil engineering professor at Rice, University of Louisiana at Lafayette civil engineering chair, and Southern Illinois University applied science professor, and Martin Clark, pastor, “How do we Know the Bible is True,” 1995, http://www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-t003.html, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

Scientific Accuracy **Another striking evidence of divine inspiration is** found in the fact that **many** of the **principles of modern science were recorded as facts of nature in the Bible long before scientist confirmed them experimentally**. A sampling of these would include: **Roundness of the earth** (Isaiah 40:22) **Almost infinite extent of the** sidereal **universe** (Isaiah 55:9) **Law of conservation of mass and energy** (II Peter 3:7) **Hydrologic cycle** (Ecclesiastes 1:7) **Vast number of stars** (Jeremiah 33:22) **Law of increasing entropy** (Psalm 102:25-27) Paramount importance of blood in life processes (Leviticus 17:11) **Atmospheric circulation** (Ecclesiastes 1:6) **Gravitational field** (Job 26:7) **and** many **others**. These are not stated in the technical jargon of modern science, of course, but in terms of the basic world of man's everyday experience; nevertheless, they are completely in accord with the most modern scientific facts. **It is significant** also **that no real mistake has ever been demonstrated in the Bible—in science, in history, or in any other subject**. Many have been claimed, of course, but conservative Bible scholars have always been able to work out reasonable solutions to all such problems. Unique Structure The remarkable structure of the Bible should also be stressed. Although it is a collection of 66 books, written by 40 or more different men over a period of 2,000 years, it is clearly one Book, with perfect unity and consistency throughout. The individual writers, at the time of writing, had no idea that their message was eventually to be incorporated into such a Book, but each nevertheless fits perfectly into place and serves its own unique purpose as a component of the whole. Anyone who diligently studies the Bible will continually find remarkable structural and mathematical patterns woven throughout its fabric, with an intricacy and symmetry incapable of explanation by chance or collusion. The one consistent theme of the Bible, developing in grandeur from Genesis to Revelation, is God's great work in the creation and redemption of all things, through His only Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. Bible's Unique Effect The Bible is unique also in terms of its effect on individual men and on the history of nations. It is the all-time best seller, appealing both to hearts and minds, beloved by at least some in every race or nation or tribe to which it has gone, rich or poor, scholar or simple, king or commoner, men of literally every background and walk of life. No other book has ever held such universal appeal nor produced such lasting effects. One final evidence that the Bible is true is found in the testimony of those who have believed it. Multitudes of people, past and present, have found from personal experience that its promises are true, its counsel is sound, its commands and restrictions are wise, and its wonderful message of salvation meets every need for both time and eternity.

**6. Pascal’s wager- infinite gains means you should believe no matter what the cost**

**Kreeft, Boston College philosophy professor, 2**

(Peter, Ph.D., "The Argument from Pascal's Wager," 2002, www.peterkreeft.com/topics/pascals-wager.htm, accessed 1-14-12, mss)

Suppose someone terribly precious to you lay dying, and the doctor offered to try a new "miracle drug" that he could not guarantee but that seemed to have a 50-50 chance of saving your beloved friend's life. Would it be reasonable to try it, even if it cost a little money? And suppose it were free—wouldn't it be utterly reasonable to try it and unreasonable not to? Suppose you hear reports that your house is on fire and your children are inside. You do not know whether the reports are true or false. What is the reasonable thing to do—to ignore them or to take the time to run home or at least phone home just in case the reports are true? Suppose a winning sweepstakes ticket is worth a million dollars, and there are only two tickets left. You know that one of them is the winning ticket, while the other is worth nothing, and you are allowed to buy only one of the two tickets, at random. Would it be a good investment to spend a dollar on the good chance of winning a million? No reasonable person can be or ever is in doubt in such cases. But deciding whether to believe in God is a case like these, argues Pascal. **It is** therefore **the height of folly not to "bet" on God, even if you have no certainty, no proof, no guarantee that your bet will win.** To understand Pascal's Wager you have to understand the background of the argument. Pascal lived in a time of great scepticism. Medieval philosophy was dead, and medieval theology was being ignored or sneered at by the new intellectuals of the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century. Montaigne, the great sceptical essayist, was the most popular writer of the day. The classic arguments for the existence of God were no longer popularly believed. What could the Christian apologist say to the sceptical mind of this age? Suppose such a typical mind lacked both the gift of faith and the confidence in reason to prove God's existence; could there be a third ladder out of the pit of unbelief into the light of belief? Pascal's Wager claims to be that third ladder. Pascal well knew that it was a low ladder. If you believe in God only as a bet, that is certainly not a deep, mature, or adequate faith. But it is something, it is a start, it is enough to dam the tide of atheism. The Wager appeals not to a high ideal, like faith, hope, love, or proof, but to a low one: the instinct for self-preservation, the desire to be happy and not unhappy. But on that low natural level, it has tremendous force. Thus Pascal prefaces his argument with the words, "Let us now speak according to our natural lights." Imagine you are playing a game for two prizes. You wager blue chips to win blue prizes and red chips to win red prizes. The blue chips are your mind, your reason, and the blue prize is the truth about God's existence. The red chips are your will, your desires, and the red prize is heavenly happiness. Everyone wants both prizes, truth and happiness. Now suppose there is no way of calculating how to play the blue chips. Suppose your reason cannot win you the truth. In that case, you can still calculate how to play the red chips. Believe in God not because your reason can prove with certainty that it is true that God exists but because your will seeks happiness, and God is your only chance of attaining happiness eternally. Pascal says, "Either God is, or he is not. But to which view shall we be inclined? Reason cannot decide this question. [Remember that Pascal's Wager is an argument for sceptics.] Infinite chaos separates us. At the far end of this infinite distance [death] a coin is being spun that will come down heads [God] or tails [no God]. How will you wager?" The most powerful part of Pascal's argument comes next. It is not his refutation of atheism as a foolish wager (that comes last) but his refutation of agnosticism as impossible. Agnosticism, not-knowing, maintaining a sceptical, uncommitted attitude, seems to be the most reasonable option. The agnostic says, "The right thing is not to wager at all." Pascal replies, "But you must wager. There is no choice. You are already committed [embarked]." We are not outside observers of life, but participants. We are like ships that need to get home, sailing past a port that has signs on it proclaiming that it is our true home and our true happiness. The ships are our own lives and the signs on the port say "God". The agnostic says he will neither put in at that port (believe) nor turn away from it (disbelieve) but stay anchored a reasonable distance away until the weather clears and he can see better whether this is the true port or a fake (for there are a lot of fakes around). Why is this attitude unreasonable, even impossible? Because we are moving. The ship of life is moving along the waters of time, and there comes a point of no return, when our fuel runs out, when it is too late. The Wager works because of the fact of death. Suppose Romeo proposes to Juliet and Juliet says, "Give me some time to make up my mind." Suppose Romeo keeps coming back day after day, and Juliet keeps saying the same thing day after day: "Perhaps tomorrow." In the words of a small, female, red-haired American philosopher, "Tomorrow is always a day away. And there comes a time when there are no more tomorrows. Then "maybe" becomes "no". Romeo will die. Corpses do not marry. Christianity is God's marriage proposal to the soul. Saying "maybe" and "perhaps tomorrow" cannot continue indefinitely because life does not continue indefinitely. The weather will never clear enough for the agnostic navigator to be sure whether the port is true home or false just by looking at it through binoculars from a distance. He has to take a chance, on this port or some other, or he will never get home. Once it is decided that we must wager; once it is decided that there are only two options, theism and atheism, not three, theism, atheism, and agnosticism; then the rest of the argument is simple. **Atheism is a terrible bet. It gives you no chance of winning** the red prize. Pascal states the argument this way: You have two things to lose: the true and the good; and two things to stake: your reason and your will, your knowledge and your happiness; and your nature has two things to avoid: error and wretchedness. Since you must necessarily choose, your reason is no more affronted by choosing one rather than the other. That is one point cleared up. But your happiness? Let us weigh up the gain and the loss involved in calling heads that God exists. Let us assess the two cases: **if you win, you win everything: if you lose, you lose nothing.** Do not hesitate then: wager that he does exist. **If God does not exist, it does not matter** how you wager, for there is nothing to win after death and nothing to lose after death. **But if God does exist, your only chance of** winning **eternal happiness is to believe**, and your only chance of losing it is to refuse to believe. As Pascal says, "I should be much more afraid of being mistaken and then finding out that Christianity is true than of being mistaken in believing it to be true." If you believe too much, you neither win nor lose eternal happiness. But if you believe too little, you risk losing everything. **But is it worth the price? What must be given up** to wager that God exists? **Whatever it is, it is only finite, and it is most reasonable to wager something finite on the chance of winning an infinite prize**. Perhaps you must give up autonomy or illicit pleasures, but **you will gain infinite happiness in eternity**, and "I tell you that you will gain even in this life "—purpose, peace, hope, joy, the things that put smiles on the lips of martyrs.

**Outweighs death**

**Habermas and Moreland, PhD philosophy professors, 98**

(Gary R., former William Tyndale College philosophy professor, and Ph.D. in history and the philosophy of religion from Michigan State University, and J.P., Biola University Talbot School of Theology Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Southern California, Beyond Death: Exploring the Evidence for Immortality, 1998, Wipf and Stock Publishers, p. 348-350) RKB

Consider **also the fear of extinction** fostered by visions of funerals, caskets, and bodily decay. This fear **is** directly due to improper thinking patterns we can correct. It is also **misplaced** factually, **because eternal life**, not eternal extinction, **is a reality**. So, **however** unpleasant and **scary these imaginings may be, they will not hinder us from experiencing immediate consciousness after death. We** do, in fact, **survive our** own **funerals and bodily decomposition. A blissful existence awaits believers** (2 Cor. 5:8). In 1 Corinthians 15:53-57, Paul also states that after our bodies are raised, death will finally be conquered. **The grave will have lost its bite** (vv. 53-56); it will maintain no more control over the destinies of human beings. And once again, **the certainty of these events is an empirical, factual one: Because of Jesus' resurrection** from the dead (v. 57; 2 Cor. 4:14), **our** bodily **resurrection and the defeat of death are definite.** Although we will not deny that death embodies the chief unknown ever encountered by human beings, Jesus did experience it, and he conquered it by rising from the dead. And **while Jesus' resurrection does not tell us everything** we may wish to know **about** the nature of **eternal life, it does reveal enough that we need not be so fearful of death.** Because of Jesus' experience, death and its aftermath are no longer a frightening mystery. We really can know their most important aspects and calm our sometimes raging fears. In fact, in this book we have even developed a "Christmas morning" picture of heaven. We do, indeed, have some good ideas of what heaven will be like, and we will also be pleasantly surprised by what we don't know about it or can only speculate about. Therefore, while we perhaps know very little about what follows death, **what we do know is abundantly able to soothe our fears** if we will only allow it. From this we can also find reasons for calming our worries about the threat of nonexistence. We know certain details about heaven, including our immediate existence after death, because of Jesus. And **Scripture confirms** that **we will** still **be alive after our bodies die** (Phil. 1:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:1-8). So this is yet another place where practicing proper thinking is imperative. **Nonexistence is simply an unbiblical and untrue prospect, so why concentrate on it?** Some philosophical considerations are worthwhile here. While our greatest fear may be experiencing nonexistence, a moment's reflection shows that this could never be the case. No one could ever experience and then report back to us a state that denies our sense experience by its very nature. Therefore, we will never experience nonexistence. What we may fear the most could never happen, for this is a contradictory notion. Further, even in a worst-case scenario involving the nonexistence of the next life, we could never know this to be the case experientially. It would seem that those struggling with this fear should meditate on these truths. For similar reasons, we can rest assured that we will not be alone after death. We experience fellowship, and that even more fully, after our passing to the next world (Matt. 8:11; 2 Cor. 5:8). Jesus exemplified this fellowship during his post-resurrection appearances to his disciples. So there is no factual basis for the belief that the afterlife is a separate, lonely existence. The facts argue otherwise. **The sooner we align our thinking with these facts, the sooner we will experience our own personal victory over the fear of death.** Standing before Christ's judgment seat (see 2 Cor. 5:10) is another worry for some Christians, but it doesn't need to be. Believers will be present with the Lord after death (v. 8; cf. Phil. 1:21-23), not rejected by him. Because of Christ's actions on our behalf, accomplished through his death and resurrection (Eph. 2:4-7), Christians will not be condemned (John 3:16-18, 36; 5:24-29). Anxieties to the contrary dominate us because we do not think biblically about them. Only unbelievers need to fear condemnation. So the answer to any worries we have about death is to trust the Lord in light of the known facts of the Gospel (2 Cor. 6:2). The certainty of our future should not give us an excuse to be proud or calloused (1 Cor. 10:12), but it should help us realize deep within our being that our eternal destiny is not at stake. **Now none of this means that death is our friend.** Death is an enemy, a consequence of our wrongdoing, a bitter pill that goes down hard. Thinking about it often hurts. And suffering through it as it claims loved ones (or even just contemplating this event) tears at our hearts and minds**. As painful as** all **this is, though,** we can find hope and solace in the fact that **death is not the end.** It does not have the final say. For Christians, **ultimate victory lies on the other side of death. And there we will find the best in (eternal) life.** **God through Christ** has **turned death into the door that opens to the fullest possible joy—heavenly bliss** (Ps. 16:11). As believers, **we can stare death in the face and see it as an evil from which God brings good.** For us it can even be a blessing to die so we can be at home with Christ (Phil. 1:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:8).'\* **The more we can bring our thoughts in line with these truths, the greater will be our opportunity to conquer even the most painful side effects of the fear of death**. Of course, **we are not suggesting** that **we can (or should** even try to) **progress to the place where** even the thought of our own **death** or that of a loved one **does not bother us. But this is not a defeat**. The temporal separation and pain we experience even affected Jesus after the death of his friend Lazarus. Jesus stood in front of Lazarus' tomb and wept (John 11:35). And Jesus even knew that he would raise Lazarus from the dead! Feelings of loss and sadness are appropriate. But we don't have to fear death and what lies beyond it. Like all human beings, Christians struggle with their emotions, but they do not have to be overcome by them. Believers can still achieve victory over the most painful results of mankind's greatest fears. That's the testimony of Scripture. And it's the witness and example of Jesus, who even though he wept over death, came to free us from the bondage-creating elements of this king of anxiety. Here we will outline three steps to handling our fears of death: Internalizing the truth that eternal life is an actual reality, shifting our pattern of thinking to God's top-down heavenly perspective, and replacing our anxious thoughts of death with these biblical truths. In other words, **we need to be sure of the reality of eternal life, apply this truth to everyday life, and then allow these new attitudes to transform our fearful thoughts about death.** Now we want to walk back through these steps, showing you even more specifically how you can rely on them to help you overcome your fears. Throughout this book we have provided numerous evidences and arguments that eternal life is real. Just one of these evidences, Jesus' resurrection from the dead, provides a strong twofold argument for the believer's eternal life. First, the very nature of his resurrection indicates victory over death. When the disciples saw the risen Jesus, they beheld walking, talking eternal life. Second, Jesus' central message was the kingdom of God and the necessary requirements for entrance into eternal life. So if any of Jesus' messages were vindicated by the Resurrection, his teachings about the afterlife were, since they were his chief focus. Since eternal life is a fact, to reject it involves accepting a falsehood, and to believe it as true lays the foundation we need to shoulder sickness, disappointment, and fear. Since we Christians will live after the death (or even the final corruption) of our earthly bodies, we have no ultimate reason to fear its power. The glories of heaven can even make the prospect of our future abode an enjoyable longing (Phil. 1:20-24; 2 Cor. 5:8). **At the very least, while still viewing death as an enemy and a necessary evil, we do not have to be overcome with worry over its reality.**

