## Underview

Competing interpretation- debaters can run \_\_\_ conditional offs

Standards

1. info processing- forces the aff to make strategic decisions- biggest internal link to education since life is a decision making game
2. neg flex- aff has infinite prep and the first and last speech, conditional offs are the only neg resource to solving the inherent fairness skew
3. inevitable- any two responses come from multiple worldviews
4. Logic- squo is always an option, the judge shouldn’t have to choose between two bad options
5. Good aff construction- showing that the aff is only better than the status quo or another policy option leads to bad policy, they need be able to prove both- construction is an internal link to education cuz it determines pre-round research
6. Perm check- you get the aff and the perm, I get the k and the squo, otherwise fairness gets destroyed
7. Blip deterrence- in uncondo you can blow up a 2 second perm to 2 minutes of the 1ar, condo key to preventing the strat skew
8. Uncondo gives the aff a 2-1 strat skew since they can either win case outweighs or the counterplan is bad
9. Checks unpredictable add-ons they could have in the 1ar since the k would still link but my case turns wouldn’t
10. absent condo we either have to concede their epistemology or the link a- might force debaters to concede violent arguments which means it’s an internal link to inclusion b- means I can’t test the affirmative fully which skews me on fairness cuz they can always test the 1nc

A2 strat skew

1. Your strat had to answer everything so it’s inevitable
2. Your weighing should come over case and the offs otherwise it’s bad weighing

A2 education

1. If I can’t go for advocacies then people won’t answer them

A2 clash

1. I still fill a 2nr with clash so it’s nonunique- I can’t say more than 6 minutes of neg stuff

A2 deep educaiton

1. No warrant why better
2. I go deeper when I collapse

A2 no RVIs

I get RVIS- this debate is between two competing models so if I win mine’s better I should win the debate since they’ve done an action- reading theory- that uniquely encourages their model- dropping them is key to rectifying

## New affs cringe

Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the aff at least 30 minutes before the round – to clarify, this can be informal disclosure  
Violation: screenshot in doc

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

1 - forces us to rely on generics rather than strategies tailored to the affirmative— kills nuanced clash since every debate is the same.

2- they get infinite time to frontline their aff, while I come into the round guessing – kills fairness

3 - discourages cheap shot aff’s. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose- surprise factor affs incentivize cases that are as fringe as possible instead of well-researched realistic affirmatives- incentivizes useless education

Voters

1. fairness -we can’t determine truth of arguments if they’re not tested fairly
2. education -only reason why schools fund debate
3. clash- key to learning about policymaking, only portable skill we get from debate

Critical thinking is non-unique because people would still have to come up with answers to the aff before the round.

Drop the debater on disclosure- the theory is on the entire aff so dta means they lose

Competing interps, reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention

NO RVI A. incentives good theory debaters to bait abuse b- chills debaters from running theory on good teams even if they deserve it c- illogical, you don’t win for proving you’re fair

## Tea time

#### Interpretation- Debaters must defend the resolution resolved: The Appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Violation- extrat- they defend a method of partial education and an abandonment of the political- that stuff isn’t anywhere close to resolutional- they also affirm all property bad

**1] Semantics outweigh:**

**A] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament**

**B] Jurisdiction -- you can’t vote affirmative if they haven’t affirmed**

**C] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.**

**2] Limits:**

**A] Quantitative – there are tens of of thousands of affs because they can call any action that any space company does ‘unjust’- that makes negating impossible**

**B] Qualitative – they take away generic turns like appropriations good and functionally jettison "private entities" from the topic, which shifts away from the core topic lit – also means there is no universal DA to spec affs**

**3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage – most authors writing about space policy talk about lots of different types**

**4] No PICs offense – potential neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse because that would permit infinite 1AC abuse and you could j read pics bad**

**D] Paradigm Issues –**

**1] T is DTD – A] their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start B] DTA is incoherent because we indict their advocacy**

**2] Comes before 1AR theory -- A] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff B] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC C] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them**

## Quakerism

#### Welcome to the art museum, reality is a gallery with exhibits that organize the world on the plane of aestheticization in the grand triumph of form over function

**Collins 2k**, Quaker Plaining as Critical Aesthetic, George Fox University, Dr Peter J. Collins is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Durham University, UK. completed an MA in development studies and a PhD in social anthropology at Manchester University. His research interests include religion (especially Quakerism), ritual and symbolism; historical anthropology; qualitative research methods, particularly narrative analysis; the anthropology of Britain; aesthetics and the built environment. He was recently engaged in an NHS-funded projects looking at hospital design and the space and place of hospital chaplaincies, <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1185&context=quakerstudies>, r0w@n + sean!

