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#### Genocidal disposition is not an event but on an ongoing process that functions through a tripartite structure of elimination, replacement, and indoctrination. Debate as a competitive research activity is not isolated from said violence, but works to iteratively indoctrinate settler ideologies which is necessary to maintain the broader process of genocide.

Patel 14 [Lisa (Leigh) Patel (2014), Countering Coloniality in Educational Research: From Ownership to Answerability, Educational Studies, 50:4, 357-377, DOI: 10.1080/00131946.2014.924942, Accesed via Taylor Francis Online]//itsnagisa

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AS SETTLER COLONIALISM The United States, in addition to many other places such as Australia, Canada, and Israel, is ongoing project of settler colonialism (Byrd 2011; A. Smith 2010; Wolfe 1991). Rather than a single event, settler colonialism is a continuous process and logic with three mutually dependent components (Tuck and Yang 2012), all of which work in tandem and rely on each other to maintain the structure of colonialism. The first practice is to seize the land, resources, cultural practices, and goods of a desired location. Beginning with land grabs in the 14th century and continuing through contemporary times, the United States was founded on the practice of outsiders claiming land and resources. However, in settler colonialism, there can never be enough land to satisfy the thirst of a few. The logic of physical invasions and opportunistic treaties with Native peoples echo in contemporary times with private takeover of public, potentially collective, spaces (Martusewicz, Edmondson, and Lupinacci 2011). In education, this is most notable through the dismantling of public education (Fine and Fabricant 2012) for the proliferation of privatized venture philanthropy in education and teacher education, leveraged through educational metrics measuring teacher, school, and pupil performance (Kumashiro 2010). As one of the last public spaces in the United States, education has experienced a surge of privatization that acts in keeping with a genealogy of land grabs. What were once public schools, with names like Washington Elementary School or Paul J. Robeson High School, are increasingly renamed and claimed for private interests, with many locations simultaneously claimed and linked through private ownership, under the names of Harlem Children's Zone, Kipp Academy, and MATCH (e.g. http://www.matcheducation.org/). Au and Ferrare's (2014) network analysis reveals the small number of educational reformers who leverage disproportionately large symbolic and material sponsorship to establish private-like charters and claim those lands. But to sustain this land grab, the peoples already residing there must be eliminated for settlers to replace them, whereby state-sanctioned violence occurs as a second conjoining practice of settler colonialism. As Smith (2012) put it, “This logic holds that indigenous peoples must disappear. In fact, they must always be disappearing, in order to enable non-indigenous peoples’ rightful claim to land. Through this logic of genocide, non-Native peoples then become the rightful inheritors of all that was indigenous—land, resources, indigenous spirituality, and culture.” A key trope through which settler colonialism operates is erasing to replace. The land grabs relied on, and continue to rely on, codified blood quantum laws to ensure the gradual diminishment of Native peoples. This logic is present in the land grabs of public schooling spaces that use the law and metrics of achievement as codified strategies to claim property, specifically through the marginalizing and eroding of histories and place-based knowledges of communities (Fenwick 2013). K–12 schools are also connected to the tertiary education and the forms of knowledge and knowledge production sanctioned therein. Higher education, as key companion pillar with the church and state in the establishment of this settler colony as a nation (Wilder 2013), further reflects these move of settling, including erasing to replace. The settler colonial project first constructed colleges as places for ministerial education for wealthy men, with strict focus on Greek, Latin, geometry, ancient history, logic, ethics and rhetoric, with few discussions, or as Freire (1970) termed, a banking approach to education wherein students, even the privileged male students allowed to enjoy this property, were seen as vessels in which the culture of the colony should be sown. For White men, though, this planting of knowledge was with home codes and perspectives. For Indigenous communities, this banking approach erased their lived experiences