# Dowling r5 vs mini meng <3

## 1

#### Interpretation: the affirmative may only garner offense from the hypothetical enactment of the resolution.

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Violation: they don’t and they gain offense off something that isn’t the passage of a government action i.e. the method. Reading a disad is insufficient when they would uplayer it.

#### Debate is a game since we’re both here to win so procedural questions come first. The only role of the ballot and judge is to vote for whoever better debated the topic. Only evaluating the truth of the plan allows us to determine the practical impacts of politics and preserves the predictability that fosters engagement. Rigorous contestation and third and fourth-line testing are key to generate the self-reflexivity that creates ethical subjects.

#### Vote Neg:

#### Their interp explodes limits and allows affs to monopolize the moral high ground. The lack of a stable mechanism lets them radically re-contextualize their aff and erase neg ground via perms – that causes a race to the margins where they’re incentivized to defend uncontestable statements like “racism bad” or “2+2=4.” Caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their model.

#### 2] SSD is good – it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism, while SSD encompasses your education.

#### 3] TVA: Allow for strikes only for Asian workers

#### Detailed research over specific points of difference is necessary for activism.

**Iverson ’9** [Joel; 2009; Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Montana, Ph.D in Communication from Arizona State University Relations at the University of Sydney; Debate Central, “Can Cutting Cards Carve into Our Personal Lives: An Analysis of Debate Research on Personal Advocacy,” https://debate.uvm.edu/dybvigiverson1000.html; GR]

Mitchell (1998) provides a thorough examination of the pedagogical implication for academic debate. Although Mitchell acknowledges that debate provides preparation for participation in democracy, limiting debate to a laboratory where students practice their skill for future participation is criticized. Mitchell contends:

For students and teachers of argumentation, the heightened salience of this question should signal the danger that critical thinking and oral advocacy skills alone may not be sufficient for citizens to assert their voices in public deliberation. (p. 45)

Mitchell contends that the laboratory style setting creates barriers to other spheres, creates a "sense of detachment" and causes debaters to see research from the role of spectators. Mitchell further calls for "argumentative agency [which] involves the capacity to contextualize and employ the skills and strategies of argumentative discourse in fields of social action, especially wider spheres of public deliberation" (p. 45). Although we agree with Mitchell that debate can be an even greater instrument of empowerment for students, we are more interested in examining the impact of the intermediary step of research. In each of Mitchell's examples of debaters finding creative avenues for agency, there had to be a motivation to act. It is our contention that the research conducted for competition is a major catalyst to propel their action, change their opinions, and to provide a greater depth of understanding of the issues involved.

The level of research involved in debate creates an in-depth understanding of issues. The level of research conducted during a year of debate is quite extensive. Goodman (1993) references a Chronicle of Higher Education article that estimated "the level and extent of research required of the average college debater for each topic is equivalent to the amount of research required for a Master's Thesis (cited in Mitchell, 1998, p. 55). With this extensive quantity of research, debaters attain a high level of investigation and (presumably) understanding of a topic. As a result of this level of understanding, debaters become knowledgeable citizens who are further empowered to make informed opinions and energized to take action. Research helps to educate students (and coaches) about the state of the world.

Without the guidance of a debate topic, how many students would do in-depth research on female genital mutilation in Africa, or United Nations sanctions on Iraq? The competitive nature of policy debate provides an impetus for students to research the topics that they are going to debate. This in turn fuels students’ awareness of issues that go beyond their front doors. Advocacy flows from this increased awareness. Reading books and articles about the suffering of people thousands of miles away or right in our own communities drives people to become involved in the community at large.

Research has also focused on how debate prepares us for life in the public sphere. Issues that we discuss in debate have found their way onto the national policy stage, and training in intercollegiate debate makes us good public advocates. The public sphere is the arena in which we all must participate to be active citizens. Even after we leave debate, the skills that we have gained should help us to be better advocates and citizens. Research has looked at how debate impacts education (Matlon and Keele 1984), legal training (Parkinson, Gisler and Pelias 1983, Nobles 19850 and behavioral traits (McGlone 1974, Colbert 1994). These works illustrate the impact that public debate has on students as they prepare to enter the public sphere.