The German philosopher  Wolfgang  Welsch, like Featherstone, per­ ceives a  growing tendency towards the aestheticization of everyday life but discovers in the process something more profound. Welsch notes that the increasingly intense commodification of the world has generated a  tremendous upsurge in aesthetics and in so doing has identified per­ haps the latest, and in some ways most fundamental, manifestation of the plain/ grand struggle. **Reality itself is**coming to count increasingly as**an aesthetic construction** (Welsch 1997: 85). Aestheticization, according to Welsch, describes a process operating at two significant levels. The most superficial is a  surface aestheticization­ the application of an aesthetic patina to reality (for example public places such as shopping malls and railway stations) and to products: take the marketing of cigarettes, confectionery and automobiles as three obvious examples. This is not just a  matter of extending aesthetics beyond art;**daily life is  being painted over**, artfully, with art. **The most superficial aesthetic values dominate: desire, amusement, enjoyment; each empha­sizing the**dressing up or**'cosmetics of reality'** (Welsch 1997: 3). Once again, then**, the embellishment generated by the**grand has come into the ascendancy. This is the stimulation of aesthetics**as an entirely eco­nomic strategy**, representing**the triumph of form  over function.**Furthermore,**aesthetics is no longer merely the vehicle but the essence.**Training shoes, not necessarily purchased in order to take part in sports, provide an example of aestheticization as  a means of achieving an almost frenzied degree of product differentiation (1997: 2-4). This level coincides more or less with the three aspects identified by Featherstone considered above. Welsch further identifies a  less explicit process, 'deep-seated  aestheti­ cization'. Aesthetics is now not merely central to the product  but to production itself; it is central to the design process.  **Reality**is  increas­ ingly**constituted  through media**, for example**computer and video games-virtual reality**(Welsch 1997: 4-7). If  surface-level aestheticiza­ tion governs our perception of separate bits of reality, deep-seated aestheticization determines the manner of reality's being and our con­ ception of it. Welsch underlines the extent to which aesthetic judgments are being applied during all stages of the production  process itself, pri­ marily  through computer-aided design.  The  current aestheticization attains its consummation in individuals and particularly to individual bodies, but also in our relations with others. The body has become an increasingly important site for aestheticization in relation to dressing, modification and so forth, though this is  a  complex phenomenon (see also Featherstone 1982).

#### Enlightenment and scientific reasoning is an aesthetic adventure, one that relies on aestheticized objects to construct a reality- what they miss is that these objects will ALWAYS be aesthetic- since that’s what constructed them in the first place

**Collins 2k**, Quaker Plaining as Critical Aesthetic, George Fox University, Dr Peter J. Collins is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Durham University, UK. completed an MA in development studies and a PhD in social anthropology at Manchester University. His research interests include religion (especially Quakerism), ritual and symbolism; historical anthropology; qualitative research methods, particularly narrative analysis; the anthropology of Britain; aesthetics and the built environment. He was recently engaged in an NHS-funded projects looking at hospital design and the space and place of hospital chaplaincies, <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1185&context=quakerstudies>, r0w@n + sean!

