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### T: Material Action

1. **Our interpretation – The affirmative has to defend a material action. They can talk about whatever they want, but they must present an action we can negate. The negative should win if they prove enactment of this advocacy is undesirable.**
2. **Violation- they offer no stasis point for the debate and won’t defend the consequences of their advocacy statement. They view the ballot as an end in and of itself and do not offer a practical solution to \_\_\_\_\_\_**
3. **Vote Neg:**

**1) Ground - Not defending a specific action, method, or starting point means you can literally say racism is bad and sit down. Our interpretation is key to foster debates on the means they advocate when both sides fundamentally agree on the ends.**

**No stable advocacy statement means we could k your methodology and you could say “we don’t defend that” and sit down. This debate is not productive, and it kills clash and education which is essential for access to debate and trump on theory. Every reason why your aff is good is a reason to prefer our interpretation.**

**2) Clash is predicated off of a stable topic, when there is no stability in a debate, all substantive argumentation is mooted. This is key to fairness which is essential to access on a theory level.**

**Shively, 2k** (Assistant Prof Political Science at Texas A&M, Ruth Lessl, Partisan Politics and Political Theory, p. 181-2)

The requirements given thus far are primarily negative. The **ambiguists must say "no" to-they must reject and limit-some ideas and actions.** In what follows, we will also find that they must say "yes" to some things. In particular, they must say "yes" to the idea of rational persuasion. This means, first, that **they must recognize the role of agreement in political contest, or the basic accord that is necessary to discord**. The mistake that the ambiguists make here is a common one. **The mistake is in thinking that agreement marks the end of contest-that consensus kills debate**. But this is true only if the agreement is perfect-if there is nothing at all left to question or contest. In most cases, however, **our agreements are highly imperfect**. **We agree on some matters but not on others, on generalities but not on specifics, on principles but not on their applications, and so on.** **And this kind of limited agreement is the starting condition of contest and debate**. As John Courtney Murray writes: **We hold certain truths; therefore we can argue about them**. It seems to have been one of the corruptions of intelligence by positivism to assume that argument ends when agreement is reached. In a basic sense, the reverse is true. **There can be no argument except on the premise, and within a context, of agreement**. (Murray 1960, 10) **In other words, we cannot argue about something if we are not communicating: if we cannot agree on the topic and terms of argument or if we have utterly different ideas about what counts as evidence or good argument. At the very least, we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it**. For instance, one cannot have an argument about euthanasia with someone who thinks euthanasia is a musical group. One cannot successfully stage a sit-in if one's target audience simply thinks everyone is resting or if those doing the sitting have no complaints. **Nor can one demonstrate resistance to a policy if no one knows that it is a policy**. In other words, **contest is meaningless if there is a lack of agreement or communication about what is being contested**. **Resisters, demonstrators, and debaters must have some shared ideas about the subject and/or the terms of their disagreements.** The participants and the target of a sit-in must share an understanding of the complaint at hand. And a demonstrator's audience must know what is being resisted. In short, the contesting of an idea presumes some agreement about what that idea is and how one might go about intelligibly contesting it. In other words, **contestation rests on some basic agreement or harmony.**

#### AND Lack of clash collapses the transformative potential of the AC – this denies the solvency of the affirmative method

**Tonn ’05** (Mari Boor, Professor of Communication – University of Maryland, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public”, *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, Fall)

