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## 1AC

#### The role of the judge is to reward the debater whose performance and discourse does not perpetuate the oppression of people. We must question what our discourse in round justifies.

(Christopher Vincent 2013, Debate Coach, former college NDT debater “Re-Conceptualizing Our Performances: Accountability In Lincoln Douglas Debate” [http://victorybriefs.com/vbd/2013/10/re-conceptualizing-our-performances-accountability-in-lincoln-douglas-debate)](http://victorybriefs.com/vbd/2013/10/re-conceptualizing-our-performances-accountability-in-lincoln-douglas-debate%29), HSH

In his chapter on “Non Cartesian Sums,” in *Blackness Visible*, Charles Mills argues that “white experience is embedded as normative, and the embedding is so deep that its normativity is not even identified as such.” Historically, universal theories never intended to include black bodies into the cannon. Mills argues that in philosophy: "A reconceptualization is necessary because the structuring logic is different. The peculiar features of the African American experience—racial slavery, which linked biological phenotype to social subordination, and which is chronologically located in the modern epoch, ironically coincident with the emergence of liberalism’s proclamation of universal human equality—are not part of the experience represented in the abstractions of European and Euro-American philosophers." We generate universal theories and assume they can be applied to anyone. These abstractions assume a conception of universality that never intended to account for the African American experience. This drowns out the perspectives of students of color that are historically excluded from the conversation. Normativity becomes a privilege that historically students of color do not get to access because of the way we discuss things. These same philosophical texts have served as a cornerstone in Lincoln Douglas and in turn have been used to justify exclusion. That is why it **[It] is easy for a white student to make claims that we do not know whether racism is bad,** or even question whether oppression is bad, **since after all it is just another argument on the flow. They never have to deal with the practical implications of their discourse.** These become manifestations of privilege in the debate space because for many students of color, who have to go back to their communities, they still have to deal with the daily acts of racism and violence inflicted upon their homes, communities, and cultures. To question or even make a starting point question for the debate to be about justifying why racism is bad ignores the reality of the bodies present in the room. Our justification of western philosophy has allowed us to remain disconnected from reality. Philosophy, as Mills argues, justifies particular way of knowing under free and rational thought, through a universal way of knowing, believing, and discussing. **We have embedded white ways of knowing as normative without ever challenging how it replicates oppressive structures.** The question then becomes how does our discourse justify what we believe? **For many debaters it is the gaming aspect of debate that allows us to assume that our speech can be disconnected from the speech act. The speech can be defined as the arguments that are placed on the flow, and is evaluated in the context of what is the most logical and rational argument to win the round. The critical distinction is the speech act, which is the performance of that discourse. It’s not what you say, but what you justify. Understanding the speech act requires critically assessing the ramifications of the debaters discourse. Debate is** in and of itself **a performance. To claim that it is not is to be divorced from** the **reality[.]** of what we do. **We must evaluate what a debaters performance does and justifies.** For white debaters it is easy to view the discourse as detached from the body. For those with privilege in debate, they are never forced to have their performance attached to them but instead their arguments are viewed as words on paper. They are taught to separate themselves from any ideologies and beliefs, and feel that there is no consequence to what they say. It becomes the way in which they justify what is deemed as “rational” and “logical” thought. The argument sounds like it will be competitive so it is read but it is deemed as just an argument. Judges evaluate this as just a speech. This becomes what I deem as a performance by the body, rather than a performance of the body. Performances by the body allow debaters to not be held accountable to the words they say. Words are seen as divorced from any meaning outside of the flow, versus the performance of the body where the words are attached to the body itself. Debaters often insert the performance by the body, when they make arguments that they claim that they do not believe, but think it is the best strategy for the round. This is a false assumption, since for black debaters meaning is always connected to their bodies. The best strategy should [is] never be one that at the same time justifies acts of racism.Charles Mills argues that “the moral concerns of African Americans have centered on the assertion of their personhood, a personhood that could generally be taken for granted by whites, so that blacks have had to see these theories from a location outside their purview.” For example, I witnessed a round at a tournament this season where a debater ran a utilitarianism disadvantage. His opponent argued that this discourse was racist because it ignores the way in which a utilitarian calculus has distorted communities of color by ignoring the wars and violence already occurring in those communities. In the next speech, the debater stood up, conceded it was racist, and argued that it was the reason he was not going for it and moved on, and still won the debate. This is problematic because it demonstrates exactly what Mill’s argument is. For the black debater this argument is a question of his or her personhood within the debate space and the white debater was not held accountable for the words that are said. Again for debaters of color, their performance is always attached to their body which is why it is important that the performance be viewed in relation to the speech act. Whites are allowed to take for granted the impact their words have on the bodies in the space. They take for granted this notion of personhood and ignore the concerns of those who do not matter divorced from the flow. It is never a question of “should we make arguments divorced from our ideologies,” it is a question of is it even possible. It is my argument that our performances, regardless of what justification we provide, are always a reflection of the ideologies we hold. Why should a black debater have to use a utilitarian calculus just to win a round, when that same discourse justifies violence in the community they go back home to? Our performances and our decisions in the round, reflect the beliefs that we hold when we go back to our communities. **As a community we must re-conceptualize** this distinction the performance by the body and of the body by re-evaluating **the role of the speech and the speech act. It is no longer enough for judges to vote off of the flow anymore. Students** of color **are being held to a higher threshold to better articulate why racism is bad, which is the problem in a space that we deem to be educational.** It is here where I shift my focus to a solution. **Debaters must be held accountable for the words they say in the round. We should no longer evaluate the speech. Instead we must begin to evaluate the speech act itself.** Debaters must be held accountable for more than winning the debate. They must be held accountable for the implications of that speech. As educators and adjudicators in the debate space we also have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere of education. It is not enough for judges to offer predispositions suggesting that they do not endorse racist, sexist, homophobic discourse, or justify why they do not hold that belief, and still offer a rational reason why they voted for it. Judges have become complacent in voting on the discourse, if the other debater does not provide a clear enough role of the ballot framing, or does not articulate well enough why the racist discourse should be rejected. **Judges** must be willing to foster a learning atmosphere by holding debaters accountable for what they say in the round. They **must be willing to vote against a debater if they endorse racist discourse.** They must be willing to disrupt the process of the flow for the purpose of embracing that teachable moment. The speech must be connected to the speech act. **We must view the entire debate as a performance of the body, instead of the argument solely on the flow.**Likewise, judges must be held accountable for what they vote for in the debate space. If a judge is comfortable enough to vote for discourse that is racist, sexist, or homophobic, they must also be prepared to defend their actions. We as a community do not live in a vacuum and do not live isolated from the larger society. That means that judges must defend their actions to the debaters, their coaches, and to the other judges in the room if it is a panel. Students of color should not have the burden of articulating why racist discourse must be rejected, but should have the assurance that the educator with the ballot will protect them in those moments.**Until we re-conceptualize the speech and the speech act,** and until judges are comfortable enough to vote down debaters for a performance that perpetuates violence in the debate space, **debaters and coaches alike will remain complacent in their privilege. As educators we must begin to shift the paradigm and be comfortable doing this. As a community we should stop looking at ourselves as isolated in a vacuum and recognize that the discourse and knowledge we produce in debate has real implications for how we think when we leave this space.** Our performances must be viewed as of the body instead of just by it. As long as we continue to operate in a world where our performances are merely by bodies, we will continue to foster a climate of hostility and violence towards students of color, and in turn destroy the transformative potential this community could have.

THUS

#### Resource extraction is rooted in capitalism and neoliberalism.

Jason Macleod, Legal and social theorist currently studying at Berkeley School of Law, “Marx, Capitalism, Globalization, and Climate Change: Revolutionary Ideas For Climate Change Mitigation”, 2013, <http://www.jasondmacleod.com/marx-capitalism-globalization-climate-change-revolutionary-ideas-climate-change-mitigation/>, HSH

The Industrial Revolution, the **[The] introduction of neoliberal economic ideology**, **and the capitalist notion of maximizing efficiency and production**, **have subjugated the environment to the limitless growth potential of capitalism.  The arrival of free or near-free market resources, in tandem with globalization and cheap labor, produced a cycle of exploitation, thereby allowing industry to abandon the resource exploited sites to move on to other more efficient and exploitable sites without regarding long-term environmental effects.**  Professor Kütting from the State University of New York concluded, “this liberalization and its supporting institutional framework have led to a new form of ecological imperialism that subjugates resource extraction and production to market ideology.”[[1]](http://www.jasondmacleod.com/marx-capitalism-globalization-climate-change-revolutionary-ideas-climate-change-mitigation/#_ftn1)  **Capitalism’s infinite potential for growth is incompatible with the finite natural resources available.** The current ideology degrades environmental health as corporations fail to internalize the cost of environmental protection. A recent study commissioned by the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment, concluded that in 2008, “the top 3,000 companies had an environmental impact of $2.2 trillion dollars…the estimated annual environmental costs from global human activity equat[es] to 11% of global GDP or $6.6 trillion.”[[2]](http://www.jasondmacleod.com/marx-capitalism-globalization-climate-change-revolutionary-ideas-climate-change-mitigation/#_ftn2)  They projected the cost to be $28 trillion by 2050 (excluding the costs of invaluable ecosystem services, pollution and waste).[[3]](http://www.jasondmacleod.com/marx-capitalism-globalization-climate-change-revolutionary-ideas-climate-change-mitigation/#_ftn3)  In the report, “impact” is a euphemism for environmental degradation. This process is accumulation by dispossession, the exploitation of a resource without appropriate reimbursement. The ultimate outcome of market growth and environmental exploitation is climate change.  Global society’s recreation of this relationship is essential to safeguard natural resources for future generations.  **The nature of capitalism** and its agents is that they operate in a short time horizon – profits cannot be guaranteed in the future and capitalists want to receive their profit in the moment.  This profit maximization, in the moment, **will lead to faster and faster depletion of non-renewable energy and resources.**

#### Cap is the root cause of racism.

(Alex Taylor; writer, the Socialist Worker, http://socialistworker.org/2002-2/431/431\_08\_Racism.shtml, dashes in original), HSH

FOR MANY people coming to radical politics--Blacks and whites alike--hatred of racism and a desire to get rid of it is a huge motivating factor. This is in contrast to some of the common assumptions about where racism comes from. The first is that racism is part of human nature--that it's always existed and always will. The second is the liberal idea of racism--that it comes from people's bad ideas, and that if we could change these ideas, we could get rid of it. Both assumptions are wrong. Racism isn't just an ideology but is an institution. And its origins don't lie in bad ideas or in human nature. Rather, racism [Racism] originated with capitalism[.] and the slave trade. As the Marxist writer CLR James put it, "The conception of dividing people by race begins with the slave trade. This thing was so shocking, so opposed to all the conceptions of society which religion and philosophers had…that the only justification by which humanity could face it was to divide people into races and decide that the Africans were an inferior race." History proves this[.] point. Prior to the advent of capital**ism,** racism as a systematic form of oppression did not exist**.** For example, ancient Greek and Roman societies had no concept of race **or racial oppression. These** weren't liberated **societies**. They **were built on the backs of slaves.** And these societies created an ideology to justify slavery. As the Greek philosopher Aristotle put it in his book Politics, "Some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that for these latter, slavery is both expedient and right." **However, because slavery in ancient Greece and Rome was not racially based, these societies had no corresponding ideology of racial inferiority or oppression.** In fact, Egyptian, Greek, Roman and Early Christian societies had a favorable image of Blacks[.] and of African societies. Septemus Severenus, an emperor of Rome, was African and almost certainly Black. "The ancients did accept the institution of slavery as a fact of life; they made ethnocentric judgments of other societies; they had narcissistic canons of physical beauty," writes Howard University professor Frank Snowden in his book Before Color Prejudice. "Yet nothing comparable to the virulent color prejudice of modern time existed in the ancient world. This is the view of most scholars who have examined the evidence." - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - RACISM ORIGINATED with the modern slave trade. Just as the slaveholders of ancient Greece and Rome created an ideology that their barbaric slave system was "natural," so did the modern slave-owning class. There was one important difference. According to them, slavery was "natural" because of race. Africans were not human beings, and therefore, they were born to be slaves. As historian **Eric** Williams writes[,] **in his book Capitalism and Slavery, "Slavery was not born of racism; rather,** racism was the consequence of slavery**." Again**, history bears this out. **If racism had existed prior to the slave trade, then Africans would have been the first group of people to be enslaved. But, in the early years of colonial America,** slavery was not racially based. Initially, the colonists attempted to enslave Native Americans. They also imported thousands of white indentured servants. White servants were treated like slaves. They were bought, sold, put up as stakes in card games and raped, beaten and killed with impunity. Not only was servitude a multiracial institution in [In] the early years of colonial America, there was also a surprising degree of equality between Blacks and whites**.** For example, in [In] 17th century Virginia, Blacks were able to file lawsuits, testify in court against whites, bear arms and own property, including servants and slaves**.**

#### Racism inevitably leads to genocide.

[Erin Steuter and Deborah Wills, Writers at Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., At War With Metaphor: Media, Propaganda, and Racism in the War on Terror, pg. 41 to 45, 2008], HSH

Every genocide is followed by denial. The mass graves are dug up and hidden. The historical records are burned, or closed to historians. Even during the genocide, those committing the crimes dismiss reports as propaganda. Afterwards such deniers arc called "revisionists." Others deny through more subtle means: by characterizing the reports as "unconfirmed" or "alleged" because they do not come from officially approved sources; by minimizing the number killed; by quarreling about whether the killing fits the legal definition of genocide ("definitionalism"); by claiming that the deaths of the perpetrating group exceeded that of the victim group, or that the deaths were the result of civil war, not genocide.` Before there can be an act of genocide to deny, however, there [There] must be a number of conditions in place to allow genocidal violence to occur.Stanton argues thatclassification [Classification], the first condition[,] or stage, is fundamental and deeply encoded in human language. All languages require classification, a "division of the natural and social world into categories." All cultures have categories to distinguish between "us" and "them," between members of our group and others. While all language may make this distinction, it [It] is when we add symbolization to "name and signify" our classifications that what Keen calls the "paranoid culture" begins to assert itself, making certain physical characteristics (such as skin color or facial features) symbols for racial or ethnic classifications. In the later stage of the genocidal process, these markers may become abstract and externalized, as with the yellow star forced on the Jews of Nazi Germany or the blue-checked scarf used by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia to identify, marginalize, and deport people from the Eastern Zone. Classification and symbolization are widespread human practices that are part of our national identity and cultural self-awareness. When joined by dehumanization, these qualities move a society significantly further down the grim road to genocide**.** Dehumanization relegates the classified group to a category of sub-humanity, making it easier to overcome an aversion to killing. Instead, killing becomes something to be celebrated; thus, in a notorious tape recording of an interview with members of the elite Canadian Airborne Unit in Somalia, a soldier is heard telling the interviewer that their "peacekeeping" mission "sucks, man. We ain't killed enough n yet."'' In the later stages of the genocidal process, polarization intensifies difference, as moderates are silenced or killed. Often, the first casualties of genocide are moderates within the killing groups, voices raised in objection over the escalating violence. Extremists target moderates so that only the extremes will be left in conflict, with no milder middle to slow the cycle of descent into genocide. Once moderate voices have been suppressed, individual deaths escalate into mass killings[.], in which the rhetoric of extermination is trouble, natives were always wild animals that had to be rooted out of their dens, swamps, jungles."24 Until the conquest of the natives was complete, the message was always the same and almost always voiced through metaphors of natural animality. The most fitting end for "the animals vulgarly called Indians," as Hugh Brackenridge, an eighteenth century jurist and novelist wrote, was extermination.-' Within this animal metaphor, the "injuns inability to be civilized confirmed the idea of their bestiality, which could thus be seen as fundamental, pernicious, and stubbornly resistant to improvement. In this way, they were blamed for their extermination: by being beyond the reach of the civilizing impulse, they brought their end upon themselves.

#### Rejecting resource extraction as it occurs now is key to ending capitalism. We need to rethink the way that we currently use the environment.

(Timothy Luke 01 [Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic];Education, Environment and Sustainability: what are the issues, where to intervene, what must be done?; Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 33, No. 2;), HSH

To create a truly more sustainable society, environmental **[Environmental] education must unravel the** complicated **cycles of production and consumption, which are interwoven through most technological and economic practices in contemporary transnational commerce[.]** and this unravelling must show how these cycles are verging upon almost complete chaos. Highly planned programmes for economic growth are creating many unintended and unplanned outcomes of environmental destruction, boosting society’s already high ecological risks to even higher levels. Most steps taken to mitigate these risks will not be executed with much certainty of successfully gaining their intended ends. Doing anything could make everything worse, doing nothing might make something better. At this juncture, environmental **[Environmental] education must redefine** some shared **values for an ecological society.** Unfortunately, most academic disciplines, from ecology to economics, are shackled by a set of disciplinary practices that constrain the imagination to get the approved scope and correct method of normal disciplinary inquiry. When Eugene Odum, for example, asserts that ecology is a `major interdisciplinary science that links together the biological, physical, and social sciences’ (Odum, 1975), very few biological, physical, or social scientists accept this broad interdisciplinary charge. Any ecology worth of its name would concede immediately that the economy and society are the Earth’s main environments. This reality is acknowledged by Moscovici in his re¯ ections about the question of nature in the contemporary world system. That is, science [Science] and technology have reconstituted humanity as a new material force, working on planetary basis. ‘In short[,]’, he asserts, ‘the state of nature is not now just an economy of things; it has become at the same time the work of human beings. The fact is that we are dealing with a new nature’[.] (Moscovici, 1990). This fact and how the work of human beings continuously remediates this new nature are what environmental education must address to attain sustainability. **Without sinking into a green foundationalist stance, environmental education must weave an analysis of power**, politics and the state **into** an ecology’s sense of sustainability, survival and **the environment. This** kind of interdisciplinary effort **could develop a deeply contextual understanding of nature and society as holistic cluster of interdependent relations. This view should integrate a clear sense of how ecological constraints must reshape** social/political/**economic**/cultural **practices to move past the technological and environmental failings of the present global economy.**

#### And, when weighing between impacts, genocide is functionally the worst type of oppression. We have an a priori obligation to reject things with the potential to cause genocide.

Jonathan Glover 01 [Ethics Professor King's College in London, Humanity: A Moral history of the 20th Century, 2001]., HSH

**With disasters on the scale of some in the 20th century, any ethical theory which either justifies them or can give no help in avoiding them is inadequate. The thought** at Auschwitz and other places, **‘never again,’ is more compelling than any abstract ethical principle.** (There is a parallel with a thought sometimes expressed about another part of philosophy belief in the existence of the physical world is more compelling than the belief in any philosophical theory which purports to disprove it.) **If persuaded that an otherwise convincing** ethical **theory could justify** the Nazi **genocide[,]** I **[we] should without hesitation give up the theory. In reconstructing ethics, revulsion against these things** which people have done **has a central place.**

## Underview 1

Capitalist market expansion destroys biodiversity- empirics prove.

Ostfeld and Keesing 13 (Richard S Ostfeld, Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY, USA, Felicia Keesing, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY, USA, Elsevier Encyclopedia of Biodiversity, “Biodiversity and Human Health” <http://ac.els-cdn.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/B9780123847195003324/3-s2.0-B9780123847195003324-main.pdf?_tid=e3f0ac3e-f33b-11e2-8ded-00000aab0f02&acdnat=1374545112_3c915724869f82f0aad33f3288a1e075>), HSH

The organization of economic activity into more-or-less private markets is, by and large, a phenomenon that began several hundred years ago in the West and has expanded worldwide in more recent decades (while the world's major economies have increasingly been organized along market lines, virtually all remain “mixed” economies, in which economic activity is apportioned in varying degrees between private and public sectors). (For an interesting perspective on changes in social views concerning private self-interest over the centuries, see Heilbroner, 1999.) BC The scale of economic activity neither tracks exactly the degradation of the environment in general nor the decline in biodiversity. Technological improvements may result in the production of both more valuable and less environmentally damaging goods. The empirical fact is, however, that biodiversity [Biodiversity] has declined with the appearance and expansion of modern market economies. It is easy to link the causes of biodiversity loss with the hallmarks of economic growth**.** Overharvesting results when growing demands for fish, timber, and other biological resources interact with emerging technologies for their extraction and exploitation**.** Modern market [Market] economies are not conducive to the types of social norms and local institutions that have, in many cases, led to sustainable resource extraction from common-pool resources in small-scale preindustrial communities[.] (e.g., Ostrom, 1990). International trade and travel are leading causes of the introduction of exotic diseases, pests, and predators that have eliminated native populations, particularly in isolated habitats. (It is worth noting, however, that prehistoric human migrations also had devastating effects on native biota. Paleontological evidence suggests that the extinction of American megafauna were at least suspiciously contemporary with the migration of humans across the Bering land bridge, even if experts disagree as to the culpability of humans. The extinction of Pacific island fauna, such as the giant Moa of New Zealand, has been more definitively linked to the arrival of Polynesian voyagers and, in some instances more importantly, the rats and pigs they brought with them.) In the early nineteenth century, William Blake wrote that the industrial revolution had brought “dark satanic mills,” to “England's green and pleasant land,” and by the end of the twentieth century the industrial air and water pollution that had transformed landscapes in the worlds' wealthier nations was also to be found, often in greater quantities and concentrations, in less-developed countries. Perhaps most importantly, the [The] sheer scale of human activity has resulted in the destruction of natural habitats to provide more area for industry, residences, and agriculture.

