



A-Z Spec - This is not sponsored by the UNI - This is a meme
file

Forensics (California State University, Northridge)



Scan to open on Studocu

The order will be 27 off and case

"I'm selfish, impatient and a little insecure. I make mistakes, I am out of control and at times hard to handle. But if you can't handle me at my worst, then you sure as hell don't deserve me at my best."

-Marilyn Monroe



ASPEC

A. Violation - The Affirmative fails to specify an agent of action.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - Specifying the agent is critical to disads of both politics and economics. Also key to counterplans regarding types of agents and congressional actions and kritiks of political methods.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the agent.

BSPEC

A. Violation - The Affirmative fails to specify a pending bill/movement in the United States.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - Specifying the bill is critical to politics disads. Everyone knows that Israel and I love running politics disads. Also key to counterplans regarding types of bills and congressional actions and kritiks of the discourse of these bills.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the action taken.

CSPEC

A. Violation - The Affirmative fails to specify their socioeconomic class.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Education - We can better learn about social positions and how they affect politics. No amount of stupid disads or advantage scenarios can reach this level of topical education.

Privilege - It is important to deconstruct privilege in the debate space in order to make debate more accessible to all.

DSPEC

A. Violation – the affirmative fails to specify their glorious affirmation of dialectical materialism.

B. Failure to Marx-ify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Education - This neoliberalization of society has depoliticized and corrupted our democratic and power processes, destroying political and civic engagement and creating a culture of normalized violence

Giroux 13

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/20307-hope-in-the-age-of-looming-authoritarianism>

In the current historical moment, the line between fate and destiny is difficult to draw. Dominant power works relentlessly through its major cultural apparatuses to hide, mischaracterize or lampoon resistance, dissent and critically engaged social movements. This is done, in part, by sanitizing public memory and erasing critical knowledge and oppositional struggles from newspapers, radio, television, film and all those cultural institutions that engage in systemic forms of education and memory work. Historical consciousness has been transformed into uplifting narratives, box-office spectacles and lifestyle stories fit for the whitewashed world of the Disney musketeers. As Theodor W. Adorno puts it, "The murdered are [now] cheated out of the single remaining thing that our powerlessness can offer them: remembrance." [i] The relentless activity of thoughtlessness - worship of celebrity culture, a cravenly mainstream media, instrumentalism, militarism or free-roaming individualism - undermines crucial social bonds and expands the alleged virtue of believing that thinking is a burden.¶ Civic engagement appears increasingly weakened, if not impotent, as a malignant form of casino capitalism exercises ruthless power over the commanding institutions of society and everyday existence, breathing new life into old clichés. Under casino capitalism, fantasy trumps logic, if not rationality. A sucker is still born every minute, and the house still wins. Looming dreams of riches and fame invariably descend into disappointment, defeat or addiction. Uncertainty and precariousness breed fear and insecurity instead of much-needed social reforms and a belief in a more just future. Austerity policies function as a form of trickle-down cruelty in which the poor are punished and the rich rewarded. [ii] Totalitarianism, once visible in its manifest evil, now hides in the shadow of a market logic that insists that each individual deserves his or her fate, regardless of the larger structural forces that shape it.¶ A savage market fundamentalism relentlessly denigrates public values, criminalizes social problems, and produces a manufactured fatalism and culture of fear while waging a fundamental assault upon the very conditions that make politics possible. Politics is now sapped of its democratic vitality just as traces of authoritarianism have seeped deeply into the economic and cultural structures of American life. As American society incorporates authoritarian elements of the past into its dominating ideology, modes of governance and policies, justice withers, and it becomes increasingly difficult for the American people to translate matters of civic literacy, social responsibility and the public good "back into the language of society." [iii]¶ Also see: Henry Giroux on the "School to Prison Pipeline" and Bill Moyers | Henry Giroux: Zombie Politics and Casino Capitalism¶ Americans are increasingly inspired to think uncritically, disregard critical historical narratives, and surrender to pedagogies of repression. Under the Bush-Obama administrations, American education has been cleansed of any effort to produce students who have the power to think critically and imaginatively and is now preoccupied with producing young people unaware and unwilling to fight for the right to decent employment, access to a good life, decent health care, social justice and a future that does not mimic a corrosive and morally bankrupt present. The organized culture of forgetting, with its immense disimagination machines, has ushered in a permanent

revolution marked by a massive project of distributing wealth upward, the militarization of the entire social order and an ongoing depoliticization of agency and politics itself. We no longer live in a democracy, which, as Bill Moyers points out provides the formative culture and economic conditions that enable people "to fully claim their moral and political agency."^[iv] This disembodied form of politics is not merely about the erasure of the language of public interests, informed argument, critical thinking and the collapse of public values, but a full-fledged attack on the institutions of civic society, the social contract and democracy itself. Under such circumstances, the United States has succumbed to forms of symbolic and institutional violence that point to a deep-seated hatred of democracy.^[i] Under such circumstances, common sense displaces critical thinking, individual and social agency are emptied of political substance, and a collectively engaged democratic politics appears irrelevant in the face of an unquestioned "moral" authority that parades as destiny.^[v] The language of stupidity replaces reason as scientific evidence is disparaged or suppressed, thoughtful exchange gives way to emotional tirades, violence becomes the primary means for solving problems, and anger is substituted for informed arguments. Unsurprisingly, any viable sense of social responsibility disappears beyond the fortified enclaves of ever-more-sequestered lives while various ideological fundamentalists assert their judgments of the world with a certainty that brands dissent, moral inquiry and critical questioning as excessive and threatening. Instead of affirming the wisdom of Martin Luther King Jr., Robert Kennedy, Audre Lord and other public intellectuals, Americans are inundated with the likes of Bill Gates, George Will, Rush Limbaugh, Michelle Bachmann, Sarah Palin and other anti-public commentators and pundits. Intellectuals who have sacrificed their jobs, bodies and lives in order to alleviate the suffering of others have been replaced by the new "celebrity heroes" drawn from a corrupt corporate and political culture that lives off the suffering of others.^[ii] In the place of politically vibrant and intellectually energized public spheres, Americans suffer under the self-serving interests and demands, if not downright colonization, of immensely powerful corporations and the entertainment industry, which offer up the confessional spectacles of Dr. Phil, the televised shame culture of a host of TV programs, the increasing violence entrenched in celluloid Hollywood spectacles and the corporate values embedded in survival-of-the-fittest "reality" television shows. As society is increasingly organized around shared fears, escalating insecurities, manufactured uncertainties and an intensified post-9/11 politics of terror, the institutions of government appear to be immune to any checks on their power to render democratic politics both bankrupt and inoperable.^[iii] The language of the market now offers the primary index of what possibilities the future may hold, while jingoistic nationalism and racism register its apocalyptic underbelly. As a market economy becomes synonymous with a market society, democracy becomes both the repressed scandal of neoliberalism and its ultimate fear.^[vi] In such a society, cynicism replaces hope, public life collapses into the ever-encroaching domain of the private while social ills and human suffering become more difficult to identify, understand, and engage critically. Zygmunt Bauman points out that "the exit from politics and withdrawal behind the fortified walls of the private" means not only that society has stopped questioning itself but also that those discourses, social relations and public spaces in which people can speak, exercise, and develop the capacities and skills necessary for critically encountering the world atrophy and disappear.^[vii] The result is that "in our contemporary world, post 9/11, crisis and exception [have] become routine, and war, deprivation, and [the machineries of death] intensify despite ever denser networks of humanitarian aid and ever more rights legislation."^[viii] In addition, the depoliticization of politics and the increasing transformation of the social state into the punishing state have rendered possible the emergence of a new mode of authoritarianism in which the fusion of power and violence increasingly permeates all aspects of government and everyday life.^[ix] This mad violence creates an intensifying cycle rendering citizens' political activism dangerous, if not criminal. On the domestic and foreign fronts, violence is the most prominent feature of dominant ideology, policies and governance. Soldiers are idealized, violence becomes an omniscient form of entertainment pumped endlessly into the culture, wars become the primary organizing principle for shaping relations abroad, and a corrosive and deeply rooted pathology becomes not the mark of a few individuals but of a society that, as Erich Fromm once pointed out, becomes entirely insane.^[x] Hannah Arendt's "dark times" have arrived as the concentrated power of the corporate, financial, political, economic and cultural elite have created a society that has become a breeding ground for psychic disturbances and a pathology that has become normalized. Greed, inequality and oppressive power relations have generated the death of the collective democratic imagination.^[xi] Howard Zinn wrote in the early 1970s that the "world is topsy-turvy, that things are all wrong, that the wrong people are in jail and the wrong people are out of jail, that the wrong people are in power and the wrong people are out of power, that the wealth is distributed in this country . . . in such a way as not simply to require small reform but to require a drastic reallocation of wealth."^[xi] Zinn's words are more prescient today than when he wrote them more than 40 years ago. As American society becomes more militarized, civil liberties are under siege at all levels of government. Bush and Obama have participated in illegal legalities instituting state torture and targeted assassinations, among other violations. At the local level, police all over the country are expanding their powers going so far as to subject people to

