# Loyola R6

## 1

#### [1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### [2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections temporarily, which is an indefinite suspension. That’s 1AC

#### [3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech. Fairness is a voter and outweighs – education can be gained from research

#### [5] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### [6] Paradigm Issues –

#### [a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### [b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### [c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### [1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### [2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### [3] Negation Theory “to negate” means “to deny the truth of,” which means any argument that renders the resolution false is sufficient to negate.

#### [4] Trichotomy Triple there is a trichotomy between obligation, prohibition and permissibility; proving one disproves the other two because they are three intertwined moral terms which coexist within each other. Outweighs because it interacts with each term or moral obligation.

#### [5] Status Quo Bias – you should default to a world where you don’t make change because making change assumes that world will be better than the current world

#### Negate --

#### **[1] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### [2] member[[3]](#footnote-3) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### [3] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### [4] the[[5]](#footnote-5) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### [5] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### [6] reduce[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### [7] for[[8]](#footnote-8) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### [8] medicine[[9]](#footnote-9) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

## 4

### Framework

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. Evaluate the debate after the 1nc for reciprocity because we both get one speech

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me –Reject Extinction outweighs- aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing. No aff analytics – they are unpredictable cuz any arg can be made

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

### Offense

#### Reducing IP is a form of free-riding that fails the universality test, but also uses the creators of the medicine as means to an end.

Dyke 18 Dyke, Raymond. “The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting - IPWatchdog.com: Patents &amp; Patent Law.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents &amp; Patent Law, 1 Oct. 2018, www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/.//dhsNJ

As we shall see, applying Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent. So, employing this canon, a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands. This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment. Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust.

#### Interpretation: affirmative teams must not read new offense in the 1ar related to a new fw, weigh aff arguments under our fw, recontextualize aff arguments under a different fw, or turn the 1nc fw if presumption affirms. To clarify – extinction outweighs violates

#### [1] Phil Clash and Time Skew- anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC which o/w since phil is the only thing unique to LD Debate and time is the only quantifiable metric of abuse

#### [2] Skew- They have an inherent advantage on the contention debate since they get 2ar spin so they can easily sway judge psychology in contention debates that don’t err towards one side.

#### [3] Planks Solves- because if the topic doesn’t actually negate you can put defense on the contention level.

## 5

#### I am The Spaghetti Monster, an Evil Demon from the Nether, and I have one goal: This ballot. I will wreak havoc and stop at nothing until l get this dub, then I will go back to Nether. I have taken over Kap’s Body, Fear me and my threat. No rules will constrain me as the application of rules, even when justified, are not inherent.

#### Langseth[[10]](#footnote-10),This section shows that rules themselves do not determine how they are to be followed. There is nothing, for example, inherent in an arrow that shows us which way it is pointing or directing us to go.2 Similarly, as the above quote shows, there is no means by which it can be known with com- plete certainty that, in following the arithmetical sequence 0, n, 2n, 3n, 4n... in line with the order “+1,” a person is following the intended rule, for he or she may be following an alternative rule that is compatible with the intended rule *up to a certain point.* There must be something in addition to the rule that directs us in a particular manner and indicates to us that we proceed accordingly. The argument Wittgenstein is making in Section 185 is dependent upon the fact that a rule, in order to be a rule, must be able to be broken. There must be correct and incorrect applications of a rule. The question that arises here is: What determines correct and incorrect application of a rule? Or, what justifies following a rule correctly? If a rule in itself does not show us how we are to follow it, then our interpretation of a rule must also not determine correct use. If interpretation was what determined correct use, there would be no incorrect application of a rule. This is the case because any interpretation can be seen to be in accordance with a rule.

#### Elizabeth is now under my control, I have hypnotized them during prep time and they are now my Puppet.

#### To demonstrate this, I will make them do a couple of things.

#### In their 1ar, they will make arguments about why you should vote me down and why you should vote them up. (I will also make them say they aren’t hypnotized) But know this: through telepathy, I have learned that their true intention was to lose this round; They planned to forfeit in the 1ar. It appears I didn’t need to hypnotize them in the first place. No amount of evidence can ever prove objective knowledge. Searle,[[11]](#footnote-11)

#### **You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states.** You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence about your own perceptual experiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so because **you could be** dreaming,having hallucinations, be a brain in a vat, or be **deceieved** systematically **by an evil demon**. Strange situations, yes, but **it is impossible to disprove the potentiality** **for** any of **the**se**scenarios.”**

