### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: The affirmative should only defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964. ED

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### “Appropriation” means to take as property

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168

As illustrated by this analysis, considerable ambiguity remains after this ordinary-meaning analysis and thus, the question of Treaty obligations and property rights remains unresolved. In order to resolve these ambiguities, an analysis of preparatory materials, historical context, and state practice follows.

2. Preparatory Materials

A review of meeting reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its Legal Sub-Committee regarding the Treaty reveals little to clear up the ambiguities of Articles I and II of the OST. In fact, the reports indicate that, despite several negotiating states expressing concern about the lack of clarity with respect to the meaning of "use" and the scope of the non-appropriation principle, no meaningful discussion occurred and no consensus was reached.16 9 Some commentators still conclude that the preparatory work does in fact confirm the drafters' intent for "use" to include exploitation. 170 These commentators do admit, however, that discussions of the term "exploitation" supporting their conclusion focused on remote sensing and communications satellites rather than on resource extraction.17 1 Further skepticism about such an intent for "use" to include "exploitation" also arises given the uncertainty amongst negotiating states about the meaning of these terms. A mere few months before the Treaty opened for signature in January 1967, negotiators were still asking questions about the meaning of "use" during the last few Legal Sub-Committee meetings. For example, in July 1966, the representative of France inquired: "Did the latter term ["use"] imply use for exploration purposes, such as the launching of satellites, or did it mean use in the sense of exploitation, which would involve far more complex issues?" 172 The representative noted that while some activities such as extraction of minerals were difficult to imagine presently, "[i]t was important for all States, and not only those engaged in space exploration, to know exactly what was meant by the term 'use.'173 In the same meeting, the representative from the USSR offered an interesting response to the question posed by the representative of France:

[A]dequate clarification was to be found in article II of the USSR draft, which specified that outer space and celestial bodies should not be subject to national appropriation by means of use or occupation, or by any other means. In other words no human activity on the moon or any other celestial body could be taken as justification for national appropriation. 174

This response implies that Article II acts as a qualification on Article I's broad provision for free exploration and use of outer space by all. Activity such as resource extraction would be viewed as national appropriation and such activity cannot be justified given Article II's prohibition, not even by falling within the ordinary meaning of "use." Despite this clarification, uncertainty appears to have remained, as lingering concerns were communicated in subsequent meetings by several other states, including Australia, Austria, and France."' Nevertheless, the committee put the Treaty in front of the General Assembly two months later without final resolution of the ambiguities regarding property rights arising from Articles I and II176 The preparatory materials ultimately fail to fully clarify the ambiguities of the meanings of "use" and "appropriation." The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, one of the two main drafting parties, does, however, help push back on the interpretation of some academics that the nonappropriation principle fails to overcome the presumption of freedom of use.7

3. Historical Context

Two interrelated, major historical events cannot be ignored when considering the meaning of the OST: (1) the Cold War and (2) the Space Race. The success of Sputnik I in 1957 showed space travel and exploration no longer to be a dream, but a reality.7 While exciting, this news also brought fear in light of the world's fragile balance of power and tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. 17 9 What if the Soviet Union managed to launch a nuclear weapon into space? What if the United States greedily claimed the Moon as the fifty-first state? To many, the combination of the Cold War and Space Race made the late 1950s and the 1960s a perilous time.so When viewed as a response to this perilous era, the OST begins to look much more like a nuclear arms treaty and an attempt to ease Cold War tensions than a treaty concerned with the issue of property rights in space."' The Treaty's emphasis on "peaceful purposes" supports this contextual interpretation. 1 82

On the one hand, as many suggest, this context leads to the conclusion that the vague nonappropriation principle of Article II does not prevent private property rights in space resources and the presumption of broad "use" prevails.1 83 Private property rights were simply not a concern of the Treaty drafters and therefore, the Treaty does not address-nor prohibit-such claims. On the other hand, the context surrounding the treaty's drafting does not necessarily lead to this conclusion. In fact, the emphasis on "peaceful purposes" and reducing international tension might instead suggest a stricter reading of Articles I and II. If things were so unstable and tense on Earth, the drafters may have instead intended Article II as a qualification on the general right to explore and use outer space in Article I, recognizing the simple fact that disputes over property, both land and minerals, have sparked some of history's bloodiest conflicts.

The Antarctic treaty experience evidences Cold War concern over potential resource rights disputes. Leading up to the finalization of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959,184 seven nations had already made official territorial claims over varying portions of the frozen landscape in hopes of laying claim to the plethora of resources thought to be located within the subsurface."' Although the Treaty itself did not directly address rights to mineral resources in the Antarctic,186 the treaty is interpreted to have frozen these claims in the interest of "[f]reedom of scientific investigation in Antarctica and cooperation toward that end.""' In a manner notably similar to the terms of Articles XI and XII of the OST, the Treaty promotes scientific exploration by encouraging information sharing of scientific program plans, personnel, and observations' and inspection of stations on a reciprocal basis.189 This Treaty along with several later treaties and protocols constitute the "Antarctic Treaty System," which as a whole manages the governance of Antarctica.1 9 0 In 1991, the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 91 ("Madrid Protocol") settled the question of property rights for the fifty years following the Protocol's entry into force. 192 The Madrid Protocol provides for "the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment ... [and] designate[s] Antarctica as a natural reserve, devoted to peace and science."193 Article 7 explicitly-and simplystates "[a]ny activity relating to mineral resources, other than scientific research, shall be prohibited."1 94 Though Article 25 allows for the creation of a binding legal regime to determine whether and under what conditions mineral resource activity be allowed, no such international legal regime has been created to date. 195 The ban on mineral resource exploitation may only be amended by unanimous consent of the parties. 19 6 The United States signed and ratified both the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the Madrid Protocol. 197