invasive body searches, even when they had been stopped for only minor traffic violations. One man in New Mexico was stopped for failing to come to a complete stop at a stop sign. On the baseless claim of harboring drugs, he was taken to a hospital and underwent, without consent, eight anal cavity searches, including a colonoscopy.[xii] No drugs were found. When the police believe they have the right to issue warrants that allow doctors to perform enemas and colonoscopies without consent and anyone can be seized for such barbarous practices, domestic terrorism takes on a new and perilous meaning. Similarly, young people are being arrested in record numbers in schools that have become holding centers for low-income and minority youths.[xiii]

ESPEC

A. Violation - When they gave data, the affirmatives failed to specify the margin of error.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - If their error margins are, like, 100%, then they can fabricate everything to make the perfect plan that can only be refuted by the squirreliest of k backfiles. Don't let this happen.

Fabrication - Leaving out margins of error gives you a false sense of what reality actually is. It's like lying, which is basically cheating.

FSPEC

A. Violation - The Affirmative fails to specify a funding agent.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - Specifying the funding source is critical to economic disads. Spending is my favorite disad, don't take it away from me. Also key to counterplans regarding types of funding specs and congressional actions and kritiks of economic models.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the Congressional action taken.

GSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives both failed to specify their preferred gender identification and pronouns.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Gendered language - I might accidentally refer to them by the wrong pronouns, and this makes me an oppressor. Don't let me be someone like that.

Education - If they specify, we can learn more about gender and how it functions in our society.

HSPEC

A. Violation - the affirmative fails to specify the historical background behind their plan.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Education - Do you realize how educational a history lesson would be in the middle of this debate? We always overlook how history affects our politics.

Solvency - By not looking at their historical implications, they overlook how the subjects may feel about the United States. This leads to serial policy failure.

Ground - We lose the Foucault K.

ISPEC

A. Violation - the affirmative fails to specify any international consultation with their plan.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - We lose kritiks of diplomacy, disads of foreign politics, and counterplans just if they happen to clarify their international consultation.

Moving target - No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the Congressional action taken.

JSPEC

A. Violation – the affirmative fails to specify in which way the courts will rule their plan as constitutional or unconstitutional.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Limits – The Judicial Branch is part of USFG, you can't just look over them. That makes ridiculous amounts of plans possible. Their plan should be proven constitutional.

Ground – We get disads of perception and politics but only when a plan is proven constitutional.

Solvency – Because the Constitution is basically the bomb.com, nothing will ever work if it's unconstitutional.

KSPEC

Interpretation: the affirmative team should specify what their favorite kritik is

Standards:

- 1. Friendship is key- debate is a game. We just want to be friends with the other team. By not telling us their favorite k we can't possibly hold k parties with them, ensuring many a cold debate in the future, making debate pooppy and boring- worse, you get depression**

CERZA 12- Alphonse Cerza, an honored Masonic scholar and writer and a former law professor at John Marshall Law School for 22 years, Grand Historian, "Our Most Valuable Asset." MasonicWorld.com.

<http://www.masonicworld.com/education/articles/our-most-valuable-asset-friendship.htm>

//ninjarenee

The true value of friends cannot be underestimated. There is nothing worse than be-ing alone or having the feeling that there is no one around that you can rely on for help or companionship. Nothing can be more depress-ing then the feeling that there is no one that cares about your welfare. On the positive side, the mere fact that one knows that he has friends is a comforting feeling.

So that the possession of friends is an absolute necessity in life in order to be happy. I remember an old friend who was a bachelor and had no close relatives. He lived in a rooming house where most of his fellow roomers were transients. Be-ing a member of the Craft opened up many op-portunities for him to spend his time profitably. Rather than going to his room each evening after work, he managed to go to his lodge on each meeting night. He also "adopted" a number of other lodges within a reasonable distance and visited them regularly. Many of the members of those lodges saw him so regularly that they never realized that he was only a visitor and not a regular member of that lodge. He always pitched in when there was a need for workers and he made himself useful. At these lodge meetings he paid special atten-tion to the reports about members and he took notes. On nights that he was not attending lodge meetings, he visited sick members, of-fered to do things for them, and cheered them up with his presence. Thus he was being a real friend toward his fellow members and it gave him a genuine "lift" to feel that he was utilizing his time doing something worthwhile.

This il-lustrates how Masonic friendship is a two-way street in that benefits result to everyone with these many contacts at meetings and with other relationships.

- 2. Kritiks rule- finding out their favorite kritik allows us to engage in riveting Leftist philosophy convos.**

LSPEC

A. Violation – The affirmatives failed to specify their username, server, and preferred role in League of Legends or comparable game

Standards:

- 1. Friendship is key- debate is a game. We just want to be friends with the other team. By not telling us their League info we can't possibly hold Bronze V tournaments with them, ensuring many a cold debate in the future, making debate pooppy and boring- worse, you get depression**

Cross-Apply Cerza 12

- 2. League is fun, yo. AP Teemo OP.**

MSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives failed to specify how much money their plan will cost.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - They can easily spike out of econ disads and kritiks of economics. Come on, man. Not cool.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the money.

NSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives failed to specify their names before they started giving their speech.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Self-esteem - I am now forced to refer to them as impersonal pronouns, one of which might be "guys" which is blatantly patriarchal. However, calling them by their names makes them feel more personal and cooler overall.

OSPEC

A. Violation - The aff fails to specify the philosophical basis behind their plan.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Education - We can't understand their plan unless we understand the philosophy behind it

Ground - We lose all ability to attack their fundamental framework- means we can't run our favorite Ks

PSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify their opinions regarding Russian president Владимир Путин (Vladimir Putin).

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Privyet Comrades - If they aren't Putin fans, then how can we equally address current events like the crisis in Ukraine or the shitty hotels in Sochi? I don't know if they're pro-East or pro-West, so I don't really know where to start.

Siberia - Failure to mention Putin in every single debate ever makes Putin angry, and he'll send more political prisoners to Siberia. That's bad. Save a life.

QSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify any form of quid pro quo in their aff.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Ground - no specification means no disads regarding diplomacy or counterplans removing or adding to a condition.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the condition.

RSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify the role of the affs, negs, judge, and ballot.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Order in debate - for all I know, I could be playing a unicorn. Neigh. Please bring order back into this debate.

Education - roleplaying is key to education, and non-roleplaying is awesome too. I just want to know what I'm doing here.

SSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify any specifications or limitations they need from the neg prior to the 1NC.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Neg flex - They'll try to pin me with some stupid SPEC argument, how shitty! We should be able to be more flexible but we understand their need for clarification.

Aff choice - We believe in aff choice, but they haven't given us any framework choice. They shouldn't be allowed to complain if we run arguments that they don't like answering like kritiks.

TSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify how they are topical.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Moving target - They're probably going to try to bring up a counterinterp for my T violations. It'd be real nice to know those beforehand. They can shift their case around to match our T or to match a strategic T.

USPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives have failed to specify how their plan is unique.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about their uniqueness.

Education - You should make it so that they have to run unique args. Who wants to learn about drones 100,000 times?

VSPEC

A. Violation - the affirmative fails to specify the amount of violence they solve for using specific numbers of bullets fired / bombs used.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Limits - they shouldn't be able to run ridiculous death tolls because, let's be honest, those won't actually happen.

Moving Target -No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about impact calc magnitude.

WSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify whether or not they want to win, double win, lose, or double lose.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Moving target- No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the role of this debate.

Time cube - They should've taken the time in their evilly-named 1AC to destroy evil oneness and declare double win. It's too late now. The time cube has been destroyed.

XSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify their contact with the x-traterrestrial being, Ashtar.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

ASHTAREVOLUTION - I, for one, welcome our new x-traterrestrial overlord. They don't. They will burn in the fires of Ashtar's vengeance and we will not. Let them feel the burn of their sin by making them lose.

YSPEC

A. Violation - The affirmatives fail to specify in which ways they settle Yin and Yang.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

Atmosphere - I can't deal with the potential imbalance in their plan and neither can the universe- leads to serial policy failure and turns case

ZSPEC

A. Violation – Ya basta! The affirmatives fail to specify their affiliation with the Zapatistas.

B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.

SOLIDARIDAD! The Zapatistas welcome people to join them in solidarity – connecting ourselves with them is to connect with a nonviolent protest against oppressive domination

Maccani 8 (RJ Maccani, senior reporter in NYC, working both for news organizations and resistance groups, from the newsletter, “Solidarity: What does it mean now? May/June 2008,” “Be a Zapatista Wherever You Are,”

<http://www.resistinc.org/newsletters/articles/be-zapatista-whenever-you-are>, Luke Newell)

Behind our black mask, behind our armed voice, behind our unnamable name, behind what you see of us, behind this, we are you. - Major Ana Maria of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) at the First Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism. Chiapas, Mexico, 1996¶ In their words and in their actions, Mexico's zapatista rebels have developed and propagated a powerful conception of solidarity. Through exploring a bit of their history, as well as the work of several of their supporters and allies within the USA, I seek to share here some of my understandings of what solidarity means to the zapatistas and, thus, what it might mean for those of us who seek to act in solidarity with them.¶ Everything for Everyone, Nothing for Ourselves¶ Perhaps the EZLN got lucky when they picked January 1, 1994 to be the day they would rise up in arms. As the prominent Mexican intellectual Gustavo Esteva describes it, there wasn't much else happening at the time:¶ "Not a plane crashed. No tsunami came. No princess died. No president had any sexual escapade. Nothing happened on earth. The media was empty. They had nothing to present us. So, on January 2, we had a thousand journalists in San Cristobal. CNN was projecting Zapatistas. We had beautiful images with the ski masks and all the emotion. It was perfect for the news. Six hours a day, CNN was presenting Zapatistas."¶ From Mexico's southeastern state of Chiapas, the zapatista cry of "¡Ya Basta!" ("Enough is Enough!") quickly traveled around the globe not only through the corporate media but, unfiltered and direct, over the Internet as well. A virtual army of volunteer translators and web-junkies ensured that anyone who wanted to could engage directly with the communiqués, stories and letters of the zapatistas. In the same moment that the North American Free Trade Agreement went into effect, the EZLN - in image and word - and the poverty of southern Mexico were catapulted into the consciousness of people around the world.¶ Although they succeeded in liberating over a million acres of land from plantation owners in the first days of the uprising, the zapatistas' rag tag army of poorly equipped peasant soldiers could never have dreamed of matching the violence of the Mexican military. Demanded "work, land, housing, food, health care, education, independence, freedom, democracy, justice and peace." they called on their fellow Mexicans to join them by rising up in arms to depose the one-party rule of the PRI (Institutional Revolutionary Party). In response to this call, the zapatistas instead found themselves confronted by a global "civil society" that echoed their demands but sought to achieve them through nonviolent means. That the zapatistas were not annihilated by the Mexican Army has less to do with their military prowess and more to do with the hundreds of thousands of people who flooded the streets of Mexico City and other cities around the world in support of peace.¶ Taking a cue from the people they had hoped to lead into battle, the zapatistas decided to stop speaking with "the fire" in order to strengthen the path of "the word". And so in the 14 years since the uprising, the zapatistas have hosted countless consultas (mass consultations), encuentros (gatherings for listening and speaking), and other engagements with various segments of a national and international "civil society" that was attracted to them and who the zapatistas recognized as their peers. As Subcomandante Marcos, the spokesperson of the zapatistas, remarked in a recent interview,¶ "it so happened that we, the EZLN, were almost

all indigenous from here in Chiapas, but we did not want to struggle just for our own good, or just for the good of the indigenous of Chiapas, or just for the good of the Indian peoples of Mexico. We wanted to fight along with everyone who was humble and simple like ourselves and who was in great need and who suffered from exploitation and thievery by the rich and their bad governments here, in our Mexico, and in other countries in the world." [emphasis added]¶ Since their public emergence, the zapatistas have sought to sustain an open and non-vanguardist style, communicated through the aphorisms "Walking, we ask questions" and "Lead by obeying." Their commitment to struggling not just for themselves, but for the betterment of everyone, is expressed powerfully and clearly in their "Everything for everyone, nothing for ourselves."

Transformality K

A. Link: Use of suffering to advance a political agenda objectifies the oppressed and is a prophylactic preventing action

Berlant 98 (Lauren – George M. Pullman Distinguished Service Professor of English at the University of Chicago, Ph.D. from Cornell University, "Poor Eliza," in *American Literature*, Volume 70, Number 3, p. 635-668, http://www2.law.columbia.edu/faculty_franke/Gay_Marriage/Poor%20Eliza.pdf)

What distinguishes these critical texts are the startling ways they struggle to encounter the Uncle Tom form without reproducing it, declining to pay the inheritance tax. The postsentimental does not involve an aesthetic disruption to the contract sentimentality makes between its texts and readers - that proper reading will lead to better feeling and therefore to a better self. What changes is the place of repetition in this contract, a crisis frequently thematized in formal aesthetic and generational terms. In its traditional and political modalities, the sentimental promises that in a just world a consensus will already exist about what constitutes uplift, amelioration, and emancipation, those horizons toward which empathy powerfully directs itself. Identification with suffering, the ethical response to the sentimental plot, leads to its repetition in the audience and thus to a generally held view about what transformations would bring the good life into being. This presumption, that the terms of consent are transhistorical once true feeling is shared, explains in part why emotions, especially painful ones, are so central to the world-building aspects of sentimental alliance. Postsentimental texts withdraw from the contract that presumes consent to the conventionally desired outcomes of identification and empathy. The desire for unconflictedness might very well motivate the sacrifice of surprising ideas to the norms of the world against which this rhetoric is being deployed. What, if anything, then, can be built from the very different knowledge/experience of subaltern pain? What can memory do to create conditions for freedom and justice without reconfirming the terms of ordinary subordination? More than a critique of feeling as such, the postsentimental modality also challenges what literature and storytelling have come to stand for in the creation of sentimental national subjects across an almost two-century span. Three moments in this genealogy, which differ as much from each other as from the credulous citation of Uncle Tom's Cabin we saw in *The King and I* and *Dimples*, will mark here some potential within the arsenal that counters the repetition compulsions of sentimentality. This essay began with a famous passage from James Baldwin's "Everybody's Protest Novel," a much-cited essay about Uncle Tom's Cabin that is rarely read in the strong sense because its powerful language of rageful truth-telling would shame in advance any desire to make claims for the tactical efficacy of suffering and mourning in the struggle to transform the United States into a postracist nation. I cited Baldwin's text to open this piece not to endorse its absolute truth but to figure its frustrated opposition to the sentimental optimism that equates the formal achievement of empathy on a mass scale with the general project of democracy. Baldwin's special contribution to what sentimentality can mean has been lost in the social-problem machinery of mass society, in which the production of tears where anger or nothing might have been became more urgent with the coming to cultural dominance of the Holocaust and trauma as models for having and remembering collective social experience.²⁰ Currently, as in traditional sentimentality, the authenticity of overwhelming pain that can be textually performed and shared is disseminated as a prophylactic against the reproduction of a shocking and numbing mass violence. Baldwin asserts that the overvaluation of such redemptive feeling is precisely a condition of that violence. Baldwin's encounter with Stowe in this essay comes amidst a general wave of protest novels, social-problem films, and film noir in the U.S. after World War Two: *Gentleman's Agreement*, *The Postman Always Rings Twice*, *The Best Years of Our Lives*. Films like these, he says, "emerge for what they are: a mirror of our confusion, dishonesty, panic, trapped and immobilized in the sunlit prison of the American dream." They cut the complexity of human motives and self-understanding "down to size" by preferring "a lie more palatable than the truth" about the social and material effects the liberal pedagogy of optimism has, or doesn't have, on "man's" capacity to produce a world of authentic truth, justice, and freedom.²¹ Indeed, "truth" is the keyword for Baldwin. He defines it as "a devotion to the human being, his freedom and fulfillment: freedom which cannot be legislated, fulfillment which cannot be charted."²² In contrast, Stowe's totalitarian religiosity, her insistence that subjects "bargain" for heavenly redemption

