### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021/2022 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation: you did not. Screenshots in Doc

#### 1] Evidence Ethics --- disclosure deters mis-cutting, power-tagging, abuse of brackets and ellipses, and plagiarism. Independent reason to vote you down because it promotes better norms about academic engagement---debate is an academic environment and must ensure that we become fair scholars. Even if you don’t lose on fairness in the round, you will lose in college if you violate academic ethics which establish a crucial real-world norm, and outweighs any in-round impact. Also, if you aren’t honest, we don’t know what else you’re lying about which means we don’t know if your arguments are actually true since they can be misrepresented.

#### 2] Revolutionary testing - their affirmative is an echo chamber absent the ability to test it from multiple angles which replicates the issue of status quo solvency because not everyone key to change starts from the position of understanding that their aff grants to their method. Black kids around the country rely on interconnected networks like disclosure to share methods and liberation tactics which makes our method key to your solvency.

#### 3] White Flooding DA – if only non-black debaters disclosed then the wiki would be full of super white arguments like friv theory and tricks. Turns new black debaters away from the community.

#### 4] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

### 2

#### We advocate the 1AC without their call for the ballot. To clarify, this is a PIC out of their demand to “take this round hostage” and “blacken the debate space”.

#### Calls to “blacken debate” creates a parasitic and de-radicalized relationship to white recognition that turns case.

Curry 13 Tommy Curry 2013, Professor of Philosophy at Texas A&M University, “Dr. Tommy Curry on the importance of debate for blacks,” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZMmkPhvDK2E#t=174> //Re-cut by Elmer

However, with the lure of progress, more black people are participating in debate, more black judges, more conceptual debates about blackness. There comes a deradicalization of what black theory and what black people are supposed to do and represent. Despite our pretense, debate is still a very privileged world. It’s a pretend world where black people can have their queerness, their feebleness, their faux radicality recognized. For actual oppressed people, people who can’t afford debate, who have no knowledge of debate, who fight against actual mechanisms of state, who are not recognized, these very same qualities mean death. So in debate rounds we get to act, we’re the conduits of this black suffering. The demographic increase in the black population in debate, however, it’s kind of brought about a new morality that’s committed to fighting for inclusion, intellectual space, our expanded ideas of home. But in this I think we miss the extent of our dependency on white recognition. That white judge in the back of the room that’s comprehending and assimilating our goals with their own liberal and progressive existence. In other words, it’s through our appeal to white men and women, our need for their recognition, for their ballot, that frames the ultimate message of our pessimism, our gender critiques, our colonial analysis. We’re fundamentally dependent on how the white mind situates itself conceptually to the project of diversification. We appeal to their sympathy, or worse yet, to the intersectional empathies of whites as the gauge of the transformative potentialities of black theory and historic black thought. So in these spaces real radicality does not come from an appeal to white recognition, but the rejection of it. In the declaration that black knowledge or black theory or black accounts of existence in all of the economic and sexual plurality of our thought is the radicality comes from the idea that we think that those questions can be answered in the annals of how black people have historically thought about themselves. It need not depend on our alliances or allegiances with white liberals rationalizing their own existence as justifiable through their endorsement or alliances with what we think about ourselves or black people’s situation in the world. Black debate should ultimately move to the rejection of white education – adjudication if black theory is about the liberation of black people and a move to definitions of knowledge or cells or concepts that don’t currently exist then how can we expect the dilapidated ideas of white sentimentality projected from an archaic and racialized whiteness to understand or even comprehend the interrelatedness of propositions that are beyond their present being. How they understand something that is beyond their very own existence the true radicality of black people debating points to the negation of white comprehension of black ideas of liberation not their assimilation or recognition of them. So these ideas of us saying we have progressed fundamentally rooted in how white people see us is a problem.

#### Hijacks King 17 – we’re a refusal of white recognition that separates resistance from liberal allyship.