The freezing of territorial claims in the Antarctic 98 by the Antarctica Treaty of 1959199 illustrates the existence of true concern over potential resource dispute and conflict during the Cold War, in addition to the major concerns posed by nuclear weapons.2 00 The drafting states also recognized the potential for conflict over property in outer space and drew on the language of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 to draft the OST.2 01 Given these driving concerns, Article II could be reasonably read as qualifying Article I's general rule. Under this reading, Article II serves the same qualifying purpose as Article IV regarding military and nuclear weapon use in space. Some might push back on this interpretation by claiming that the drafters could have used language such as that in the Madrid Protocol to explicitly prohibit mining in space. However, this argument is flawed. The Madrid Protocol was not written until well after both the original Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the OST. Furthermore, the timing of the Madrid Protocol perhaps provides further evidence that resources in space are not to be harvested until a subsequent agreement regarding rights over them can be agreed upon internationally. While the historical context does leave some ambiguity as to whether the OST permits property rights over space resources, the Antarctic experience provides a compelling analogy and suggests that the OST does not allow for property rights in space resources.

4. State Practice

In its Frequently Asked Questions released about the SREU Act, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology forcefully asserted that the Act does not violate international law.20 2 in fact, according to the committee, the Act's provision of property rights "is affirmed by State practice and by the U.S. State Department in [c]ongressional testimony and written correspondence."2 03 Proponents of this view base their beliefs on several examples. One, "no serious objection" arose to the United States and the Soviet Union bringing samples of rocks and other materials from the Moon back by manned and robotic missions in the late 1960s, nor to Japan successfully collecting a small asteroid sample in 2010.204 Two, a practice of respecting ownership over such retrieved samples and a terrestrial market for such items exists, as illustrated by the fact that no one doubts that the American Museum of Natural History "owns" three asteroids found in Greenland by arctic explorer Robert E. Peary that are now part of the museum's Arthur Ross Hall of Meteorites. 205 Three, Congressmen also cite to a federal district court case, United States v. One Lucite Ball Containing Lunar Material,2 06 to illustrate state practice in favor of ownership over spaces resources. The case involved an Apollo lunar sample gifted to Honduras by the United States. The sample was stolen and sold to an individual in the United States.2 07 When caught during a sting operation intended to uncover illegal sales of imposter samples, the buyer was forced to forfeit the lunar sample after the court concluded the moon rocks had in fact been stolen, basing its decision in part on its recognition of Honduras having national property ownership over the sample. 208

These examples appear overwhelming, but they are not actually examples of activities of the same "form and content" that the SREU Act approves. 2 09 These examples all involve collection of samples in limited amounts and for scientific purposes, while the SREU Act approves large-scale collection and for commercial exploitation. The OST explicitly emphasizes a "freedom of scientific investigation in outer space," and the collection of scientific samples reasonably fall under this enumerated right. 2 10 Alternatively, the OST says nothing with respect to commercial exploitation, only discussing "benefits" of space in terms of sharing those benefits with all mankind.211 Furthermore, the American Museum of Natural History and Lucite Ball examples relied upon are misleading because they suggest that types of celestial artifacts found or gifted on Earth are subject to the same legal regime as resources mined or collected in space, which may not necessarily be true. The analogy of ownership over fish extracted from the high seas is also often cited in response to this pushback. Much like outer space, the high seas are open to all participants, yet the law of the seas still recognizes the right to title over fish extracted on the high seas by fishermen, who can then sell the fish.212 But again, this analogy has limited import because both the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea ("UNCLOS") explicitly recognize the right to fish, while the OST grants no such right to exploit space resources. 2 1 3

Furthermore, state practice relevant to the question of property rights under the OST goes beyond these examples and analogies of ownership of resources taken from commons. State practice regarding property rights in general must be considered. For example, Professor Fabio Tronchetti disagrees with the oft-cited notion that state practice affirms the SREU Act.2 14 According to the professor, "under international law, property rights require a superior authority, a State, entitled to attribute and enforce them." 2 15 By granting property rights in the SREU Act, the United States impliedly claims that it has the authority to confer property rights over space resources-an authority traditionally reserved for the owner of a resource. This notion clashes with the nonappropriation principles of the OST. Though there is no consensus regarding whether the nonappropriation principle prohibits claims of sovereignty over resources, a strong consensus at least exists that the principle prohibits states from claiming sovereignty over real property in space.216 In some traditional systems of mineral ownership, however, ownership over resources ran with ownership over land.217 For example, under Roman law, property rights over subsurface minerals belonged to the landowner. 2 18 Thus, if the United States cannot have title in space lands under the nonappropriation principle, it cannot have title to the space resources in those lands either. Without title to the resources, the United States cannot bestow such title to its citizens under traditional international property law; by claiming that it can bestow such title, the United States is abrogating Article II of the OST. One could also argue that the in situ resources the Act grants rights in are actually still part of the celestial bodies; thus, the resources are real property prior to their removal, and are off limits under the Treaty.2 19 Given the limited import of the cited examples of state practice (limited quantity and scientific versus large-scale and commercial), the traditional practice of property rights being conferred from a sovereign to a citizen become incredibly compelling and suggest the SREU Act may abrogate the United States' treaty obligations.