## Underview 2

Neoliberalism destroys value to life and creates massive social inequality and masks loss of higher social meaning through empty material consumption.

Heron 08 (“Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency” International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society, Vol. 20, No. 1/4, The New Sociological Imagination III (Sep., 2008), pp. 85-101; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40206149>), HSH

Generally, neoliberalism [Neolib] is about facilitating freer movement of goods, resources andenterprises across national boundarie**s[.]**, ultimately seeking cheaper resources to maximize profit and efficiency. For the purpose of this paper, we may summarize it as a theory which endorses the market as the mover and shaker of the economy and the key instrument through which social problems can now be solved. It requires: state disengagement, reduced policy autonomy by the state (and more toward the international financial institutions which promote the implementation of a neoliberal programme); ideological separation of economics from the political process; emphasizes a growth-first strategy as 'development'; emphasizes international competitiveness as positive; and trade is viewed as the engine of growth (Mengisteab 1999, pp. 140-144). Thus, power shifts from labour to capital and from state to market and international financial institutions, and as such, citizens are locked out of major decisions that affect their social well-being. In essence, neoliberalism [It] promotes a 'development strategy' that emphasizes efficiency, growth and competitiveness over social justice and redistribution**.** The ideology of neoliberalism, works through specific institutions and regimes that significantly controls the way in which globalization is directed**.** Neoliberalism is becoming more far-reaching in its ideational impact. Imbued with a promethean impulse, this brand of globalization presents us with a world of limitless opportunity of things: a [A] world of **t**echnological rapidity, a borderless culture of material contentment, available at the click of a button or the swipe of a card**.** Increasingly the role that TV media plays and the news and angles that the media takes, are controlled for the most part by these same corporations will carry nothing serious or any kind of critical analysis of the conditions of a globalized world. These dominant media firms, such as AOL-Time Warner, Sony, News Corporation, and Viacom, see themselves as global entities, where commercial deregulation, convergence and consolidation of overseas markets is the order of the day (McChesney 2001). In short, once you are hooked into US cable the world becomes pre-occupied with a world that does not reflect the reality of the majority of the world's population (Wilkin 1996). This is problematic because of a social preoccupation within American culture with material things as objects from which happiness may be derived. Consumerism, such as going shopping, or using different products or finding new products, are promoted as ways which should actually make life easier. In some cases, this may be so as the ideology of neoliberalism seeks to capture private life and define it under the regime of capital. Hence, more and more aspects of daily living become commercialized, as there is a continuous search of business in areas of social activity that can be subsumed within the capital-generating circuit[.] (Heilbroner 1985, p. 118). Thus advertising images by McDonalds and Wal-mart for instance, presents us with products of consumption as the glue of family life. Pepsi and Sprite become essential to cultural connectivity and the quenching of thirst. However, the [The] preoccupation with things as significant to human happiness presents a false sense of reality at different levels, where the widening gap between the rich and the poor, between men and women, is a prominent feature of globalization**.** So it is difficult to fathom that happiness can be derived from using a rose-scented soap, when one considers that 1.3 billion of the world's population have no access to clean water much less being able to purchase a rose-scented soap. Ideologically, the forces of globalization, seek to reshape the world in accordance with a new global imaginary that serves the interests of some far better than most**.** A triumphant account of globalization sees it as the imminent unification of the world when in reality it is their vision of the world as their market (Perez Lara 1999). The ideologues of globalization, may promise plenty for all, but the actual forecast of what globalization spells for the future could be seen as pessimistic, depending on your location**.** Box 2 demonstrates, however, that poverty [Poverty] and inequality continues to be a feature of global capitalism and its manifestations have been arguably more acute since the onset of contemporary globalization**.** Economic marginalisation also implies political marginalisation as in the midst of spreading democracy; the most important decisions about human life are progressively removed beyond the reach of electorates. Women and the poor in particular who are often not adequately represented in the upper echelons of political power[.] where the decisions that affect so many are made, will increasingly have less access to these avenues of power and decision-making. Thus the world may be reconfigured but the reconfiguration takes place under the regime of capitalism which continues to reproduce under new circumstances, and in new forms, the new inequalities built in its structuring of the world. The term itself is conspicuous. While it suggests that globalization is a process encompassing the entire globe, again it is in reference to the market that the globalizers envision - everywhere and anywhere that is within their reach. Actual areas and peoples of the world are not necessarily significant in and of themselves unless they facilitate capital accumulation. Wilkin (1996) speaks of the representation of globalization whereby the global mass communications promotes and disseminates the material commodities and become significantly persuasive components to secure consumers and to maintain market share. The suggestion here is not that people are devoid of agency and that all we do is sit back, shut up and shop. Rather, the suggestion is that in selling the material commodity, a lifestyle of consumption, abundance, wealth and luxury is also promoted. The idea is to promote a kind of consumer citizen that may somehow attain bliss or happiness from reducing contact with nature to the use of an apricot-scented shampoo or eating a fruit that is 'perfect' because it has been grown in genetically controlled environment. And this [This] Western lifestyle is a myth, an empty, spiritless place, which has no bearing on reality in which one in five persons lives in abject poverty. What is important about the propagandistic role of mass communication in promoting this ideology is that it also promotes and reinforces a view of the world that serves to mystify social relations (Wilkin 1996). The ideological weight of globalization, suggests that market-driven economic policies, and privatizing social services such as education, health, water, electricity and tele- communications, and trade arrangements based on the purchase of cheap raw materials from the third world and opening up third world markets to first world products will allow for social development. Continuing this basic economic relation established with fifteenth century imperialism from imperial power to colony, **[Capitalism]** to date has not proved beneficial for the developing world. Instead what has occurred has been the exacerbation of existing structures of inequality, thereby linking neoliberal policies to new forms of social exclusion. The neoliberal policy package draws its social power from the political and economic power of those whose interests it expresses: stockholders, financial operators, industrialists, conservative politicians and high-level financial officials. Bourdieu (1998, p. 3) similarly emphasizes that neoliberalism "to favour severing the economy from social realities and thereby constructing, in reality, an economic system conforming to its description in pure theory that is a sort of logical machine that presents itself as a chain of constraints regulating economic agents." Bourdieu carries this role of ideology further by elaborating on it as a form of 'symbolic violence' by which he explains as the manner in which those who wield power exert their domination with the tacit consent of the dominated. This particular world order, being promoted as 'logic' and 'natural' indeed amounts to no more than parochial 'truths' being elevated as universal (cited in Rist 2006, pp. 78-79) and negatively affects the functioning of the world capitalist system and the exercise of human agency embedded in the web of social relations within.

## Underview 3

#### Presume aff and prefer aff interps because it’s always easier to negate.

1. Neg gets to adapt to the AC, which means I have to debate better just to remain equal with them since they always start out with the advantage, which violates fairness.
2. The 7-4-6-3 times skew means the neg rebuttals are easier.
3. The neg only has to extend once and I have to extend twice, and they get much longer to do it.
4. I have to try to preempt the neg since they can adapt, but the neg can just pick a strat that the spikes don’t apply to, which wastes minutes of the AC.
5. Neg theory is drop the argument, aff theory is drop the debater:
6. The 1AR time skew means the neg can read a bunch of shells in the NC that I can’t respond to, making substance debate impossible.
7. The 1AR time skew means if the neg chooses to read a ton of drop the debater shells in the NC and I drop one of them, I lose.

#### Aff only RVIS

1. The 7-4-6-3 time skew means the neg can go for both theory and substance while I have to try to win all of the theory debate in the AR’s because it’s game over if I don’t. Checking back time skew makes answering theory heavy NC’s a lot more doable.
2. Theory is used for creating good norms. Abusing theory destroys norms that improve debate. Aff RVI’s check back on useless theory by making the neg less likely to run frivolous theory since they know they can’t win an RVI. And, this means that having an RVI controls the internal link to fairness or education in debate, since if I don’t get RVI’s then that sends the message that we don’t care about norms that affect fairness or education.

#### CX checks on theory and T.

1. There’s an infinite number of shells I could potentially violate and theory is for creating good norms. Running theory in a round where it could have been avoided simply by asking destroys debate by taking away from substance, which defeats the purpose of theory. So the neg must read me the explicit interp and violation and offer me the opportunity to just concede the argument that violates since that would be more productive to debate than running theory. If the neg doesn’t do this, I automatically get an I-meet to the interp, since there is a chance I would have tried to comply. This I-meet triggers an RVI since running theory in a round where it could have been avoided by simply asking is counteractive to both debate and the production of useful norms.

#### The aff chooses the framework for the round.

1. The neg can adapt to my framework without losing time, while I lose 6 minutes if I have to adapt to his, especially if they just pick a framework that strategically excludes my offense. This is key to fairness since I have to have equal time to set up arguments to be able to win.
2. Time skew- If I lose my framework it’s game over, since the neg gets 6 minutes to respond to my 4 minute 1AR – linking into their framework is a no-go. Giving me framework choice is the only way to have a remotely competitive round, which is key to fairness because both debaters need to have equal access to the ballot to be able to win.
3. The neg must defend an explicit written text that advocates real world policy implementation.
4. Strat Skew- If the neg doesn’t read a CP, they can change the way that their advocacy functions in the next speech. Having a text binds them to the specifics of their arguments and prevents them from shifting out of my offense. Strat is key to fairness since it is key to creating a coherent ballot story.
5. Time skew- If the neg doesn’t defend a counterplan, they can just read a bunch of vague truth testing arguments or sketchy a prioris and then extend the one that I drop or make the least substantive responses to. This would destroy the value of my first 10 minutes of speech time and make the 2AR pointless. Time is key to fairness because both debaters need to have equal time to set up arguments to be able to win.
6. Ground Skew-If the neg doesn’t read a specific advocacy text it’s impossible for me to run DAs and turns that link back to their advocacy, but I also can’t do substantive comparison between the nuances of my position and theirs based on both textual and mechanical competition. Ground is key to fairness because both debaters need equal access to the ballot in order to have an equal chance to win.