The debaters who take active roles such as protesting sanctions were probably not actively engaged in the issue until their research drew them into the topic. Furthermore, the process of intense research for debate may actually change the positions debaters hold. Since debaters typically enter into a topic with only cursory (if any) knowledge of the issue, the research process provides exposure to issues that were previously unknown. Exposure to the literature on a topic can create, reinforce or alter an individual's opinions. Before learning of the School for the America's, having an opinion of the place is impossible. After hearing about the systematic training of torturers and oppressors in a debate round and reading the research, an opinion of the "school" was developed. In this manner, exposure to debate research as the person finding the evidence, hearing it as the opponent in a debate round (or as judge) acts as an initial spark of awareness on an issue. This process of discovery seems to have a similar impact to watching an investigative news report.

Mitchell claimed that debate could be more than it was traditionally seen as, that it could be a catalyst to empower people to act in the social arena. We surmise that there is a step in between the debate and the action. The intermediary step where people are inspired to agency is based on the research that they do. If students are compelled to act, research is a main factor in compelling them to do so. Even if students are not compelled to take direct action, research still changes opinions and attitudes.

Research often compels students to take action in the social arena. Debate topics guide students in a direction that allows them to explore what is going on in the world. Last year the college policy debate topic was,

Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should adopt a policy of constructive engagement, including the immediate removal of all or nearly all economic sanctions, with the government(s) of one or more of the following nation-states: Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Syria, North Korea.

This topic spurred quite a bit of activism on the college debate circuit. Many students become actively involved in protesting for the removal of sanctions from at least one of the topic countries. The college listserve was used to rally people in support ofvarious movements to remove sanctions on both Iraq and Cuba. These messages were posted after the research on the topic began. While this topic did not lend itself to activism beyond rallying the government, other topics have allowed students to take their beliefs outside of the laboratory and into action.

In addition to creating awareness, the research process can also reinforce or alter opinions. By discovering new information in the research process, people can question their current assumptions and perhaps formulate a more informed opinion. One example comes from a summer debate class for children of Migrant workers in North Dakota (Iverson, 1999). The Junior High aged students chose to debate the adoption of Spanish as an official language in the U.S. Many students expressed their concern that they could not argue effectively against the proposed change because it was a "truism." They were wholly in favor of Spanish as an official language. After researching the topic throughout their six week course, many realized much more was involved in adopting an official language and that they did not "speak 'pure' Spanish or English, but speak a unique dialect and hybrid" (Iverson, p. 3). At the end of the class many students became opposed to adopting Spanish as an official language, but found other ways Spanish should be integrated into American culture. Without research, these students would have maintained their opinions and not enhanced their knowledge of the issue. The students who maintained support of Spanish as an official language were better informed and thus also more capable of articulating support for their beliefs.

The examples of debate and research impacting the opinions and actions of debaters indicate the strong potential for a direct relationship between debate research and personal advocacy. However, the debate community has not created a new sea of activists immersing this planet in waves of protest and political action. The level of influence debater search has on people needs further exploration. Also, the process of research needs to be more fully explored in order to understand if and why researching for the competitive activity of debate generates more interest than research for other purposes such as classroom projects.

Since parliamentary debate does not involve research into a single topic, it can provide an important reference point for examining the impact of research in other forms of debate. Based upon limited conversations with competitors and coaches as well as some direct coaching and judging experience in parliamentary debate, parliamentary forms of debate has not seen an increase in activism on the part of debaters in the United States. Although some coaches require research in order to find examples and to stay updated on current events, the basic principle of this research is to have a commonsense level of understanding(Venette, 1998). As the NPDA website explains, "the reader is encouraged to be well-read in current events, as well as history, philosophy, etc. Remember: the realm of knowledge is that of a 'well-read college student'" (NPDA Homepage,<http://www.bethel.edu/Majors/Communication/npda/faq2.html>). The focus of research is breadth, not depth. In fact, in-depth research into one topic for parliamentary debate would seem to be counterproductive. Every round has a different resolution and for APDA, at least, those resolutions are generally written so they are open to a wide array of case examples, So, developing too narrow of a focus could be competitively fatal. However, research is apparently increasing for parliamentary teams as reports of "stock cases" used by teams for numerous rounds have recently appeared. One coach did state that a perceived "stock case" by one team pushed his debaters to research the topic of AIDS in Africa in order to be equally knowledgeable in that case. Interestingly, the coach also stated that some of their research in preparation for parliamentary debate was affecting the opinions and attitudes of the debaters on the team.