**The alternative: reject the aff in favor of a collective effort towards a spiritual investigation**

**Our impacts outweigh suffering, war and death- the relation to God is the ONLY worthwhile source of value- AND this means you err neg on the question of whether God exists**

**Craig, Talbot School of Theology philosophy research professor, 4**

(Dr. William Lane, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Birmingham (England), Th.D. under from the University of Munich, "Does God Exist?" 2004, delveintojesus.com/Articles/64/Does-God-Exist.aspx, accessed 11-20-11, mss)

C. S. Lewis once remarked that God is not the sort of thing one can be moderately interested in. After all, if God does not exist, there's no reason to be interested in God at all. On the other hand, **if God does exist, then this is of paramount interest, and our ultimate concern ought to be how to be properly related to this being upon whom we depend moment by moment for our very existence**. So people who shrug their shoulders and say, "What difference does it make if God exists?" merely show that they haven't yet thought very deeply about this problem. Even atheist philosophers like Sartre and Camus who have thought very seriously about this problem admit that the existence of God makes a tremendous difference for man. Let me mention just three reasons why it makes a big difference whether God exists. 1. **If God does not exist, life is** ultimately **meaningless**. If your life is doomed to end in death, then ultimately it does not matter how you live. In the end it makes no ultimate difference whether you existed or not. Sure, **your life might have** a **relative significance** in that you influenced others or affected the course of history. **But ultimately [hu]mankind is doomed to perish in the heat death of the universe.** Ultimately **it makes no difference** who you are or **what you do**. Your life is inconsequential. **Thus**, **the contributions of the scientist** to the advance of human knowledge, **the research** of the doctor **to alleviate pain and suffering**, **the efforts of the diplomat to secure peace** in the world, **the sacrifices of good people** everywhere to better the lot of the human race **ultimately all these come to nothing**. Thus, if atheism is true, life is ultimately meaningless. 2. If God does not exist, then we must ultimately live without hope. If there is no God, then there is ultimately no hope for deliverance from the shortcomings of our finite existence. For example, there is no hope for deliverance from evil. Although many people ask how God could create a world involving so much evil, by far most of the suffering in the world is due to man's own inhumanity to man. The horror of two world wars during the last century effectively destroyed the 19th century's naive optimism about human progress. If God does not exist, then we are locked without hope in a world filled with gratuitous and unredeemed suffering, and there is no hope for deliverance from evil. Or again, if there is no God, there is no hope of deliverance from aging, disease, and death. Although it may be hard for you as university students to contemplate, the sober fact is that unless you die young, someday you you yourselfwill be an old man or an old woman, fighting a losing battle with aging, struggling against the inevitable advance of deterioration, disease, perhaps senility. And finally and inevitably you will die. There is no afterlife beyond the grave. Atheism is thus a philosophy without hope. 3. On the other hand, **if God does exist, then not only is there meaning and hope, but there is** also **the possibility of coming to know God** and His love personally. Think of it! **That the infinite God should love you** and want to be your personal friend! **This would be the highest status a human being could enjoy!** Clearly, if God exists, it makes not only a tremendous difference for mankind in general, but it could make a life-changing difference for you as well. Now admittedly none of this shows that God exists. But does show that it makes a tremendous difference whether God exists. **Therefore, even if the evidence for and against the existence of God were absolutely equal, the rational thing to do,** I think, **is to believe** in Him. That is to say, **it seems** to me **positively irrational when the evidence is equal to prefer death, futility, and despair over hope, meaningfulness and happiness.**

### The off

#### Obama is shifting from drones to detention

Dillow 13

(Clay, “Obama Set To Reboot Drone Strike Policy And Retool The War On Terror “, 5/23/13, <http://www.popsci.com/technology/article/2013-05/obama-set-reboot-drone-strike-policy-and-retool-war-terror>)