Insofar as everything is not made uniformly better in the aestheticiza­ tion process, how**can we judge good from bad?** **We would**generally **look to**judge according to**criteria of morality**, truth or aesthetics.**Ethics has itself become increasingly bound up with aesthetics**; our discussion of plain/ grand discourse  suggests that this was always the case. The criterion of truth has been diminished as scientific rationality itself has increasingly become an aesthetic category (Welsch 1997: 20-24). The process of epistemological aestheticization has been under way for more than two centuries. Komer points out that 'It is a fundamental axiom of the Kantian philosophy that our thinking  depends for its objects on per­ ception' (Komer 1990: 45). In his Critique if Pure Reason, Kant argued that**we impose a  sense of order on the world and come to know the world**, a  priori,**by categorizing it in terms of time and space.**It is through this process that things in the world exist for us in the first place: **reality extends just so far as do these facilities. This is an intrinsi­ cally aesthetic adventure**insofar as**these categories exist as forms of intuition**and imagination**and is fundamental to our knowledge of the world** (see also Collinson 1992: 134-44). Reality is a mutable construct which human beings generate through forms of intuition, projections, illusions, fantasies, and on, and **such knowledge implies an aesthetic per­ spective** (Welsch 1997: 46-4 7). According to Welsch, then,  there has been an immensely significant 'aesthetic tum' during the last 250 years. The**Enlightenment reality can**no longer**be seen** as independent of cognition, but**only as the result of a process of social construction**-and this is **equally true of science and hermeneutics** (Welsch 1997: 22-23). If in the past we thought  of aesthetics as concerned only with secondary,  supplementary  'outward' realities, then today we must recognize that**aesthetics**(or 'proto­ aesthetics')**is intimately, even inseparably, bound up with knowledge and reality**: this is correctly identified by Welsch as a  major legacy of modernity. I  would add that, together, these deep-rooted processes represent an important contemporary manifestation of embellishment, of 'grand' discourse. Welsch suggests that there is  **no single rational argument**which**is able to engage effectively with this aestheticization. All thinkable objections will**themselves **be subject to it**, insofar as**our view of the world has become thoroughly aestheticized.**This**epistemological**or transcendental**aestheticization is the driving force behind the**more **manifest processes.** **In assuming this manner of constructing reality we become aesthetic to our core**and it  is**this cognitive preparation**that**facilitates our everyday participation in the mundane processes of 'surface' and 'deep-seated' aes­theticization.**And if aestheticization means that the unaesthetic is made, or understood, to be aesthetic, how can we critique  artefacts of the aestheticization process, given the unavailability of ethics and reason for this purpose? Having discounted the criteria of truth and morality, we are left with aesthetic criteria which, Welsch  claims, do enable us to distinguish between the accomplished and the unaccomplished, better or worse, exemplary and digressive (1997: 24-25). It would certainly seem appropriate to emphasize aesthetic criteria in this  age of global aestheticization.

#### The 1AC’s investment in form of communication dooms their project to inevitable aestheticization- only action-plaining can rupture their co-option

**Collins 2k**, Quaker Plaining as Critical Aesthetic, George Fox University, Dr Peter J. Collins is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Durham University, UK. completed an MA in development studies and a PhD in social anthropology at Manchester University. His research interests include religion (especially Quakerism), ritual and symbolism; historical anthropology; qualitative research methods, particularly narrative analysis; the anthropology of Britain; aesthetics and the built environment. He was recently engaged in an NHS-funded projects looking at hospital design and the space and place of hospital chaplaincies, <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1185&context=quakerstudies>, r0w@n + sean!