#### I have programmed them to think that they are not hypnotized, that they want to win the round, and that they think what I am saying is very silly. But no matter our empirical observations, their intentions are indeterminate. Kant Immanuel, The Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. 1781. Under heading “Exposition of the Cosmological Idea of Freedom in Harmony with the Universal Law of Natural Necessity.” available online: <http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext03/cprrn10.txt> SJCP//JG The **real morality of actions’--**their **merit** or demerit**, and** even that of **our own conduct, is completely unknown to us.** Our **estimates can relate only to** their **empirical character**. **How much is the result of** the action of **free will**, how much is to be **ascribed to nature** and to **blameless error**, **or to** a happy **constitution of temperament** (merito fortunae), **no one can discover, nor,** for this reason, **determine with perfect justice.**

#### Of course, I have no intention of keeping them as my puppet, (I have too many). When they say

#### “I am forfeiting this round, yes this is serious, and this comes before all other arguments. To clarify- I am kicking every single argument I made and asking you to vote for Kaps” and then stop speaking, then they will wake up and you will know they are no longer under my command. Until then, I am the puppet-master.:

## 6

#### The following arguments are all drop the debater to deter future abuse

#### [1] The aff debater must say the words “praise the spaghetti monster” once every speech – anything else causes the spaghetti monster to kill us all which is a reason to reject them

#### [2] They must call me “Kaps” in cross examination, anything else incentivizes psychological violence which is a reason to reject them

#### [3] No aff arguments – key to letting me hang out with my friends faster after round

#### [4] No prep time for the aff - key to allow for strategic on the fly thinking

#### [5] Don’t evaluate the 1AC – key to stop them from reading boring policy positions

#### [6] Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### [7] DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### [8] RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

#### [9] No overview answers to neg arguments – they must LBL everything – key to stop abusive grouping of arguments

#### [10] Vote for brown people – key to empowering minority populations who are marginalized in America

#### [11] No new 2ar responses – they’re infinetly abusive because they save their best args for last and I can’t respond

## 7

#### Earth is flat – tons of warrants.

Anti-Vaccine Scientific Support Arsenal 16 [Anti-Vaccine Scientific Support Arsenal, 2-8-2016, "Top Ten Undeniable Proofs the Earth is Flat," FLAT EARTH SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE, https://flatearthscienceandbible.com/2016/02/08/top-ten-undeniable-flat-earth-proofs/] JS

1) The horizon always appears completely flat 360 degrees to the observer, regardless of how high you go up. Any curvature you think you see is from curved airplane windows or Go Pro cameras and fisheye lenses (which NASA loves to use). The reality is that the horizon never curves because we are on an endless plane. On a globe with 25,000 miles in circumference you would see a noticeable disappearance of objects the further they are as they would be leaning away from you and dropping below the constantly curving horizon! 2) The horizon always rises to meet your eye level never no matter how high in altitude you go. Even at 20 miles up the horizon rises to meet the observer/camera. This is only physically possible if the earth is a huge "endless" flat plane. 3) The natural physics of water is to find and maintain its level. If Earth were a giant spinning sphere tilting and hurling through space then truly flat, consistently level surfaces would not exist here. There would be a massive bulge of water in the oceans because of the curvature of the earth. If earth was curved and spinning the oceans of water would be flowing down to level and covering land. Some rivers would be impossibly flowing uphill. There would massive water chaos and flooding! What we would see and experience would be vastly different! But since Earth is in fact an extended flat plane, this fundamental physical property of fluids finding and remaining level is consistent with experience and common sense. The water remains flat because the earth is flat! 4) If Earth were a ball 25,000 miles in circumference as NASA and modern astronomy claim, spherical trigonometry dictates the surface of all standing water must curve downward an easily measurable 8 inches per mile multiplied by the square of the distance. This means along a 6 mile channel of standing water, the Earth would dip 6 feet on either end from the central peak. Every time such experiments have been conducted, however, standing water has proven to be perfectly level. 