with their own physical and spiritual mortification, merely and violently confirms the fundamental abjection of all persons, especially the black ones who wear the dark night of the soul out where all can see it. Additionally, Baldwin argues that Uncle Tom's Cabin instantiates a tradition of locating the destiny of the nation in a false model of the individual soul, one imagined as free of ambivalence, aggression, or contradiction. By "human being" Baldwin means to repudiate stock identities as such, arguing that their stark simplicity confirms the very fantasies and institutions against which the sentimental is ostensibly being mobilized. This national-liberal refusal of complexity is what he elsewhere calls "the price of the ticket" for membership in the American dream.²³ As the Uncle Tom films suggest, whites need blacks to "dance" for them so that they might continue disavowing the costs or ghosts of whiteness, which involve religious traditions of self-loathing and cultural traditions confusing happiness with analgesia. The conventional reading of "Everybody's Protest Novel" sees it as a violent rejection of the sentimental.²⁴ It is associated with the feminine (Little Women), with hollow and dishonest capacities of feeling, with an aversion to the real pain that real experience brings. "Causes, as we know, are notoriously bloodthirsty," he writes.²⁵ The politico-sentimental novel uses suffering vampirically to simplify the subject, thereby making the injunction to empathy safe for the subject. Of course there is more to the story. Baldwin bewails the sentimentality of Richard Wright's Native Son because Bigger Thomas is not the homeopathic Other to Uncle Tom after all, but one of his "children," the heir to his negative legacy.²⁶ Both Tom and Thomas live in a simple relation to violence and die knowing only slightly more than they did before they were sacrificed to a white ideal of the soul's simple purity, its emptiness. This addiction to the formula of redemption through violent simplification persists with a "terrible power": it confirms that U.S. minorities are constituted as Others even to themselves through attachment to the most hateful, objectified, cartoon-like versions of their identities, and that the shamed subcultures of America really are, in some way, fully expressed by the overpresence of the stereotypical image.

B. Impact: This creates a marketplace of trauma for consumption, constructing the Other as an object in a sentimental economy, and shielding criticism of the law
Berlant 99 (Lauren – George M. Pullman Distinguished Service Professor of English at the University of Chicago, Ph.D. from Cornell University, "The Subject of True Feeling: Pain, Privacy and Politics," in *Cultural Pluralism, Identity Politics and the Law*, Ed. Sarat & Kearns, p. 49-54)

Ravaged wages and ravaged bodies saturate the global marketplace in which the United States seeks desperately to compete "competitively," as the euphemism goes, signifying a race that will be won by the nations whose labor conditions are most optimal for profit? In the United States the media of the political public sphere regularly register new scandals of the proliferating sweatshop networks "at home" and "abroad," which has to be a good thing, because it produces feeling and with it something at least akin to consciousness that can lead to action.³ Yet even as the image of the traumatized worker proliferates, even as evidence of exploitation is found under every rock or commodity, it competes with a normative/utopian image of the U.S. citizens who remains unmarked, framed, and protected by the private trajectory of his life project which is sanctified at the juncture where the unconscious meets history: the American Dream.⁴ In that story one's identity is not borne of suffering, mental, physical, or economic. If the U.S. Worker's lucky enough to live at an economic moment that sustains the Dream he gets to appear at his least national when he is working and at his most national at leisure, with his family or in semipublic worlds of other men producing surplus manliness (e.g., via sports). In the American dreamscape his identity is private property, a zone in which structural obstacles and cultural differences fade into an ether of prolonged, deferred, and individuating enjoyment that he has earned and that the nation has helped him to earn. Meanwhile, exploitation only appears as a scandalous nugget in the sieve of memory when it can be condensed into an exotic thing of momentary fascination, a squalor of the bottom too horrible to be read in its own actual banality. The exposed traumas of workers in ongoing extreme conditions do not generally induce more than mourning on the part of the state and the public culture to whose feeling based opinions the state is said to respond. Mourning is what happens when a grounding object is lost, is dead, no

longer living (to you). Mourning is an experience of irreducible boundedness: I am here, I am living, he is dead, I am mourning. It is a beautiful, not sublime, experience of emancipation: mourning supplies the subject the definitional perfection of a being no longer in flux. It takes place over a distance: even if the object who induces the feeling of loss and helplessness is neither dead nor at any great distance from where you are? In other words, **mourning can also be an act of aggression, of social deathmaking**; it can perform the evacuation of significance from actually-existing subjects. Even when liberals do it, one might say, are ghosted for a good cause.⁶ The sorrow songs of scandal that sing of the exploitation that is always "elsewhere" (even a few blocks away) are in this sense aggressively songs of mourning. Play them backward, and the military march of capitalist triumphalism (The Trans-Nationale) can be heard. Its Lyric, currently creamed by every organ of record in the United States, is about necessity. It **exhorts citizens to understand that the "bottom line" of national life is neither utopia nor freedom but survival**, which **can only be achieved by a citizenry that eats its anger, makes no unreasonable claims on resources or controls over value, and uses its most creative energy to cultivate intimate spheres** while scrapping a life together flexibly in response to the market world's caprice.⁸ In this particular moment of expanding class unconsciousness that looks like consciousness emerges a peculiar, though not unprecedented, here: the exploited child. If a worker can be infantilized, pictured as young, as small, as feminine or feminized, as starving, as bleeding and diseased, and as a (virtual) sieve, the righteous indignation around procuring his survival resounds everywhere. The child must not be sacrificed to states or to profiteering. His wounded image speaks a truth that subordinates narrative: he has not "freely" chosen his exploitation; the optimism and play that are putatively the right of childhood have been stolen from him. Yet only "voluntary" steps are ever taken to try to control this visible sign of what is ordinary and systemic amid the chaos of capitalism, in order to make its localized nightmares seem inevitable. Privatize the atrocity, delete the visible sign, make it seem foreign. Return the child to the family, replace the children with admits who can look dignified while being paid virtually the same revoking wage. The problem that organizes so much feeling then regains livable proportions, and the uncomfortable pressure of feeling dissipates, like so much gas. Meanwhile, **the pressure of feeling the shock of being uncomfortably political produces a cry for a double therapy—to the victim and the viewer**. But before "we" appear too complacently different from the privileged citizens who desire to caption the mute image of exotic suffering with an aversively fascinated mooning (a desire for the image to be dead, a ghost), we must note that this feeling culture crosses over into other domains, the domains of what we call identity politics, where the wronged take up voice and agency to produce transformative testimony, which depends on an analogous conviction about the self-evidence and therefore the objectivity of painful feeling. The central concern of this essay is to address the place of painful feeling in the making of political worlds. In particular, I mean to **challenge** a powerful popular **belief in the positive workings of** something I call **national sentimentality**, a rhetoric of promise that a nation can be built across fields of social difference through channels of affective identification and empathy. Sentimental politics generally **promotes and maintains the hegemony of the national identity form**, no mean feat in the face of continued widespread intercultural antagonism and economic cleavage. But national sentimentality is more than a current of feeling that circulates in a political field: the phrase describes a longstanding contest between two models of US citizenship. In one, the classic made), **each citizen's value is secured by an equation between abstractness and emancipation: a cell of national identity provides juridically protected personhood for citizens regardless of anything specific about them**. In the second model, which was initially organized around labor, feminist, and antiracist struggles of the nineteenth-century United States, another version of **the nation is imagined as the index of collective life**. This nation is propped by suffering citizens and noncitizens whose structural exclusion from the utopian-American dreamscape exposes the state's claim of legitimacy and virtue to an acid wash of truth telling that makes hegemonic disavowal virtually impossible, at certain moments of political intensity. Sentimentality has long been the means by which mass subaltern pain is advanced, in the dominant public sphere, **as the true core of national collectivity**. It **operates when the pain of intimate others burns into the conscience of classically**

