### 1

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

#### Violation: Graphical user interface, application, table Description automatically generated

#### 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

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### A~ anything else moots 7 minutes of the NC – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that their theory of power is better than another before you adopt it.

#### B~ 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.

#### C~ it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false. Inclusion is a fallacy of origin because just because something is a prerequisite doesn’t make it more important

#### D~ Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### E~ ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem.

#### F~ Other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape

### 3

#### Ethical disagreement is inevitable which requires us to understand ethics as pluralistic- best empirics.

Polzler and Wright 19[Thomas Pölzler and Jennifer Cole Wright- “Empirical research on folk moral objectivism” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6686698/> NCBI. Published July 5th 2019] UT AI

Examining these studies' results more closely, however, makes it less clear whether this interpretation is appropriate (Pölzler, 2018b). Take again Goodwin and Darley's study. In this study, almost 30% of subjects' responses to the disagreement measure and almost 50% of their responses to the truth‐aptness measure fell on the option that the researchers took to be indicative of subjectivism (Goodwin & Darley, 2008, pp. 1347, 1351). Moreover, while some moral statements were dominantly classified as objective (e.g., the above statement about robbery), many others were dominantly classified as nonobjective (e.g., the stem cell research statement). This suggests that subjects in Goodwin and Darley's study may have actually favored what Wright, Grandjean, and McWhite (2013) called “metaethical pluralism,” i.e., they sometimes sided with objectivism and other times with nonobjectivism. More recent studies have by and large confirmed this hypothesis of folk metaethical pluralism. Wright et al. (2013) and Wright, McWhite, and Grandjean (2014), for example, replicated Goodwin and Darley's results, using the exact same measures, but letting subjects classify the presented statements as moral and nonmoral themselves. Objectivity ratings for statements that were dominantly self‐classified as moral varied between as little as 5% and as much as 85%. Research based on different measures yielded high proportions of intrapersonal variation as well (e.g., Beebe, 2014; Beebe, Qiaoan, Wysocki, & Endara, 2015; Beebe & Sackris, 2016; Fisher, Knobe, Strickland, & Keil, 2017; Goodwin & Darley, 2012; Heiphetz & Young, 2017; Wright, 2018; Zijlstra, forthcoming‐a).2

#### **Only an agnostic deliberation model accepts ongoing confrontation as legitimate rather than oppositional.** Thus, we propose agonistic pluralism as a counter-methodology to

Mouffe 2[Chantal Mouffe- Chantal Mouffe is a Belgian political theorist, formerly teaching at University of Westminster. “The Democratic Paradox” Verso. London New York [https://monoskop.org/images/4/41/Mouffe\_Chantal\_The\_Democratic\_Paradox\_2000.pdf 2000](https://monoskop.org/images/4/41/Mouffe_Chantal_The_Democratic_Paradox_2000.pdf%202000)] Recut UT AI

Envisaged from the point of view of “agonistic pluralism”, the aim of democratic politics is to construct the “them” in such a way that it is no longer perceived as an enemy to be destroyed, but an “adversary”, i.e. somebody whose ideas we combat but whose right to defend those ideas we do not put into question. This is the real meaning of liberal democratic tolerance, which does not entail condoning ideas that we oppose or being indifferent to standpoints that we disagree with, but treating those who defend them as legitimate opponents. This category of the “adversary” does not eliminate antagonism, though, and it should be distinguished from the liberal notion of the competitor with which it is sometimes identified. An adversary is an enemy, but a legitimate enemy, one with whom we have some common ground because we have a shared adhesion to the ethico-political principles of liberal democracy: liberty and equality. But we disagree on the meaning and implementation of those principles and such a disagreement is not one that could not be resolved through deliberation and rational discussion. Indeed, given the ineradicable pluralism of value, there is not rational resolution of the conflict, hence its antagonistic dimension. This does not mean of course that adversaries can never cease to disagree but that does not prove that antagonism has been eradicated. To accept the view of the adversary is to undergo a radical change in political identity. It is more a sort of conversion than a process of rational persuasion (in the same way as Thomas Kuhn has argued that adherence to a new scientific paradigm is a conversion). Compromises are, of course, also possible; they are part and parcel of politics; but they should be seen as temporary respites in an ongoing confrontation.

#### No permutation in a methods debate: It’s a question of competing methodologies not whether they can be combined and Incentivizes 1ar shiftiness where they redefine their advocacy to make it compatible which is especially true when they read a non-topical aff.

#### Additionally prefer

#### 1] Performativity- Responding to our framework concedes the validity of agonism since that in and of itself is a process of contestation that agonism would say is valuable and necessary for spaces like debate to function.