A final piece of evidence, however, again inserts ambiguity into the interpretation: the sweeping rejection of the Moon Agreement and its limitations on property rights by the international community discussed supra Part JJJ.A.2. On the one hand, the rejection may imply that the international community approved of property rights. On the other hand, however, there were other reasons for the sweeping rejection. For example, Professors Francis Lyall and Paul B. Larsen claim the "main area of controversy"2 2 0 actually surrounded the Agreement's proclamation of the Moon and celestial bodies and their natural resources as the "common heritage of mankind" in Article 11.1,221 rather than the Agreement's general property-right provisions. Many believed the invocation of the "common heritage of mankind" language would impart actual obligations upon parties to share extracted resources, whereas the "province of all mankind" and "for the benefit and interest of all" language of the OST did not.222 As with ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, and historical context, state practice leaves some ambiguities and state interpretations should also be considered.

5. State Interpretations

Much like the preparatory materials discussed supra Part IV.A.1, subsequent state interpretation of the OST fails to fully address the question of the legality of property rights in space resources. On the one hand, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations found that the drafters intended Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty to be general in nature when reviewing the Treaty,223 which perhaps suggests Article II's nonappropriation principle does not qualify Article I's general right to use or act as an exception. Yet, the committee also found the Treaty to be in response to the "potential for international competition and conflict in outer space." 2 24 To the committee, Articles I, II, and III stressed the importance of free scientific investigation, guaranteed free access to all areas of celestial bodies, and prohibited claims of sovereignty.225 Not only would property rights in natural resources potentially ignite and exacerbate conflict in space, but they also seemed somewhat incompatible with scientific investigation, free access, and the prohibition on sovereignty. During its hearing on the Treaty, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations focused a majority of its discussion of Article I on whether or not the language "province of all mankind" imparted strict obligations, while devoting little to no time to the issue of the meaning of "use." 22 6 Former Justice Arthur Goldberg, then U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, did note the goal of the article was to "cnot subject space to exclusive appropriation by any particular power." 227 Nevertheless, this statement fails to resolve whether natural resources may be exploited, as such exploitation could be carried out in an inclusive manner.

The committee's review of Article II consumes only eight lines of the hearing transcript, merely adding that the Article is complementary to Article I and that space cannot be claimed for the country (likely referring to land rather than resources).2 28 A different exchange between Ambassador Goldberg, Senator Lausche, and the Chairman leaves further ambiguity regarding the use of natural resources in space: Mr. Goldberg: We wanted to establish our right to explore and use outer space. Senator Lausche: Yes. That is, any one of the signatory nations shall have the right to the use of whatever might be found in one of the space bodies. Mr. Goldberg: No, no. It doesn't mean that. It means that they shall be free on their own to explore outer space. The Chairman: Or to use it. Mr. Goldberg: To use it. The Chairman: But not on an exclusive basis. Mr. Goldberg: Everyone is free.229

At first, Ambassador Goldberg appears to have refuted the notion that a signatory could simply "use" anything found in one of the space bodies, such as a mineral, implying Senator Lausche's example exceeded the scope of Article I. He then went on to emphasize exploratory activities. But then, Ambassador Goldberg backtracked and reasserted the right to use without clarifying his initial qualification.

This sense of ambiguity remains today despite Congress signing off on the SREU Act. While sponsors of the bill and statements from resource extraction companies emphasized the broad scope of the right to "use" outer space and state practice in support of the legality of 230 property rights, several expert witnesses expressed genuine concern that obligations under the Treaty remain unclear and require additional analysis.231

B. Compatibility

Employing the treaty interpretation tools of ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, historical context, state practice, and state interpretation offers many possible understandings of the obligations imparted by Articles I and II of the OST. For example, while the ordinary meaning of "use" could reasonably include the exploitation of materials, the meeting summaries of the Fifth Session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Legal Sub-Committee make clear that no consensus was ever reached regarding whether "use" includes large-scale exploitation of space resources, let alone fee-simple ownership and the ability to sell commercially. State practice dealing with extraterrestrial samples also sheds little light on the confusion, as the examples cited all deal instead with scientific samples of limited quantity. The international community's rejection of the Moon Agreement also fails to bring clarity. While on the one hand the rejection could be read as a rejection of the idea that the OST prohibits private property rights, it could also be read as a rejection of the common heritage of mankind doctrine. Finally, the prospect of privateventure space mining and extraterrestrial resource extraction remained far off and futuristic at the time of the Treaty's negotiation, making drawing legal conclusions about the legality of these revolutionary activities extremely difficult.

Overall, however, the Treaty's structure and its purposes (preserving peace and avoiding international conflict in outer space) ultimately indicate that private property rights in space resources are prohibited by Article II's non-appropriation principle, at least until future international delegation determines otherwise (like in the Antarctic). The Treaty's structure confirms this interpretation. Article I lays down a general rule for activity in space. Subsequent articles of the Treaty then lay out more specific requirements of and qualifications to this general rule. Much like Article IV restricts the use of nuclear weapons in space, Article II restricts the use of space in ways that might result in potentially controversial property claims. Historically, claims to mineral rights have resulted in just as contentious conflict as those over sovereign lands. Treaty efforts to avoid conflicts in Antarctica and the high seas reflect similar sentiments. The Soviet Union's representative even hinted at this structural relationship between Articles I and II during Treaty S1 232 negotiations.22 In light of the imminent need to ease Cold War tensions, the potential for conflict over property, and the final structure of the Treaty, this Note concludes that the large-scale extraction of space resources is incompatible with the non-appropriation principle of Article II of the OST.23 3 As a result, the United States' provision of property rights to its citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space and asteroid resources extracted through the SREU Act contravenes its international obligations established by the OST.

#### Private entity = majority nonstate

Warners 20 (Bill, JD Candidate, May 2021, at UIC John Marshall Law School) "Patents 254 Miles up: Jurisdictional Issues Onboard the International Space Station." UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law, vol. 19, no. 4, 2020, p. 365-380. HeinOnline.

