### 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.

#### Framing: You can’t coopt any of the reasons why procedurals are bad in the context of the affirmative since I don’t constrain your ability to read it– the contention is that this aff should’ve been read, just disclosed.

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must wear a Santa hat at the Longhorn Classic. If a fellow debater asks for a Santa hat, then you are required to give them one given that you are financially able to do so. Merry Early Christmas everyone!

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards –

#### 1] Inclusion – 3 internal links

#### A] Wearing Santa hats make debate less toxic as people associate it with good memories of the past. Empirically proven by all the feel good associated with Christmas like carols, presents, etc.

#### B] Embracing the holidays earlier inspires more calendar time to celebrate gratitude, especially during a time of need when some people are experiencing hardships - solves the aff as well because everybody would be incentivized to stop racial hate crimes and violence

#### C] If people don’t have Santa Hats, it teaches debaters to ask others for one which is the key to bridging the divide between rich and poor people. – that signals a step to bridging the gap between black underresourced debaters and others as well which eventually spills over to resolving the aff as well

### 3

#### 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

### 4

#### Text: Vote Neg to redact the 1AC - the CP does the aff but doesn't say it

#### Solves the Aff – the net benefit is crackdowns- disclosing militant strategies leads to militant crackdowns and the fracturing of collectivity

### 5

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must specify and separately delineate a role of the ballot in the 1AC

#### Violation: they didn’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Shiftiness- They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague aff Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of antiblackness coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1AR which gives them access to multiple contingent standards.

#### 2] Real World- Critical educators need to be as specific as possible when delineating their theory since there are so many nuances and contextual applications of philosophy that require us to understand the core differences within the philosophy.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what framing mechanism the affirmative defends and how to link offense back to it

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)