These three topics are deeply intertwined, of course. With the drawdown of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and a reduced American presence in the regions regarded as power bases for the likes of al-Qaeda, al-Shabab, and the Taliban, American security and intelligence forces have only two real options. Strike at suspected terrorists with drones, or somehow capture those suspects and detain them (at some place like Guantanamo). It would seem that if the war on terror is going to continue (and it is--for another 10 or 20 years according to one recently-quoted Pentagon official) then it seems that either detention or the use of lethal strikes must increase. But that’s not really the case, and in today’s speech Obama is expected to outline why the administration thinks so. In his first major counterterrorism address of his second term, the President is expected to announce new restrictions on the unmanned aerial strikes that have been the cornerstone of his national security agenda for the last five years. For all the talk about drone strikes--and they did peak under Obama--such actions have been declining since 2010. And it seems the administration finally wants to come clean (somewhat) about what it has been doing with its drone program, acknowledging for the first time that it has killed four American citizens in its shadow drone wars outside the conflict zones of Afghanistan and Iraq, something the public has known for a while now but the government has refused to publicly admit. The Obama administration will also voluntarily rein in its drone strike program in several ways. A new classified policy signed by Obama will more sharply define how drones can be used, the New York Times reports, essentially extending to foreign nationals the same standards currently applied to American citizens abroad. That is, lethal force will only be used against targets posing a “continuing, imminent threat to Americans” and who cannot be feasibly captured or thwarted in any other way. This indicates that the administration’s controversial use of “signature strikes”--the killing of unknown individuals or groups based on patterns of behavior rather than hard intelligence--will no longer be part of the game plan. That’s a positive signal, considering that signature strikes are thought to have resulted in more than a few civilian casualties. Reportedly there’s another important change in drone policy in the offing that President Obama may or may not mention in today’s speech: the shifting of the drone wars in Pakistan and elsewhere (likely Yemen and Somalia as well) from the CIA to the military over the course of six months. This is good for all parties involved. The CIA’s new director, John Brennan, has publicly said he would like to transition the country’s premier intelligence gathering agency back to actual intelligence gathering and away from paramilitary operations--a role that it has played since 2001 but that isn’t exactly in its charter. Putting the drone strike program in the Pentagon also places it in a different category of public scrutiny. The DoD can still do things under the veil of secrecy of course, but not quite like the CIA can (the military is subject to more oversight and transparency than the clandestine services in several respects, and putting drones in the hands of the military also changes the governing rules of engagement). So what does this all mean for the war on terror? If Obama plans to create a roadmap for closing Guantanamo Bay and draw down its drone strike program, it suggests that the administration thinks we are winning--as much as one can win this kind of asymmetric war. It appears the war on terror is shifting toward one in which better intelligence will lead to more arrests and espionage operations to thwart terrorists rather hellfire missile strikes from unseen robots in the sky.

#### Restricted detention leads to increased drone use

Chesney 11

(Robert, Charles I. Francis Professor in Law, University of Texas School of Law, “ARTICLE: WHO MAY BE HELD? MILITARY DETENTION THROUGH THE HABEAS LENS”, Boston College Law Review, 52 B.C. L. Rev 769, Lexis)

The convergence thesis describes one manner in which law might respond to the cross-cutting pressures associated with the asymmetric warfare phenomenon—i.e., the pressure to reduce false positives (targeting, capture, or detention of the wrong individual) while also ensuring an adequate capacity to neutralize the non-state actors in question. One must bear in mind, however, that detention itself is not the only system of government action that can satisfy that latter interest. Other options exist, including the use of lethal force; the use of rendition to place individuals in detention at the hands of some other state; the use of persuasion to induce some other state to take custody of an individual through its own means; and perhaps also the use of various forms of surveillance to establish a sort of constructive, loose control over a person (though for persons located outside the United States it is unlikely that surveillance could be much more than episodic, and thus any resulting element of “control” may be quite weak).210¶ From the point of view of the individual involved, all but the last of these options are likely to be far worse experiences than U.S.-administered detention. In addition, all but the last are also likely to be far less useful for purposes of intelligence-gathering from the point of view of the U.S. government.211 Nonetheless, these alternatives may grow attractive to the government in circumstances where the detention alternative becomes unduly restricted, yet the pressure for intervention remains. The situation is rather like squeezing a balloon: the result is not to shrink the balloon, but instead to displace the pressure from one side to another, causing the balloon to distend along the unconstrained side. So too here: when one of these coercive powers becomes constrained in new, more restrictive ways, the displaced pressure to incapacitate may simply find expression through one of the alternative mechanisms. On this view it is no surprise that lethal drone strikes have increased dramatically over the past two years, that the Obama administration has refused to foreswear rendition, that in Iraq we have largely (though not entirely) outsourced our detention operations to the Iraqis, and that we now are progressing along the same path in Afghanistan.212¶ Decisions regarding the calibration of a detention system—the¶ management of the convergence process, if you will—thus take place in the shadow of this balloon-squeezing phenomenon. A thorough policy review would take this into account, as should any formal lawmaking process. For the moment, however, our formal law-making process is not directed at the detention-scope question. Instead, clarification and development with respect to the substantive grounds for detention takes place through the lens of habeas corpus litigation.

#### Increased drone use sets a precedent that causes South China Sea conflict

Roberts 13 (Kristen, News Editor at National Journal, “When the Whole World Has Drones”, 3/22/13, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/when-the-whole-world-has-drones-20130321>)