5) The sun is much closer than we have been told. It is, in fact, in our atmosphere. You can clearly see that it is not 93 million miles away. Many times you can see the sun's rays shooting out of a cloud forming a triangle. If you follow the rays to their source it will always lead to a place above the clouds. If the sun was truly millions of miles away, all the rays would come in at a straight angle. Also the sun can be seen directly above clouds in some balloon photos, creating a hot spot on the clouds below it and in other photos you can clearly see the clouds dispersing directly underneath the close small sun. 6) If we were living on a spinning globe airplane's would constantly have to dip their noses down every few minutes to compensate for the curvature of the earth (with a circumference of 25,000 miles the earth would be constantly curving at the speed of an airplane). In reality however, they never do this! They learn how to fly based on a level flat plane. Also if the earth was spinning the airplane's going west would get to their destination much faster since the earth is spinning in the opposite direction. If the atmosphere is spinning with the earth then airplanes flying west would have to fly faster than the earth's spin to reach its destination. In reality, the earth is flat and airplanes just fly level and reach their destination easily because the earth is not moving. 7) The experiment known as “Airy’s Failure” proved that the stars move relative to a stationary Earth and not the other way around. By first filling a telescope with water to slow down the speed of light inside, then calculating the tilt necessary to get the starlight directly down the tube, Airy failed to prove the heliocentric theory since the starlight was already coming in the correct angle with no change necessary, and instead proved the geocentric model correct. 8) The Michelson-Morley and Sagnac experiments attempted to measure the change in speed of light due to Earth’s assumed motion through space. After measuring in every possible different direction in various locations they failed to detect any significant change whatsoever, again proving the stationary geocentric model. 9) If “gravity” is really a force strong enough to hold the world’s oceans, buildings, people and atmosphere stuck to the surface of a spinning ball, then it is impossible for “gravity” to also simultaneously be weak enough to allow little birds, bugs, and planes to take-off and travel freely unabated in any direction. If “gravity” is strong enough to curve the massive expanse of oceans around a globular Earth, it would be impossible for fish and other creatures to swim through such forcefully held water. 10) Ship captains in navigating great distances at sea never need to factor the supposed curvature of the Earth into their calculations. Both Plane Sailing and Great Circle Sailing, the most popular navigation methods, use plane, not spherical trigonometry, making all mathematical calculations on the assumption that the Earth is perfectly flat. If the Earth were in fact a sphere, such an errant assumption would lead to constant glaring inaccuracies. Plane Sailing has worked perfectly fine in both theory and practice for thousands of years, however, and plane trigonometry has time and again proven more accurate than spherical trigonometry in determining distances across the oceans. If the Earth were truly a globe, then every line of latitude south of the equator would have to measure a gradually smaller and smaller circumference the farther South travelled. If, however, the Earth is an extended plane, then every line of latitude south of the equator should measure a gradually larger and larger circumference the farther South travelled. The fact that many captains navigating south of the equator assuming the globular theory have found themselves drastically out of reckoning, more so the farther South travelled, testifies to the fact that the Earth is not a ball.