#### 2] Root cause- Our method solve the root cause of all violence – an affirmation of ethics which recognize others is key.

Burggraeve [http://www.staff.amu.edu.pl/~ewa/Burggraeve-Violence%20and%20the%20Vulnerable%20Face%20of%20the%20Other.pdf (Roger Burggraeve was born in Passendale, Flanders (Belgium), in 1942. Salesian of Don Bosco (priest). Licentiate in Philosophy (Rome, 1966). Doctorate in Moral Theology (Leuven, 1980). Associate Professor at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven (1980-1988). Professor (Ordinarius) from 1988 till 2007; now Emeritus Professor.]

Strictly speaking, racism takes the view that one group of people is morally or culturally superior to another group, based on a hereditary difference in race. Racism considers the racial origin of an individual or a community as the factor determining not only the appearance but also the way of thinking and acting. Moreover, racism accords value to one race above all others, and one who is racist usually reckons himself among the superior race. According to racist thinking, people are considered in the ﬁrst place or even exclusively in terms of their belongingness to a different race, most often visible in color of skin and other physical features (ﬁgure, nose, eyes, and so forth). On the basis of these features, they are then judged and above all condemned. And these condemnations are in turn nourished and strengthened by all sorts of "images of the enemy” cast against the "other" race. For Levinas, it is clear that racism was incarnated in an "exceptional" way in the persecution of the Jews by the National Socialism of Hitler and his followers (AS 60), which he therefore designates as "the diabolical criminality of absolute evil” (CCH 82). In his work Mein Kampf, Hitler argued for the superiority of the so-called Aryan race, the race of the (Iber-mensch ["Superman”]. Only those who belonged to the "pure" Aryan race, who all the more so embodied this race purely, had the right to live and reproduce. The Nazis therefore not only developed ingenious, scientiﬁcally designed programs to "solve" the Jewish question (the Endlb’sung, or Shoah) by means of concentration camps and gas chambers (of which Auschwitz in Poland was only one, but the most famous). They also developed and enacted complex, extensive sterilization programs aimed speciﬁcally at the physically and mentally handicapped so that the Aryan race would not be stained by begetting "impure" children. And there were also the infamous euthanasia programs established in order to remove "gently" the incurably ill and mentally handicapped, who were thus less valuable and unnecessary members of the Aryan race. Because homosexuals did not contribute to the furthering of the pure Aryan race they were severely persecuted, and the gypsies were eradicated because they did not belong to the Aryan race and therefore represented a threat to its purity. In a Wider sense, one also speaks of racism when one recognizes and relates to others on the basis of their belonging to another culture, language group, or religion. As contemporary examples of this, we can point to the manner in which people today reject immigrants from the Arab world and wish to expel them because of their origin in another religion, speciﬁcally Islam and its related traditions. Or think of the long-standing suppression and discrimination against African Americans in the United States, many of whose ancestors were brought over from Africa as slaves. According to Levinas, the core of racism consists not in the denial of, or failure to appreciate, similarities between people, but in the denial of, or better said, failure to appreciate and value, people’s differences, or better still, the fundamental and irreducible otherness by which they fall outside of every genre and are thus “unique”: "Alterity ﬂows in no sense out of difference, to the contrary difference goes back to alterity” (VA 92). A racist relation wants to recognize and value only the "same," or one’s “own” [het eigene], and therefore excludes the "foreign." Out of self-defense, we are easily inclined to accept and consider positively only that which agrees with, or is "similar" to, ourselves. One finds the other embarrassing, threatening, and frightening. One therefore tries to expel him from oneself, to place him outside so that he can be considered as the "enemy" from whom one "may" defend oneself, and whom one may even "destroy" as what brings life and well-being under pressure, unless one can reduce him to oneself or make him a part of oneself. One wants to accept ”others” (or "strangers," or ”foreigners”) only to the extent that they belong to one’s own “genre” or “kind,” which is to say to one’s own blood and soil, to the same family, tribe, sex, clan, nation, church, club, or community, do the same work, have the same birthplace and date. One’s ”own” is praised and even divinized at the price of the "other," which is vilified. The “stranger” becomes the scapegoat on whom we blame all of our problems and worries. One accepts differences only insofar as they are a matter of accidental particularities or specificities within a same genre or basic design, in which individuals differ from one another within a same “sort” only very relatively (for example, character, taste, intellectual level), and in which their deeper afﬁnity is not at all tested (VA 97). Against this background, it is clear that for Levinas anti-Semitism, as a specific and advanced form of racism, takes aim at the Jew as the intolerable other. For anti-Semitic thinking and sentiment, the Jew is simply the enemy, just as for every racism the other is the enemy