The plain was extant as an influential discourse long before George Fox and his contemporaries adopted it in the mid-seventeenth century. Focusing particularly on language, Peter Auksi (1995) shows that the oppositional discourse of the plain and grand styles has its roots deep in the Classical tradition of rhetoric. The plaining of Quakers is a part of this larger, more complex discourse, involving an unending tension between plaining and, for want of a better word, embellishment. By thus contextualizing the Quaker plain style I believe that we can better appreciate its pervasive ambiguity, paradox and contradiction, as well as 126 COLLINS QUAKER PLAINING AS CRITICAL AESTHETIC its potential as ethically informed critical aesthetic. For instance, being simple is no simple matter. Even in the seventeenth century Friends complained that simplicity had become affectation. It is worth briefly reconsidering Margaret Fell/Fox's trenchant views on the matter: We are now coming into that which Christ cried woe against, minding altogether outward things, neglecting the inward work of Almighty God in our hearts. . . (Quaker Faith and Practice 199 5: 20.31, extracted fr om Portfolio 25/66, Library of the Society ofFriends, London) Here, Fell/Fox is not so much criticizing Friends for choosing to live plainly as chastising them for adopting the plain style merely as an orna­ mentation. Far from helping Friends to see the essence of things unclut­ tered by external embellishment, some Friends had, in their enthusiasm for exclusivity, overstepped the mark. As Auksi points out during his discussion of Pauline simplicity: If the devotee of Christian plainness in artistic expression has one central premise, it is this: the more lowly, artless, ineloquent, unadorned, and 'earthen' the outward vessel or covering garment of its style is, the more God-given and divinely persuasive appears the excellency of the matter to be conveyed or covered (Auski 1995: 91). Fell/Fox is reminding Friends how misguided this assumption is. **To pay too much attention to the form or style, the 'outward covering' is to turn attention away from what is truly important-content, the kernel**, the seed. However,**to cultivate the artless is to be artful**, and that is to deny the Light Within.In any case, Fell/Fox's opinion went largely unheeded at the time and the rules and regulations, glossed as 'disci­ pline', accumulated throughout most of the eighteenth century (see Vann 1969). It is worthwhile to consider in more detail the discourse of which this is just one example. In the first place, plain is to grand as spirit is to flesh and it is on this correspondence that the moral purchase of the plain rests. According to the Apostle Paul and many others, the plain generally emphasizes the internal over the external, content over form: the latter taken as super­ ficial and inherently of lesser worth (Auksi 1995: Ch. 4 passim). Paul attempted to distance the new religious awareness from the old, separat­ ing the dry ritualism of the old guard from the freedom and intensity that come from the promptings of the inward spirit. He spoke with the assistance not of men but of God: his rhetorical ideals are moral ideals which agree perfectly with the Sermon on the Mount. The Scriptural distinction between the kernel and the husk, between that which comes from God and that which men and women invest to give the kernel a fleshly, rhetorical ornamentation, became a key metaphor in the six­ teenth and seventeenth centuries. There are numerous references to Paul's epistles in the writings of early Friends and particularly in Fox (Pickvance 1989). Throughout the ages, the plain has been made to stand for the spiritual, the otherworldly, whereas its opposite, the grand, has implied 'urbanity and elegance' or more basically the material world (Auksi 1995: 40). But insofar as the plain may encase and therefore obscure, rather than reveal the Spirit, the claim to moral superiority by the plain must remain a site of contestation. **The plain is open to aesthetic judgment and is therefore subjective. Like the grand, the plain can be thought of as elegant, fashionable and therefore fleeting.** A contemporary example is the trend towards rnini­ malism which characterizes interior design, as well as some modern painting and music. Plato, in his Republic, concludes 'beauty of style and harmony and grace and good rhythm depend on simplicity' (quoted in Anksi 1995: 44)-establishing that the plain is an aesthetic ideal to which all the liberal arts ought to conform. Cicero was fully aware of the importance of the 'careful negligence' (1995: 56) resulting from a lack of ornament. He compares the plain style to the cosmetic adornment of women who can please even when unembellished. On the other hand, the plain has on occasion been characterized as crude, ugly and less than pleasing. While Jerome cautions that clothes may be overadorned he adds, 'an affected shabbiness does not become a Christian' (1995: 152). But then Jerome also admits that in his own translations of Scripture, 'the art was to hide the art' (1995: 168). There is nothing that is essentially plain, then. **The plain is an effect, a construct, no matter how strong or sincere one's convictions.** Among some eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Friends it led to quaintness. Classical rhetoricians such as Demosthenes manifest a major paradox: they praise simplicity, but as an effect, as an explicitly constructed artefact. It was this paradox that Fell/Fox sought to expose. We might argue that **plaining becomes authentic only when it is utterly habitual or 'second nature'**. But whether authentic or not, the plain can be well or poorly constructed, that is, it has aesthetic qualities. Quintillian fiercely criticizes the extreme use of common vulgarisms in the name of a sincere and unostentatious simplicity because they miss the crucial point that 'naturalism' is itself an artistic COLLINS QUAKER PLAINING AS CRITICAL AESTHETIC construct (Auksi 1995: 40). For Symon Patrick, the seventeenth-century pamphleteer, the plain style is a human achievement for those who have submitted to reason, humane learning and civilised order rather than an inspired gift, presented to the chosen few (1995: 277-78). Apart from Quaker texts, seventeenth-century handbooks of homiletics broaden the ideal of rhetorical plainness including advice on right living, liturgy, manners, dress and so on (1995: 290). The preacher is pressed to conceal his art and artifice and any mode of artistic expression, plain or not, as representing a formal technical skill. Of course, in concealing his �rt he reaffirms it. The plain is rarely artless, it is generally a construct10n, a more or less conscious means of eschewing embellishment. A further important theme within plain/ grand discourse is that truth needs no ornamentation. The following derives from London Yearly Meeting of 1691: It is our tender and Christian advice that Friends take care to keep to truth and plainness, in language, habit, deportment and behaviour; that the simplicity of truth in these things may not wear out nor be lost in our days, nor in our posterity's; and to avoid pride and immodesty in apparel, and all vain superfluous fashions of the world (Quaker Faith and Practice 1995: 20.28). loading... QUAKER STUDIES properly known by words, images and materials that misrepresent its very nature. Taken to its logical extreme,**the spiritualist argument would imply the final inadequacy of all words before God**.In driving towards stillness, silence and the plain, Zwingli helped make possible many other experiments in negation and abstraction-including Quakerism. He believes that **God cannot be represented but the paradox is that the absence of representation itself is made to represent God** (Auksi 1995: 228-31). **Both plain and grand styles** derive primarily from the agent, not the act: they each **result from the author's disposition.** Aristotle, while agree­ ing that rhetoric is an important art, argues that it is the moral character of the orator which is essential to his ability to persuade. This is a distinction later upheld by Augustine who holds that the life of the speaker has greater weight in determining whether he is obediently heard than any grandness of eloquence. The mediaeval theologian Peter Damian wrote: 'A clear life is of more value as an example than elo­ quence or precise elegance in words'. His model is John: 'Let the sim­ plicity of Christ instruct me'. **The plain is a way of life, not just a manner of speaking** (Auksi 1995: 189). As Fell/Fox noted, it is not sufficient merely to change one's clothes, one needs to change one's life. The plain is held up as a religious ideal, as one that individuals might aspire to. The plain style serves as a metonym for the person. Among the most ardent champions of the plain style were the Stoics, who maintained a rational, one might say 'puritan', plainness in speech, dress and lifestyle, scorning arts such as cooking, painting, sculpture, architecture. For the Stoics, pleasure was a vice. The leading Stoic, Seneca, regarded style as a moral index, as an ethical reflector of character and society. His central premise was that an individual's soul or spirit shapes their abilities: a person's speech just like their life. He argued that while metaphor has its place, speech which deals with the truth should be unadorned-an argument developed by several Renaissance Christian humanists (Auksi 1995: 36). Cicero quipped that the Stoics would teach us all to fall silent: Stoicism ad absurdum or Quaker worship? (1995: 64). As a result of this slight detour it is possible to see that the plain/ grand, as discourse, has a long and complex history. The plain has, for more than 2000 years, been locked into a dialogue with the grand. It has remained a site of profound aesthetic, spiritual and moral contestation. No sphere of society has escaped-economics, the arts, religion, leisure, politics-in all of these spheres, the discourse of the plain has been, 130 COLLINS QUAKER PLAINING AS CRITICAL AESTHETIC above all, a critical endeavour. This is largely because the grand has generally remained in the ascendancy, has garnered for itself greater resources and has remained the more powerful ideology. The plain has most often been invoked in order to 'curb the excesses' of the influential, the dominant, the powerful. The plain has remained, for the most part, a levelling tendency-marking distinction without hierarchy. With this in mind, I return to the question posed at the start of this essay: What relevance, if any, does Quaker plaining have today?