with Eurocentric epistemologies, which can never be made home because of the dispossession it is premised upon (Anzaldúa 1999). This project of erasure is found throughout many of the historical manifestations of IHEs’ curricula, a logic that grounded Indian boarding schools in the philosophy of “kill the Indian to save the man” (Pratt 1892, 214). Contemporary manifestations of this logic include the maintained and protected use of euro-centric curricula and pedagogy as common core to a solidified banking approach to higher education (Spring 2010). As Wilder points out in his historical analysis of the roles elite institutions of higher education played in supporting, exploiting, and perpetuating slavery in the United States, studies that unproblematically investigate how to best and most efficiently teach academic standardized English to nonnative speakers are complicit in this erase to replace colonial trajectory. It is important to note here that the deepest investment of settler colonialism is to erase Indigenous peoples. The erasure of culture and language of minoritized peoples, such as migrants, works in tandem with replacing Indigenous peoples with others, such as migrant workers, but not as landowners. The erasure of Indigeneity is also apparent in the knowledge production more specifically located in educational research that names White, Black, and Latino populations, sometimes Asian, but rarely Indigenous peoples in statistics of school-based achievement. Although the White center of achievement gap studies problematically reifies Whiteness as normal and desirable (Leonardo 2009), the failure to name Indigenous peoples acts echoes this need to erase. Even though the recent US federal policy of No Child Left Behind (NCLB 2002), prompted states and districts to disaggregate achievement data according to racial groups, including Indigenous students, the prevailing trope in educational research, particularly well-funded educational research, is the achievement gap between White and Asian to that of Black and Latino students. This binary leverages a linked achievement rate of glossed-over statistics of various Asian Americans’ achievement to standards of White achievement to fundamentally locate deficit within Black and Latino populations while also erasing Indigenous peoples. Additionally, the US federal policies of NCLB and its follower, Race to the Top ([RTTP] 2001) demand identification to punish so-identified delinquent populations, rather than to redress a system based on colonial stratification (Leonardo 2009). By organizing research around these policies and pursuing their funding streams, not only has federally sanctioned educational research contributed to this construction of Whiteness, it has also supported the almost constant conflation between test scores and learning, an abrogation of responsibility to which I return in the conclusion of the article. A third necessary practice of settler colonialism, and one that conjoins tightly with White supremacy in the United States, is to import slave labor in chains and render human beings as chattel. In this process, humanity is immediately put in tension with, and ultimately subjugated to, property. African slaves became chattel long before the transporting ships reached their destinations, with bodily treatment of the captured Africans becoming the first in an ongoing stripping away of humanity (Spillers 1987). Continuing through the contemporary prison industrial complex and the low-wage locations of forced migrants (Ngai 2005), slave labor is necessary to become chattel, harvest the resources of the land and, through economic stratification and sequestering, ensure that land and property rights are reserved for a much smaller group of settlers. Higher education is, like other social fields in capitalist-anchored settler colonies, predicated on individuals holding differential status so that many are competing for the limited resources of higher status, reflected in salary and reputation. Within that field, publications and grant procurement (Daza, 2012, 2013a) represent the forms of capital most readily translated into higher status. By reflecting rather interrupting hierarchies based on competition and status, the academy has sustained problematic relationships with vulnerabilized communities (Tuck 2009). Part of this has transpired through scholarship that has worked from and validated racist premises of societal difference (Wilder 2013), as well as the relationships between researcher and researched (Tuck and Guishard 2013). For applied fields, such as educational research, these patterns manifest themselves in who is researched and what theoretical frames drive the data gathering, analysis, and implications.