To satisfy these three necessary requirements for a new patent regime, the ISS IGA must add an additional clause ("Clause 7") in Article 21 specifically establishing a patent regime for private nonstate third parties onboard the ISS. First, Clause 7 would define the term "private entity" as an individual, organization, or business which is primarily privately owned and/or managed by nonstate affiliates. Specifically defining the term "private entity" prevents confusion as to what entities qualify under the agreement and the difference between "public" and "private."99 This definition would also support the connection of Clause 1 in Article 21 to "Article 2 of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization." 100 A succinct definition also alleviates international concerns that the changes to the ISS IGA pushes out Partner State influence. 101 Some in the international community may still point out that Clause 7 still pushes towards a trend of outer space privatization. However, this argument fails to consider that private entities in outer space have operated in space almostas comprehensively as national organizations. 102

#### They violate— obviously don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1 -- Competitive equity – 3 warrants:

#### a] Ground: they get to pick the topic ex post facto which incentivizes vague argumentation that’s not grounded in a consistent, stable mechanism – they’re playing dodgeball with hand grenades – caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their model.

#### b] Limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. Cutting negs to every possible aff is a commitment even large squads can’t handle, let alone small schools like us. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution

#### c] Fairness is an impact – 1] it’s an intrinsic good – some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity – if it didn’t exist, then there wouldn’t be value to the game since judges could literally vote whatever way they wanted regardless of the competing arguments made 2] probability – your ballot can’t solve their impacts but it can solve mine – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but can rectify skews[3] internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education 4] comes before substance – deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it – any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. This means they don’t get to weigh the aff.

#### 2 -- Switch-side debate –

#### a] the reason debate is a unique process is because it demands rigorous testing of advocacy skills through not getting to pick and choose what to defend – it’s the only plausible explanation for the form of the activity – it also solves their offense.

Poscher 16 Ralf Poscher, Diat the Institute for Staatswissenschaft and Philosophy of Law at the University of Freiburg “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement”, Metaphilosophy of Law, Tomasz Gizbert-Studnicki/Adam Dyrda/Pawel Banas (eds.), Hart Publishing. 2016.

Hegel’s dialectical thinking powerfully exploits **the idea of negation**. It **is** a **central** feature of spirit and consciousness that they have the power to negate. The spirit “is this power only by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it. This […] is the magical power that converts it into being.”102 The tarrying with the negative is part of what Hegel calls **the “labour of the negative”**103. In a loose reference to this Hegelian notion Gerald Postema **points to** yet another feature of **disagreements as a necessary ingredient of the process of practical reasoning. Only if our reasoning is exposed to contrary arguments can we test its merits. We must go through the “labor of the negative” to have trust in our deliberative processes**.104 This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. **Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive** in various ways. **The first phenomenon** Postema draws attention to **is** the **group polarization** effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 **The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups**106 **can be countered** at least in some settings **by the inclusion of dissenting voices**. In these scenarios, **disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases**.107 **A second** deliberative **dysfunction** mitigated by disagreement **is superficial agreement**, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. **Disagreement can help** to police such distortions of deliberative processes **by challenging superficial agreements**. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. **Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”.** These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. **Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning**, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, **entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs**, attitudes and dispositions, **we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs**, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea. **In hard cases we must** – in some way – **lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves** in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, **until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions**. In these cases **it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the view towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement**. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case. **It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of** legal **disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases**, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. **Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading** him: **to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others**. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena. f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, **the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate**, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, **our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements** that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. **Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts** even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? **The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean** and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But **what was wrong with** District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly **flipping a coin**?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, **why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered?** One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that **the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure**. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or **taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play**. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. **Pure non‐rational procedures** – like flipping a coin – **would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements**.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. **That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation**. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. **If the judges were to flip a coin** at the end of the trial in hard cases, **there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements** and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above. 2. THE SEMANTICS OF AGONISTIC DISAGREEMENTS The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus **the agonistic account** of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular. However, it **must** still **come up with a semantics that explains in what sense we disagree about the same issue and are not just talking at cross purposes**. In a series of articles David Plunkett and Tim Sundell have reconstructed legal disagreements in semantic terms as metalinguistic negotiations on the usage of a term that at the center of a hard case like “cruel and unusual punishment” in a death‐penalty case.116 **Even though the different sides in the debate define the term differently, they are not talking past each other, since they are engaged in** a metalinguistic **negotiation on** the use of **the same term.** The metalinguistic negotiation on the use of **the term serves as a semantic anchor for a disagreement on the substantive issues** connected with the term because of its functional role in the law. The “cruel and unusual punishment”‐clause thus serves to argue about the permissibility of the death penalty. This account, however only provides a very superficial semantic commonality. But the commonality between the participants of a legal disagreement go deeper than a discussion whether the term “bank” should in future only to be used for financial institutions, which fulfills every criteria for semantic negotiations that Plunkett and Sundell propose. Unlike in mere semantic negotiations, like the on the disambiguation of the term “bank”, there is also some kind of identity of the substantive issues at stake in legal disagreements. A promising route to capture this aspect of legal disagreements might be offered by recent semantic approaches that try to accommodate the externalist challenges of realist semantics,117 which inspire one‐right‐answer theorists like Moore or David Brink. Neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics provide for the theoretical or interpretive element of realist semantics without having to commit to the ontological positions of traditional externalism. In a sense they offer externalist semantics with no ontological strings attached. The less controversial aspect of the externalist picture of meaning developed in neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics can be found in the deferential structure that our meaning‐providing intentions often encompass.118 In the case of natural kinds, speakers defer to the expertise of chemists when they employ natural kind terms like gold or water. If a speaker orders someone to buy $ 10,000 worth of gold as a safe investment, he might not know the exact atomic structure of the chemical element 79. In cases of doubt, though, he would insist that he meant to buy only stuff that chemical experts – or the markets for that matter – qualify as gold. The deferential element in the speaker’s intentions provides for the specific externalist element of the semantics. In the case of the law, the meaning‐providing intentions connected to the provisions of the law can be understood to defer in a similar manner to the best overall theory or interpretation of the legal materials. Against the background of such a semantic framework the conceptual unity of a linguistic practice is not ratified by the existence of a single best answer, but by the unity of the interpretive effort that extends to legal materials and legal practices that have sufficient overlap119 – be it only in a historical perspective120. **The fulcrum of disagreement** that Dworkin sees in the existence of a single right answer121 **does not lie in its existence, but in the communality of the effort – if only on the basis of an overlapping common ground of legal materials, accepted practices, experiences and dispositions. As two athletes are engaged in the same contest when they follow the same rules, share the same concept of winning and losing and act in the same context, but follow very different styles** of e.g. wrestling, boxing, swimming etc. **They are in the same contest, even if there is no single best style** in which to wrestle, box or swim. **Each**, however, **is engaged in developing the best style to win against their opponent, just as two lawyers try to develop the best argument to convince** a bench of **judges**.122 **Within such a semantic framework even people with radically opposing views about the application of an expression can still share a concept, in that they are engaged in the same process of theorizing over roughly the same legal materials and practices. Semantic frameworks along these lines allow for adamant disagreements without abandoning the idea that people are talking about the same concept. An agonisti**c account of legal disagreement can build on such a semantic **framework**, which **can explain in what sense** lawyers, judges and **scholars engaged in agonistic disagreements are not talking past each other. They are engaged in developing the best interpretation of roughly the same** legal **materials, albeit against the background of diverging beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that lead them to divergent conclusions** in hard cases. Despite the divergent conclusions, **semantic unity is provided by the largely overlapping legal materials that form the basis for their** **disagreement. Such a semantic collapses only when we lack a sufficient overlap in the materials**. To use an example of Michael Moore’s: If we wanted to debate whether a certain work of art was “just”, we share neither paradigms nor a tradition of applying the concept of justice to art such as to engage in an intelligible controversy.