And that’s a NATO ally seeking the capability to conduct missions that would run afoul of U.S. interests in Iraq and the broader Middle East. Already, Beijing says it considered a strike in Myanmar to kill a drug lord wanted in the deaths of Chinese sailors. What happens if China arms one of its remote-piloted planes and strikes Philippine or Indian trawlers in the South China Sea? Or if India uses the aircraft to strike Lashkar-e-Taiba militants near Kashmir? “We don’t like other states using lethal force outside their borders. It’s destabilizing. It can lead to a sort of wider escalation of violence between two states,” said Micah Zenko, a security policy and drone expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “So the proliferation of drones is not just about the protection of the United States. It’s primarily about the likelihood that other states will increasingly use lethal force outside of their borders.” LOWERING THE BAR Governments have covertly killed for ages, whether they maintained an official hit list or not. Before the Obama administration’s “disposition matrix,” Israel was among the best-known examples of a state that engaged, and continues to engage, in strikes to eliminate people identified by its intelligence as plotting attacks against it. But Israel certainly is not alone. Turkey has killed Kurds in Northern Iraq. Some American security experts point to Russia as well, although Moscow disputes this. In the 1960s, the U.S. government was involved to differing levels in plots to assassinate leaders in Congo and the Dominican Republic, and, famously, Fidel Castro in Cuba. The Church Committee’s investigation and subsequent 1975 report on those and other suspected plots led to the standing U.S. ban on assassination. So, from 1976 until the start of President George W. Bush’s “war on terror,” the United States did not conduct targeted killings, because it was considered anathema to American foreign policy. (In fact, until as late as 2001, Washington’s stated policy was to oppose Israel’s targeted killings.) When America adopted targeted killing again—first under the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks and then expanded by President Obama—the tools of the trade had changed. No longer was the CIA sending poison, pistols, and toxic cigars to assets overseas to kill enemy leaders. Now it could target people throughout al-Qaida’s hierarchy with accuracy, deliver lethal ordnance literally around the world, and watch the mission’s completion in real time. The United States is smartly using technology to improve combat efficacy, and to make war-fighting more efficient, both in money and manpower. It has been able to conduct more than 400 lethal strikes, killing more than 3,500 people, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and North Africa using drones; reducing risk to U.S. personnel; and giving the Pentagon flexibility to use special-forces units elsewhere. And, no matter what human-rights groups say, it’s clear that drone use has reduced the number of civilians killed in combat relative to earlier conflicts. Washington would be foolish not to exploit unmanned aircraft in its long fight against terrorism. In fact, defense hawks and spendthrifts alike would criticize it if it did not. “If you believe that these folks are legitimate terrorists who are committing acts of aggressive, potential violent acts against the United States or our allies or our citizens overseas, should it matter how we choose to engage in the self-defense of the United States?” asked Rep. Mike Rogers, R-Mich., chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. “Do we have that debate when a special-forces team goes in? Do we have that debate if a tank round does it? Do we have the debate if an aircraft pilot drops a particular bomb?” But defense analysts argue—and military officials concede—there is a qualitative difference between dropping a team of men into Yemen and green-lighting a Predator flight from Nevada. Drones lower the threshold for military action. That’s why, according to the Council on Foreign Relations, unmanned aircraft have conducted 95 percent of all U.S. targeted killings. Almost certainly, if drones were unavailable, the United States would not have pursued an equivalent number of manned strikes in Pakistan. And what’s true for the United States will be true as well for other countries that own and arm remote piloted aircraft. “The drones—the responsiveness, the persistence, and without putting your personnel at risk—is what makes it a different technology,” Zenko said. “When other states have this technology, if they follow U.S. practice, it will lower the threshold for their uses of lethal force outside their borders. So they will be more likely to conduct targeted killings than they have in the past.” The Obama administration appears to be aware of and concerned about setting precedents through its targeted-strike program. When the development of a disposition matrix to catalog both targets and resources marshaled against the United States was first reported in 2012, officials spoke about it in part as an effort to create a standardized process that would live beyond the current administration, underscoring the long duration of the counterterrorism challenge. Indeed, the president’s legal and security advisers have put considerable effort into establishing rules to govern the program. Most members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees say they are confident the defense and intelligence communities have set an adequate evidentiary bar for determining when a member of al-Qaida or an affiliated group may be added to the target list, for example, and say that the rigor of the process gives them comfort in the level of program oversight within the executive branch. “They’re not drawing names out of a hat here,” Rogers said. “It is very specific intel-gathering and other things that would lead somebody to be subject for an engagement by the United States government.”

#### Extinction

Wittner 11 (Lawrence S., Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research., 11/28/2011, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

## 2NC

### FW: A2 “Perm”

#### 2. Perm is impossible—their model transforms debate into discussion

**Speice 03** (Speice, Patrick, Wake Forest ,and Lyle, Jim, debate coach at Clarion, 2003, “Traditional Policy Debate: Now More Than Ever”, Debaters Research Guide, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/SpeiceLyle2003htm.htm) FS

The structure of intercollegiate and high school debate builds on to this competitive framework. Judges not only answer a yes/no question regarding the resolution/plan, their decision generates a winner and a loser for the event. Judges assign winners, determine who does the better debating, and give speaker points and ranks to determine which teams are excelling more than others in advancing particular claims that provide an answer to the question asked by the resolution. And, the competitiveness of the activity extends across rounds as tournaments promote the better teams to elimination rounds and crown a champion. Participants at tournaments such as the Tournament of Champions and the National Debate Tournament are determined by evaluating competitive success across the entirety of the debate season. Debate, neither in an ultra-generic form nor the specific form that we participate in can be classified merely as discussion or dialogue. If it were decided that the promotion of education is of greater importance than preserving debate as a game, then the activity would begin to fall apart. Imagine that if instead of having two teams argue over competing viewpoints about a particular resolution/plan that debate instead asked debaters to simply inform the other participants of a different viewpoint regarding the plan. What would the activity look like then? Instead of hearing why the plan was good and bad, or why one policy alternative was better than another, we instead would hear why the plan is good, and why the plan reminded us of a story about one’s childhood. How would the judge evaluate such claims? If the desirability of the plan loses its importance and debate ceases to answer a yes/no question, what criteria should be used to resolve the “debate” (Smith, 2002)? While promoting intellectual development and enterprise are important components of the activity, the promotion of these values at the expense of the value of clash can only lead to the transformation of debate into discussion. In fact, it is not only that such a development spurs the loss of competitiveness, such a turn for the activity risks the loss of debate itself. Teams can begin to argue however they wish, and the “2 + 2 = 4” strategy becomes viable. What comes to matter then is word choice or performance. The result is a loss of depth of the education provided by the activity. Learning loses direction and begins to wander into the realm of acquiring random trivia. The entire purpose of having a policy resolution is rendered moot. Certainly one of the things most debaters enjoy about debate is that it really has no rules, however, if we decide to completely throw away “rules,” even as guiding principles, then the activity becomes something other than debate as an activity premised on fairness and competitive equity. Does any of this mean that there is no room for experimentation in the activity? Does any of this mean that there is no room for critical argumentation in debate, in policy debate? The answer to both questions is “No.” What this does suggest, however, is that before we adopt, and use, these newer debate practices we need to consider how these tools fit into the overall scheme of the activity and its goals.

### FW: Limits—Creativity 2NC

#### Constraints comparatively inspire greater creativity—rules create specific challenges that must be overcome, improving the overall feat

**Mayer 6** – Marissa Ann Mayer, vice-president for search products and user experience at Google, February 13, 2006, “Creativity Loves Constraints,” http://www.businessweek.com/print/magazine/content/06\_07/b3971144.htm?chan=gl

When people think about creativity, they think about artistic work -- unbridled, unguided effortthat leads to beautiful effect. But if you look deeper, you'll find that some of the most inspiring art forms, such as haikus, sonatas, and religious paintings, are fraught with constraints. They are beautiful because creativity triumphed over the "rules." Constraints shape and focus problems and provide clear challenges to overcome. Creativity thrives best when constrained. But constraints must be balanced with a healthy disregard for the impossible. Too many curbs can lead to pessimism and despair. Disregarding the bounds of what we know or accept gives rise to ideas that are non-obvious, unconventional, or unexplored. The creativity realized in this balance between constraint and disregard for the impossible is fueled by passion and leads to revolutionary change. A few years ago, I met Paul Beckett, a talented designer who makes sculptural clocks. When I asked him why not do just sculptures, Paul said he liked the challenge of making something artistically beautiful that also had to perform as a clock. Framing the task in that way freed his creative force. Paul reflected that he also found it easier to paint on a canvas that had a mark on it rather than starting with one that was entirely clean and white. This resonated with me. It is often easier to direct your energy when you start with constrained challenges (a sculpture that must be a clock) or constrained possibilities (a canvas that is marked).