#### Flat earth flips existing all conceptions of science & society at large – this means you go neg on presumption because their presumptions are presumptive

DirtyOldAussie 17 [DirtyOldAussie, 4-1-2017, "What are the true implications of a Flat Earth vs Spherical Earth? How else would our thinking change if it really was flat? • r/AskReddit," reddit, \*this post was marked serious so it’s legit, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskReddit/comments/670rf6/what\_are\_the\_true\_implications\_of\_a\_flat\_earth\_vs/] JS

You'd have throw away the theory of gravity, special relativity, Newtonian mechanics, conventional astronomy, celestial mechanics, cosmology and a bunch of other fairly well established structures. Then you'd also have to deal with several worldwide conspiracies involving government, airline pilots, space agencies, astronomers, ships captains and others.

## 8

**Text –** **తెలుగులో చేయండి**

#### The NC embodies the oppressor and weaponizes language to rupture debate – we defend radical mimicry

**Conquergood 2**, Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research, Dwight Conquergood, TDR (1988-) Vol. 46, No. 2 (Summer, 2002), pp. 145-156 (12 pages) Published by: [The MIT Press](https://www.jstor.org/publisher/mitpress) SJDH

Geertz's now classic depiction of the turn toward texts in ethnography and cultural studies needs to be juxtaposed with Zora Neal Hurston's much earlier and more complex rendering of a researcher reading the texts of subordinate others: The theory behind our tactics: "The white man is always trying to know into somebody else's business. All right, I'll set something outside the door of my mind for him to play with and handle. He can read my writ- ing but he sho' can't read my mind. I'll put this play toy in his hand, and he will seize it and go away. Then I'll say my say and sing my song." ([I935] I990:3) Hurston foregrounds the terrain of struggle, the field of power relations on which texts are written, exchanged, and read. Whereas Geertz does not problematize the ethnographer's will-to-know or access to the texts of others, Hurston is sensitive to the reluctance of the subordinate classes "to reveal that which the soul lives by" (2) because they understand from experience the ocular politics that links the powers to see, to search, and to seize. **Aware of the white man's drive to objectify, control, and grasp as a way of knowing, subordinate people cunningly set a text, a decoy, outside the door to lure him away from "homeplace" where subjugated but empowering truths and survival secrets are sheltered** (hooks 1990). In Hurston's brilliant example, vulnerable people actually redeploy the written text as a tactic of evasion and camouflage, performatively turning and tripping the textual fetish against the white person's will-to-know. "So driven in on his reading," as Williams would say, he is blinded by the texts he compulsively seizes: "knowing so little about us, he doesn't know what he is missing" (Hurston [1935] 1990:2). Once provided with something that he can "handle," "seize," in a word, apprehend, he will go away and then space can be cleared for performed truths that remain beyond his reach**: "then I'll say my say and sing my song." By mimicking the reifying textualism of dominant knowledge regimes, subordinate people can deflect its invasive power. This mimicry of textualism is a complex example of "mimetic excess" in which the susceptibility of dominant images, forms, and technologies of power to subversive doublings holds the potential for undermining the power of that which is mimed** (Taussig I993:254-55). Note that in Hurston's account, subordinate people read and write, as well as perform. **With her beautiful example of how a text can perform subversive work, she disrupts any simplistic dichotomy that would align texts with domination and performance with liberation**. In Hurston's example, **the white man researcher is a fool not because he values literacy, but because he valorized it to the exclusion of other media, other modes of knowing.** I want to be very clear about this point: textocentrism-not texts-is the problem. The constitutive liminality of performance studies lies in its capacity to bridge segregated and differently valued knowledges, drawing together legitimated as well as subjugated modes of in- quiry. From her ethnographic fieldwork in the coal camps and "hollers" of West Virginia, Kathleen Stewart documents an especially vivid example of text- performance entanglements: how official signs and local performances play off and with each other in surprising and delightful ways. After a dog bit a neighbor's child, there was much talk and worry throughout the camp about liability and lawsuits: Finally Lacy Forest announced that he had heard that "by law" if you had a NO TRESPASSING sign on your porch you couldn't be sued. So ev- eryone went to the store in Beckley to get the official kind of sign. Neighbors brought back multiple copies and put them up for those too old or sick or poor to get out and get their own. Then everyone called everyone else to explain that the sign did not mean them. In the end, every porch and fence (except for those of the isolated shameless who don't care) had a bright NO TRESPASSING, KEEP OFF sign, and people visited together, sitting underneath the NO TRESPASSING signs, looking out. (1996:141; see also Conquergood I997)4 Through the power of reframing, social performances reclaim, short-circuit, and resignify the citational force of the signed imperatives. Moreover, Ngugi wa Thiong'o's concept of "orature" complicates any easy **separation between speech and writing, performance and print, and reminds us how these channels of communication constantly overlap, penetrate, and mutually produce one another** (1998). The **performance studies project makes its most radical intervention, I believe, by embracing both written scholarship and creative work, papers and performances. We challenge the hegemony of the text best by reconfiguring texts and performances in horizontal, metonymic tension,**