#### The will to elimination has indoctrinated itself into all settler institutions making genocidal elimination possible. The inevitable 1AR’s link turns and permutations will conflate the distinctions between colonization and racialized violence and in such create a quagmire rather than creating a language to fuel liberation programs. This should be starred as a reason why you should at least within debate refuse to invest into a politics of contingency

Rifkin 14 [Mark, 'Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance,']//itsnagisa

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associations they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settlercolonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func - tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sovereignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and maintain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and management: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix).

#### The 1AC is a call upon the shadow archive that uses the benign affect of medical access to enact widespread genocidal violence.

Pugliese 13 [Pugliese, Joseph] "State Violence and the Execution of Law Biopolitical caesurae of torture, black sites, drones” *GlassHouse Book,* 2013]//itsnagisa

As I remarked in Chapter 2 in the context of Abu Ghraib, the shadow archive is an historical repository of discursive practices that, although barely discernible because of its shadow status, continues to animate and shape the cultural intelligi- bility of contemporary practices. Haunting this contemporary use of medicine for biopolitical warfare, experimentation, and torture is a dense shadow archive of colonial and racist medicine that has been critical in shaping the biopolitical configuration of the US nation. The brutal literality of the power of colonial disease to determine who would live and who would die is clearly evidenced in the case of smallpox. The colonial settlers of North America deployed smallpox as a technique of biowarfare to advance the destruction of Native Americans in order to facilitate land clearing and white colonization. In their study of the destructive impact of the disease on Native American communities in colonial North America, Kristine Patterson and Thomas Runge note that: ‘Smallpox ultimately killed more Native Americans in the early centuries than any other disease or conflict. It was not unusual for half a tribe to be wiped out; on some occasions, the entire tribe was lost.’25 Referring to the first documented account of the power of smallpox to effect mass extermination, the authors write that: ‘The first epidemic occurred in 1616 along the Massachusetts coast, eliminating nearly 90% of the Massachusetts tribe of the Algonquin nation. This was later referred to as an act of Divine Providence to clear the land for settlers that landed at Plymouth in 1620.’26 The historical moment that marks the colonial foundation of the white nation is inscribed with an epidemiological case of ethnic cleansing that dovetails perfectly with a germinal form of that providential myth that will expand expo- nentially in its latter guise as Manifest Destiny – with its attendant massive campaign of genocidal expropriation of Native American lands. As a technique of biowarfare, smallpox operated as a ‘Trojan Horse,’ entering Native American communities through gifts of blankets and barrels inoculated with the disease. In an effort to quash Native American resistance against the conquest of their lands, one military officer recommends that: ‘You [Colonel Henry Bouquet] will do well to try and inoculate the Indians by means of blankets, as well as to try every other method tha[t] can serve to extirpate this execrable race.’27 This campaign of extir- pation assumed many forms and continued well into the twentieth century, with the US state mobilizing medical personnel in the forced sterilization of Native American women. Native American women, Andrea Smith notes, are ‘threat- ening because of their ability to reproduce the next generation of peoples who can resist colonization’;28 consequently, their bodies become the target of biowarfare practices such as sterilization. Administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, steril- ization rates as ‘high as 80 percent’ have been documented on some reserva- tions.29 The practice of obtaining informed consent was either entirely disregarded or ‘consent forms were signed while the patient was anesthetized or in the throes of labor.’30 As a technique of biowarfare deployed in order to neuter and extin- guish the state’s designated enemies, the threat of sterilization reared its contem- porary head in one of the US’s transnational gulags: ‘In January 2004 at a holding facility, an interrogator assigned to a SOF [Special Operations Forces] unit told two detainees that they would be sterilized, then poured the contents of a Chemlight onto one of the detainee’s genitals.’31

#### International law attempts to uphold the ideology of colonial saviorism – it attempts to justify ongoing genocide and serves as a scheme to remake native cultures into a Eurocentric image.

**Mutua 01** [Mutua, Makau, Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights (2001). Harvard International Law Journal, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 201-245, 2001, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1525547>] //DD PT