Perhaps the most conspicuous effort at replacing public debate with therapeutic dialogue was President Clinton's Conversation on Race, launched in mid-1997. Controversial from its inception for its ideological bent, the initiative met further widespread criticism for its encounter-group approaches to racial stratification and strife, critiques echoing previously articulated concerns- my own among them6-that certain dangers lurk in employing private or social communication modes for public problem-solving.7 Since then, others have joined in contesting the treating of public problems with narrative and psychological approaches, which-in the name of promoting civility, cooperation, personal empowerment, and socially constructed or idiosyncratic truths-actually work to **contain dissent**, locate systemic social problems **solely within individual neurosis**, and otherwise **fortify hegemony**.8 Particularly noteworthy is Michael Schudson's challenge to the utopian equating of "conversation" with the "soul of democracy." Schudson points to pivotal differences in the goals and architecture of conversational and democratic deliberative processes. To him, political (or democratic) conversation is a contradiction in terms. Political deliberation entails a clear instrumental purpose, ideally remaining ever mindful of its implications beyond an individual case. Marked by disagreement-even pain-democratic deliberation contains **transparent prescribed procedures** **governing** participation and **decision making** so as to protect the timid or otherwise weak. In such processes, written records chronicle the interactional journey toward resolution, and in the case of writing law especially, provide accessible justification for decisions rendered. In sharp contrast, conversation is often "small talk" exchanged among family, friends, or candidates for intimacy, unbridled by set agendas, and prone to egocentric rather than altruistic goals. **Subject only to unstated "rules**" such as turn-taking and politeness, conversation tends to advantage the gregarious or articulate over the shy or slight of tongue.9 The events of 9/11, the onset of war with Afghanistan and Iraq, and the subsequent failure to locate Iraqi weapons of mass destruction have resuscitated some faith in debate, argument, warrant, and facts as **crucial to the public sphere**. Still, the romance with public conversation persists. As examples among communication scholars, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's 2001 Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture treated what she termed "the rhetoric of conversation" as a means to "manage controversy" and empower non-dominant voices10; multiple essays in a 2002 special issue of Rhetoric & Public Affairs on deliberative democracy couch a deliberative democratic ideal in dialogic terms11; and the 2005 Southern States Communication Convention featured family therapist Sallyann Roth, founding member and trainer of the Public Conversations Project, as keynote speaker.12 Representative of the dialogic turn in deliberative democracy scholarship is Gerard A. Hauser and Chantal Benoit-Barne's critique of the traditional procedural, reasoning model of public problem solving: "A deliberative model of democracy . . . constru[es] democracy in terms of participation in the ongoing conversation about how we shall act and interact-our political relations" and "Civil society redirects our attention to the language of social dialogue on which our understanding of political interests and possibility rests."13 And on the political front, British Prime Minister Tony Blair-facing declining poll numbers and mounting criticism of his indifference to public opinion on issues ranging from the Iraq war to steep tuition hike proposals-launched The Big Conversation on November 28, 2003. Trumpeted as "as way of enriching the Labour Party's policy making process by listening to the British public about their priorities," the initiative includes an interactive government website and community meetings ostensibly designed to solicit citizens' voices on public issues.14 In their own way, each treatment of public conversation positions it as a democratic good, a mode that heals divisions and carves out spaces wherein ordinary voices can be heard. In certain ways, Schudson's initial reluctance to dismiss public conversation echoes my own early reservations, given the ideals of egalitarianism, empowerment, and mutual respect conversational advocates champion. Still, in the spirit of the dialectic ostensibly underlying dialogic premises, this essay argues that various negative consequences can result from transporting conversational and therapeutic paradigms into public problem solving. In what follows, I extend Schudson's critique of a conversational model for democracy in two ways: First, whereas Schudson primarily offers a theoretical analysis, I interrogate public conversation as a praxis in a variety of venues, illustrating how public "conversation" and "dialogue" have been **coopted to silence rather than empower** marginalized or dissenting voices. In practice, public conversation easily can emulate what feminist political scientist Jo Freeman termed "the **tyranny of structurelessness**" in her classic 1970 critique of consciousness- raising groups in the women's liberation movement,15 as well as the key traits Irving L. Janis ascribes to "groupthink."16 Thus, contrary to its promotion as a means to neutralize hierarchy and exclusion in the public sphere, public conversation can and **has accomplished the reverse**. When such moves are rendered transparent, public conversation and dialogue, I contend, risk increasing rather than diminishing **political cynicism and alienation**. **[Continues…]** This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that traditionally excluded females and nonwhites and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power **unchecked and** potentially **capricious**. Moreover, **the privileging of the self, personal experiences, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm mirrors justifications once used by dominant groups who used their own lives, beliefs, and interests as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress women, the lower class, and people of color**. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102

#### 3) Anti-Politics – Their “close-to-home” form of politics breeds apathy which turns the case method

Nina **Eliasoph** is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern California –Theory and Society, Vol. 26, No. 5 (Oct., 19**97**), pp. 605-647 – http://www.jstor.org/stable/658024