privileged national subjects, such that they feel the pain of flawed or denied citizenship as their pain. Theoretically, to eradicate the pain those with power will do whatever is necessary to return the nation once more to its legitimately utopian order. Identification with pain, a universal true feeling, then leads to structural social change. In return, subalterns scarred by the pain of failed democracy will reauthorize universalist notions of citizenship in the national utopia, which involves in a redemptive notion of law as the guardian of public good. The object of the nation and the law in this light is to eradicate systemic social pain, the absence of which becomes the definition of freedom. Yet, since these very sources of protection—the state, the law, patriotic ideology—have traditionally buttressed traditional matrices of cultural hierarchy, and since their historic job has been to protect universal subject {citizens from feeling their culture} and corporeal specificity as a political vulnerability, the imagined capacity of these institutions to assimilate to the affective tactics of subaltern counterpolitics suggests some weaknesses, or misrecognitions, in these tactics. For one thing, it may be that the sharp specificity of the traumatic model of pain implicitly mischaracterizes what a person is as what a person becomes in the experience of social negation; this model also falsely premises a sharp picture of structural violence's source and scope, in turn promoting a dubious optimism that law and other visible sources of inequality, for example, can provide the best remedies for their own taxonomizing harms. It is also possible that counterhegemonic deployments of pain as the measure of structural injustice actually sustain the utopian image of a homogeneous national metaculture, which can look like a healed or healthy body in contrast to the scarred and exhausted ones. Finally, it might be that the tactical use of trauma to describe the effects of social inequality so overidentifies the eradication of pain with the achievement of justice that it enables various confusions: for instance, the equation of pleasure with freedom or the sense that changes in feeling, even on a mass scale, amount to substantial social change. Sentimental politics makes these confusions credible and these violences bearable, as its cultural power confirms the centrality of inter-personal identification and empathy to the vitality and viability of collective life. This gives citizens something to do in response to overwhelming structural violence. Meanwhile, by equating mass society with that thing called "national culture," these important transpersonal linkages and intimacies are too frequently serve as proleptic shields, as ethically uncontestable legitimating devices for sustaining the hegemonic field.⁹

C. Alternative: Our alternative is useless scholarship --- this is the only way to prevent co-option and break down oppression

Forte 9 (Maximilian – Professor of Anthropology at Concordia University, ““Useless Anthropology”: Strategies for Dealing with the Militarization of the Academy,” in ZERO ANTHROPOLOGY, 5-22-9, <http://zeroanthropology.net/2009/05/22/%E2%80%9Cuseless-anthropology%E2%80%9D-strategies-for-dealing-with-the-militarization-of-the-academy/>)

One does not need to seek employment with the Pentagon, take part in counterinsurgency, or work for the Human Terrain System in order to provide useful, even if involuntary, support for the national security, intelligence and military goals of the U.S., or any NATO state for that matter. In fact, one does not even need to be an American anthropologist in order to provide the U.S. military and intelligence with the information they seek. One needs to simply produce useful anthropology and not be mindful of the consequences of how it can be used by unintended audiences, now or in the future, to support agendas of which one may have limited awareness and even less desire to support. With this and much more in mind, my ambition is to seek the creation of a useless anthropology, and while some would say I was always on the right track for achieving that, I think more of us need to share a goal of producing useless research, to make worthless contributions, and by useless I mean useless to power, to empire, to domination, to regimes of scrutiny and inspection of the periphery. And not just

useless, but even toxic and repulsive to the scientists of conquest – an anthropology of both withdrawal and resistance, free of false dilemmas that work to support business as usual, willing to set fire to the crops we planted if it stops them from being harvested by the tyrant, liberating ourselves from being our own best hostages. The idea is to refuse further engagement with the international traffic in information and knowledge that supports the workings of empire, capital, and the state. In this presentation I seek to make three main points. First, to indicate some of the ways that all of us can be even unwillingly useful in supporting U.S. military and intelligence interests. Second, to reflect on the meaning of useful anthropology. Third, to point the way to possible alternatives, that could entail unthinking anthropology as we know it. With reference to the first point, Gerald Sider made the point that at this moment in history “there is no such thing as an innocent anthropology” (p. 43). We know now that the U.S. military and intelligence are looking for ways of incorporating scholars in producing a global surveillance net. One way is to bring social scientists on counterinsurgency and pacification missions. Another is to have them conduct analysis of stolen Iraqi documents (see here and here), or to conduct fieldwork in areas of emerging or potential threat and describe the radicalization process and ways of counteracting it, as part of the Pentagon’s Minerva Research Initiative, managed in partnership with the National Science Foundation. Another is to comb through open access electronic resources. And yet another is just to get everything for free, by scanning, copying, seizing any or all electronic devices or written records from researchers as they enter the United States whether returning home to the U.S., or just traveling through. U.S. Border Patrol and Customs agents can: scan and hold laptops indefinitely; they can make electronic copies of hard drives, flash drives, cellphones, iPods, pagers, beepers, video and audio tapes; and, they can seize papers, documents, books, pamphlets, or even litter. This is also true of Canada and the UK. Open access publishing, and publishing in electronic formats that are thus amenable to automated harvesting, is a critically important way that ethnographic data can be used by the national security state without the willing participation of researchers. “Intelligence does not have to be secret to be valuable!” says the website of the University of Military Intelligence, regarding open access resources, which takes us to Intelink-U, part of the U.S. Army’s Foreign Military Studies Office, emerging from the Open Source Information System which serves the US intelligence community with open source intelligence. Among Intelink-U’s subscriptions is the University of New Mexico’s Latin America Database, as well as EbscoHost Databases. The Foreign Military Studies office is also in the process of creating the World Basic Information Library (WBIL), which promotes the concept of “distance drilling” telling us that: “About 85% of requirements in the intelligence business can be met with open source, unclassified sources, and can be exploited by qualified military reservists working by telecommuting. The WBIL has remotely located reservists from all four branches of the service doing ‘virtual’ collection and production utilizing their home Personal Computers.” Also, the Information Operations Advisory Task Force states that it has a “requirement to provide US Forces [in] Afghanistan...with the capability to collect, analyze, and disseminate open source (i.e. sociological or anthropological) information.” With reference to the second point of this presentation, the bases for a useful anthropology, let us note that useful, objective, neutral, and scientific, are once again the buzzwords for an anthropology aligned with power, in the service of the national security state, while rhetorically attempting to move the militarization of the academy beyond the sphere of “politics”. Criticism is political; support is scientific. If you oppose military objectives, you are biased; if you provide practical knowledge, you are objective, and objective is good, just like machines are good. On the other hand, military interest in anthropology is to a significant extent the perhaps unintended outcome of anthropology’s success in marketing itself. The compulsion in this discipline, from the time before its institutionalization in universities, has been to market itself to power as a useful science, with valuable contributions to make, later boasting of the vital importance of ethnography as anthropology’s unique contribution, so much so that anthropology and ethnography are wrongly equated. We wanted the attention of elites, and now we’ve got it. The military is interested in both culture and ethnography. In an article in National Defense Magazine, we are told that “A deeper understanding of culture has become an official part of Marine Corps strategy.” Meanwhile, General William “KIP” Ward, Commander, United States Africa Command, said this about the Pentagon’s work in Africa: “A lot of activity goes on in the continent through our non-government organizations. Academia is involved. When I was in previous assignments, someone came to me and would talk about, well, ‘Ward, you need to get a cultural anthropologist on your team.’ I said, what! A cultural what? Anthropologist? To do what? Get out of here. Or, ‘Ward, you need to have someone to help you understand the human dimension. You need some human terrain analysis.’ I said, ‘what? Get out of here.’ But it’s important, and where do those skills, talents reside — academia.” But for more academics to be more useful, they need to get over certain twinges of moral compunction. In the minds of the state and military some of us have already reverted to being a tool of imperialism, assuming we were ever anything else. Not serving imperialism is routinely called “retreating from the world” by some. Montgomery McFate, the anthropology PhD who has been the most prominent spokesperson for the Human Terrain System, wrote in a military journal that, “Over the past 30 years, as a result of anthropologists’ individual career choices and the tendency toward reflexive self-criticism contained within the discipline itself, the discipline has become hermetically sealed within its Ivory Tower....anthropologists still prefer to study the ‘exotic and useless,’ in the words of A.L. Kroeber....The retreat to the Ivory Tower is also a product of the deep isolationist tendencies within the discipline.” (p. 28) She doesn’t stop there, unfortunately, she notes that, “frequently backed up by self-reflexive neo-Marxism, anthropology began a brutal process of self-flagellation, to a degree almost unimaginable to anyone outside the discipline....The turn toward postmodernism within anthropology exacerbated the tendency toward self-flagellation....(also) This movement away from descriptive ethnography has produced some of the worst writing imaginable.” (p. 28) In this regard, she merely echoes some of the conservative and often overwrought backlash within the discipline over this trend that it imagined to be postmodern, whatever that is, apparently being self-critical is evil. With reference to the third and final point of this presentation, looking for alternatives and options to cooptation, for less useful anthropologies, I was inspired by Sider’s ideas about how a partisan anthropology, done “to help the victims of currently intensifying inequalities,” might begin, and it would begin in “the design of fieldwork and in the context of understanding struggle” (p. 44). He advocates against interviews, against asking questions of so-called informants, and against any form of recording data. Asking questions, he notes, is a seemingly simple act that opens our work to

