**Util NC**

**The ROB is to evaluate the simulated consequences of the aff policy.**

**1. The state is inevitable - speaking the language of power through policymaking is the only way to create social change in debate.**

**Coverstone 5** – (Alan Coverstone; Masters in communication from Wake Forest, longtime debate coach;

**However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly** **co-opted by those who do learn the language of power**. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. **The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary** **and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate.** Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. **Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism.**

#### 2. Maintaining the AC framework is key to debatibility:

**A] Ground – every impact functions under consequentialism whereas other ethics flow to one side exclusively.**

**B] Topic lit – most articles are written through the lens of consequentialism.**

**Debatability is a voter because it’s a pre-requisite – without it we can’t have a discussion.**

#### 3. Human life outweighs under any fw - biological death destroys any hope of ontological improvement

**Paterson 3 –** (Craig Paterson; Department of Philosophy, Providence College; “A Life Not Worth Living?”; 2003)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, **death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightning strikes**.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unin- tentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, **concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject**, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical 79 ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82