## Blocks

### AT “Creates Growth”

#### Turn: Economic growth and competitiveness is a violent expansion of the worst social values—causes dehumanization.

Bookchin 93-Director Emeritus @ the Institute for Social Ecology [Murray, *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, “What is Social Ecology?” 1993, <http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bookchin/socecol.html>], HSH

But just [Just] as hierarchies and class structures tend to acquire a momentum of their own and permeate much of society, so too the **[The] market began to acquire a life of its own and extended its reach beyond limited regions into the depths of vast continents.** Exchange ceased to be primarily a means to provide for modest needs, subverting the limits imposed upon it by guilds or by moral and religious restrictions. **Not only did it place a high premium on techniques for increasing production; it also became the procreator of needs**, many of which are simply useless, **and gave an explosive impetus to consumption and technology.** First in northern Italy and the European lowlands, later-and most effectively-in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the **[The] production of goods exclusively for sale and profit** (the capitalistic commodity) **rapidly swept aside all cultural and social barriers to market growth.** By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the **[The] new industrial capitalist class** with its factory system and commitment to limitless expansion **began to colonize the entire world, and** finally, **most aspects of personal life.** Unlike the feudal nobility, which had its cherished lands and castles, the [The] bourgeoisie had no home but the marketplace and its bank vaults. As a class, they [They] turned more and more of the world into an ever-expanding domain of factories. Entrepreneurs of the ancient and medieval worlds had normally gathered their profits together to invest in land and live like country gentry-given the prejudices of their times against "ill-gotten" gains from trade. On the other hand, the industrial **[Industrial] capitalists** of the modern world **spawned a** bitterly competitive **marketplace that placed a high premium on industrial expansion and the commercial power it conferred, and functioned as though growth were an end in itself.** It is crucially important, in social ecology, to recognize that industrial **[Industrial] growth** does not result from a change in a cultural outlook alone “and least of all, from the impact of scientific rationality on society. It **stems** above all **from** harshly objective factors churned up by **the expansion of the market itself[.]**, factors that are largely impervious to moral considerations and efforts at ethical persuasion. Indeed, despite the close association between capitalist development and technological innovation, the **[The] most driving imperative of the capitalist market**, given the dehumanizing competition that defines it, **is the need to grow, and to avoid dying at the hands of savage rivals.** Important as greed or the power conferred by wealth may be, sheer **[Sheer] survival requires that an entrepreneur must expand his or her productive apparatus to remain ahead of other entrepreneurs and try**, in fact, **to devour them. The key** to this law of life-to survival-**is expansion, and greater profit, to be invested in still further expansion.** Indeed, the **[The] notion of progress, once identified** by our ancestors **as** a faith in **the evolution of greater human cooperation and care, is now identified with economic growth.**

Cross apply Stueter and Wills from the AC, they say that dehumanization inevitably leads to genocide, which functions as another reason to reject resource extraction.

### AT “Cap Inevitable”

#### TURN: The argument that we cannot overcome capitalism saps the critical energy from revolution – the system is only strong because we think it is. This perpetuates cap.

 (Slavoj Zizek 95, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University Ideology Between Fiction and Fantasy, Cardozo Law Review), HSH

The problematic of "multiculturalism" that imposes itself today is therefore the form of appearance of its opposite, of [Of] the massive presence of Capitalism as universal world system: it bears witness to the unprecedented homogenization of today's world. It is effectively as if, since the horizon of social imagination no longer allows us to entertain the idea of an eventual demise of Capitalism - since, as we might put it, everybody seems to accept that Capitalism is here to stay - the critical energy found a substitute outlet in fighting for cultural differences which leave the basic homogeneity of the capitalist world-system intact. So we are fighting our battles for the right of ethnic minorities, of gays and lesbians, of different "life-styles," etc., while Capitalism pursues its triumphant march[.] - and today's [Today’s] critical theory, in the guise of "cultural studies," is doing the ultimate service to the unrestrained development of Capitalism by actively contributing in the ideological effort to render its massive presence invisible[.]: in a typical postmodern "cultural critique," the very mention of Capitalism as world system tends to give rise to the accusation of "essentialism," "fundamentalism," etc.

### AT “Cap Good”

#### Be skeptical of their impact & solvency claims – neoliberal and capitalist knowledge production creates a monopoly on truth by allocating decision-making to ‘experts’ that exclude competing ideas, dismissing them as ideological

(Edgardo Lander 02, Prof. of Sociology and Latin American studies at the Venezuelan Central University in Caracas, “Eurocentrism, Modern Knowledges, and the “Natural” Order of Global Capital, Nepantla: Views from South”, 3.2, muse), HSH

The naturalization of these processes of free circulation of investment and trade, as criteria that dictate the terms under which all societies on the planet necessarily must be organized, is explicitly supported by the expertiseof those who speak in the name of specialized knowledges in this case of economic science[.] (a knowledge in the singular): It is widely recognized by economists and trade experts that the WTO system contributes to development. (WTO 1999b, 7) The economic case for an open trading system based upon multilaterally agreed rules is simple enough and rests largely **on** commercial common sense. But it is also supported by evidence: the experience of world and economic growth since ]World War II.]the Second World War.(8) Economists agree that the greatest gains go to the country that slashes its own trade barriers**.** Readiness to open up to foreign suppliers of consumer goods and of inputs to production improves choices as well as competition in price and services offered. **P**rotection that gives special favours to one sector or another of the economy distorts the way a country uses its productive resources. Removal or reduction of distortions allowsresources to be used more efficiently. (WTO 1999a, 5) Another manifestation of the “naturalization”/depoliticization of the issues at stake in international economic relations is the tendency to turn disagreements into technical issues that can be resolved in an “objective” and “impartial” manner by the relevant specialists. The Multilateral Agreement on Investment establishes that regulations (including environmental or health-related regulations) that can be considered polemical from the point of view of their scientific justification may be submitted to a body of scientific experts for consideration (OECD 1998, 66). Similar practices are established in WTO agreements. A separate agreement on food safety and animal and plant health standards (sanitary and phytosanitary measures) sets out the basic rules. It allows countries to set their own standards. (WTO 1999b, 19) Member countries are encouraged to use international standards, guidelines and recommendations where they exist. However, members may use measures which result in higher standards if there is scientific justification. (ibid.) What in these texts appears to be the simple application of objective scientific criteria in reality relates to extremely complex and controversial matters. This is the type of situation that arises when, whether on the basis of scientific evidence (on which consensus may or may not exist) or based on specific preferences on the part of the population, standards are established that regulate, limit, or block the use of a certain product or technological process. This can be seen in the heated debate surrounding foods derived from genetically modified plants and animals. One well-known case illustrating the application of WTO standards is the U.S. lawsuit involving the European Union’s ban on the sale—in E.U. territory—of beef treated with growth hormones. The WTO ruled in favor of the United States, categorizing this ban as an unfair, protectionist practice that went against free trade, forcing the European Union to either allow the importation of these products or face severe sanctions, in spite of the opposition of a great majority of the continent’s population. The opinion of a few experts, chosen by the WTO authorities dealing with conflict resolution, thus overruled the democratically expressed wishes of the people of the European Union. In this case it was determined that the fear of consuming beef treated with growth hormones lacked scientific basis; inside the new world order defined by the WTO, this preference was not one for which people could legitimately opt. The majority of the ethical and political confrontations having to do with techno-scientific matters do not have a univocal scientific solution, and differences of opinion and interpretation can continue indefinitely (Nelkin 1977, 1984). Generally, the issues at stake cannot be resolved solely on the basis of experts’ opinions. People are being denied the sovereign right to found their decisions on ethical choices or on particular cultural contexts. This is an example of the growing authoritarianism of the global capitalist order, exposing the population to the potentially harmful effects of certain techno-scientific processes against its expressed will, merely because “specialists” consider that their opposition is based on nothing more than prejudice. These are not issues that depend on the existence or absence of consensus in the scientific community. In any case, as Hans Jonas (1984, 118) argues, human capacity to wield power over nature is always greater than the predictability of this power’s long-range effects[.], which, in case of doubt, calls for an ethics of responsibility.7 This ethical choice is denied when it is assumed that, to make this type of decision it suffices to take into account the opinions of experts and the rights of investors (Lander 1994). Beyond the internal controversies within Western, techno-scientific communities lies the fact that in the thousands of conflicts occurring in the world today between the interests of transnational capital and those of rural or indigenous people concerning the use of the environment, there is generally also a conflict in the parties’ views of the cosmos, an antagonism between different knowledge systems and different ways of conceiving the relationships between culture and nature. Nevertheless—and this is a perfect expression of the continual functioning of colonial mechanisms—in the new global capital order only one form of knowledge is recognized: Western scientific knowledge. From this discourse of knowledge the criteria and procedures are established by which all controversies are decided.

### AT Impact Turns to Biodiversity

TURN: By prioritizing resource extraction, we view the Earth as an instrument for human ends which we can abuse; this is the root cause of the environmental crisis.