#### b] topical version of the aff solves – they can still have all their advantages under TVA <INSERT TVA>

#### c] Vote negative – a] this procedurally evaluates whether their model is good, which is a prior question b] they can’t get offense: we don’t exclude them, only persuade you that our methodology is best. Every debate requires a winner and loser, so voting negative doesn’t reject them from debate, it just says they should make a better argument next time.

#### 3 -- Skills – multiple warrants

#### a] Argument Refinement and research – forcing them to defend the resolution makes them have to cut new positions every two months and forces them to explore the depths of the literature as opposed to just recycling the same set of non T affs over and over that lead repetitive and stale debates – they reject argument innovation and force every non t debate into either k vs t or k v k.

#### b] Education is an impact – it’s the most portable impact of debate

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations—it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for. Reasonability is arbitrary and unpredictable, inviting a race to the bottom and we’ll win it links to our offense.

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse and because the 2N doesn’t get new disads to whole rez so it’s permanently skewed.

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### No impact turns to T—T is a procedural that determines case’s validity and every argument says the aff is bad

### 1NC – OFF

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer –

**1 -- Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable.** **On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” **If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

**2 -- Lexical pre-req: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose**

#### 3 -- Actor-specificity - Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### 4 -- Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 5 -- Occam’s Razor – historical moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality prove non fallibility, which means you default to the most simple conception of intrinsic values and decision calc

#### 6 -- Extinction comes first!

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

### Case

#### 1 -- ROTB is to vote for the debate who proves the biggest consequences – anything else is arbitrary and self-serving

#### 2 -- Nothing spills over – there’s no connection between the ballot and chancing people’s attitudes.

#### a. Thousands and thousands of Ks and performance affs and negs empirically denies your “spillover” offense and proves it doesn’t alter mindsets.

#### b. No warrant for a ballot – the competitive nature of debate coopts any ethical value of advocating the neg – winning rounds only makes it look like they just want to win which means advocating by losing is more effective.

#### c. Ballot paradox – either they don’t care about winning and you should vote affirmative, or they want to win which proves that debate is competitive, and fairness is an impact

#### d. Voting aff doesn’t access social change, but voting neg resolves our procedural impacts.

Ritter ‘13 (JD from U Texas Law (Michael J., “Overcoming The Fiction of “Social Change Through Debate”: What’s To Learn from 2pac’s Changes?,” National Journal of Speech and Debate, Vol. 2, Issue 1)

The structure of competitive interscholastic debate renders any message communicated in a debate round virtually **incapable of creating any social change**, either in the debate community or in general society. And to the extent that the fiction of social change through debate can be proven or disproven through empirical studies or surveys, academics instead have analyzed debate with **nonapplicable** rhetorical **theory** that **fails to account for the unique aspects** of competitive interscholastic debate. Rather, the current debate relating to activism and competitive interscholastic debate concerns the following: “What is the best model to promote social change?” But a more fundamental question that must be addressed first is: **“Can debate cause social change?”** Despite over two decades of opportunity to conduct and publish empirical studies or surveys, academic proponents of the fiction that debate can create social change have chosen **not to prove this fundamental assumption**, which—as this article argues—is **merely a fiction** that is **harmful in** most, if not **all, respects**. The position that competitive interscholastic debate can create social change is more properly characterized as a **fiction** than an argument. A fiction is an invented or fabricated idea purporting to be factual but is **not provable** by any human senses or rational thinking capability or is unproven by valid statistical studies. An argument, most basically, consists of a claim and some support for why the claim is true. If the support for the claim is false or its relation to the claim is illogical, then we can deduce that the particular argument does not help in ascertaining whether the claim is true. Interscholastic competitive debate is premised upon the assumption that debate is argumentation. Because fictions are necessarily not true or cannot be proven true by any means of argumentation, the competitive interscholastic debate community should be **incredibly critical** of those fictions and adopt them only if they promote the activity and its purposes.