#### Restrictions are enabling, not inhibiting—they create the possibility for interactions that cannot be completely predicted in advance

**Armstrong 2K** (Paul B., Dean and Professor of Literature at Brown University, New Literary History, 31: 211–223, “The Politics of Play: The Social Implications of Iser’s Aesthetic Theory”)

The contradictory combination of restriction and openness in how play deploys power is evident in Iser’s analysis of “regulatory” and “aleatory” rules. Even the regulatory rules, which set down the conditions participants submit to in order to play a game, “permit a certain range of combinations while also establishing a code of possible play. . . . **Since** these **rules limit the text game without producing it, they are regulatory but not prescriptive. They do no more than set the aleatory in motion,** and the aleatory rule differs from the regulatory in that it has no code of its own” (FI 273). **Submitting to the discipline of regulatory restrictions is both constraining and enabling because it makes possible certain kinds of interaction that the rules cannot completely predict or prescribe in advance**. Hence the existence of aleatory rules that are not codiﬁed as part of the game itself but are the variable customs, procedures, and practices for playing it. Expert facility with aleatory rules marks the difference, for example, between someone who just knows the rules of a game and another who really knows how to play it. Aleatory rules are more ﬂexible and open- ended and more susceptible to variation than regulatory rules, but **they** too **are characterized by a contradictory combination of constraint and possibility, limitation and unpredictability,** discipline and spontaneity. **As a rule-governed but open-ended activity, play provides a model for deploying power in a nonrepressive manner that makes creativity and innovation possible not in spite of disciplinary constraints but because of them**. Not all power is playful, of course, and some restrictions are more coercive than enabling. **But thinking about the power of constraints on the model of rules governing play helps to explain the paradox that restrictions can be productive rather than merely repressive.** Seeing constraints as structures for establishing a play-space and as guides for practices of exchange within it envisions power not necessarily and always as a force to be resisted in the interests of freedom; **it allows** imagining the **potential for power to become a constructive social energy that can animate games of to-and-fro exchange between participants whose possibilities for self-discovery and self-expansion are enhanced by** the **limits shaping their interactions.**

### FW: Limits—Decision-Making 2NC

#### Effective deliberation is the lynchpin of solving all existential global problems

**Lundberg 10** - Christian O. Lundberg 10 Professor of Communications @ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p311

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech—as indicated earlier, debate builds capacity for critical thinking, analysis of public claims, informed decision making, and better public judgment. If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems place such a high premium on education (Dewey 1988,63, 154). Debate provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them. The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources: To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144) Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials. There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement and new articulations of democratic life. Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including: domestic and international issues of class, gender, and racial justice; wholesale environmental destruction and the potential for rapid climate change; emerging threats to international stability in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing challenges of rapid globalization including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill and sensitivity provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the existential challenges to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

#### It’s the only portable skill

**Steinberg & Freeley 8** \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp9-10

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition. Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions. Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations. We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car.what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration? Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game?And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs.online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs? The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates. Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized. Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others. Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

### FW: SSD Good—Activism 2NC

Empirically proven—the **best** advocates learned to debate **both sides first**

**Dybvig and Iverson 2K** (Kristin and Joel, Arizona State U., “Can Cutting Cards Carve into Our Personal Lives: An Analysis of Debate Research on Personal Advocacy”, http://debate.uvm.edu/dybvigiverson1000.html)

**Not all debate research appears to generate personal advocacy** and challenge peoples' assumptions. **Debaters must switch sides**, so they must inevitably debate against various cases. **While this may seem to be inconsistent with advocacy, supporting and researching both sides** of an argument **actually created stronger advocates. Not only did debaters learn both sides** of an argument, **so that they could defend their positions** against attack, **they also learned** the **nuances** of each position. **Learning** and the intricate nature of various policy proposals **helps debaters** to **strengthen their own stance** on issues.

### FW: SSD Good—Tolerance 2NC

#### Tolerance solves oppression and violence

**Atif 10** (Laiq Ahmed, president of Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamaat Malta, 12/26/10, “Importance of tolerance” Times of Malta) http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20101226/opinion/importance-of-tolerance.342594

**In an age where the** electronic **media has drawn us** closer **together into** what is called a global village, or **a global society, its benefits will only be felt when mutual goodness prevails**, when mutual respect and understanding prevail. **If, instead of good feelings, hatred emerges**, if restlessness usurps heartfelt peace, then we must accept that **this is not progress**, but is something that will take us towards unexpected results. In this globalisation, where people of different backgrounds, cultures and religions are living together, and where the world has become multicultural and full of diversity, **establishing tolerance and harmony has become** very **crucial** and important, **and fostering mutual love** and affection **has become vital. Without tolerance and harmony** the lasting **peace of societies cannot be maintained**, and loyalty for each other cannot be established. Loyalty is borne from feelings of love and affection. At a personal level the feelings of love strengthens the feelings of loyalty. When a citizen loves his country, he exhibits loyalty and devotion and makes sacrifices for the sake of the nation. If sentiments of love do not exist, then the spirit of sacrifice cannot be formed. Unless a person loves another he can never have good feelings in his heart towards him, and he cannot faithfully fulfil the rights due to that person. **Lack of tolerance leads to fighting, violence, and** finally it **destroys the peace and security of society. When people fail in their arguments they become intolerant, and then they use force and aggression to support their point of view.**

### FW: Topic Good—Policy 2NC

### FW: Topic Good—War Powers 2NC

A limited topic over war powers authority is key to solving the harms of the 1AC – it allows for an engaged public that can expose the hypocrisy of the federal government – only focus on specific policy questions can actualize change by making it relevant to policy-makers – the aff is more likely to cause disengagement and moral quietude than actual change

**Mellor 13**

The Australian National University, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, Department Of International Relations,   
“Why policy relevance is a moral necessity: Just war theory, impact, and UAVs,” European University Institute, Paper Prepared for BISA Conference 2013, DOA: 8-14-13

