#### defend a subset of countries and/or appropriation.

#### Violation: they defend Private entities ought not appropriate lunar heritage sites in outer space.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – Tiny affirmatives create many permutations of affirmatives making it impossible to do research. There are 194 Nations in the UN, there is mining, there are specific satelittes, there are forms of tourism, each possibility makes the combinations endless. This destroys small school participation and causes people to leave the activity.

#### 2] Clash – Tiny affirmatives shift out of generic DAs and Ks, giving them a head start while everyone else scrambles. This destroys critical thinking skills and never allows for affirmatives to actually test the validity of their methods.

#### Drop the debater to preserve accessibility. Accessibility is a multiplier for all impacts and controls the internal link to education and fairness. Debate is a game but if only a few play, it isn’t actually competitive. Likewise, educational values in debate cannot spill over if only a few access the same education everytime.

#### Use competing interps –reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### No RVIs—it’s their burden to be topical – shouldn’t get a cookie for being fair

RVIs create a race to the bottom. Debaters will intentionally be abusive to win on the theory page.

### Shell

**A. Interp: Debates must adopt a three tier process based on**

**1) personal experience**

**2) organic intellectuals**

**3) academic intellectuals**

**This is the best way to verify truth claims while incorporating personal knowledge that is a vital check on privilege and exclusion**

**Reid-Brinkley 08- PhD from UGA, professor of communications at the University of Pittsburgh** (Shanara, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE,”)

The process of signifyin’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence. As Green argues, their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”57 In other words, those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These legitimating practices usually function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledge-making practices, while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making 83 practices. The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.”58 Jones and Green offer an alternative framework for drawing claims in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. And we talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three blind folded people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then you can achieve a greater truth.59 Jones argues that without the three tier process debate claims are based on singular perspectives that privilege those with institutional and economic power. The Louisville debaters do not reject traditional evidence per se, instead they seek to augment or supplement what counts as evidence with other forms of knowledge produced outside of academia. As Green notes in the double-octo-finals at CEDA Nationals, “Knowledge surrounds me in the streets, through my peers, through personal experiences, and everyday wars that I fight with my mind.”60 The thee-tier process: personal experience, organic intellectuals, and traditional evidence, provides a method of argumentation that taps into diverse forms of knowledge-making practices. With the Louisville method, personal experience and organic intellectuals are placed on par with traditional forms of evidence. While the Louisville debaters see the benefit of academic research, they are also critically aware of the normative practices that exclude racial and ethnic minorities from policy-oriented discussions because of their lack of training and expertise. Such exclusions prevent radical solutions to racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia from being more permanently addressed. According to Green: bell hooks talks about how when we rely solely on one perspective to make our claims, radical liberatory theory becomes rootless. That’s the reason why we use a three-tiered process. That’s why we use alternative forms of discourse such as hip hop. That’s also how we use traditional evidence and our personal narratives so you don’t get just one perspective claiming to be the right way. Because it becomes a more meaningful and educational view as far as how we achieve our education.61 The use of hip hop and personal experience function as a check against the homogenizing function of academic and expert discourse. Note the reference to bell hooks. Green argues that without alternative perspectives, “radical libratory theory becomes rootless.” The term rootless seems to refer to a lack of grounded-ness in the material circumstances that academics or experts study. In other words, academics and experts by definition represent an intellectual population with a level of objective distance from that which they study. For the Louisville debaters, this distance is problematic as it prevents the development of a social politic that is rooted in the community of those most greatly affected by the status of oppression.

#### Violation: They have academic intellectuals but do not include personal experience or organic intellectuals.

#### Standards

#### 1] Paternalism - Their appeal to experts replicates the paternalism of colonialism- establishes police as the only source of knowledge

**Kothari 05- Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester,** (Uma, “Authority and Expertise: The Professionalisation of International Development and the Ordering of Dissent,” Antipode//MGD)

I begin with an examination of the post-war production of the development expert and the reproduction of systems of expertise and forms of authority that they articulate. To highlight the rising status and importance of the expert, I subsequently contrast the contemporary development professional with the British colonial officer, a figure who was frequently opposed to these new systems of expertise and subjectivity. Many former colonial officers who subsequently worked for the aid industry condemn post-independence development ‘‘experts’’ as self-designated professionals arguing that they possess limited knowledge and experience of the countries for which they advise, design and implement policies. This discussion exemplifies the continuities and divergences from colonialism to development and, more importantly, the trajectory from colonial rule to the neoliberal agenda and discourse of contemporary international development. The third section demonstrates the constraining effects of designating and channelling expertise and the subsequent co-optation of potentially critical discourses. This discussion focuses upon the creation of professionals and the exclusive forms of knowledge that surround the practice of participatory development—a popular approach that through its incorporation into mainstream, orthodox development has led to its widespread adoption in development policy and practice reflecting, in part, the continuing universalising project and strategies of neoliberalism (see Kothari and Minogue 2002). These refer primarily to the policies of economic reform, minimalist states, privatisation and principles of marketbased economics and the policy instruments of, for example, the World Bank and IMF’s structural adjustment programmes that enable them. But neoliberal policies further extend to, and affect, social, cultural and political issues including processes of social change and development, access to rights and justice as well as forms of individual and community dispossession (see Harvey 2003).

#### 2] Activism - Organic intellectualism does not forego theory- integrates it into vital political activism on the frontlines

**Hall 96- professor emeritus at Open University, cultural theorist, former president of the British Sociological Association** (Stuart, “Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies,” p. 267//MGD)

But I think it is very important that Gramsci’s thinking around these questions certainly captures part of what we were about. Because a second aspect of Gramsci’s definition of intellectual work, which I think has always been lodged somewhere close to the notion of cultural studies as a project, has been his requirement that the ‘organic intellectual’ must work on two fronts at one and the same time. On the one hand, we had to be at the very forefront of intellectual theoretical work because, as Gramsci says, it is the job of the organic intellectual to know more than the traditional intellectuals do: really know, not just pretend to know, not just to have the facility of knowledge, but to know deeply and profoundly. So often knowledge for marxism is pure recognition—the production again of what we have always known! If you are in the game of hegemony you have to be smarter than ‘them’. Hence, there are no theoretical limits from which cultural studies can turn back. But the second aspect is just as crucial: that the organic intellectual cannot absolve himself or herself from the responsibility of transmitting those ideas, that knowledge, through the intellectual function, to those who do not belong, professionally, in the intellectual class. And unless those two fronts are operating at the same time, or at least unless those two ambitions are part of the project of cultural studies, you can get enormous theoretical advance without any engagement at the level of the political project. I’m extremely anxious that you should not decode what I’m saying as an anti-theoretical discourse. It is not anti-theory, but it does have something to do with the conditions and problems of developing intellectual and theoretical work as a political practice. It is an extremely difficult road, not resolving the tensions between those two requirements, but living with them. Gramsci never asked us to resolve them, but he gave us a practical example of how to live with them. We never produced organic intellectuals (would that we had) at the Centre. We never connected with that rising historic movement; it was a metaphoric exercise. Nevertheless, metaphors are serious things. They affect one’s practice. I’m trying to redescribe cultural studies as theoretical work which must go on and on living with that tension.

#### Example of a 3-tier policy affirmative: Including the perspective of indigenous populations overwhelmed by overfishing, discussing decolonized efforts of denuclearization by activists, discussing how you engage with keeping, a personal relationship to the preservation of space and/or the earth we live on.

Cross apply the education and the paradigm issues from the spec shell. On RVIs: