## T fw

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the efficacy of a topical proposal relative to the status quo or a competing option

#### First is fairness – debates about scholarship in a vacuum are myopic and breed reactionary generics – they allow the aff to cement their infinite prep advantage, because all the aff has to do is find evidence supporting an ideological orientation towards the world – this crushes clash because all of our prepared negative strategies are based on praxis, and by not defending a clear actor and mechanism we lose 90% of negative ground, and the aff still retains traditional competition standards like perms to make being neg impossible - Fairness is an intrinsic good and key to the mechanisms of debate

#### Second is ground: defending a personal survival strategy forces the 1nc to negate your identity – that forces me to make terrible neg arguments that deny a personal strategy for you – the ballot becomes a referendum on identity rather than a contestable thesis point which is messed up

#### Third is a TVA: you can read a version off the aff that discusses how compulsory voting solves for the harms of the aff – if they argue that doesn’t solve or has issues that proves my fairness claim all their deficits to a TVA are neg arguments allowing for ground and clash and topic education

#### Switch side debate solves your offense – read it as a kritik on the negative

## 1NC – SSD Blackness Short

#### Violation: Wrong starting point – the resolution must be the starting point of the debate. Your 1ac might be about the topic, but not topical. And, you must have an interpretation of the topic. Even if you don’t like the topic, you need an interpretation.

#### Standards: Switch side debate requires you to affirm the resolution. Fluidity is the strategy of whiteness, able to mold and shape itself to avoid being identified and to remain invisible.

#### Switch side debate is blackness – Conviction based debate is whiteness.

Evans, 2012. Rashad. JD Penn. <http://www.rwesq.com/the-3nr/> November 21

I agree with this argument.  However, you have no warrant to support the claim that SSD prevents the pursuit of social justice. **SSD best facilitates social justice**. You have already dropped my argument that **it protects negative ground and that protecting negative ground is essential to promoting social justice in debate. You also dropped my argument that allowing Debaters to go rogue because of their “personal convictions” may mean that we never discuss issues pertaining to social justice because debaters may choose to avoid those issues all together.** In short, **“conviction based debate” (“CBD”) is neither necessary nor sufficient to produce social justice.** You lose this argument. CH says: Rashad has presented a defense of a “Black SSD” which allows individuals to “[engaged] the resolution from [their] specific social location”. This modification to the traditional practice of SSD, he claims, exposes debates to a broad range of topics, encourages reflexivity, forces students to “check their privilege”, and offers creative takes on the topic, all while preserving the “instrumental goal” of topic-based fairness in debate. However, none of the purported benefits \*justify\* SSD. Rashad has to thread the needle: First, you dropped my pre-empt to this argument**. SSD is Blackness; CBD is whiteness. Therefore, Black SSD is not a modification by a clarification.** However, your ghetoization of debate that is engaging as opposed to dismissive highlights the problems with CBD and is my first voting issue in this debate. **Encouraging debaters to engage the resolution from their social location is not a Black thing; it’s just a thing. It recognizes that white people have a social location as well and that they must begin to situate themselves as merely part of the picture and not the whole picture. In other words, SSD or Black SSD as you call it forces you realize that your view comes from somewhere and is not just a view from nowhere.** Lastly, this argument was gay turned in the 1NC. SSD requires debaters to speak on issues they may not otherwise consider**.  In the world of increasing diversity and Black participation in particular, SSD takes on even more significant meaning as it is a unique opportunity to incorporate Black thought into debate and policy making.  This incorporation solves the fundamental problem with all debate:  it’s too white, too male, and too straight.** Again, debate infused by Black and queer thought is the solution to the ills you identify.  Your argument has been turned.

#### It’s a voting issue - You fail to ground your discourse in materiality – you don’t defend anything and understand the impacts of your inaction

Rashad Evans writes while debating Casey Harrigan in 2012: Rashad Evans, 2012 11-20-2012 (<http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/>)

**A quare approach to debate includes afro-pessimism**.  For instance, **I am pessimistic that any of the solutions being floated around will meaningfully address anti-blackness. I am pessimistic of changes in MPJ, resolutional wording or tournament practices to address the attitudinal and structural (throwback) barriers to black participation in debate.  A quare approach to debate recognizes the importance that color, sex and gender have in structuring our lives and producing differing results for different people.** **Disidentification is a way by which we can enact change at the structural level through localized acts of resistance**. It is a process whereby we can work on and against the system. I started this process at Harvard with the initiation of my affirmative action policy and have continued on facebook and my blog**. This disidentification is important because it recognizes the material consequences of our actions and inactions. It also allows individuals utilize discourse in a subversive way. E. Patrick Johnson explains that: “Foucault himself acknowledges that discourse has the potential to disrupt power: “Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, anymore than silences are. We must make allowances for complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmit and produces power; it reinforces it , but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. Although people of color, myself included, may not have theorized our lives in Foucault’s terms, we have used discourse in subversive ways because it was necessary for our survival. Failure to ground discourse in materiality is to privilege the position of those whose subjectivity and agency, outside the realm of gender and sexuality, have never been subjugated.”** Therefore**, we must look look at the material consequences of our acts and inactions and account for the ways in which certain performances either maintain power or subvert power.** In addition, **we must account for stylistic differences. It is at the level of style that most black and queer politics are enacted.  In the debate space, stylistic differences is one of the most important ways that Black debaters enact their politics and resistance.  Style is an important tool of survival for Black, queer and female debaters. One cannot speak if she cannot speak with and from her own voice.    Style is important and so too is the value of using the debate space to theorize about life more generally.  Debate is a homeplace for its participants.  Theorizing about things like anti-blackness, humanism and feminism from within the debate space is important to teaching debaters how to theorize about this issues outside the debate space**.  We must always be able to be critical in those places where we are most familiar and most comfortable.  That is why these discussions regarding debate are so important. **Important to a quare understanding of debate is the work done by Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley and her call that we pay specific attention to how we produce our scholarship.  Responsible argumentation should account for multiple forms of knowledge including (1) academic scholars, (2) organic intellectuals and (3) personal experience.  Responsible debaters also engage in knowledge production and not just knowledge consumption.**

#### Preserving negative ground key to fairness for minorities in debate

Rashad Evans, 2012. 11-20-2012 (<http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/>)

**SSD is the** only **way to organize a fair debate tournament.  We** must have a topic**.  There must be** rules **and allowing any and everyone go rogue because of their “personal convictions” it is a** recipe for disaster**.**  I don’t want to live and debate in that world.  **There must be strict requirements on defending the resolution to allow for** fair **and predictable** negative ground**.** By the way, **protecting fair negative ground is easier and more important than all other concerns regarding fairness**.  All people of all convictions have to be negative at some point.  Which means that **the affirmative-negative dialiectic is the** only intersectional analysis that can be performed **because all people of all identities will eventually find themselves on the affirmative or negative side in debate**.  Preserving negative ground then preserves the ground of women, minorities **and hippies. SSD ensures that we have all hands on deck in these extraordinary times.** We need all perspectives and all peoples to engage in all debates.  SSD facilitates this.  Allowing students to pick their own topic because of their “personal convictions” may mean that important issues get ignored all together.  I mean, what would happen if we let the students set the curriculum?  Would they learn anything, ever?  How many times have you heard these questions in a classroom:  why do I have to learn this?  Will this be on the exam?  My major is X, why do I need to learn Y?  Blah.  Yes, students would almost always like to do what they want to do.  If we allowed this where would we be as a country? Who will be there to tackle the important questions pertaining to immigration, energy production, the Arab Spring, etc? **Engaging the resolution from your specific social location can cause others to change their views. There are several examples of creative interpretations of the resolution that have inspired folk to view the topic and life differently.  This is when debate is at its best and when it’s engaging in important knowledge production.  Debate and debaters have the potential to infuse new arguments, ideas and perspectives into the resolution and into the broader discussion**.