(Richard Sivil, studied at the University of Durban Westville, and at the University of Natal, Durban. He has been lecturing philosophy since 1996. His primary interest lies in the field of Ethics, Evnironmental Philosophy, Buddhist Philosophy and Quantum Physics “Why We Need A New Ethic For The Environment.” 2000. Web. 7 December 2013. <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter\_vii.htm>.), HSH

Three **[The] most significant and pressing** factors **[factor] contributing to the environmental crisis** are the ever increasing human population, the energy crisis, and **[is] the abuse and pollution of the earth’s natural systems. These** and other factors contributing to the environmental **crisis can be directly linked to anthropocentric views of the world. The perception that value is located in**, and emanates from, **humanity has resulted in understanding human life as an ultimate value, superior to all other beings. This has driven innovators in medicine and technology to ever improve our medical and material conditions, in an attempt to preserve human life, resulting in more people being born and living longer.** In achieving this aim, they have indirectly contributed to increasing the human population. **Perceptions of superiority, coupled with developing technologies have resulted in a social outlook that generally does not rest content with the basic necessities of life.** Demands for more medical and social aid, more entertainment and more comfort translate into demands for improved standards of living. Increasing population numbers, together with the material demands of modern society, place ever increasing demands on energy supplies. While wanting a better life is not a bad thing, given the population explosion the current energy crisis is inevitable, which brings a whole host of environmental implications in tow. This is not to say that every improvement in the standard of living is necessarily wasteful of energy or polluting to the planet, but rather it is the cumulative effect of these improvements that is damaging to the environment. **The abuses facing the natural environment as a result of the energy crisis and the food demand are clearly manifestations of anthropocentric views that treat the environment as a resource and instrument for human ends. The pollution and destruction of the non-human natural world is deemed acceptable, provided that it does not interfere with other human beings.**

And, justifying environmental protection by way of protecting humanity is anthropocentric and perpetuates environmental impacts. The alternative is to embrace a non-anthropocentric ethic. This does not cede the political, but it does entail rejection of the negative’s human-centered justifications and framing.

Eric Katz and Lauren Oechsli, 1993 (Members of the Science, Technology, and Society Program,, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark. Katz is currently Vice President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics , “Moving beyond Anthropocentrism: Environmental Ethics, Development, and the Amazon”, <http://www.umweltethik.at/download.php?id=392>.), HSH

We believe that the [The] mistake is not the policy of preservation itself, but the anthropocentric instrumental framework in which it is justified. Environmental policy decisions should not merely concern the trade-off and comparison of various human benefits. If environmentalists claim that the Third World must preserve its environment because of the overall benefits for humanity, then decision makers in the Third World can demand justice in the determination of preservation policy: preservationist policies unfairly damage the human interests of the local populations. If preservationist policies are to be justified without a loss of equity, there are only two possible alternatives: either we in the industrialized world must pay for the benefits we will gain from preservation or we [We] must reject the anthropocentric and instrumental framework for policy decisions. The first alternative is an empirical political issue, and one about which we are not overly optimistic. The second alternative represents **a shift in philosophical world view.** We are not providing a direct argument for a nonanthropocentric value system as the basis of environmental policy. Rather, our [The] strategy is indirect**.** Let us assume that a theory of normative ethics which includes nonhuman natural value has been justified. In such a situation, the human community, in addition to its traditional human-centered obligations, would also have moral obligations to nature or to the natural environment in itself. One of these obligations would involve the urgent necessity for environmental preservation. We would be obligated, for example, to the Amazon rain forest directly. We would preserve the rain forest [environment], not for the human benefits resulting from this preservation, but because we have an obligation of preservation to nature and its ecosystems**.** Our duties would be directed to nature and its inhabitants and environments, not merely to humans and human institutions. **From this perspective, questions of the trade-off and comparison of human benefits, and questions of justice for specific human populations, do not dominate the discussion.** This change of emphasis can be illustrated by an exclusively human example. Consider two businessmen, Smith and Jones, who are arguing over the proper distribution of the benefits and costs resulting from a prior business agreement between them. If we just focus on Smith and Jones and the issues concerning them, we will want to look at the contract, the relevant legal precedents, and the actual results of the deal, before rendering a decision. But suppose we learn that the agreement involved the planned murder of a third party, Green, and the resulting distribution of his property. At that point the issues between Smith and Jones cease to be relevant; we no longer consider who has claims to Green’s wallet, overcoat, or BMW to be important. The competing claims become insignificant in light of the obligations owed to Green. This case is analogous to our view of the moral obligations owed to the rain forest. As soon as we realize that the rain forest itself is relevant to the conflict of competing goods, we see that there is not a simple dilemma between Third World develop- ment, on the one hand, and preservation of rain forests, on the other; there is now, in addition, the moral obligation to nature and its ecosystems. When the [The] nonanthropocentric framework is introduced, it creates a more complex situation for deliberation and resolution. It complicates the already detailed discussions of human trade-offs, high-tech transfers, aid programs, debt- for-nature swaps, sustainable development, etc., with a consideration of the moral obligations to nonhuman nature. This complication may appear counterproduc- tive, but as in the case of Smith, Jones, and Green, it actually serves to simplify the decision. Just as a concern for Green made the contract dispute between Smith and Jones irrelevant, the obligation to the rain forest makes many of the issues about trade-offs of human goods irrelevant.12 It is, of course, unfortunate that this direct obligation to the rain forest can only be met with a cost in human satisfaction—some human interests will not be fulfilled. Nevertheless, the same can be said of all ethical decisions, or so Kant teaches us: we are only assuredly moral when we act against our inclinations. To summarize, the [The] historical forces of economic imperialism have created a harsh dilemma for environmentalists[.] who consider nature preservation in the Third World to be necessary. Nevertheless, environmentalists can escape the dilemma, as exemplified in the debate over the development of the Amazon rain forest, if **they reject the axiological and normative framework of anthropocentric instrumental rationality.** A set of obligations directed to nature in its own right makes many questions of human benefits and satisfactions irrelevant. The Amazon rain forest ought to be preserved regardless of the benefits or costs to human beings. Once we move beyond the confines of human-based instrumental goods, the environmentalist position is thereby justified, and no policy dilemma is created. This conclusion serves as an indirect justification of a nonanthropocen- tric system of normative ethics, avoiding problems in environmental policy that a human-based ethic cannot.13

1. This is consistent with the original AC advocacy so it isn’t a strat shift. Luke says that we have to reconceptualize the relationship between nature and the economy through environmental education, which is the exact same thing that Katz and Oechsli are saying.
2. If we reconceptualize the way in which we view nature and reject anthro, humans and nonhumans are functionally equal, since the justification for human superiority is the direct product of anthro, which means this functions as an independent reason to affirm under Vincent in the AC framework.

Cold utilitarian calculus directly excludes the natural world and cannot accurately make decisions—you should always prioritize an ethic that recognizes the value of the natural world.

(Eric Katz, Director of Science, Technology, and Society Program at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, “Nature as Subject” 1997), HSH

**One approach** within this conception of environmental philosophy **would be to seek** these "**'environmentally appropriate" ethical princi­ples in the direct application of traditional ethical theories--such as utilitarianism[.]**, Kantianism, rights theory, or contractarianism--to the newly emerging problems of the environmental crisis. From this perspective, environmental philosophy would be a version of a basic ap­plied ethics. Its subject matter--the justification of environmental policies--would be new, but the philosophical principles and ethical ideals used to analyze and solve these new problems would be the familiar positions and ideas of Western philosophy. **A rather different ap­proach to environmental philosophy would eschew the traditional ver­sions of ethical theory and offer a radical reinterpretation or critique of the dominant philosophical ideas[.]** of the modern age. From this critical perspective, traditional **[Traditional] ethical systems must be modified [and]**, expanded, or **transcended[.]** in order to deal with the fundamental philosophical issues raised by the existence of the contemporary environmental cri­sis. **The crucial change would be an expansion of ethical thought be­yond the limits of the human community to include the direct moral consideration of the natural world.** In these essays I have chosen this second path. My basic critical idea is that human **[Human]-centered** (or "anthropocentric") **ethical systems fail[.]** to account for a moral justification for the central policies of environmen­talism. From this negative account of anthropocentrism I derive my fundamental position in environmental ethics: the direct moral consider­ation and respect for the evolutionary processes of nature. I believe that it is a basic ethical principle that we **[We] must respect Nature as an ongoing subject of a history, a life-process, a developmental system.** The natural world--natural entities and natural ecological systems--deserves our moral consideration as part of the interdependent community of life on Earth. Hence the title of this collection. I consider **Nature[,]** as **analo­gous to a human subject, [is] entitled to** moral **respect[.]** and subject to tradi­tional ethical categories. I do not anthropomorphize Nature; I do not ascribe human feelings and intentions to the operations of natural processes. I do not consider natural processes to be sentient or alive. I merely place Nature within the realm of ethical activity. The basis of a moral justification of environmental policy is that we **[We] have ethical obligations to the natural world[.]**, just as we have ethical obligations to our fellow human beings. In these essays I explain and analyze this nonanthropocentric perspective in environmental philosophy. Mass extinction is key to evolution.

1. This is an independent reason to affirm, regardless of the framework, because it’s a reason to reject the way that the NC weighs impacts.
2. Even if extinction does come first, you still affirm because Sivil is a link turn.

### AT Privatization CP

#### TURN: This is pure neoliberal capitalism.

Hariadi Kartodihardjo & Hira Jhamtani, Lecturer University of Indonesia & activist at Institute for Global Justice, 2009, Environmental Politics and Power in Indonesia, eds. H. Kartodiharjo and H. Jhamtani, p. 55-6, HSH

**In developing countries,** including Indonesia, **where neo-lib**eralism and democracy **concepts dominate economic development, individual ownership of natural resources becomes a mainstream concept underlying the formulation of a country's political economic policies. Polices controlling the degradation of natural resources and the environment** are often separate from, **or fail to consider common property. Policies controlling environmental damage only discuss who is responsible for externalities** (Baumol and Oates 1988). Meanwhile, mistakes in resource allocation are considered the result of the public domain over open access resources. Therefore, resolutions **[Resolutions] proposed revolve around the imposition of taxes or charges and privatization.** Both are considered able to resolve the allocation of exclusive property rights. **This approach is frequently used when handling environmental problems[.]** resulting from factories' toxic waste. But in practice--whether laid out implicitly or explicitly in legislation--it is also applied to control damage to natural resources in broader terms (Buck 1996 and Whale et al. 2000 in Berge 2003).