use by those who seek to dominate and control the people we study (p. 45). There are other ways we can work, he says, less open, but not impervious, to subsequent manipulation. Other options include choosing research projects that, in the eyes of the national security state, are entirely useless, and to write up the results in very esoteric language, with ample self-criticism. Another option is to do more "research at home" either collaborating with persons who are not the subject of either a moral panic or some hyperbolic national security hysteria, or, producing critiques of the way elites exercise power and enforce inequalities and injustices. Another option is open source ethnography done online, to collaborate with the producers of online information of ethnographic value, remixing it so that it becomes problematic to military examination. Not publishing in open access formats is another option, especially once the work is not funded by a public agency, the argument that "the public has a right to the research it funded" vanishes into irrelevance. We can also imagine experimenting with forms of research communication that defy easy understanding and conventional requirements of the military planner's database, such as fictionalized ethnographies; ethnographic poetry; open source cinema (see here also); theatrical coproductions, and so forth.

Case

2NC

SPEC Arguments

They say “27 off is abuse”

1. Original abuse occurred by the 1AC's failure to specify- we ran our args as reactions to what they did
2. The aff should be able to defend what they do and do not do in the 1AC- there are reasons why each of our SPECs might not be necessary and we're ready to have that debate
3. The aff has infinite prep time, and this strategy is widely available online. They should have been ready to debate this
4. Equal speech times check abuse- we had 8 minutes to run this, and you had 8 minutes to refute it- do a decent line-by-line and you'll be done with time to spare
5. Squirrely arguments are more real world- not everyone IRL will play nice, and being able to deal with things that might feel unfair is key to being an effective advocate in the real world
6. Stable 2NR checks abuse- no matter what, we're only going for one off case position in the 2NR which means that you and I both get 5 minutes to talk on one point- do a decent overarching job at the debate and you'll be ready for whatever we choose to go with
7. No rule violation- nowhere is there a cap for how many off case arguments we can run and it was OUR hard work and practice that enabled us to run 27 off- reward us for our practice and prep and don't penalize us if the aff can't meet that standard
8. Promotes education- breadth is good- we can learn more- which turns their education arguments- where else would they get a chance to debate about Yin and Yang, the Zapitistas, or Friendship in debate?

They say “SPEC arguments are illegitimate”

1. SPEC is another form of theory- we

Transformality K

They say “perm”

1. Group the perms- they're all severance because the 1AC spent a lot of time trying to convince you to vote aff by crying crocodile tears about all the violence and death that would occur as a result of not enacting plan
2. Severance perms are illegitimate and a voter
 - A. Kills clash and education- severing out of what you advocate means the neg can never have stable ground to debate against
 - B. Not real world- you can't just abandon key points of your argument and claim that you win
 - C. Infinitely regressive- if severance is okay, it justifies severing out of your entire plan and just claiming “vote aff on presumption”
3. Rejecting liberalism while still endorsing the AFF reaffirms the idea that a responsible agent can morally determine the nature of suffering --- total rejection of liberalism is key

Abbas 10 (Asma – Professor of Social Studies at Bard College at Simon's Rock, *Liberalism and Human Suffering: Materialist Reflections on Politics, Ethics, and Aesthetics*, p. 38-39)

The dizzying back and forth between professed Kantians and Humeans blurs the fact that, regardless of whether morality is anchored interior to the acting subject or determined by the effects of the actions of the subject as they play out in the outside world, the unit of analysis is quite the same. Thus, when touchy liberals desire better attention to the fact of human pain and suffering, they manage to talk about cruelty where, ironically, cruel actions are derivatives of cruel agents and the victim's suffering is just fallout. Besides this shared inability to dispel the primacy of the agent and the perpetrator in favor of the sufferer of pain, the rift between Kant and Hume is deceptive in another way. In terms of historical evolution, the current status of cruelty betrays a fetish of the active agent. It is no accident that the terms “good” and “evil” require a focus on cruelty and its infliction, leaving untouched the suffering of cruelty. Moral psychology ends up being the psychology of cruelty, which is a moral question, and hence of those who cause it. In the same frame, suffering is never a moral, let alone political or legal, question unless a moral agent with a conscience has caused it. All sufferers automatically become victims in the eyes of politics and law when “recognized.” Suffering is thus relevant as a political question only after it is a moral one, when it is embodied and located in a certain way, when it surpasses arbitrary thresholds. It is one thing to claim that liberalism, whether empiricist or idealist, cannot overcome its subject-centeredness even in its moments of empathy for the “victim.” It is another to understand the stubborn constitution of the agent at the helm of liberal

justice and ask what makes it so incurable and headstrong and what the temperament of this stubbornness might be: is it pathetic, squishy, helplessly compassionate, humble, philanthropic, imperialist, venomous, neurotic, all of the above, or none of these? Not figuring out this pathos is bound to reduce all interaction with liberal assertions to one or another act of editing or "correcting" them. Inadvertently, all protests to liberalism tread a limited, predictable path and will be, at some point, incorporated within it. Liberalism's singular gall and violence is accessed every time a resistance to it is accommodated by liberalism. Think, for instance, not only of how often liberals affirm their clumsiness and mediocrity in speaking for the other's suffering but also of how quickly its antagonists—purveyors of many a righteous anti-representational politics—"make space" for the voice of others without challenging the liberal, colonizing structures that determine and distribute the suffering and speaking self, and the suffering and speaking other, to begin with. This protest leaves unquestioned what it means to speak for one's own, or others', suffering and whether there are other ways of speaking suffering that problematize these as the only options.