#### The impact is total aestheticization- it saps value to life, kills any attempts at progress, and institutionalizes hopelessness

**Collins 2k**, Quaker Plaining as Critical Aesthetic, George Fox University, Dr Peter J. Collins is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Durham University, UK. completed an MA in development studies and a PhD in social anthropology at Manchester University. His research interests include religion (especially Quakerism), ritual and symbolism; historical anthropology; qualitative research methods, particularly narrative analysis; the anthropology of Britain; aesthetics and the built environment. He was recently engaged in an NHS-funded projects looking at hospital design and the space and place of hospital chaplaincies, <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1185&context=quakerstudies>, r0w@n + sean!

Maquet compares the aesthetic  point of view  with contemplation (Maquet 1986: 51-58). Similarly Welsch argues that aesthetics teaches us that we need respite from the bombardment to which modern culture subjects our senses-we require 'delays, quiet areas and interruption'.**Total aestheticization inevitably generates its antithesis: where every­ thing is presented as beautiful  nothing is beautiful.** What is more, **continued stimulation leads to torpor and a  sense of powerlessness**, or 'anaestheticization', along  with**a  growing inability to discriminate between the good, the bad and the ugly**(Welsch 1997: 83). Aesthetics alone facilitates  a calm assessment of the jumble that aestheticization produces.  Critical progress within the context of gross commodification currently depends not upon an exaggerated or 'hyper-aestheticization' of culture but, instead, the development of a  'blind  spot culture'. To per­ ceive something is necessarily to overlook something else: vision is impossible without a  blind-spot. Developed sensibility, an example of which is  plaining, is attentive to this and faces the consequences, not only in relation to form and design, traditionally defined, but also in daily life. An aesthetically reflective awareness  helps  illuminate and clarifY issues which arise in our daily lives and marks the impact of dif­ ference and exclusion. Welsch makes great claims for an 'aestheticically sensitised awareness' which he argues is allergic to injustice and encour­ ages us to defend the rights of the oppressed. As such, aesthetics is able to contribute at least indirectly to the micro-politics that infuse  our worldview. If  we shrink from merely sanctioning every aspect of the aestheticization process then it is from the standpoint of aesthetics that critique must come (Welsch 1997: 25-27). And so it  is  possible to see why plaining conceived as  aesthetic is so important. It is as morally and spiritually informed aesthetic that the Quaker plain can enable us to become conscious of and therefore critique an ideology that finds its apogee in the prevailing consumer culture. While the Quaker plain style provides an antidote to the surface aestheticization of everyday life, plaining represents an alternative to the deep aestheticization which has come to dominate our understanding of the world. One's manner of living can be many things, including an aesthetic, as Tolstoy (1969) and, most recently,  Michel  Foucault and Gilles Deleuze have commented (Goodchild  1996). Plaining, a  more or less self-con­ scious process which has constituted an ethic as well as an aesthetic, has been at the core of a Quaker way of life since the mid-seventeenth cen­ tury. The testimonies are most obviously constitutive of a  moral code; even  the apparently trivial prescriptions and proscriptions (the 'peculiarities') were undergirded by Scriptural (and therefore, moral) authority. How this was to be done, unless by example, is less clear. It is possible that Quaker plaining, as an ethically, spiritually and politically inspired aesthetic, could prove a  valuable asset in helping us see and consequently see through the damaging aestheticization processes identified by Welsch, Featherstone and others. And it  is  the continuing relevance and potentially  liberating  force of the plain and plaining, a dynamic and critical aesthetic, morally and theologically informed, that I have sought to highlight in this essay.

#### Thus the alternative is Quaker Plaining- establishing a blind spot in the affirmative’s 360 degree display of aestheticization that lets us deconstruct our understandings of the world and live without them

**Collins 2k**, Quaker Plaining as Critical Aesthetic, George Fox University, Dr Peter J. Collins is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at Durham University, UK. completed an MA in development studies and a PhD in social anthropology at Manchester University. His research interests include religion (especially Quakerism), ritual and symbolism; historical anthropology; qualitative research methods, particularly narrative analysis; the anthropology of Britain; aesthetics and the built environment. He was recently engaged in an NHS-funded projects looking at hospital design and the space and place of hospital chaplaincies, <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1185&context=quakerstudies>, r0w@n + sean!