#### TURN: Privatization doesn’t solve, it just links back into capitalism through neoliberalism.

Robert Plastow 10, University of Exeter, “Neoliberalism in environmental governance: a paradoxical double movement?”, May 2010, [https://www.academia.edu/2703516/Neoliberalism\_in\_environmental\_governance\_a\_paradoxical\_double\_movement#](https://www.academia.edu/2703516/Neoliberalism_in_environmental_governance_a_paradoxical_double_movement)], HSH

**Neoliberalism** has developed into an extremely strong and dynamic ideology within Western capitalist societies and as a result has permeated nearly all areas of life. It **has had an increasing influence on policy development, particularly environmental governance[.]**, heralding a restructuring and rescaling of state and use of regulation. Previously, environmental conservation has been seen as a key opponent to the neoliberal agenda as the change in social relations to nature it brings has often been destructive to the earth and demanding of natural resources. However, market **[Market] based instruments and other neoliberal policy tools have been of increasing importance to environmental governance and conservation, reflecting the power and pervasiveness of its rationality and adoption worldwide.** This essay will begin by attempting to define neoliberalism before elucidating some of its qualities and main theoretical concepts, detailing its perceived advantages and disadvantages, whilst outlining its rise in environmental governance. Neoliberalism avoids any one specific definition due to its lack of coherence and consistency as a single homogenous, integrated 'thing', (Castree, 2009; Perrault, 2005). Instead, it has been suggested that it is best understood as a spatio-temporal variable process of neoliberalisation, (Castree, 2008; Heynen and Robbins, 2005; Peck and Tickell, 2002), which has been expressed over the last thirty years through various forms of local, national, and international experiments in laissez-faire political economy around the world, (Castree, 2009: 1788). During the 1980s in the US and UK, neoliberalism took hold under President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher, influenced by economists such as Friedman, Hayek and Epstein, and stood as a counter to what it viewed as the failures of the Keynesian, state-coordinated model, (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004). Peck and Tickell, (2002), termed this period in the 1980s as 'rollback neoliberalism', determinable by patterns of deregulation and dismantlement; the 1990s saw an emergent phase of “active state-building and regulatory reform”, which they called 'roll-out neoliberalism', (2002: 383). **This can be seen in the new institutions created by Blair and Clinton in the 90s** following the dismantlement of Keynesian structures, and were “designed **to embed the neoliberal project more deeply in civil society[.]**”, (Holifield, 2004: 285; Jessop, 2002). **The incorporation of environmentalism into institutions of neoliberalism has been valuable in** the rolling-out, or deep **neoliberalisation[.]** phase, (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004) and is a strength owing to the fluidity and adaptability of neoliberal discourse. This philosophy is evident in the Kyoto Declaration and its flexible mechanisms and is based on “a mode of resource regulation which aims to deploy markets as the solution to environmental problems”, (Bakker, 2007: 433). **The traditional approach in environmental governance has been state regulation, in what is known as 'command and control' practices[,]** such as capping emissions or fish catches, **which rely on legally established limits and are enforced by the state[.]**, (Mansfield, 2007). **In contrast, many policies today contain elements of the neoliberal agenda and** what has been called **'freemarket environmentalism' has proliferated in a dialogue between environmentalism and proponents of neoliberalism[.]**, (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004). **Creations of this proliferation include** tradeable emission permits, eco-taxes, transferable fishing quotas, user fees for public goods and aspects of utility privatization, as well as **plenty of corporate green-washing[.]**, (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004: 279). Throughout these practices and in general, neoliberalism is complexly assembled, consisting of different representations, institutional practices and ideological commitments, (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004), occurring at multiple geographical scales (Castree, 2008b; McCarthy and Prudham, 2004). It is also suggested that neoliberalism be understood in combination with capitalism, of which it is an expression or a 'shell' (Castree, 2008). Castree adds that both neoliberalism and capitalism, “exist in an overdetermined socio-environmental world [which] means that both phenomena are constitutively `impure': the clean lines of their conceptual specification do not mirror their messy imbrication in diverse real world situations”, (2008; 141). There are attempts at unifying conceptions of what neoliberalisation looks like, such as Castree's privatisation, marketisation, deregulation, reregulation, and the construction of flanking mechanisms in civil societies (Castree, 2008); or Heynen and Robbin's four dominant relations inherent to capital’s neoliberal agenda of: governance, privatization, enclosure and valuation, (2005: 6), which will be touched upon throughout this essay. **At its core neoliberalism believes in the unparalleled capability of the market in the distribution and allocation of goods and services in meeting the diverse needs of people all over the world, displaying a commitment to extending the competitive relations of the market as far as possible, keeping state intervention to a minimum[.]** (Castree, 2008: 143; Holifield, 2004: 286). **When we direct this ideology towards the environment[,]** and neoliberalise nature, **we confront a potential paradox in that conserving nature is operated by commodifying it[.]**, balancing the antithetical acts of destroying existing and creating new biophysical resources, (Castree, 2008: 150).

### AT Imperialism

#### TURN: Capitalism, not environmentalism, is the root cause of imperialism that exploits poor countries. This is a case turn to the NC.

(John B. Foster 11, Oregon University Department of Sociology Professor, Monthly Review, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>, 6/22/11), HSH

Since September 11, 2001, the **[The] United States has waged wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, expanded the global reach of its military base system, and increased the level of its military spending to the point that it now spends about as much on the military as all other nations of the world combined.** Glorying in the U.S. blitzkrieg in Iraq, journalist Greg Easterbrook proclaimed in the *New York Times* (April 27, 2003) that **U.S. military forces are “the strongest the world has ever known[,]**…stronger than the Wehrmacht in 1940, **stronger than the legions at the height of Roman power.”** Numerous critics on the U.S. left have responded by declaring, in effect, “Let’s throw the bastards out.” The U.S. government under the Bush administration, so the argument goes, has been taken over by a neoconservative cabal that has imposed a new policy of militarism and imperialism. For example, University of California at Los Angeles sociologist Michael Mann argues at the end of his *Incoherent Empire* (2003) that “a neoconservative chicken-hawk coup…seized the White House and the Department of Defense” with George W. Bush’s rise to the presidency. For Mann the end solution is simply to “throw the militarists out of office.” The argument advanced here points to a different conclusion. **U.S. militarism and imperialism have deep roots in U.S. history and the political-economic logic of capitalism. As even supporters of U.S. imperialism are now willing to admit, the United States has been an empire from its inception.** “The United States,” Boot writes in “American Imperialism?,” “has been an empire since at least 1803, when Thomas Jefferson purchased the Louisiana Territory. Throughout the 19th century, what Jefferson called the ‘empire of liberty’ expanded across the continent.” Later the United States conquered and colonized lands overseas in the Spanish-American War of 1898 and the brutal Philippine-American War that immediately followed—justified as an attempt to exercise the “white man’s burden.” After the Second World War the United States and other major imperialist states relinquished their formal political empires, but retained informal economic empires backed up by the threat and not infrequently the reality of military intervention. The Cold War obscured this neocolonial reality but never entirely hid it. **The growth of empire is neither peculiar to the United States nor a mere outgrowth of the policies of particular states. It is the** systematic **result of** the entire history and logic of **capitalism. Since its birth in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries capitalism has been a globally expansive system[.]**—one that is hierarchically divided between metropole and satellite, center and periphery. **The objective of the imperialist system of today as in the past is to open up peripheral economies to investment from the core capitalist countries[.]**, thus ensuring both a continual supply of raw materials at low prices, and a net outflow of economic surplus from periphery to center of the world system. In addition, the third world is viewed as a source of cheap labor, constituting a global reserve army of labor. **Economies of the periphery are structured to meet the external needs of the United States and the other core capitalist countries rather than their own internal needs. This has resulted** (with a few notable exceptions) **in conditions of unending dependency and debt peonage in the poorer regions of the world.**

### AT Nietzsche K

1. TURN: Nietzsche’s philosophy glorifies racism and queer bashing – the neg says that genocide is just a really cool thing.

(Kelly L. Ross, PhD, Department of Philosophy, Los Angeles Valley College. Friesian.com, “Friedrich Nietzsche”, last updated in 2008. [http://www.friesian.com/NIETZSCH.HTM AD 7/9/09](http://www.friesian.com/NIETZSCH.HTM%20AD%207/9/09)), HSH

First of all, **Nietzsche's racism is unmistakable.** The best way to approach this is to let Nietzsche speak for himself. In the quotes that follow, I will simply offer examples from The Genealogy of Morals alone, as translated by Francis Golffing (in the footnotes I have been adding some passages from Beyond Good and Evil for comparison). The Latin malus ["bad"] (beside which I place melas [Greek for "black"]) might designate the common man as dark, especially black-haired ("hic niger est"), as the pre-Aryan settler of the Italian soil, notably distiguished from the new blond conqueror race by his color. At any rate, the Gaelic presented me with an exactly analogous case: fin, as in the name Fingal, the characteristic term for nobility, eventually the good, noble, pure, originally the fair-haired as opposed to the dark, black-haired native population. The Celts, by the way, were definitely a fair-haired race; and it is a mistake to try to relate the area of dark-haired people found on ethnographic maps of Germany to Celtic bloodlines, as Virchow does. These are the last vestiges of the pre-Aryan population of Germany. (The subject races are seen to prevail once more, throughout almost all of Europe; in color, shortness of skull, perhaps also in intellectual and social instincts. Who knows whether modern democracy, the even more fashionable anarchism, and especially that preference for the commune, the most primitive of all social forms, which is now shared by all European socialists -- whether all these do not represent a throwback, and whether, even physiologically, the Aryan [master] race of conquerors is not doomed?) [The Birth of Tragedy and The Genealogy of Morals, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956, p.164, boldface added; note the term "master" deleted in the Golffing translation; note] Here we have an unmistakable racism: the **[The] good, noble,** and **blond Aryans, contrasted with the dark and primitive indigenes of Europe. While Nietzsche's thought is often defended as unrelated to the racism of the Nazis, there does not seem to be much difference from the evidence of this passage.** One difference might be Nietzsche's characterization of the "commune" as "the most primitive of all social forms." Nazi ideology was totalitarian and "social," denigrating individualism. Nietzsche would not have gone for this -- and the small, dark Hitler is certainly no Aryan -- but then many defenders of Nietzsche these days also tend to prefer a communitarian democracy, which means they might have more in common with the Nazis, despite their usual anti-racism, than Nietzsche himself. This is characteristic of the confusion of contemporary politics, let alone Nietzsche apologetics. The passage above, at least, provides as much aid and comfort for the Nazis as for any other interpretation or appropriation of Nietzsche. **Nietzsche's racism might be excused as typical of its age, and criticism of it anachronistic. However, the racism of Thomas Jefferson, a century earlier, involved an explicit denial that physical or intellectual differences between the races** (about which Jefferson expressed no certainty) **compromised the rights of the inferior races. To Nietzsche,** however, the "subject races" have no "rights"; and domination, not to mention all the forms of "oppression" excoriated by the trendy Left, are positive and desirable goods. This **[this] anxiety or distemper may be due to a variety of causes. It may result from a crossing of races too dissimilar (or of classes too dissimilar. Class distinctions are always indicative of genetic and racial differences[.]**: the European Weltschmerz and the pessimism of the nineteenth century were both essentially the results of an abrupt and senseless mixing of classes)... [p.267, boldface added, note] In the litany of political sins identified by the Left, "racism, classism, and homophobia" are the holy trinity -- with "classism," of course, as a codeword for the hated capitalism. Here we see that for **[For] Nietzsche racism and "classism" are identical: the "subject races" form the subject classes. This is good and noble.** We also get another aspect of the matter, the "mixing" of races and classes is "senseless" and productive of the pessimism and social problems of modern society. In these terms, Nietzsche can only have approved of the Nazis laws against marriage or even sex between Aryans and Untermenschen. The lack of rights for the dark underclasses brings us to the principal theme of The Genealogy of Morals: **The morality of "good and evil" has been invented out of hatred and resentment by the defeated and subjugated races, especially the Jews. People who love Nietzsche for his celebration of creativity and his dismissal of** the moralism of traditional religion, mainly meaning Christianity, **usually seem to think of going "beyond good and evil" as merely legitimizing homosexuality, drugs, [and] abortion[.]**, prostitution, pornography, and the other desiderata of progressive thinking. **They don't seem to understand that Nietzsche wasn't particularly interested in things like that, but, more to the point, legitimizing rape, murder, torture, pillage, domination, and political oppression by the strong.** The only honest Nietzschean graduate student I ever met frankly stated, "To be creative, you must be evil." We get something similar in the recent Sandra Bullock movie, Murder by Numbers [2002], where the young Nietzschean student simply says, "Freedom is crime." The story of the movie is more or less that of Leopold and Loeb, the Chicago teenagers who in 1924 murdered a young boy (Bobby Franks) to prove that they were "beyond good and evil." Leopold and Loeb understood their Nietzsche far better than most of his academic apologists.

