# Miro— K v Theory

## K v Theory

### NC ROTJ

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### NR ROTJ—ext.

#### The role of the judge is a *central framing question* for the methodologies introduced in this round—the <<Affirmatives>> focus on ideal theory and what “ought to” be is a form of fantasy roleplaying that ignores changing knowledge production *in this round.* As a critical educator combatting oppression, the judge must first consider the implications of the knowledge that we present in round before some imagined post-fiat impact—you must refuse neutrality in favor of voting for the methodology that best combats oppressive knowledge in this round. – that’s Giroux.

#### <<We know that our activity is problematic when it forces us to justify why policies that lead to the disproportionate disenfranchisement and oppression of minorities are bad.>>

### NR ROTJ—AT: fwk precludes

#### Must justify meta-theoretical requirement that debaters justify why oppression is bad—I’ll extend three warrants against this.

### NR K—AT: generic theory

#### I meet— <<explain why>>. You should evaluate this debate based on reasonability—theory prolif sets a non-arbitrary voting threshold, means good is good enough—I could always spec more.

#### Counter-interp— <<counter her interp>>

#### This argument is a question of models for debate—fairness claims collapse because they presume one model of debate is good which can only be judged by the external impact it has.

#### Their interp infinitely regresses.

#### <<Drop activism here>>-- they probably conceded it.

#### <<Drop reasons why the K > theory>>

#### <<Drop AT: fairness answers>>

#### <<Answer their standards here.>>

### NR K—AT: k bad

#### Counterinterp: Debaters can read positions that question the underpinnings of the AC.

#### I’ll turn back their fairness claims—

#### Middle-ground on fairness— The AC was 10 seconds of plan-text and 7:50 of value-judgments about the world. If they’re not prepared to defend those judgments, that’s not due to any fault of ours—*they were a core part of the AC.*

#### And on education—

#### Best for critical education— we must challenge the underpinnings of our thought so that we can develop better arguments in the future

#### Don’t buy his claims about how some forms of education outweigh—you can get <<phil/policy>> education in any other round, critical education uniquely key.

### NR ROTJ—K > Theory

#### You should evaluate the K before theory—

#### You can’t evaluate arguments unless you first know what your role as judge is—if your role as judge is to be a critical education combatting oppression, then the only way you can evaluate theory is through how it implicates methodologies to combat oppression.

#### Theory rests on the assumption that their model of debate is one worth preserving which the K is impact turning—squo forms of knowledge are replicating the impacts of the K, there’s only a risk that we create a new, more ethical form of debate.

#### <<>>

#### Case is a disad— their theory excludes disruptive methodologies like the Aff, means that they have to win that their claims of fairness outweigh ableist violence.

### NR ROTJ—Activism Ext

#### Activism is the *most important standard in this round*—without activism, all of their education and fairness claims are meaningless, no matter what we learn, unless we have the ability to take it out of the round and use it, it is, by definition, useless.

#### Only the ROTJ accesses activism—by focusing on the practical construction of knowledge in this round rather than *ideal* theory, we can develop concrete strategies for making change.

### NR ROTJ—AT: fairness

#### K turns fairness—

#### Their claims of how to best preserve debate beg the question. Why is the form of debate they defend one that deserves to be preferred—if I win that my methodology is productive for combatting oppressive knowledge, this is an external impact justifying my form of debate.

#### Extend Giroux— utilizing fairness as a factor in decision making prioritizes self-interest over the educational value of the public sphere which coopts and destroys debate making flawed ideology replicate itself causing the violent norms. We’ve mechanized debate to the point that we’re stuck in the same repetitious cycle.

#### Fairness is not a voter—just an internal link to education, if I win I promote new forms of knowledge, that outweighs fairness. Flipping a coin to decide a winner would be fair but would destroy debate which proves that only education is constitutive of debate.

### NR ROTJ—AT: #notallKs

#### They say that they don’t trade off with reading critiques, only my form but that’s wrong—

#### Even if it’s true that their interp doesn’t explicitly limit out all Ks, empirically, it infinitely regresses. Debaters will always change what interpretation they read to exclude whatever particularly form a K takes and then claim all other forms are okay—this collapses to functional exclusion which means my K is a disad to their interp--don’t allow him to recontextualize because I have no 3NR.

#### Their interp is uniquely bad—it overburdens the neg to <<do the interp>>. <<Explain more>>

### NR ROTJ—AT: policy focus good for activism

#### Wrong—policy focus abstracts you from what you can personally do to combat structural problems—even if all of her arguments about policy focus are true, the only way we can get in the position to change policy is by first focusing on in-round micropolitics.

#### Disproven empirically by organizations like Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle, an activist organization comprised of debaters who discussed in round methods.

### NR—AT: policymaking

#### I don’t trade off with policymaking—you have other rounds.

#### TURN: cross-apply K card—policymaking education is training for neocons, replicates aff impacts. Only neg combines policymaking with critical reflection.