#### e. Movements antagonistic towards the state ultimately get cracked down by the state -- BPP in the 60s, BLA in the 70s all prove – The US sent FBI agents into the BPP as soon as they suspected a loss of power

#### 3 -- Debating political solutions is an iterative process that uses the academy as a site of movement building that creates a bulwark against Trump’s fascism.

Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor 17, assistant professor of African American studies at Princeton University [“Home Is the Crucible of Struggle,” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 69, No. 2, June 2017, p. 229-233, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

**Creating home**, or what may also be described as a struggle to belong, **has always been political in the U**nited **S**tates. **In a country founded on** the **extermination** of its indigenous population, **whose wealth was derived from** the forced labor of **the enslaved**, and for whom that wealth was multiplied a trillion times over through the violent expropriation of waves upon waves of immigrant labor—**to stay or belong has been brutally contested** and valiantly fought to achieve. In other words, **we share a history of repression and resistance in the** elemental, human **struggle** to belong, **to be home. Those various battles over land rights and citizenship; the right to work and housing; the right to vote, speak, and organize have all been in an effort to reshape** or reform **the** injustice and **oppression that shapes the** daily **lives of most people** in this country. In this persistent quest, **we now enter into a period of** both certainty and **uncertainty**. We can be certain that the administration of Donald **Trump will pursue policies that will make the lives of** ordinary **people** substantially harder. We can be certain that **his administration will attack immigrants. He has promised** to restore **law and order, which appears to be an invitation for the police to continue their assaults on Black and Brown communities. Trump has bragged about sexually assaulting women while decrying** their rights to **reproductive freedom**. Trump and **his cohort have all but declared war on Muslims** in the United States and beyond. **We have seen a revival of the white supremacist Right** and an unleashing of open racial animus. In the month after the election of Trump, over one thousand hate crimes across the country were reported. Since he has taken office, Jewish cemeteries have been desecrated; mosques have been burned; and swastikas have been brandished in acts of vandalism and intimidation. **What is uncertain is the extent to which Trump will be able to follow through on his threats** against a variety of communities. **This uncertainty is not with Trump's intention** to inflict as much pain and harm on the most vulnerable people in the United States; **rather, it is based on a calculation that** our ability to organize and build movements will **complicate, blunt, and**, in some cases, **thwart the Trump agenda**. [End Page 229] **The challenge is** in **using the spaces we occupy in the academy to approach this task**. There will be many different kinds of organizing spaces developed in the coming years, but **there is a particular role we can play** in this moment. **This organizing possibility exists** only when we recognize the academy, itself, **as a site of politics and struggle. Those who ignore that reality do so because they have the luxury to** or because they are so constrained by compartmentalization that they ignore the very world they are living in. **In the last two years we have seen the** flowering of campus struggles **against racism, rape, and sexual violence, amid campaigns for union recognition and the right of faculty to control** the atmosphere of **their classrooms. Whether or not we on campus see them as political spaces,** the right wing certainly does**. They have raged against "safe spaces"** and what they refer to as "political correctness." **While reasonable people may debate** the merits and meaning of **concepts like safe spaces, we should not confuse those discussions with an attack from the right** that is intended **to create "unsafe spaces" where racial antagonism, sexual predation, and homophobia are considered rites of passage** or, as the new president describes as it, "locker room" behavior. **These**, unfortunately, **are only** smaller battles **happening within the larger transformation of colleges and universities into the leading edge of various** neoliberal practices, from the growing use of "contingent labor" to the proliferation of online education, to certificate and master's programs that are only intended to increase the coffers while adding little to nothing to the intellect or critical thinking capacities of its participants. Robin Kelley reminds us that **universities will "never be engines for social transformation," but they are places that often reflect, and** in some situations **magnify, the tensions that exist in society** more generally. There is a relationship between the two. The struggles for academic units in Black and Chicano studies in the 1960s were born of the political insurgencies that captivated those communities while shaking the entire country to its core. Robert Warrior reminds us that in Native studies there is a commitment to crash through the firewall that is often intended to silo scholarship from the communities it is often derived from. He writes that a "clear predominance exists in Native studies of scholarship that obligates itself in clear ways to being connected to the real lives of real peoples living in real time. More than just connected, a hallmark of Native studies scholarship is a preoccupation with how the work of scholars and scholarship translates itself into the process of making the Indigenous world a better, more just, and more equitable place to live, thrive, and provide for future generations." **Scholarship alone is not politics, but the study of history, theory, and politics can imbue our political practice with depth and confidence. Today there is a** [End Page 230] **need to connect the** legacy **of resistance, struggle, and transformation with a** new generation **of students and activists who are** desperately looking for hope **that their world is not coming to an end**. To be sure, there is deep malaise and fear about the meaning of a Trump presidency. It is not to be underestimated. Anyone who is so open about his antipathy and disgust with entire populations of people should be believed when he promises to amplify the suffering in this society. And **we should not underestimate the obstacles that confront a political Left that is deeply fractured and politically divided. But we should also remember that** the future is not already written**. It has yet to be cast in stone. The stories of our demise have been predicted over and over again**. The marches that erupted in the immediate aftermath of the Trump victory give a sense of the resistance to come. Who could have predicted that the day after Trump's inauguration between three and four million people in the United States would take to the streets to defiantly resist