**This** section of the paper **considers** more generally **the need for** just war **theorists to engage with policy debate** **about the use of force**, **as** **well as to engage with the** more **fundamental moral and philosophical principles** of the just war tradition. **It draws on** John **Kelsay’s** **conception of just war thinking as being a social practice**,35 **as well as on** Michael **Walzer’s understanding of the role of the social critic in society**.36 It argues that the just war tradition is a form of “practical discourse” which is concerned with questions of “how we should act.”37 Kelsay argues that: **[T]he criteria of jus ad bellum and jus in bello provide a framework for structured participation in a public conversation about the use of military force** . . . **citizens who choose to speak in just war terms express commitments** . . . [i**]n the process of giving and asking for** **reasons for going to war**, **those who argue** in just war terms **seek to influence policy** **by persuading others that their analysis provides a way to express and fulfil the desire that military actions be** both **wise and just.38** He also argues that “**good just war thinking involves continuous and complete deliberation**, in the sense that one attends to all the standard criteria at war’s inception, at its end, and **throughout the course of the conflict**.”39 **This** is important as it **highlights the need for** just war **scholars to engage** **with the ongoing operations in war and the specific policies that are involved**. **The question of** **whether a particular** war is just or unjust, and the question of whether a particular **weapon (like drones**) **can be used in accordance with the jus in bello criteria**, only **cover a part of the overall justice of the war**. **Without an engagement with the reality of war**, **in** **terms of the policies used** in waging it, **it is impossible to engage with the “moral reality of war,”40 in terms of being able to discuss it and judge it in moral terms** Kelsay’s description of just war thinking as a social practice is similar to Walzer’s more general description of social criticism. The just war theorist, **as a social critic, must be involved with his or her own society and its practices**. In the same way that the social critic’s distance from his or her society is measured in inches and not miles,41 the just war **theorist must be close to and must understand the language through which war is constituted, interpreted and reinterpreted**.**42 It is only by understanding the values and language that their own society purports to live by that the social critic can hold up a mirror to that society to** **demonstrate** its **hypocrisy** **and to show the gap that exists** between its practice and its values.43 **The tradition** itself **provides a set of** **values and principles and**, as argued by Cian O’Driscoll, **constitutes a “language of engagement**” **to spur participation in public and political debate**.44 This language is part of “our common heritage, the product of many centuries of arguing about war.”45 **These principles and this language provide the terms through which people understand and come to interpret war, not in a deterministic way but by providing the categories necessary for moral understanding and moral argument about the legitimate and illegitimate uses of force**.46 **By spurring and providing the basis for political engagement the just war tradition ensures that the acts that occur within war are considered according to just war criteria and allows policy-makers to be held to account on this basis. Engaging with the reality of war requires** recognising that war is, as Clausewitz stated, **a continuation of policy**. **War**, according to Clausewitz, **is subordinate to politics and to political choices and these political choices can, and must, be judged and critiqued**.47 **Engagement and political debate are morally necessary** **as the alternative is disengagement and moral quietude**, **which is a sacrifice of the obligations of citizenship**.48 **This engagement must bring** just war **theorists into contact with the policy makers** **and** **will require work that is** accessible and **relevant to policy makers**, **however this does not mean a sacrifice of critical distance or an abdication of truth in the face of power.** **By engaging in detail** **with the policies being pursued** and their concordance or otherwise with **the principles of the just war tradition the policy-makers will be forced to account for their decisions and justify them in just war language.** **In contrast to the view**, **suggested** by Kenneth **Anderson, that “the public cannot be made part of the debate**” **and that “[w]e are** necessarily **committed into the hands of our political leadership**”,49 it is incumbent upon just war theorists to ensure that the public are informed and are capable of holding their political leaders to account. **To accept the idea that the political leadership are stewards and that accountability will not benefit the public, on whose behalf action is undertaken, but will only benefit al Qaeda,50 is a grotesque act of intellectual irresponsibility**. As Walzer has argued, it is precisely because it is “our country” that we are “especially obligated to criticise its policies.”51 This paper has discussed the empirics of the policies of drone strikes in the ongoing conflict with those associate with al Qaeda. It has demonstrated that there are significant moral questions raised by the just war tradition regarding some aspects of these policies and it has argued that, thus far, just **war scholars have not paid sufficient attention or engaged in sufficient detail with the policy implications of drone use.** **As such it has been argued that it is necessary for just war theorists to engage more directly with these issues and to ensure that their work is policy relevant**, **not in a utilitarian sense of abdicating from speaking the truth in the face of power**, **but by forcing policy makers to justify** their **actions according to the principles of the just war tradition, principles which they invoke themselves in formulating policy.** **By highlighting hypocrisy and providing the tools and language** **for the interpretation of action**, **the just war tradition provides the basis for the public engagement and political activism that are necessary for democratic politics.52**

### Crisis Good – 2NC

**AND- Suffering is key to find eternal salvation**

**Ortberg, pastor, 11**

(John, Menlo Park Presbyterian Church pastor and editor-at-large of Leadership, "Don't Waste A Crisis," Christianity Today Library, 1-31-11, www.ctlibrary.com/le/2011/winter/dontwastecrisis.html, accessed 12-21-11, mss)

It's as if in normal life **we step onto a treadmill and begin running after something—money, security, or success—when adversity knocks us off. Suffering enables us to see the folly of chasing after temporal gods, and when people suffer, they often resolve to not return to their old way of life when things normalize**. But you have a finite window of time to make changes, otherwise you drift back to old patterns. Soren Kierkegaard wrote that "**affliction is able to drown out every earthly voice … but the voice of eternity deep in the soul it cannot drown."**

**AND- Crisis fills up the church pews-**

**A. Economic downturn proves**

**DiMartino, staff writer, 9**

(Mediha, "As times worsen, many turn to religion for help, comfort," 3-14-11, Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, l/n, accessed 12-21-11, mss)

**As times worsen, many turn to religion for help, comfort**

Next month Christine Alfonso will be out of a job. The RV supplier she has been working for past 17 years is closing its doors. But Alfonso is turning her worries over to God. "Because of my faith and the church I belong to, I am not stressed," she said. **While the retail stores wait for customers, church pews are filling with people looking for solace during the economic downturn. "In times of affluence and prosperity there is a tendency to be forgetful of the divine," said** Hamid **Mavani, an assistant professor of religion** at the Claremont Graduate University. But **when a crisis hits, it is natural for people to drift toward institutionalized religion or spirituality, he said. People are hoping to find comfort and a source of optimism**. "They have lost their investments, their hard-earned money and feel like they have been cheated," Mavani said. "But they have faith that somehow whatever transpires is part of the divine grace."

**Suffering leads to church growth- tsunami proves**

**Tryggestad, Christian Chronicle, 5**

(Erik, "Persecution, church growth seen in tsunami countries," Christian Chronicle, June 05, www.christianchronicle.org/article2042536~Persecution,\_church\_growth\_seen\_in\_tsunami\_countries, accessed 1-18-12, mss)

**They came for the Gospel, not the clothes**, said Jacob Chukka. In early June the minister in the southern Indian city of Bangalore said that, for the second time since the Dec. 26 tsunami, he had traveled to Andaman and Nicobar, island chains south of Myanmar. **The islands**, politically part of India, **were heavily damaged by the tsunami. More than 600 people “rushed to hear the Gospel,”** Chukka said, **even though “we never published that we were giving tsunami relief ... (only) about Bible classes**.” Chukka and fellow church members distributed saris, towels blankets and money to Christians, Muslims and Hindus on the islands, the minister said. The Saturn Road church, Garland, Texas, and the Patton Lane church, Tyler, Texas, support the work.