### NR—AT: ground

#### They have ground—they have their entire aff to leverage against the K.

#### Ground loss inevitable— all teams try to write their args strategically to deny ground, at least I don’t have shitty theory spikes

#### Ground claims replicate exclusion and are wrong

Harrigan 12 (Casey Harrigan, Director of Debate @ MSU previously at UGA and Wake, <http://msudebate.blogspot.com/2012/11/1ar-ssd.html>, 20th November 2012)//Miro

Appeals to fairness and Neg ground prove your model is little different than old school White SSD hegemony. Honestly, I don't see too many women, minorities, or hippies getting upset about the teams that have chosen to reject SSD. Mostly, I see elite schools, traditional policy teams that fear change, and people of privilege who object using the claim of fairness to paper over their personal unwillingness to engage with difference. Debate will not fall apart. Some of the most meaningful ground emerges from points of stasis between teams arguing from conviction. There are always places to disagree. And, chaos is pretty much the status quo, in case you haven’t noticed. Loyola EM made the damn semis of the NDT. Not unique.

### NR—AT: jurisdiction

#### Cross-apply the ROTJ analysis from above—this entire debate is a question of what your role should be—questions of judge jurisdiction miss the point.

### NR—AT: resolvability

#### You can only resolve the debate if you know what your role is—means the K precludes your role of the judge.

### NR—AT: colt peacemaker

## Spikes

### NC Comparative World

#### Prefer comparative worlds—

#### Ground—truth-testing unlimits neg ground, allowing infinite NIBs and skeptical arguments—kills side balance and substantive education.

#### Aff flexibility— Comparative worlds allows the aff to choose how they defend the topic, allowing for more in-depth debate and combatting neg side biass.

#### Policy-making education— Comparative worlds allows debaters to engage in in-depth debate about policy which is a key portable skill. Spikes

### NC Spikes—Drop on

#### You should let me answer spikes if they’re extended into the 1AR, this is best—

#### Strat skew: my interpretation prevents <<him/her>> from reading an infinite number of spikes in the AC and then extending the ones I drop—I can never win because I’ll never have time to answer all of <<her>> planks.

#### Clash: Forcing the 1AR to pick and choose what spikes to extend is best for clash—allows me to engage in the warrants behind the theory rather than blippy line-by-line. Privilege substantive engagement over tagline debate.

#### And it encourages substantive education—any alternative gives the Aff incentive to read spikes at the expense of substance, this is *empirically* what makes LD debate look like a joke.

## AROTBC Bad

### NC AROTBC

#### I should be able to read an alternative role of the ballot—

#### Ground—The aff would always win since they can just pick a self-serving ROTB. Even if they prove the ROTB is good, they will always be more prepared on it, putting me at a significant disadvantage.

#### Critical education—there is no incentive to question the assumptions underlying the AC under his ROTB—talking about issues of social injustice are uniquely key in debate in order to connect abstract philosophical roleplaying with concrete action we ourselves can take inside and outside of round.

#### Strat skew—Aff ROTB choice allows the aff to dictate what the neg strategy will be for the round. This overcompensates the aff for timeskew, turning their time/strat skew standards. Further, this allows the aff to frontline and prep everything on the contention debate.

## Disclosure Theory

### f/l

#### I meet— <<explain why>>

#### Counter-interp— Debaters who have no coach or team-mates should not be required to disclose positions.

#### First is dialogue— My interpretation allows for better dialogue, it forces the debater to engage with my argument instead of relying upon coaches or backfiles. This is key to education, simply regurgitating pre-written arguments takes out the educational value of debate. Education comes first because the only way you can evaluate whether debate is a good activity is based on the external impact it has.

#### Second is equity— disclosure for small schools disproportionately advantages large schools with lots of coaching, backfiles, and teammates—they can prep out against smaller cases while I don’t have the same ability to research.

### AT: ground/clash

#### No ground loss—

#### Clash only exists when you understand the arguments you’re reading—if you are simply reading backfiles, clash is meaningless—that means only my interpretation accesses true clashGround-loss inevitable: all teams try to write their arguments strategically to deny ground

## ROTB Policy

### Miro ROTJ Policy

#### The role of the judge is to vote for the side that presents the best postfiat policy option <<that insert their ROTB>>—

#### Policy making education is key to effective activism—we have to learn how to translate our grassroots activism into policy, debate is a key training—any alternative is armchair activism—this is the best internal link to their ROTB. Also allows you to learn more about the way the enemy thinks. <<Nobody has ever stopped structural oppression with the ballot, but people have learned policy skills they can use to do so in debate.>>

#### Allowing Affirmative offense on both pre-fiat and post-fiat layers is a strat skew—they’ll always go for the layer that they have the most offense on which moots my NC. This also kills in-depth education because we only get superficial coverage of both layers of the debate.