as such, that is to say not on the basis of personality, one or another character trait, or a specific act considered morally troublesome or objectionable, but due only to his very otherness. In anti-Semitism, the Jew, as "other," is always the guilty one. It is never "oneself," the embodiment of the "same" that not only arranges everything around itself but also profiles itself as principle of meaning and value (CAJ 77—79).From this perspective on racism as rejection of the other, it appears, according to Levinas, that racism is not a rare and improbable phenomenon existing in the heart and thought of only some "perverse" people that has nothing to do with us. Insofar as one is, according to the spontaneous dynamic of existing, or conatus essendi, directed toward the "same," toward maintaining and fortifying one’s ”own”—all such as I have just sketched it—one must be considered "by nature” potentially racist, though of course without being "predestined" for it. In itself, this admits no question of psychological or pathological deviation. According to Levinas, this implies that one cannot simply dispense with the racism of Hitler and the Nazis, in contrast to something instead occurring only once, as a wholly distinct and incomparable phenomenon, at least if one views it not quantitatively but qualitatively, which is to say in terms of its roots and basic inspiration. In an attempt to hold open a pure—in fact, Manichean—distinction between "good" (us) and "bad" (the ”others”), thus keeping oneself out of range of the difficulties in question, it happens all too often that Hitlerism is described as something completely unique that has nothing in common with the aims and affairs of the common mortal. The perspective of Levinas shows that Hitlerism, with its genocide and other programs of eradication, is only a quantitative extension, that is to say a consistent, systematic, and inexorably reﬁned outgrowth of racism in its pure form, one that, in its turn, represents a concretization of the effort of existing, which, as the reduction of the other to the same, is the nature of our existence (without,on the other hand, our being abandoned to this nature as a fatality, since as ethical beings we can overcome it). No one is invulnerable; any of us is a potential racist, and at least sometimes a real racist. Racism, like Hitlerism, does not occur by chance, or by an accidental turn. Nor is it an exceptional perversion occurring in a group of psychologically disturbed people. It is a permanent possibility woven into the dynamic of our very being, so that Whoever accedes to and lives out the dynamic of his own being inevitably extends racism in one or another form (AS 60—61). We can no longer blame racism and anti-Semitism on "others," for both their possibility and the temptation to them are borne in the dynamic of our ohm being: as "non-reciprocal determination of the other” (T I 99), which is precisely the kernel of our freedom (TI 97). It is specifically to unmask this racist violence, and all forms of violence as modalities of denial of the other as other, that Levinas discerns the basic ethical norm in the commandment mentioned and explicated above, “Thou shall not kill,” which is to say in the commandment to ;respect the otherness of the other. In committing to the possible overcoming of evil, and of racism in particular, through the ethical choice for the good, Levinas certainly realizes how vulnerable this "overcoming" of evil is. By rejecting the idea that every objective system, through its ironclad, mechanistic laws and coerciveness, might be able to render evil impossible forever, and instead basing everything on the ethical call to the good, he makes clear that abuse, violence, and the racist exclusion and elimination of the other are constantly possible and can never be definitively overcome. In ethics, there is no eschatology, in the sense of a guaranteed "better world” or "world without evil.” There is only the ”good will” that must always prove itself in a choice against evil that is neither evident nor easy. Only in this way can there be a good future and justice for the other: only through ethical vigilance with respect to all forms of violence, tyranny, hate, and racism, and a society that nurtures in both our upbringing and education a “sensibility” for the other as “stranger.” Such a sensitivity takes in full seriousness the ethical essence of the human person, and serves always to put us back on the path to a culture "where the other counts more than I do,” and where the most foreign enjoys our complete hospitality.

#### Now Negate

#### 1] Being non-t is bad- It’s a deliberate attempt to moot contestation and clash within a deliberative structure which betrays the very core aspects of our framework.

#### 2] Gillespie- saying communicative structures like debate can never be valuable prove they foreclose the possibility of engaging in spaces like debate that can create valuable deliberative structures.

#### 3] Surrender to blackness- Saying we should unconditionally surrender ourselves to a group of people without truly engaging in a discussion of why their politics are valuable undermines deliberative structures and says we should accept truths without contesting them.

### 4

#### 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.

#### Outweighs under the Refusal RoTB – we’re a refusal of white recognition that separates resistance from liberal allyship.

#### This proves the Aff is a double-turn – their claims of “inclusion” are a double-turn w/ the totalizing refusal of problematic spaces such as Debate.

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)