and oppose the new president? In fact, **we have already seen in the last decade the eruption of mass struggle embodied in** the **Occupy** movement **and** most recently the rise of **Black Lives Matter**. **The challenge to** **Trump**, however, **will demand** more than moral outrage**. It requires a** strategy**, and strategy can be developed** only **when we have political clarity on the nature of Trumpism**. The queer theorist Lisa Duggan made an important observation at the association's annual meeting last November in Denver. In an emergency session assessing the US presidential election, there was a sense of urgency that we have talked enough and now is the time to act. But Duggan made the important observation that **while action is always necessary, we must also create the** political and intellectual spaces **necessary for debate, argument, and discussion. We cannot act in intelligent ways without understanding why we are acting and what we are acting against**. In other words, politics and ideas matter as much as the action **necessary to transform conditions we abhor**. This may seem like a minor or even self-evident point, but **there is a constant critique that we are often "preaching to the choir"** or a question about the usefulness of sitting in yet "another" meeting. But **this most recent electoral season has also shown that the choir has different pitches and cadences. The choir can be off-key. This is not to suggest that we should all agree or mute the areas of disagreement and tension, but we should be** clear about those differences**. Just as we should be clear on what is agreed on and what are the bases on which we can overcome differences and unite. These various position s cannot be intuited; they are** discovered through patient debate. **Beyond the culture of respectful** internal **debate** and discussion, **academics** also **have something to contribute. The confidence necessary to effectively** [End Page 231] engage in **struggle is not easily attained in an** atmosphere of defeat and defensiveness. **Those are the moments to draw on the history of resistance** in the movements of the oppressed. Often the political establishment better understands the power of this history than those who are its rightful inheritors. There is a reason that the federal government invested so heavily in the repression of the Black liberation movement of the 1960s. The point was not only to defeat the struggle; it was intended to snuff out its legacy. In significant ways the repression has carried on until this very day. There is a reason sixty-nine-year-old Assata Shakur remains a political exile in Cuba and our government continues to keep a $2 million bounty on her head while shamefully including her on the misnamed terrorist watch list. It is the same reason that the Angola Three—Robert King, Albert Woodfox, and Herman Wallace, Black Panther members held in the infamous prison in Louisiana—collectively spent 113 years in solitary confinement as political punishment for their ideas. It is the same reason 45 years after the Attica Prison Rebellion in 1971, federal and state officials continue to hide the truth of its brutal repression. The most important, and thus damning, archives that the historian Heather Ann Thompson used to write her book on Attica have, once again, disappeared from public scrutiny. **Not only does the political establishment want to punish and demonize the voices for Black liberation, but** more important, **they want to bury the legacy, the history, and politics of the movement itself**. **It is clear to understand why. It is not irrational hatred of African Americans; it is quite simply because when Black people go into struggle, it unravels the dominant narrative, or the fabrications at the heart of American mythology—that we are a democratic and just society**. Only a cursory knowledge of Black history—and the history of indigenous people in this land—shatters the United States' obsession with its own self-idealization as an "exceptional" society. In doing so, **Black struggles are examples of how the "margins" can upend and destabilize the supposed center**. And **perhaps even more important is how those struggles within the various iterations of the Black Freedom movement become a platform for other liberation struggles to emerge. This was the legacy of the Black insurgency of the 1960s. As a result, the political establishment distorts this history and distorts its radical content**, its radical leaders, and their voices. This is not just a lesson of who gets to tell history; this legacy of repression affects the movements of today. The attempt to distort and bury the struggles from a previous period of Black rebellion deprives the current generation of the politics, strategy, and tactics of our movement historically. It diminishes the analyses and the political tools necessary to help forge a way forward in [End Page 232] this political moment. But perhaps, most perniciously, the efforts to disconnect people, especially young people, moving into struggle from their radical roots and history, are to dramatically limit our political imaginations so that we believe that the best we can hope for in this life is a Black president or a more responsive and less inept Democratic Party: the establishment wants us to believe that life as it currently is, is the best we can hope for. This is why, for example, the scholar and activist Angela Davis is so important because she is a connection to our radical history. She is the living legacy of a political movement that put liberation at its center. And you can see her political and intellectual fingerprints all over our movement today—from the politics of Black feminism and the concept of intersectionality to the demand of abolition and the rejection of the very normative idea that humans should be surveilled, caged, or killed by the state. It is no wonder that her politics and activism have deeply influenced many of the Black queer women at the heart of the Black Lives Matter movement. She compels us to think more deeply, to get to the root of the matter, to be radical in our analysis, and to struggle harder—not just in the world as it is but for the world as we want it to be. Davis is but a single example. There are many other examples where those from a previous era of struggle whom we respect and honor connect our searching present with a previous moment of insurgency and struggle. In our lifetimes, **we have never been more in need of the inspiration, the lessons, and the strength of those who have bequeathed to us the certainties and uncertainties of home today.** **The challenge continues to lie in our abilities to transcend,** through argument, debate, and struggle**, the many paths that crisscross and potentially divide our resistance to hatred, bigotry, and oppression. This is a** call for solidarity**, but not on the basis of papering over the different experiences that create different levels of consciousness within our society. Solidarity is most palpable when there is recognition that our fates are** connected **and that an injury to one is an injury to all. Another world is truly possible, but only if we are willing to struggle for it**.