### Impact Calc

**Outweighs death**

**Habermas and Moreland, PhD philosophy professors, 98**

(Gary R., former William Tyndale College philosophy professor, and Ph.D. in history and the philosophy of religion from Michigan State University, and J.P., Biola University Talbot School of Theology Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Southern California, Beyond Death: Exploring the Evidence for Immortality, 1998, Wipf and Stock Publishers, p. 348-350) RKB

Consider **also the fear of extinction** fostered by visions of funerals, caskets, and bodily decay. This fear **is** directly due to improper thinking patterns we can correct. It is also **misplaced** factually, **because eternal life**, not eternal extinction, **is a reality**. So, **however** unpleasant and **scary these imaginings may be, they will not hinder us from experiencing immediate consciousness after death. We** do, in fact, **survive our** own **funerals and bodily decomposition. A blissful existence awaits believers** (2 Cor. 5:8). In 1 Corinthians 15:53-57, Paul also states that after our bodies are raised, death will finally be conquered. **The grave will have lost its bite** (vv. 53-56); it will maintain no more control over the destinies of human beings. And once again, **the certainty of these events is an empirical, factual one: Because of Jesus' resurrection** from the dead (v. 57; 2 Cor. 4:14), **our** bodily **resurrection and the defeat of death are definite.** Although we will not deny that death embodies the chief unknown ever encountered by human beings, Jesus did experience it, and he conquered it by rising from the dead. And **while Jesus' resurrection does not tell us everything** we may wish to know **about** the nature of **eternal life, it does reveal enough that we need not be so fearful of death.** Because of Jesus' experience, death and its aftermath are no longer a frightening mystery. We really can know their most important aspects and calm our sometimes raging fears. In fact, in this book we have even developed a "Christmas morning" picture of heaven. We do, indeed, have some good ideas of what heaven will be like, and we will also be pleasantly surprised by what we don't know about it or can only speculate about. Therefore, while we perhaps know very little about what follows death, **what we do know is abundantly able to soothe our fears** if we will only allow it. From this we can also find reasons for calming our worries about the threat of nonexistence. We know certain details about heaven, including our immediate existence after death, because of Jesus. And **Scripture confirms** that **we will** still **be alive after our bodies die** (Phil. 1:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:1-8). So this is yet another place where practicing proper thinking is imperative. **Nonexistence is simply an unbiblical and untrue prospect, so why concentrate on it?** Some philosophical considerations are worthwhile here. While our greatest fear may be experiencing nonexistence, a moment's reflection shows that this could never be the case. No one could ever experience and then report back to us a state that denies our sense experience by its very nature. Therefore, we will never experience nonexistence. What we may fear the most could never happen, for this is a contradictory notion. Further, even in a worst-case scenario involving the nonexistence of the next life, we could never know this to be the case experientially. It would seem that those struggling with this fear should meditate on these truths. For similar reasons, we can rest assured that we will not be alone after death. We experience fellowship, and that even more fully, after our passing to the next world (Matt. 8:11; 2 Cor. 5:8). Jesus exemplified this fellowship during his post-resurrection appearances to his disciples. So there is no factual basis for the belief that the afterlife is a separate, lonely existence. The facts argue otherwise. **The sooner we align our thinking with these facts, the sooner we will experience our own personal victory over the fear of death.** Standing before Christ's judgment seat (see 2 Cor. 5:10) is another worry for some Christians, but it doesn't need to be. Believers will be present with the Lord after death (v. 8; cf. Phil. 1:21-23), not rejected by him. Because of Christ's actions on our behalf, accomplished through his death and resurrection (Eph. 2:4-7), Christians will not be condemned (John 3:16-18, 36; 5:24-29). Anxieties to the contrary dominate us because we do not think biblically about them. Only unbelievers need to fear condemnation. So the answer to any worries we have about death is to trust the Lord in light of the known facts of the Gospel (2 Cor. 6:2). The certainty of our future should not give us an excuse to be proud or calloused (1 Cor. 10:12), but it should help us realize deep within our being that our eternal destiny is not at stake. **Now none of this means that death is our friend.** Death is an enemy, a consequence of our wrongdoing, a bitter pill that goes down hard. Thinking about it often hurts. And suffering through it as it claims loved ones (or even just contemplating this event) tears at our hearts and minds**. As painful as** all **this is, though,** we can find hope and solace in the fact that **death is not the end.** It does not have the final say. For Christians, **ultimate victory lies on the other side of death. And there we will find the best in (eternal) life.** **God through Christ** has **turned death into the door that opens to the fullest possible joy—heavenly bliss** (Ps. 16:11). As believers, **we can stare death in the face and see it as an evil from which God brings good.** For us it can even be a blessing to die so we can be at home with Christ (Phil. 1:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:8).'\* **The more we can bring our thoughts in line with these truths, the greater will be our opportunity to conquer even the most painful side effects of the fear of death**. Of course, **we are not suggesting** that **we can (or should** even try to) **progress to the place where** even the thought of our own **death** or that of a loved one **does not bother us. But this is not a defeat**. The temporal separation and pain we experience even affected Jesus after the death of his friend Lazarus. Jesus stood in front of Lazarus' tomb and wept (John 11:35). And Jesus even knew that he would raise Lazarus from the dead! Feelings of loss and sadness are appropriate. But we don't have to fear death and what lies beyond it. Like all human beings, Christians struggle with their emotions, but they do not have to be overcome by them. Believers can still achieve victory over the most painful results of mankind's greatest fears. That's the testimony of Scripture. And it's the witness and example of Jesus, who even though he wept over death, came to free us from the bondage-creating elements of this king of anxiety. Here we will outline three steps to handling our fears of death: Internalizing the truth that eternal life is an actual reality, shifting our pattern of thinking to God's top-down heavenly perspective, and replacing our anxious thoughts of death with these biblical truths. In other words, **we need to be sure of the reality of eternal life, apply this truth to everyday life, and then allow these new attitudes to transform our fearful thoughts about death.** Now we want to walk back through these steps, showing you even more specifically how you can rely on them to help you overcome your fears. Throughout this book we have provided numerous evidences and arguments that eternal life is real. Just one of these evidences, Jesus' resurrection from the dead, provides a strong twofold argument for the believer's eternal life. First, the very nature of his resurrection indicates victory over death. When the disciples saw the risen Jesus, they beheld walking, talking eternal life. Second, Jesus' central message was the kingdom of God and the necessary requirements for entrance into eternal life. So if any of Jesus' messages were vindicated by the Resurrection, his teachings about the afterlife were, since they were his chief focus. Since eternal life is a fact, to reject it involves accepting a falsehood, and to believe it as true lays the foundation we need to shoulder sickness, disappointment, and fear. Since we Christians will live after the death (or even the final corruption) of our earthly bodies, we have no ultimate reason to fear its power. The glories of heaven can even make the prospect of our future abode an enjoyable longing (Phil. 1:20-24; 2 Cor. 5:8). **At the very least, while still viewing death as an enemy and a necessary evil, we do not have to be overcome with worry over its reality.**