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

#### 4] Fairness is an impact –

#### A] Fairness is good and prior – debate’s a game that requires effective competition and negation, which makes their offense inevitable, it internal link turns clash and engagement.

#### B] Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters.

#### C] Can’t weigh the aff—it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### D] Inescapable – the AC conforms to every norm of debate – speed, speech times, ballots – proves they value playing the game and isolating T as the one bad rule is arbitrary.

#### E] Probability – ballots can’t shape our subjectivity or create broad political change but can rectify in-round skews.

#### 5] Exclusionary rule- you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### No impact turns:

#### 1] T is just an argument for why the aff is a bad idea, which is what every single negative position says—there’s nothing unique about T that causes violence but the cap k or case turns don’t

#### 2] T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable

**Use competing interps—reasonability collapses to offense defense paradigm.**

**No RVIs — Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect**

## 1.5

#### Abstract critique has derailed the Asian American Movement- political action is the only hope of change

Lin, JD Yale, 04

(Elbert, IDENTIFYING ASIAN AMERICA Southwestern University Law Review 2004 33 Sw. U. L. Rev. 217)

Change is needed in asian America. n1 The asian American "movement" - the asian American struggle for equality and against anti-asian American discrimination - continues to founder. America remains largely unaware or unconvinced of serious race-based discrimination against asian Americans. The problem, I believe, is a deep-seated one. Asian America has not simply been employing an unsuccessful strategy, it has been and continues to be wholly misguided in the sort of strategy it should be using. I lay the blame at the feet of current asian American race scholars. They have taken the asian American movement away from identity-based organizing and toward the universe of coalition building-type strategies. They have also boxed the movement into thinking only about methods that advance a "progressive" agenda. My belief is that only when asian America has shifted its basic direction will it be able to begin considering an appropriate strategy. In this Article, my goal is to address this first step: I make the case for a shift and chart a new direction for the asian American movement. First, I critique current asian American race theory. I demonstrate the weaknesses in its arguments against identity-based organizing. Indeed, I show that a successful strategy must embrace racial identity. I also illustrate the pitfalls of limiting ourselves to a "progressive" (or any political) agenda. Second, I use my critiques as guidelines for a new framework. The appropriate universe of strategies, therefore, includes those strategies that embrace identity-based organizing and that have a broader, more inclusive focus. But given the correct universe of strategies, which is the proper approach? A sufficiently thorough discussion must await a future forum. In this Article, I only set up that conversation. I roughly outline my preferred strategy and demonstrate how it passes my critiques of current asian American scholarship - in other words, that it falls within the new universe of identity-based, inclusive strategies. Before beginning, a few caveats are in order. For one, my critique will seem in large part directed at asian Critical scholars. This is because "asianCrit" dominates asian American race theory. My intent, however, is not to take sides; indeed, I draw on arguments from different asian American race theorists as they are appropriate. I believe no single [\*219] approach has been sufficient. I also do not mean to say asian American race scholarship has been wholly impotent. On the contrary, asian American race thinking has strongly made the case that asian Americans face race-based discrimination. In particular, they have drawn attention to the race-ing of asian Americans as perpetual foreigners, and they have undermined the model minority stereotype. My purpose here is to pick up where this success leaves off. Indeed, the strategy I believe asian America should follow is one where we make our treatment as perpetual foreigners our sole focus. I am critical only of their implementation - that they have failed to make the right things the objects of their action. Finally, I will not address the argument that asian American race theory has not failed or erred because its purpose never was to foment a successful movement. This Article takes as a fundamental assumption the belief that normative theory - including race theory - is intended to have practical effect. Much of legal academia, I understand, would contend otherwise. I assert, however, that race theory especially should have a practical intent. The fact that race scholars continue to struggle to find academic venues for discussion makes it ever more important not to waste our limited space on idle musings.

## 2

#### PIC: We endorse the aff besides reading it against another Asian debater in debate

#### Solves all of your offense—allows you to engage in poetry against other debaters besides Asians

#### DAs:

#### 1] Negation---if your aff is true, you force us to negate our own identity by defending the model minority as good or that there is no impact etc which is psychologically violent. Two impacts:

#### A] That fractures collectivity for your movement and destroys coalitions by pitting Asians against each other which is a tool of the white man.

#### B] Causes psychological violence for Asian debaters which outweighs by making the debate space non-inclusive

## 3

PIC: Allow Asian workers to strike

Extempted