4. The aff is in the OPPOSITE direction of the alternative, which means you can evaluate the aff as a disad to the perm- the only possibility is that the perm functions worse than the alt alone

Link

They say “no link- we aren’t banking on suffering”

But their seemingly objective impact claims are a mask of what they really want you to vote on- the suffering that they claim will happen

High-magnitude impact calculus is based on a culture of fear

Lynne Stuart **Parramore** Oct 30, 2014 (Lynn Parramore is contributing editor at AlterNet. She is cofounder of Recessionwire, founding editor of New Deal 2.0, and author of "Reading the Sphinx: Ancient Egypt in Nineteenth-Century Literary Culture." She received her Ph.D. in English and cultural theory from NYU, and she serves on the editorial board of Lapham's Quarterly. Follow her on Twitter @LynnParramore).http://www.salon.com/2014/10/30/americas_growing_society_of_fear_paranoia_conspiracy_theories_and_the_rise_of Ebola_partner/

In some pockets of America, people are freaking out about getting Ebola. Parents in Mississippi kept their children home from middle school because the principal recently traveled to Africa. A Texas college has turned away students from Ebola-infected countries. Some conservative commentators want to close down the borders and ban flights to and from West Africa. With only four known cases of Ebola appearing in the U.S., the chances of contracting the disease are close to nil, but that doesn't prevent a fantasy from taking shape, one in which something terrifying arises from deepest, darkest Africa, threatening to take over our bodies. The fantasy summons our prejudices and clouds our thinking. Air pollution is far more likely to injure and kill us, but that idea doesn't carry the narrative punch of an Ebola fantasy. The threat of airborne toxins feels too pervasive and we feel too vulnerable and exposed. The damage is gradual and often invisible, rather than immediate and dramatic. It doesn't allow us to conjure an outsider, a scary other on whom we can project our anxieties. The individual survivalist can do little to reduce the threat of air pollution to his own body except perhaps move to another town. But purchasing rubber gloves and shopping at less crowded times of the day as protection from Ebola can convey a feeling of safety and control — even against a virtually non-existent threat. There are many real dangers of modern life, like the fact that the richest one percent have now grabbed half the world's assets or the ongoing destruction of nature — two massive problems whose danger is accelerating. But it's the unlikely scenarios and unproven threats to our individual bodies that seem to have the firmest grip on our imaginations. Sociologists refer to the “risk society” as one in which people increasingly think about threats to personal safety, both real and unreal. America is becoming a risk society, focused disproportionately on individual physical fears instead of say, economic risks, which may seem harder to understand and confront. Our bodies — the fragile flesh envelopes we are forced to carry around — become the site of our anxiety and the place where imaginary battles are played out. Americans are unlikely to suffer from vitamin deficiencies, for example, and yet we fill our shelves with largely useless and sometimes harmful dietary supplements to treat nonexistent conditions. One moment we are removing gluten from our diets because of nonsensical fears that it is wreaking havoc on our bodies; the next moment we're stocking up on hand-sanitizers despite the fact that they may be helping to create resistant superbugs. Irrational fears have always been with us, of course. For 200 years, Europeans were

afraid of tomatoes because they believed that wealthy people got sick and died after eating them. In reality, the pewter plates used by aristocrats were giving them lead poisoning, heightened by the tomato's acidity. But the tomato itself became the culprit, and the fear denied people a perfectly healthy food option. Fears that tomatoes were poisonous lingered long after science had discovered the dangers of lead. Similarly today, it doesn't matter how many times the notion that Canola oil (made from the rape plant, a member of the mustard family) is poisonous is debunked, the myth that it will hurt you persists on the Internet and removes a perfectly healthy oil from many American diets.

Fear is contingent on discourse of suffering- means they bite the link

Jaggi **Vasudev 2013** (Jaggi Vasudev, commonly known as Sadhguru, is an Indian yogi, mystic, philanthropist and author of over 100 titles in 8 different languages.[1] He founded the Isha Foundation, a non-profit organisation which offers yoga programs around the world, including India, United States, England, Lebanon, Singapore, Canada, Malaysia, Uganda, China, Nepal and Australia. The Foundation is also involved in various social and community development activities, which have resulted in the Foundation being granted special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations) <http://www.ishafoundation.org/blog/sadhguru/masters-words/how-to-overcome-fear/>

Sadhguru: Fear is simply because you are not living with life, you are living in your mind. Your fear is always about what's going to happen next. That means your fear is always about that which does not exist. If your fear is about the non-existent, your fear is hundred percent imaginary. If you are suffering the non-existential, we call that insanity. So, people may be in just socially accepted levels of insanity, but if you're afraid or if you're suffering anything which does not exist, it amounts to insanity, isn't it? People are always suffering either what happened yesterday or what may happen tomorrow. So your suffering is always about that which does not exist, simply because you're not rooted in reality, you're always rooted in your mind. Mind is – one part of it is memory, another part of it is imagination. Both of them are in one way imagination, because both of them don't exist right now. You're lost in your imagination, that's the basis of your fear. If you were rooted in reality, there would be no fear. What fear does is it puts boundaries around you. It is because of fear that you build boundaries all the time. If you put boundaries and restrict the area of your life, you may be safe but the problem is you are safe even from life. You are protected from life itself. That's real protection! The Hallucinatory Mind You must decide whether you have come here to experience life or to avoid life. If you have come to experience life, one thing that is needed is intensity. If you do not have intensity you will experience a meager life. The moment you use fear as a tool to protect yourself, your intensity will go down. Once it goes down, your ability to experience life is gone. You become a psychological case. What happens in your mind is all there will be. You will never experience anything fantastic and ecstatic because when you are fearful, you will not have a sense of abandon. You can't sing, you can't dance, you can't laugh, you can't cry, you can't do anything that is life. You can only sit here and grieve about life and all the risks of life. If you look at it carefully, what is fear about? Your fear is never about what has happened. It is always about what may happen. It is always about the future. The future is yet to happen. It has not yet happened. That means, it is not in existence. So, being fearful means you are suffering that which does not exist. If you suffer that which does not exist, should we call you sane or insane? Your only comfort is "everybody is like me." You have the majority with you! But that still doesn't make it right because you are suffering that which does not exist. How to Overcome Fear Fear is not a product of life.

Fear is a product of a hallucinatory mind. You suffer that which does not exist because you are rooted not in reality but in your mind which is constantly eating up on the past and excreting into the future. You don't actually know anything about future. You just take a piece of the past, apply make-up on it and think it is future.

Even if you don't buy that- Discourse of "problem solving" leads to perpetuation of the state

Mann 96 (Paul, Department of English Pomona College, "The Nine Grounds of Intellectual Warfare", <http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/text-only/issue.196/mann.196>)

To repeat: The object of criticism is always a symptom, if you will, of the structure of critical discourse itself, always a phenomenalization of the device. But this device tends to appear in a surrogate form, still dissimulated and displaced; it appears and does not appear, makes itself known in ways that further conceal its stakes. And it always appears too late, at the very moment it ceases to function: a kind of theory-death, a death that is not a termination but a particular sort of elaboration. Now, everywhere we look, critics will be casting off their clerical mantles and rhetorical labcoats for suits of discursive armor; the slightest critical aggression or resentment will be inflated with theoretical war-machines and territorial metaphors.⁷ At the same time, the very rise of war discourse among us will signal the end of intellectual warfare for us, its general recuperation by the economics of intellectual production and exchange. It might therefore be delusional -- even, as some would argue, obscene, given the horrible damage of real war -- to think of this academic bickering as warfare, and yet it remains a trace of war, and perhaps the sign of a potential combat some critical force could still fight. It would be a mistake to assume that this metamorphosis of discourse as war into discourse on war has occurred because criticism has become more political. On the contrary, criticism has never been more than a political effect -- "policy" carried out, and in our case dissipated, by other means. The long process of seizing politics as the proper object of criticism is one more tardy phenomenalization of the device. What we witness -- and what difference would it make even if I were right? -- is not proof of the politicization of criticism but an after-image of its quite peripheral integration with forms of geopolitical conflict that are, in fact, already being dismantled and remodeled in war rooms, defense institutes, and multinational corporate headquarters. War talk, like politics talk, like ethics talk, like all critical talk, is nostalgic from the start. While we babble about territories and borders, really still caught up in nothing more than a habitual attachment to disciplinary "space" and anxious dreams of "agency," the technocrats of warfare are developing strategies that no longer depend on any such topography, strategies far more sophisticated than anything we have imagined. And we congratulate ourselves for condemning them, and for our facile analogies between video games and smart bombs. I would propose two distinct diagnoses of the rise of war talk. On one hand, war talk is merely another exercise in rhetorical inflation, intended to shore up the fading value of a dubious product, another symptom of the imaginary politics one witnesses everywhere in critical discourse, another appearance of a structural device at the very moment it ceases to operate. On the other hand, war talk might still indicate the possibility of actually becoming a war machine, of pursuing a military equivalent of thought beyond all these petty contentions, of realizing the truth of discourse as warfare and finally beginning to fight. It will be crucial here not to choose between these diagnoses. In the domain of criticism they function simultaneously, in a perpetual mutual interference; there is no hope of extricating one from the other, no hope of either becoming critical warriors or being relieved of the demand that we do so.