**not by replacing one hierarchy with another, the romance of performance for the authority of the text. The "liminal-norm" that Jon McKenzie identifies as the calling card of performance studies (2001:41) manifests itself most powerfully in the struggle to live betwixt and between theory and theatricality, paradigms and practices, critical reflection and creative accomplishment. Performance studies brings this rare hybridity into the academy, a commingling of analytical and artistic ways of knowing that unsettles the institutional organization of knowledge and disciplines.** The constitutive liminality of performance studies lies in its capacity to bridge segregated and differently valued knowledges, drawing together legitimated as well as sub- jugated modes of inquiry. There is an emergent genre of performance studies scholarship that epitomizes this text-performance hybridity. A number of performance studies-allied scholars create performances as a supplement to, not substitute for, their written research. These performance pieces stand alongside and in metonymic tension with published research. The creative works are developed for multiple professional rea- sons: they deepen experiential and participatory engagement with materials both for the researcher and her audience; they provide a dynamic and rhetorically compelling alternative to conference papers; they offer a more accessible and engaging format for sharing research and reaching communities outside academia; they are a strategy for staging interventions. To borrow Amanda Kemp's apt phrase, they use "performance both as a way of knowing and as a way of showing" (I998: I6). To add another layer to the enfolding convolutions of text and performance, several of these performance pieces have now been written up and published in scholarly journals and books (see Conquergood 1988; Becker, McCall, and Morris 1989; McCall and Becker I990; Paget I990; Pollock 1990; Jackson 1993, 1998; Allen and Garner 1995; Laughlin 1995; Wellin 1996; Jones 1997; Kemp I998). Performance studies is uniquely suited for the challenge of braiding together disparate and stratified ways of knowing. We can think through performance along three crisscrossing lines of activity and analysis. We can think of performance (I) as a work of imagination, as an object of study; (2) as a pragmatics of inquiry (both as model and method), as an optic and operator of research; (3) as a tactics of intervention, an alternative space of struggle. Speaking from my home department at Northwestern, we often refer to the three a's of performance studies: artistry, analysis, activism. Or to change the alliteration, a commitment to the three c's of performance studies: creativity, critique, citizenship (civic strug- gles for social justice). We struggle to forge a unique and unifying mission around the triangulations of these three pivot points: I. Accomplishment-the making of art and remaking of culture; creativity; embodiment; artistic process and form; knowledge that comes from doing, par- ticipatory understanding, practical consciousness, performing as a way of knowing. 2. Analysis-the interpretation of art and culture; critical reflection; thinking about, through, and with performance; performance as a lens that illuminates the constructed creative, contingent, collaborative dimensions of human com- munication; knowledge that comes from contemplation and comparison; concentrated attention and contextualization as a way of knowing. 3. Articulation-activism, outreach, connection to community; applications and interventions; action research; projects that reach outside the academy and are rooted in an ethic of reciprocity and exchange; knowledge that is tested by practice within a community; social commitment, collaboration, and contri- bution/intervention as a way of knowing: praxis. Notwithstanding the many calls for embracing theory and practice, universities typically institutionalize a hierarchical division of labor between scholars/re- searchers and artists/practitioners. For example, the creative artists in the Department of Fine Arts are separated from the "serious" scholars in the Department of Art History. Even when scholars and practitioners are housed within the same department, there often is internal differentiation and tracking, e.g., the literarytheorists and critics are marked off from those who teach creative and expository writing. This configuration mirrors an entrenched social hierarchy of value based on the fundamental division between intellectual labor and manual labor. In the academy, the position of the artist/practitioner is comparable to people in the larger society who work with their hands, who make things, and who are valued less than the scholars/theorists who work with their minds and are comparable to the more privileged professional-managerial class. Indeed, sometimes one of the reasons for forming schools of fine and performing arts is to protect artists/ practitioners from tenure and promotion committees dominated by the more institutionally powerful scholar/researchers who do not know how to appraise a record of artistic accomplishment as commensurate with traditional criteria of scholarly research and publication. The segregation of faculty and students who make art and perform from those who think about and study art and performance is based on a false dichotomy that represses the critical-intellectual component of any artistic work, and the imaginative-creative dimension of scholarship that makes a difference. A spurious, counterproductive, and mutually denigrating opposition is put into play that pits so-called "mere technique, studio skills, know- how" against so-called "arid knowledge, abstract theory, sterile scholarship." This unfortunate schism is based on gross reductionism and ignorance of "how the other half lives." Students are cheated and disciplines diminished by this academic apartheid. **The ongoing challenge of performance studies is to refuse and supercede this deeply entrenched division of labor, apartheid of knowledges, that plays out inside the academy as the difference between thinking and doing, interpreting and making, concep- tualizing and creating. A performance studies agenda should collapse this divide and revitalize the connections between artistic accomplishment, analysis, and articulations with communities; between practical knowledge (knowing how), propositional knowledge (knowing that), and political savvy (knowing who, when, and where).** This epistemological connection between creativity, critique, and civic engage- ment is mutually replenishing, and pedagogically powerful. Very bright, talented students are attracted to programs that combine intellectual rigor with artistic excellence that is critically engaged, where they do not have to banish their artistic spirit in order to become a critical thinker, or repress their intellectual self or political passion to explore their artistic side. Particularly at the PhD level, original scholarship in culture and the arts is enhanced, complemented, and complicated in deeply meaningful ways by the participatory understanding and community involvement of the researcher. This experiential and engaged model of inquiry is coextensive with the participant-observation methods of ethnographic research. The ongoing challenge of performance studies is to refuse and supercede this deeply entrenched division of labor, apartheid of knowledges, that plays out inside the academy as the difference between thinking and doing, interpreting and mak- ing, conceptualizing and creating. The division of labor between theory and practice, abstraction and embodiment, is an arbitrary and rigged choice, and, like all binarisms, it is booby-trapped. It's a Faustian bargain. If we go the one-way street of abstraction, then we cut ourselves off from the nourishing ground ofparticipatory experience. If we go the one-way street of practice, then we drive ourselves into an isolated cul-de-sac, a practitioner's workshop or artist's colony. Our radical move is to turn, and return, insistently, to the crossroads.

## 10

#### The burden of the aff is to prove that they are consistent with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer this –

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Langesth, Jonathan. “Wittengenstein’s Account of Rule-Following and Its Implications”. Stance Vol 1, April 1, 2008. <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2008_spring/12Wittgenstein.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Searle, John R. Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World. New York: Basic Books; 2000. (27). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)