Cross apply Stueter and Wills from the AC, that racism leads to genocide. You reject the K under Vincent, regardless of the solvency claims, because the solvency claims actually just perpetuate racial domination and genocide.

1. Suffering is not inevitable. This delinks the K.

(Vishna Mangalwadi, L’Abri Fellowship, 2002 <http://www.vishalmangalwadi.com/vkmWebSite/files/When_the_New_Age_Gets_Old.pdf>)

The Bible, which has molded Western history, sees creation, both 'living' and 'non-living', as very good. Man was made to live in Eden, that is, bliss. **Evil and suffering** entered history later. They **are** therefore **finite and temporary aberrations[.]**, introduced by the 'fall' or the free choice of human beings. **Because suffering is not intrinsic to the human condition, it can be overcome and removed. This viewpoint gives a basis of hope for our future.** In the West Thomas More immortalized this hope in his book Utopia (1516). However, in **[In] Western history the hope is often secularized, as in the French Revolution[,]** inspired by Rousseau, in the theory of **social evolution, and in** the **dialectical materialism[.]** of Engels and Marx.

### AT Apoca Rhetoric K

#### Only tragic framing of warming as inevitable causes inaction – the aff’s comic framing allows for agency.

Foust & Murphy 09 – \*Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver AND \*\*doctoral student in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver (Christina R. & William O’Shannon, “Revealing and Reframing Apocalyptic Tragedy in Global Warming Discourse,” Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, Vol. 3 No. 2, July 2009, pp. 151 – 167, Taylor & Francis)//, HSH

A comic apocalyptic frame suggests that human beings have agency at different points within the global warming narrative. Comically framed discourse posits that humans may mitigate the worst effects of climate change, or that they may adapt to the unchangeable telos. For instance, Kristof (2005) identifies relatively inexpensive ‘‘initial steps we can take to reduce carbon emissions . . . like encouraging mass transit, hybrid vehicles, better insulation and energy-efficient light bulbs,’’ which ‘‘could reduce global emissions by one-third’’ (p. A25). At the same time it leaves open the possibility that humans may influence the future, apocalyptic rhetoric from a comic frame casts global warming as a material reality, (more or less) ordained and thus constraining human choices. Empowerment within the comic variation of apocalypse is not a trivial matter, however. It requires humans to make the right decisions from a limited set of choices: ‘‘Nature commands humans to adapt or die. The natural world keeps erupting, shifting, storming, collapsing, whirling. It refuses, despite our entreaties, to become something dependable and constrained and rational’’ (Achenbach, 2004, p. C1). In other words, a comic apocalypse does not suggest that events are controllable through any or all human actions. Using the comic frame permits humans to miss the fully tragic telos (which would, presumably, end all time and humanity): In [climatologist Roger Pulwaty’s] view, a crisis is a point in a story, a moment in a narrative that presents an opportunity for characters to think their way through a problem. A catastrophe . . . is one of several possible outcomes that follows from a crisis. ‘‘We’re at the point of crisis . . . ’’ Pulwaty concluded. (Gertner, 2007, p. 68) By distinguishing between ‘‘crisis’’ and ‘‘catastrophe,’’ the comic variation suggests that the tragic telos is only one potential ending to the climate change narrative, contingent upon whether humans alter their behavior in an appropriate manner. Human beings can assume responsibility within a comically constructed apocalypse, even if the narrative begins tragically. Eilperin (2007) reports that ‘‘the warming of the climate system is unequivocal . . . even in the best-case scenario, temperatures are on track to cross a threshold to an unsustainable level’’ which ‘‘could’’ produce effects ‘‘irreversible within a human lifetime’’ (p. A1). What begins as a tragically ordained story takes a comedic turn, as humans have an opportunity to realize that they are mistaken. Eilperin interviews climate scientist Gerald Meehl, who concludes ‘‘that a sharp cut in greenhouse gas emissions could still keep catastrophic consequences from occurring: ‘The message is, it does make a difference what we do’’’ (p. A1). Comically, the telos does not overshadow the significance of human choice, which may stave off total catastrophe. While mitigation is one potential source for human agency, another is adaptation. As Revkin (2007) quotes Dr. Mike Hulme: ‘‘Climate change is not a problem waiting for a solution . . . but a powerful idea that will transform the way we develop’’ (p. A16). The emphasis on transformation suggests that humans can adapt to the apocalyptic telos of global warming, even though the telos is, implicitly, foretold. The comic telos thus requires humans to rethink their choices, sometimes after the worst effects of global warming have taken place. Such effects may be forecast as though they will (most likely) occur, maintaining the apocalyptic structure (even in the comic variation): If the scientists are right about an apocalyptic future of floods, droughts, dead coral reefs, rising sea levels and advancing deserts, global warming is an existential threat that should affect our approach to just about every issue. To take it seriously, we would have to change the way we think about transportation, agriculture, development, water resources, natural disasters, foreign relations, and more. (Grunwald, 2006, p. B1) Though the ending of global warming is foretold, climate change provides a comic challenge from which people may learn, grow, and adapt. While the tragic variation would end the narrative with humans and all other species as victims of the catastrophic effects of global warming, the comic version is more open-ended. Furthermore, comic variations often present the apocalyptic telos in a nontotalizing way, again with the effect of amplifying human agency. Comic versions of the global warming narrative posit localized effects, as Clynes (2007) suggests: ‘‘A one-meter rise in sea levels over the next 93 years would have enormous consequences, flooding low-lying coastal areas and megadeltas, such as the Nile and Brahmaputra in Bangladesh, where millions of people live’’ (p. 52). Though Northern industrialized nations could adapt to flooding, developing coastal countries likely could not: ‘‘the dramatic effects of climate change could push the number of displaced people globally to at least one billion’’ (Clynes, 2007, p. 52). Discourse such as this takes seriously global warming’s threat, while emphasizing a non-total telos. As exemplary of the comic variation, it reinforces responsibility for making ethical choices, rather than resigning oneself to the foretold, total catastrophe. In addition, comic discourse indicates a time frame (93 years in the previous example) over which global warming will occur, rendering the temporality comic. While a tragic temporality might predict an exact date after which human agency is impossible; or, leave time to be experienced as rapid through its portrayal of catastrophic events; a comic framing allows readers to experience a more manageable time period across which effects may occur. In comic temporality, the effects of global warming do not happen all at once: ‘‘while widespread permanent inundation . . . is possible, it isn’t likely to occur in [New York City] in our grandchildren’s lifetimes, or even their grandchildren’s. And an extra 5 to 10 inches of water over the next few decades,’’ Rogers (2007) concludes, is manageable for residents (p. 1). While such temporality may make the issue of climate change appear less pressing to crass readers unconcerned with their families’ or communities’ futures, **i**t permits human action on climate change, rather than limiting possible expressions of human agency to total resignation**.**

### AT Development Language K

#### TURN: Extend Taylor 02, capitalism is the root cause of racism. History confirms this. There was no concept of racial inferiority before cap. If you affirm and reject cap these people will stop being oppressed and enslaved. It has nothing to do with development rhetoric, it has everything to do with the racist logic of cap and how that influences the development of countries. The NC is false, and this is a case turn.

### AT Theory in General

#### Extend Vincent. We have to understand that debate is a performance so that we can evaluate the distinction between the speech and the speech act. The speech act is beyond the arguments that we make on the flow, it also includes the discourse of those arguments.

## Substance Extensions

Vincent- Debate is a performance. In order to evaluate the entire performance, we must evaluate both the speech and the speech act. The speech act is the performance of our discourse. We have to evaluate what our performance justifies. If a performance justifies oppression, we should reject it, because it’s intuitive in an educational space that oppression is a bad thing.

Macleod 13- Resource extraction is capitalistic notions about the expansion of markets and commodification. It’s rooted in capitalism.

Taylor 02- Cap is the root cause of racism. This is historically verified. Prefer historical verification because observational logic is rooted in subjective understanding, so it differs from person to person, but history is static and unchanging, meaning the warrant is uncontestable.

Stueter and Wills 08- Racism leads to genocide because humans give classifications to each other based on things like skin color and facial features, but when we dehumanize a specific classified group, we make them less than human in our minds, so it’s much easier to overcome any type of aversion to killing.

Luke 01- We need to reconceptualize our commodification of the environment. Doing so will allow us to redefine our societal values. Once we do this, we will understand that current capitalistic economic practices aren’t okay, so we will reject them on face. Rejecting resource extraction is necessary to end capitalism.

Glover- Arguments that justify genocide have no place in modern ethics, so anything that justifies genocide or even has the potential to justify genocide should be rejected a priori.