And the state is the best internal link to our commodification impacts since it's the liberal politics of the state that benefit the most from it

Impact

They say “liberal politics and reform good- we need to fix specific instances of oppression”

Liberalism thrives on suffering – discourse only furthers the system

Abbas 10 (Asma, Bard College at Simon's Rock, Division of Social Studies, “Liberalism and Human Suffering: Materialist Reflections on Politics, Ethics, and Aesthetics”)

Liberalism continually refuses to acknowledge or confront the processes that underlie and overwrite its needed abstractions such as subjectivity, victimization, ownership, memory, pain, injury, harm, and representation. When it does try to grasp the dynamic processes constituting experience, liberalism cannot do so without congealing them. In dividing up experience into suffering, injury, and injustice, it remains oblivious and insensitive to the internal relations between various registers of the experience it installs and shapes. By virtue of their shared formalism, idealist and empiricist liberalisms affirm each other's inability to recognize the spatial or temporal excess and residue of concepts. The word “admission” conveys this mechanistic logic, where subjects and their suffering are admitted into liberalism on preset terms, and where entry into a sphere or arena requires registering at the door with an assigned role, relinquishing any matter and materiality not relevant to the operations of liberal justice. The problem is not passivity per se but the lack of respect both the idealists and the empiricists have for the body's way of suffering through the world. The inert woundedness in each case is considered inferior to the condition that puts the wounds to use, trades them, alienates them, or transcends them, with amputations, anesthesia, repression, denial, and amnesia. The idealist body, transcended, stays around as a tool for knowing, assessing, and doing. It becomes easily colonizable, with all ability to ask questions and pass judgment reposed securely in supposedly superior faculties. When liberals like Shklar invest in their empiricism or materialism, the body is more present, but it is always already conscripted—at best, as the barricade at which these conflicts are fought; at worst, as one source of subjugated knowledge among others. Such materialism separates our ways of knowing, being, and confronting the matter and categories of experience; it is not dialectical. Any return to the body without a requisite disruption in these terms of relating knowledge, experience, creation, and destruction to each other, ontologically and epistemologically, is bound to only exhumate the body in predictably vulgar and servile ways. The victim is similarly redeemed by being corralled back to the center of a liberal politics that conceives of itself as having any fidelity to its founding. The word “inclusion,” when used in conventional political discourse, still potentially misleads by suggesting that what is now being included or admitted was ever out. It is hard, though, to take liberalism at its word about when it excludes and when it includes—unless, of course, when each is seen in a relation to the other and to the conditions therein.⁴⁶ If the sufferer does not fulfill these conditions, her suffering remains invisible and illegible. When these conditions are enforced as the premise for suffering to matter and justice to be done, the violence, humiliation, and subjection that are conferred in this process are either not even sensed or are accepted as inevitable. Maybe when all is said and done, despite its steadfast adherence to a noble will to admit the excluded, liberalism has failed to earn any trust in its ability to sense absent presences and present absences—otherwise, why the impulse to hide one's face every time the curtain call sounds for the meticulously dictated performances of victims?

Liberalism turns us all into slaves of the system and makes suffering worthless

Abbas 10 (Asma, Bard College at Simon's Rock, Division of Social Studies, “Voice Lessons: Suffering and the Liberal Sensorium”,

https://www.academia.edu/12959331/Voice_Lessons_Suffering_and_the_Liberal_Sensorium)

Liberalism may have ushered in yet another coming of slave morality, in order never to be caught in its own act: where one can either follow the pied piper into fifteen minutes of glorious victimhood, or resist this accommodation by regularising the pain so that the former is no longer tempting. This may be the only way the remainder, the excess of the discourse, protects itself. Or, to be hopeful for a moment, this could force another sensibility of suffering, obligation and sympathy altogether, beyond the depleted senses of the colonisers. A materialist ought to be able to embrace finitudes and deaths, those of senses as well, when one's senses of damage have been damaged beyond damage, when suffering only becomes material when someone in power names it so. Maybe it opens the possibility of seeing the affluent enact their farce of petting their consciences so that any mention of human suffering immediately triggers a Pavlovian response to recite, for instance, how much private humanitarian aid has flowed into South East Asia or Haiti. Is there a closeness in the silence that the Rabbi keeps, and which Prior Walter rewrites? Is there a different way those that are "closer" ought to suffer? What contempt must or does this familiarity breed—and toward whom? Is silence the consequence of questions that no longer seem to fit? When silence is deemed the befitting response to suffering, is that an essential claim about suffering, or a historical one? Perhaps the words and queries preceding the moment of speech are so overpowering that the sufferer does not even know where to begin. Liberal inadequacies in this regard also miss the fact of the how elite philosophical, political, and legal discourses are complicit in rendering suffering—whether "natural" or "moral"—mute by insisting on a certain kind of speech and translation. The way in which the question has forever been posed deserves only a very deeply felt refusal to speak.

Impact turn their "political discussion good" arguments here, judge. The state only seeks to legitimate itself at the expense of everyone- the idea of liberal politics is to cry crocodile tears about specific instances of injustice but then prop up the system that provides the preconditions for the existence of injustice.

Alternative

They say “no alt solvency” - but we have 3 responses to this

1. Rejection of each specific instance of liberal knowledge production undermines the ability of the state to perpetuate itself- this means that even voting neg spills over to achieve partial alt solvency even in the squo without fiat or anything
2. The alternative is to create scholarship USELESS to the military state- they're banking on having pedagogical support because otherwise they can't develop new weapons and tactics- by creating useless scholarship, we collapse the ability of the state to perpetuate itself
3. The notion of “solvency” on the alt is a misunderstanding- to win the alt, we need to win that the alt is net good and resolves the impacts- which is 100% true- by not focusing on suffering and perpetuation of the state, we resolve our commodification and liberalism impacts

They say “alt is bad for education” - but we have 5 responses to this

1. The alt is good for education-learning why not to support the state is the greatest possible net impact of the round since we access root cause
2. “Useless scholarship” means that it's USELESS TO THE STATE- that's our Forte 9 evidence- means that we aren't propping up the state
3. Scholarship useless to the state is scholarship MOST USEFUL to debaters- debate is a game, a playground for us to learn how to construct and examine arguments critically- and playing around with nonsense in the debate space is the best way to be able to go toe to toe with power in the real world- The military plays with toys to imagine strategy for later, so why can't debaters do the same?

4. Their conception of “education” is just training us to be obedient little policymakers who will prop up the state in the real world- so you can turn all their education claims as directly biting our K impacts
5. Education isn't the standard to evaluate debate through- your primary consideration should be the game of it- because the game is what prepares us for the real world. The issues change, but the game of how to discuss them stays the same, so you should evaluate the game first- and there's a certain way to play the game that avoids propping up the very institutions the game is preparing us to challenge.