#### 4 -- Refusing politics is a privileged position that ensures inevitable existential collapse – only embracing top-down politics allows us to develop material solutions for life-threatening and systemic issues like Climate Change, Poverty, and Inequality

Glaser 18 [Dr. ELIANE GLASER, Ph.D. in Modern Literature, Professor at Oxford University, contributor at the New Economics Foundation and the Institute for Public Policy Research, “ANTI-POLITICS: ON THE DEMONIZATION OF IDEOLOGY, AUTHORITY AND THE STATE,” Published by Repeater Books An imprint of Watkins Media Ltd, A Repeater Books paperback original 2018, ISBN: 9781912248117//k-ng]

In this age of change and uncertainty, everyone is looking for answers. But nobody really knows what’s going to happen. In these interregnum times, nobody has a definitive or credible sense of how to proceed, or how things will all shake down. It’s actually impossible to know the kind of politics we need until we know what kind of era we’re heading into – if we are facing environmental collapse, then we’ll need a kind of existential, practical, survivalist politics – it would be appropriate in that scenario to go and live in Transition Towns and concentrate on building our resilience. In this final section, therefore, I do not lay out a new blueprint or programme or explore possible scenarios comprehensively, but I attempt to map out the kinds of considerations we need to be making when thinking about the political future. Time and again commentators have been caught out by events, and actually the one thing we can reasonably conclude from this is that we need to spend more time trying to analyse our anti-political predicament and the Left’s seeming inability to make sustained headway. There’s an odd way in which the radical solutions that preoccupy the commentariat – Universal Basic Income, robots, space-travel – seem to evade the political doldrums we are in, or presuppose what seems to me an unlikely rupture between these times of head-down long-hours work culture and Conservative dominance, and a post-work future. As I’ll argue, these imagined solutions are also often highly technological in a way that is both unattractively post-human and ecologically non-viable. We need politics more than ever to solve the persistent and worsening problems of our world – climate change, poverty, inequality, financialisation, loneliness, community breakdown; the list is long. Yet the Left is thoroughly split on the question of whether to act on a macro or a local scale; from the top down or the bottom up; using old solutions or new; and enacting them through evolution or revolution. And so often, as I’ve argued, it’s the local, the bottom-up, the new and the revolutionary that are the privileged approaches. I understand that the big-picture solutions seem daunting. I also understand the reluctance to engage with old institutions; in John Harris’s memorable phrase, to put jump leads on dinosaurs. I can appreciate the desire to work on an ultra-local level, to invent entirely new structures on the ground: to follow Colin Ward rather than Herbert Morrison. In Spain and Portugal right now, embracing community autonomy is for many the only way to live with any hope. In Italy, a movement called Genuino Clandestino has given up on mainstream politics and is returning to small-scale living off the land as a response to capitalist hegemony. To a considerable extent, it is possible to create your own phenomenological reality: to be surrounded in your everyday life by shared allotments and organic cafes and start-ups and co-ops and people who share your outlook. Such small-scale solutions are radical, empowering and create an experience of life that can feel transformative. It is also true, as Jodi Dean puts it, that Goldman Sachs doesn’t care if you keep chickens. Bottom-up projects don’t address macro power imbalances, and are hard to replicate on a large scale, particularly without inspirational leaders like Frome’s Peter Macfadyen or Barcelona’s Ada Colau. Time and again, leftist accounts of brilliant initiatives play down the importance of these individuals who actually make things happen.

#### 5 -- Policy debate key to movements even if our advocacies don’t play out IRL
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Classical policy analysis, however absent from actual policy making, remains an important vehicle for teaching policy analysts the connections between their analysis and the policymaking world in which their recommendations would live. Even if it implies more power than analysts will ever have, classical policy analysis teaches that politics, law, implementation, social structures, organizational behavior, and other factors are critical to policy outcomes and must play key roles in thinking through possible ways to address policy problems. Bringing policy ideas to fruition, bridging the worlds of research and policy making, is a critical skill for analysts to develop. In addition, policy schools are instilling in prospective policy analysts the structure and habits of mind to engage successfully in the policy enterprise. 28 Teaching disciplined thinking for public service is important. Policy analysts not only have a problem-oriented, interdisciplinary approach to policy and the ability to synthesize and bring policy relevance to problems that social scientists are not trained for, but they understand the "rational lunacy of policy-making systems" (Weiss 2009). In the absence of written classical policy analyses, policy analysts become their human embodiment. Their training will provide a mental picture of how a classical policy analysis should be performed. They can derive elements of policy analysis from writing position papers, briefing policy makers, and controlling meetings. They anticipate counterarguments and frame their analyses recognizing alternative options. In short, the mental map of a policy analysis allows good policy analysts not only to be effective in their jobs but also to advance into the public debate the appropriate elements of a policy analysis. Further, the problem orientation of policy analysis focuses at least some attention on social problems, not just political expediency. The role of policy analysts is not merely to translate research for policy makers, but to use creative means to turn available knowledge about the implications of various policy options into actionable policy recommendations appropriate for their clients. This is a subtle skill requiring attention to both political realities and the best available research. Finally, prospective policy analysts are instructed repeatedly about the importance of their relationship to the client(s), yet far less attention is paid to the other part of the policy analyst's relationship: to the community of knowledge producers. Policy analysts play critical roles as intermediaries between "custodians of the knowable" and policy makers. Their training should include the ability to understand and interpret the academic literature on a topic at a far deeper level than most journalists have the time or, often, the analytic skill set to uncover. Identifying and connecting pertinent knowledge and analysis with policy makers should be a core principle of a public policy education. Policy analysts may offer the central means to provide policy makers with the key elements of classical policy analysis, though not in the way, through written reports, it was originally conceived. Creating a profession for committed, accomplished, and well-trained individuals to participate in the world of public policy may be among the most important contributions of policy analysis education.