Maquet compares the aesthetic  point of view  with contemplation (Maquet 1986: 51-58). Similarly Welsch argues that aesthetics teaches us that we need respite from the bombardment to which modern culture subjects our senses-we require 'delays, quiet areas and interruption'. Total aestheticization inevitably generates its antithesis: where every­ thing is presented as beautiful  nothing is beautiful. What is more, continued stimulation leads to torpor and a  sense of powerlessness, or 'anaestheticization', along  with a  growing inability to discriminate between the good, the bad and the ugly (Welsch 1997: 83). Aesthetics alone facilitates  a calm assessment of the jumble that aestheticization produces.  **Critical progress within the context of gross commodification currently depends not upon an exaggerated or 'hyper-aestheticization' of culture but**, instead**, the development of a  'blind  spot culture'. To per­ ceive something is necessarily to overlook something else: vision is impossible without a  blind-spot.**Developed sensibility, an example of which is**plaining, is attentive to this and faces the consequences, not only in relation to form and design,**traditionally defined,**but also in daily life.** An **aesthetically reflective awareness  helps  illuminate and clarifY issues**which arise**in our daily lives and marks the impact of dif­ference and exclusion.** Welsch makes great claims for an 'aestheticically sensitised awareness' which he argues is allergic to injustice and encour­ ages us to defend the rights of the oppressed. As such, aesthetics is able to contribute at least indirectly to the micro-politics that infuse  our worldview. If  we shrink from merely sanctioning every aspect of the aestheticization process then it is from the standpoint of aesthetics that critique must come (Welsch 1997: 25-27). And so it  is  possible to see why plaining conceived as  aesthetic is so important. It is **as morally and spiritually informed aesthetic that the Quaker plain can enable us to become conscious of and therefore critique an ideology that finds its apogee in the prevailing consumer culture.** While the Quaker plain style provides an antidote to the surface aestheticization of everyday life, **plaining represents an alternative to the deep aestheticization which has come to dominate our understanding of the world.** One's manner of living can be many things, including an aesthetic, as Tolstoy (1969) and, most recently,  Michel  Foucault and Gilles Deleuze have commented (Goodchild  1996). Plaining, a  more or less self-con­ scious process which has constituted an ethic as well as an aesthetic, has been at the core of a Quaker way of life since the mid-seventeenth cen­ tury. The testimonies are most obviously constitutive of a  moral code; even  the apparently trivial prescriptions and proscriptions (the 'peculiarities') were undergirded by Scriptural (and therefore, moral) authority. How this was to be done, unless by example, is less clear. It is possible that Quaker plaining, as an ethically, spiritually and politically inspired aesthetic, could prove a  valuable asset in helping us see and consequently see through the damaging aestheticization processes identified by Welsch, Featherstone and others. And it  is  **the continuing relevance and potentially  liberating  force of the plain and plaining**, a dynamic and critical aesthetic, morally and theologically informed, that I have sought to highlight in this essay.

## Buddhism

#### Nice to meet you judge, I’m you, you’re me, we’re all each other– now vote neg

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

#### The ego- or the fake perception of the individual- is the root of all suffering

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH+ r0w@n

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands**. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion**; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as **delusion is** basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the **ego instincts** in Buddhism **is one of the forms of craving**. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. **The craving for egotistical pursuits** **has** its **deeper spring in** the dogma of personal immortality. This is **the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life.** The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. **Such** annihilationist **views** may be **closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide**. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. **The ego illusion is** not merely an intellectual construction, but is **fed by deeper affective processes.** Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of **the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively** may turn out to be **more subtle expressions of their ego**, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

## Case

Presumption

1. Conceded in cross that the aff does nothing- even if they prove the world’s unjust now- if they don’t have any mech to make it more just who cares