## Theory Frontlines/Extensions

### Presumption

#### Extend A, that the neg gets to adapt to the AC while I have to read without having any idea what they’ll say, so they always start out with an advantage. Presumption is necessary to check back this advantage because I have to debate better in overcoming it just to remain equal with them.

#### Extend B, that the 7-4-6-3 time skew means that my rebuttals are harder.

#### Extend C, that I have two rebuttals that I have to make extensions in and they only have one, it’s twice as bad because they have so much longer to do extensions in that rebuttal. Collective time doesn’t matter in this instance because even though I have 7 total rebuttal minutes, if I run out of time to extend anything important in my 1AR, I can’t do anything about that in my 2AR.

#### Extend D, that they can just pick a strat that circumvents parts of the AC, which renders parts of my case useless.

### Aff Only RVI’s

#### Extend A, the 7-4-6-3 time skew means I have to win the theory debate in the 1AR because if I don’t, the neg can just go 6 minutes in on whatever I dropped in the NR. RVI’s help because I only have to win one. Extend that this is key to fairness because it solves back time skew.

#### Extend B, that aff RVI’s deter harmful theory by making the neg less likely to run it for no reason, which is good because theory is creating good norms and bad theory destroys good norms.

### CX Checks

#### Extend that they have to check interps and violations in CX to give me the opportunity to comply because theory is for improving debate and it’s better for debate if we just reject abusive arguments from the get-go and have a substantive round. Running theory when it could have been avoided harms substantive debate, and thus destroys the purpose of theory. All they had to do was read me the interp in CX and ask if I would just kick the argument that violated. But they didn’t. So extend that I get an I meet which triggers an RVI because RVI’s are supposed to deter harmful theory debate, and unnecessary theory is harmful theory.

### AFC

## Full Shells

### CX Checks

A. Counter-Interpretation: The neg debater must allow the aff debater to run an argument containing the impact that debaters must check the interpretation and violation of a theoretical argument of a proposed debate practice during cross-examination.

B. First, I meet because I ran cross-examination checks are necessary for the round in the AC. Second, they try to deny me the ability to run CX checks.

C. Standards:

1.) Time Skew- allowing the neg to run theory without checking it in CX opens the floodgates for multiple theory interpretations that I don’t violate. This functions as a massive time skew because each new shell functions as a game-over issue for the aff, forcing me to over-invest time on each interpretation. Additionally, the neg will always be ahead on the theory debate since they can use the 13 to 7 time advantage after theory in the NC to overload the aff. CX checks arguments avoid this problem by only allowing the neg to run theory shells that the AFF clearly violates. Skewing the time in favor of one debater is key to fairness as it arbitrarily gives one debater a better chance of winning the debate.

2.) Strategy Skew- The neg ability to run theory that doesn’t link to the AC forces the aff to avoid the substantive debate and engage in the theory debate since theory functions on the highest level.  By forcing me to answer non-linking theory in the 1AR, my opponent ensures that I change my strategy from substance to theory, considerably skewing my initial strategy. Strategy skew is key to fairness as it disproportionately impacts one debater’s ability to implement their prep.

3.) Resolvability- With ridiculous amounts of “I meets,” debates have become increasingly more difficult to resolve, which is empirically verified. And, because blippy I meets are so short that responses are continually less and less responsive, putting the judge in an awkward spot. CX checks this back since I’ll concede violations to your interps, regardless if they’re reasonably getting us out of the “I meet” conundrum, making the debates more resolvable. Resolvability is the biggest impact back to fairness because if the debate isn’t resolvable, a non-arbitrary decision is impossible.

D. Voter: Fairness since it ensures both debaters have equal access to the ballot. By voting the debater down, it will start a norm to not run abusive arguments because they will be voted down. A debater is fair when their arguments don’t put the opponent in a disadvantaged situation and favors him or herself. By signing the ballot against the one who is being abusive, you start a trend in the community that will deter others from not being abusive. The role of the judge is to be a rule enforcer and make sure debaters don’t violate the rules of debate.

### Drop the Debater Bad

1. Interp: Debaters may advocate theory or topicality shells only if the impact of the shell is to drop the specific offending argument.
2. Violation: They are trying to drop the debater.
3. Standards:
4. Effective norm creation: Drop the debater incentivizes more abusive theory practices.

**Sigel furthers:** [Doug Sigel, Northwestern University. *Punishment: Does It Fit the Crime?* 1985; http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Sigel985Water.htm, JD, University of Texas Law Review, Notes Editor], HSH

First, **punishment arguments do not deter bad debate.** It has already been argued that **sophisticated debaters who run "junk" arguments" will eagerly latch onto punishment as another way to avoid research.** Some elaboration seems in order. Suppose you and your partner plan on running a world government counterplan nearly every round. Your response to the threat of punishment will be to write detailed briefs ) defending the legitimacy of your counterplan. **When another [debater]** team **initiates a punishment argument [debaters]** you **will "TURN" the argument and make it a reverse voting issue.** When the 1AR drops numbers 11, 21 and 26 because of time pressure [the negative] you will likely win the debate. It seems clear that **for teams that systematically abuse the activity punishment isn't really a problem. At worst they can muddle up the issue and at best they can win on reverse-punishment.** Second, **losing bad arguments is normally: an adequate disincentive.**

And, this turns the neg’s solvency. Dropping the debater incentivizes spending time on theory to get an RVI, and kills the norm creating ability of theory. And, this means that I control the internal link to fairness or education because running ‘drop the debater’ increases the likelihood of people taking good norms and arguing against them just to get an RVI. Effective norm creation links to positive advancement of activities because it is through the norms that the debate community endorses that the activity progresses.

1. Maximization of substantive debate: Dropping the argument allows us to turn the debate back into substance without worrying about losing to theory. If we spend all of our time from this speech onward on theory then we completely kill any educational value of the debate. This controls the internal link to fairness and education because continuing to debate theory in a round where it could have been dropped is detrimental to the production of good debate. Maximization of substantive debate is key to positive advancement of activities because the more we are able to actually debate the better the activity is.
2. Voter: Positive advancement of activities: Debate is a continually progressing activity. LD has grown to have a multitude of nuances and norms that contribute to the very identity of debate. The ability to develop LD comes prior to Fairness or Education because our conceptions of what is fair or educational are determined by how debate advances. Just as theory pre-empts substance because it shows how we should debate substance, meta-theory preempts theory because it creates norms for how we create norms. So, this is the highest layer of the round. Drop my opponent’s shell to remove it from the round and allow us to continue with the debate.

AT: Already spent time developing theory.

1. Turn: Drop the argument theory can be less developed than drop the debater. A) I can’t RVI drop the argument theory, so I’m less likely to attack it and more likely to accept it. B) Drop the debater theory has to be developed enough to be debated the whole round exactly because it incentivizes a response. So, drop the debater is actually the cause of long theory.
2. In the long run you actually increase the amount of theory that people run. People will just get really good at theory and use the abusive arguments to bait theory and get an RVI. This destroys education more than abusive strategies, because a theory debate completely kills education from substance, whereas even a skewed substance debate will provide some education. And, this completely kills the voter of fairness, because there’s no point of running theory if we never get around to setting the norms into place in substance.

### Multiple Shells Bad

A is the Interpretation: Neither debater may advocate more than one theoretical argument where each is sufficient to vote down the other debater.

B is the Violation: The negative is attempting to use multiple theory shells, each as an independent way of voting down the affirmative.

C is Standards:

Effective norm creation: Multiple theory shells inhibit norm creation. Theory must be used for the purpose of creating good norms for debate. This is the link that the neg provides to the ballot of the judge – the aff is employing a harmful norm and should be voted down to deter the use of that norm, or to punish the aff for using that norm. People follow what is effective in debate – when prestandards started losing to theory, it sent the message that the debate community would not tolerate them, and we no longer see as many prestandards as a few years ago. Using multiple theory shells destroys the ability to create norms because the judge’s ballot only indicates that one side was completely wrong and one was completely right – it doesn’t send the message that “I voted on this good norm, not this irrelevant norm” meaning that the ability of theory to send a message is destroyed. This controls the internal link to the neg voter, because their voter is grounded in how this round will affect debate as a whole, such as a lack of education or a lack of fairness. Effective norm creation links to positive advancement of activities because it is through the norms that the debate community endorses that the activity progresses. Absent the ability to clearly show what norms we support, debate would stagnate.

D is the Voter: Positive advancement of activities: Debate is a continually progressing activity. LD has grown to have a multitude of nuances and norms that contribute to the very identity of debate. The ability to develop LD comes prior to Fairness or Education because our conceptions of what is fair or educational are determined by how debate advances. Just as theory pre-empts substance because it shows how we should debate substance, meta-theory preempts theory because it creates norms for how we create norms. So, this is the highest layer of the round. Vote me up as a sign of approval for the norm I am proposing, as your ballot is the clearest sign of approval.

And, just to be clear, the spikes in the AC don’t violate because they aren’t full shells.

### Neg Must Defend CP

1. Extend the interp from the underview that the neg has to defend a explicit written implementation of real world policy.
2. Violation: They don’t.
3. Standards:
4. Strat Skew- If the neg doesn’t read a CP, they can change the way that their advocacy functions in the next speech. Having a text binds them to the particulars of their arguments and prevents them from shifting out of my offense. Strat is key to fairness since it is key to creating a coherent ballot story.
5. Time skew- If the neg doesn’t defend a counterplan, they can just read a bunch of vague truth testing arguments or sketchy a prioris and then extend the one that I drop or make the least substantive responses to. This would destroy the value of my first 10 minutes of speech time and make the 2AR pointless.
6. Ground Skew-If the neg doesn’t read a specific advocacy text it’s impossible for me to run DAs and turns that link back to their advocacy, but I also can’t do substantive comparison between the nuances of my position and theirs based on both textual and mechanical competition. Ground is key to fairness because both debaters need equal access to the ballot in order to have an equal chance to win.
7. You vote on fairness because debate is competitive activity so there needs to be an equal playing field because your job is to determine the better debater. A fair round is necessary to have an educational round since if the debate was always skewed to one side or full of bad norms we’d never really learn anything. Drop the debater because 1. This shell is about an argument that the neg failed to make, and you can’t drop an argument that doesn’t exist AND 2. Dropping the debater sets the norm that the neg can’t without running a real world policy text, which will end the problem.