The idea that the human rights corpus is concerned with ordering the lives of non-European peoples has a long history in international law itself. More recent scholarship explores this link between international law and the imposition of European norms, values, ideas, and culture on non-European societies and cultures. Since the inception of the current international legal order some five centuries ago, there have been outright challenges by non-European cultures to the logic, substance, and purpose of international law. The development of human rights has only blunted, but not eliminated, some of those challenges. V. THE METAPHOR OF THE SAVIOR The metaphor of the savior is constructed through two intertwining characteristics—Eurocentric universalism and Christianity's missionary zeal. This section examines these characteristics and the institutional, international actors who promote liberal democracy as the antidote to human rights abuses. First, the savior metaphor is deeply embedded in the Enlightenment's universalist pretensions, which constructed Europe as superior and as center of the universe. International law itself is founded on these assumptions and premises. International law has succeeded in governing "states of all civilizations, European and non-European," and it has become "universal" although some have argued that it bears an ethnocentric fingerprint. In addition to the Eurocentric focus of human rights, the metaphor of the savior is also located in the missionary's Christian religion. Inherent to any universalizing creed is an unyielding faith in the superiority of at least the beliefs of the proselytizer over those of the potential convert, if not over the person of the convert. The project of universality or proselytism seeks to remake the "other" in the image of the converter. Christianity has a long history of such zealotry. Both empire-building and the spread of Christendom justified the means. Crusades, inquisitions, witch burnings, Jew burnings and pogroms, burnings of heretics and gay people, of fellow Christians and of infidels —all in the name of the cross. It is almost as if Constantine, upon his and his empires conversion to Christianity in the fourth century, uttered a well-fulfilled prophecy when he declared: 'In the name of this cross we shall conquer.' The cross has played the role of weapon time and time again in Christian history and empire building. In fact, the political-cultural push to universalize one's beliefs can be so obsessive that it has been identified frequently with martyrdom in history. [T]he supreme sacrifice was to die fighting under the Christian emperor. The supreme self-immolation was to fall in battle under the standard of the Cross .... But by the time Christianity was ready to meet Asia and the New World, the Cross and the sword were so identified with one another that the sword itself was a cross. It was the only kind of cross some conquistadores understood. There is a historical continuum in this impulse to universalize Eurocentrism and its norms and to ratify them under the umbrella of "universalism." Whether it is in the push for free markets, liberal systems of government, "civilized" forms of dress, or in the ubiquity of the English language itself, at least the last five centuries can appropriately be called the Age of Europe. These Eurocentric models have not been content to remain at home. They intrinsically define themselves as eternal truths. Universalization is an essential attribute of their validity. This validation comes partly from the conquest of the "primitive" and his introduction and delivery to "civilization." For international law, Anghie has captured this impulse clearly: [T]he extension and universalization of the European experience, which is achieved by transmuting it into the major theoretical problem of the discipline [international law], has the effect of suppressing and subordinating other histories of international law and the people to whom it has applied. Within the axiomatic framework of positivism, which decrees that European states are sovereign while non-European states are not, there is only one means of relating the history of the non-European world, and this the positivists proceed to do: it is a history of the civilizing mission, the process by which peoples of Africa, Asia, the Americas, and the Pacific were finally assimilated into a European international law. The impulses to conquer, colonize, save, exploit, and civilize non- European peoples met at the intersection of commerce, politics, law, and Christianity and evolved into the Age of Empire. As put by John Norton Pomeroy, lands occupied by "persons who are not recognized as belonging to the great family of states to whom international law applies" or by "savage, barbarous tribes" belonged as of right upon discovery to the "civilized and Christian nation." The savior-colonizer psyche reflects an intriguing interplay of both European superiority and manifest destiny over the subject. The "othering" project degrades although it also seeks to save. One example is the manipulative manner in which the British took over large chunks of Africa. Lord Lugard, the British colonialist, described in denigrating language a "treaty-making" ceremony in which an African ruler "agreed" to "British protection." He described this ceremony with both parties "[s]eated cross-legged on a mat opposite to each other on the ground, you should picture a savage chief in his best turn-out, which consists probably of his weapons of war, different chalk colourings on his face, a piece of the skin of a leopard, wild cat, sheep or ox." As put by a European missionary, the "Mission to Africa" was "the least that we [Europeans] can do ... to strive to raise him [the African] in the scale of mankind." Anghie notes that the deployment of denigrating, demeaning language is essential to the psyche of the savior. He writes: The violence of positivist language in relation to non-European peoples is hard to overlook. Positivists developed an elaborate vocabulary for denigrating these peoples, presenting them as suitable objects for conquest, and legitimizing the most extreme violence against them, all in the furtherance of the civilizing mission — the discharge of the white man’s burden. Human rights law continues this tradition of universalizing Eurocentric norms by intervening in Third World cultures and societies to save them from the traditions and beliefs that it frames as permitting or promoting despotism and disrespect for human rights itself.