**If it's not something that** [pause] **effects** [pause] **my** [pause] **family, I don't see** [pause] **me** [pause] **doing it**. [Speeds up] **And-I-mean-of-course-nuclear-war-could-affect-my** [chuckles] **family. But** I still don't - **if it's not local**, **I mean, I'm more - maybe it's small-minded**. (Sherry, a schools volunteer, in an interview) **Was she really as small-minded as she claimed to be? ``I care about issues that are close to home**,'' ``I care if it affects me personally,'' ``I care if it's for my children'': **these are the familiar phrases that many Americans use to explain political involvement and apathy**. Journalists, activists, and theorists often take these phrases at face value; politicians base social policies on them, trying to play to voters whom they imagine to be self-interested and short-sighted, cutting funds for projects that do not seem ``close to home.'' **The phrases are usually interpreted as transparently obvious indications of citizens' self-interest and lack of broad political concern** - their ``small-mindedness.'' **But these instant, extravagant expressions of self-interest do not simply indicate clear, straightforward self-interest or parochial thinking**. **The phrases work hard. Activists, intellectuals, and other concerned citizens often assume that someone** like Sherry **just doesn't care or is self-interested or ignorant; we try to draw people like her into political participation by impressing upon them that they should care (perhaps by telling them how nuclear war might affect their kids**), or telling them not to be so self-interested. **This article shows just how hard someone** such as Sherry **has to work to avoid expressing political concern**. **Penetrating this pervasive culture of political avoidance requires a new way of understanding this thing that sounds like apathy and self-interest**. **Using examples from a two-year fieldwork and interview study among volunteers, activists, and recreation groups in a sprawling West Coast suburb, this article shows how much emotional and interactional weight these common phrases bear**; expanding from the case of ``close to home'' to everyday political speech in general, the article outlines questions about culture, power, and emotions, in order to explore a way of thinking about political engagement, disengagement, and grassroots social change. **If we recognize that producing apathy takes a great deal of work, then we may find an unnoticed reserve of hope; we may begin to draw out the contradictory, tangled, democratic impetus embedded in citizens' everyday interactions - and also the impetus toward self-enclosed, narrowness embedded in these same interactions. In other words, by paying attention to the ways people actually talk in these groups, we can begin to understand the politics of civil society - sometimes participating in civic groups expands citizens' horizons, sometimes it shrinks them, sometimes it does both at once.**

#### The impact is huge --- ceding the political makes collective action impossible --- moving away from anti-politics is vital to check extinction – this is the largest impart under their method

**Small ‘6**

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, **the new century will present challenges that require collective action**, unity, and enlightened self-interest. **Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates**, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability **will require** cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all **solidarity** – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. Our very existence **depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society.**  With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. **We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation.** Unlike any other crisis before**, the** noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. **Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events.** Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, **we need to teach cooperation**, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. **It will require a** radical **transformation of our conception of education**. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, **civic engagement**, and service learning in education **will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty**. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; **today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world.** Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, **part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government** and commerce, **have the potential for positive change.** Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

#### To clarify the shell – we’re impact turning their method and saying their method of debate is terrible.

### **CP – Equity**

#### Counterplan text – Member nations of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 should equitably distribute all resources harvested and exploited in outer space between all signatory nations.

#### Specifically, we defend a model similar to the welfare state of Norway, as advocated by

**Shammas and Holen 19** ~Victor L. Shammas -X, Tomas B. Holen- X) "Capitalism and Outer Space: Replies to an Interlocutor" Dr. Victor Lund Shammas Blog, <https://www.victorshammas.com/blog/2019/12/17/capitalism-and-outer-space>,  12/18/2019

If you could change the way the space enterprise works, how would it look?

Our advice would be to respect the intent of the Outer Space Treaty from 1967. The Outer Space Treaty says that all resources harvested and exploited in outer space should benefit all of humankind.If we do  manage to reach the potential resources found in outer space, they should benefit all of humanity. Profits should be shared equitably between all signatory nations. As we write in our paper, Donald Trump’s administration has essentially stated that this treaty is null and void. According to Scott Pace, the Executive Director of the National Space Council, outer space is precisely *not* “the ‘common heritage of mankind’, not ‘res communis’, nor is it a public good.” Well, that’s it for the Outer Space Treaty, then, which proposed a kind of Cold War-era *proto-communism in space*, with all profits to be shared equitably between all people back on Earth. Trump’s people hate this mindset of course, because they think profit-making is the only motivator of human action, a very neoliberal notion that makes a mockery of altruism and selfless curiosity that guide and drive a thousand acts of interpersonal kindness and scientific inquiry each and every day.

The notion that the Outer Space Treaty should still apply seems quite common-sensical to us. As Norwegian scholars, coming from a Nordic, social-democratic context, we’ve witnessed first-hand the many benefits of a strong welfare state, with high levels of taxation on “ground rent” resources like hydroelectric dams and oil or natural gas fields. Profits from space enterprise should benefit all of humankind.

#### Social welfare model means that capitalists get their profit, but a helluva lot of it is redistributed back out – this solves your advantages because it makes stuff equitable whilst also solving case turns by allowing for capitalism to continue

#### CX conceded that CPs negate