#### The alternative is total refusal – only in this mode of upheaval are new futurisms possible

Grande 18 – Sandy Grande, Professor of Education and Director of the Center for the Critical Study of Race and Ethnicity at Connecticut University, 2018 (“Refusing the Settler Society of the Spectacle,” Handbook of Indigenous Education, Published by Springer, Edited by Elizabeth Ann McKinley and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, ISBN 978-981-10-1839-8, pp. 1-17)

Indigenous Refusal and the Twenty-First-Century Ghost Dance

As articulated by Indigenous scholars, Julian Brave NoiseCat and Anne Spice, “At Standing Rock, the audacious vision for an indigenous future, handed down from Wounded Knee and global in force, is alive and well.” In order for this “audacious vision” to be fully realized, it is up to all of us to see and work past the glimmer of spectacle, to resist the cult of the immediate, and to do the more deliberative work of history, earnestly connecting past with present. This requires a collective refusal to participate in the theater of cruelty and choose instead to dismantle the settler consciousness that enables it. Such efforts entail working beyond and below the surface, keeping an eye toward the process by which relations of mutuality are either abandoned or eroded by relations of capital – to in effect, decolonize.

Within this struggle, Indigenous nations, peoples, and knowledge are crucial, not because they hold any magic or “ancient wisdom” but because they represent the most enduring and resilient entities that present a competing moral vision to the settler order. Despite myriad struggles, Native peoples have maintained their autonomy and political sovereignty for centuries, confounding the infamous Thatcherism, “There is No Alternative.” And insofar as current patterns of thinking and being have contributed to the existing political, economic, and environmental crises of our time, it is incumbent upon all of us to protect the complex ecologies that sustain Indigenous communities. That said, I want to be clear that by “protect” I do not mean appropriate, mimic, exploit, or put on display. I mean to create and sustain the conditions under which such communities continue to survive and thrive.

Settlers desiring to be accomplices in the decolonial project need to assume the stance of advocate (not spectator) for Indigenous rights and perhaps more importantly, for whitestream transformation. Within activist spaces this means demonstrating a willingness to stand on the front lines to help contain the metastasizing neoliberalism. As argued by Glen Coulthard (2014), “For Indigenous nations to live, capitalism must die” (p. 173). This also necessarily demands a prior rejection of liberalism. Particularly now, as pundits and scholars begin to dissect the “success” of #NoDAPL, it is important to register the long-understood failures of liberal politics and belief in reform – of the liberal subject, of capital, of the state – through “peaceful” action and “rational” discourse. Any movement that does not first recognize the irrationality and violence of the settler state and its envoys is by definition anti-Indian.

#### FW: Eval the 1AC as a scholarly artifact – the affirmative should have to defend their epistemic orientation prior to evaluating a risk of fiated solvency.

#### a.] Anti-Naitve Education DA – Fiat is illusory and voting for them doesn’t do anything – but voting negative can reshape the scholastic practices within this activity – that outweighs because repeated practices presented in speech activities give way to parasitic spaces only challenging the underlying epistemology that shapes that is able to disrupt those settler psyches and mitigate the violence in an anti-settler activity. That Comes first: 1.] A 1% chance that debate does shape subject formation outweighs a risk that it doesn’t – because its not worth risking genocide. 2.] Accessibility structures procedural fairness - if we win a link argument it proves why the space that they forward is not only violent but also inaccessible for native folx.

#### B.] Isopolitics DA – Fiat is a form of colonial roleplaying whereby debaters can play the colonizer pretending to legislate on this land which all necessarily presumes an ethicality behind land ownershop and western law. Negation of this authority destabilizes this organizing logic of settler Political selfhood which is an independent reason you should vote negative. This means that we have impact turned their end point of their education offense because rather the constructing advocates who push towards a decolonial ethics, the skills they create, cultivate settlers who think they are more creative without giving out the land.

## Case

#### Their refusal to allow contestation of spikes when extended in the NR recreates ableism – people with learning disabilities might miss a spike and lose.

**Thompson:** Marshall Thompson [debater at Whitman and coach of Harrison HS. Big fan of Wittgenstein, Winnie the Pooh and all around great guy]. “Musings on Debate.” NSD, PDT, VBI.

First, I think that **evaluating who is the better debater via** who **dropped spikes** **excludes** lots of specific **individuals**, especially those **with learning disabilities**. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia.  Despite debating for four years with a lot of success **I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed**, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time.I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that **if spikes had** had **anywhere near the same prevalence** when **I** started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—**would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD** (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that **the values that debate cares about** and should be assessing **are not questions of handwriting or notation**. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. **Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so**. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.) Second, **spikes add in a greater dimension of randomness** to the round. If they are seen then they are ‘caught’ then they don’t really help you win, if they are not they do. **Against most debaters one can ‘reliably’ beat them or will ‘reliably’ lose to them. With cases with lots of spike** however, **one might generally beat them and** then **once just miss a spike and it is all over.** If the round were to have happened at a different time then the spike might have been caught. This ‘luck’ dimension strikes me as at least giving reason to think it does not track with what we want when assessing who did the better debating.

#### K’s come first – if you’re racist, then who cares about math

### Protect the 2NR

#### 1] Time skew--I can respond to new 1AR positions only once with the 2NR and none of my first speech matters, encouraging the aff to always introduce new 1AR layers since they get 2 speeches on the new issue they introduce and that issue comes first in the decision calculus and they can sit on it for 3 minutes in the 2ar, meaning they got the last say on all impact weighing.

#### 2] Judge intervention – it’s difficult to objectively resolve debates that only have 3 speeches since arguments aren’t fully fleshed out. Biggest link to fairness because its irreversible, debaters can still win rounds skewed against them, but not debates where the judge intervenes.

#### 3] Clash – 1AR is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1N. You are the empirical proof—you go for 1ar theory all the time. Clash has strongest link into unique and transferable education. Without it the vast majority of the debate is scripted and skewed towards topic-independent meta-debates.

### 1AR Theory

#### Drop the arg –

#### 1] Real world – we don’t give the death penalty for stealing a pencil – being slightly abusive doesn’t justify a loss since it’s disproportional – key to modeling the judicial process

#### 2] Topic ed – a) drop the debater incentivizes more theory for cheapshot wins which leads to substance crowd out, b) drop the arg allows us to go back to substance which o/w since it’s the only portable benefit, c) kills innovation since debaters don’t want to lose on theory which harms deep research

#### 3] Baiting – they encourage prep outs and RVIs which proliferates abuse – turns deterrence and is more probable since it’s proven by 2Ns scripting the condo and PICs theory debates and 1ARs on T

#### 4] Intervention – resolving the round on a blippy theory debate increases the chance a round is decided incorrectly which is definitionally unfair

#### Reasonability –

#### 1] Substance trade-off—the aff will always choose a more marginal interpretation, leading to negative strategies dependent on frequent theory debates. It is better to debate mostly fair than always debate the procedural issue of theory—your job is to foster educational debates about the topic

#### 2] Race to nowhere—competing interpretations makes the most strategic option the smallest interp which means the neg will always violate something

### New 2N Responses

#### Allow new 2N responses to blippy 1ac tricks – a) clash – anything else incentivizes hiding spikes to take out vast swathes of NC offense i.e. no neg fiat, b) inclusion – novices and lay debaters don’t know how to minesweep and are deterred from the activity – voter since you have to be in debate to gain from it

### Prag

#### 1] Justification of pragmatism as a method to find truth requires experimentation with what is an acceptable kind of idea – the only way to arrive at conclusions is by deciding that some ideas are good and some are bad, which means pragmatism alone is insufficient – a definition of the good can not be derived experientially since definitions are required to make sense of experience