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#### A] Interpretation: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose all taglines, full citations, and the first and last three words of the pieces of evidence read in their cases on the NDCA wiki at least one hour before the round

#### B] Violation: My opponent only has one aff round disclosed, it’s a different aff than the one they have on the wiki, and they haven’t disclosed docs for any of the round from this tournament or Blake or Columbia where they also competed

#### C] Net Benefits:

**1] Research** **– disclosure increases research and gets rid of anti-educational arguments because debaters are forced to prepare cases knowing that people will have answers AND people get the opportunity to research answers to disclosed cases.**

**Nails 13** - (Jacob [I am a policy debater at Georgia State University. I debated LD for 4 years for Starr's Mill High School (GA) and graduated in 2012.] "A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third-Party Disclosure)" http://nsdupdate.com/2013/a-defense-of-disclosure-including-third-party-disclosure-by-jacob-nails/)

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that **the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides.** First, **disclosure streamlines research. Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of.** Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. **The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory,** the increased quality of information **[this] could trade off with quantity**. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one’s own research. **Empirically**, however**, the opposite has been true.** In fact, a second advantage of **disclosure is that it motivates research. Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same stock AC – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it.** Likewise, **debaters with access to their opponents’ cases can do more targeted and specific research. Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and adovcacies employed by other debaters.** The incentive to cut author-specific indicts is low if there’s little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student’s cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago. Lastly, and to my mind most significantly, **disclosure weeds out anti-educational arguments. I have in mind the sort of theory spikes and underdeveloped analytics whose strategic value comes only from the fact that the time to think of and enunciate responses to them takes longer than the time spent making the arguments themselves. If [theory spikes] these arguments were made on a level playing field where each side had equal time to craft answers, they would seldom win rounds, which is a testimony to the real world applicability (or lack thereof) of such strategies.** A model in which arguments have to withstand close scrutiny to win rounds creates incentive to find the best arguments on the topic rather than the shadiest. Having transitioned from LD to policy where disclosure is more universal, I can say that **debates are more substantive, developed, and responsive when both sides know what they’re getting into prior to the round**. The educational benefits of disclosure alone aren’t likely to convince the fairness-outweighs-education crowd, but I’ve learned over the course of many theory debates that most of that crowd has a very warped and confusing conception of fairness. **Debaters who produce better research are more deserving of a win. Debaters who can make smart arguments and defend them from criticism should win out over debaters who hide behind obfuscation.** That so many rounds these days are resolved on frivolous theory and dropped, single-sentence blips suggests that wins are not going to the “better debaters” in any meaningful sense of the term. The structure of LD in the status quo doesn’t incentivize better debating.

#### 2] Clash – Disclosure is the best method for increasing clash in debates because it allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion. It also allows for more specific clash because debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to link generic arguments in.

#### 3) Argument Quality-- Disclosure controls for the element of surprise. A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

#### 4) Disclosure improves second-line argumentation. In the status quo, debaters are forced to spend more time researching and writing answers on the first line of argumentation; having frontlines for your case in the 2NR or the 1AR is an advantage, not an expectation. If both sides had equal information to prepare first-line answers, debaters would have to devise more creative and thoughtful second-line arguments. The quality of analytics would increase in later rebuttals, which would teach debaters not only to construct, but also to defend, their arguments.

#### Education is a voter—there is no professional debate league, the benefit to debate is learning real world skills and learning about the world. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear briteline. No RVIs—

#### a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect

#### b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid
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#### Interpretation: debaters can’t lie about what whether they have read their aff before

#### Violation: \_\_\_ – screenshots above.

#### Vote negative for ethics and competitive equity – academic dishonesty in the real world gets students kicked out of college and a norm where debaters can say that their aff is new and then at 2 minutes before the round say its not means debaters don’t have to disclose which makes making effective ncs impossible and means we can’t read through their evidence to determine it wasn’t cut in an unethical way.

#### Disclosure and lying come before everything else—a) it predicates how 1NC strat happens, which is the basis for 1AR theory, b) ethics and honesty is the skill most important for future life-if debate can’t inculcate that, everything else is secondary.

## 3

#### 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.

#### Appropriation is necessarily based in the Lockean labor theory of property—that exerting labor on land makes it yours. That is the same logic used to justify settler colonialism.

Gardner Seawright, researcher at University of Wisconsin-Parkside writes in 2014-- Seawright, Gardner. "Settler traditions of place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of white supremacy and settler colonialism for place-based education." Educational Studies 50.6 (2014): 554-572. (AG DebateDrills)

In line with the “laws of nature” presented by John Locke, full persons are bound to respect fundamental freedom of other full persons—“we must consider what state all men are naturally in, and that is a state of perfect freedom to order their actions and dispose of their possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man” (Locke, 1690Locke, John. 1690/1952. The Second Treatise of Government. Edited by ThomasP. Peardon. New York: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]/1952, 4). Based on this understanding, the African slave trade and settler colonization in the Americas could only have been undertaken based on the socially fabricated assumption that African, Indigenous, and other peoples of color were indeed “inferior creatures” (6). The foundational essay by Cheryl Harris (1995Harris, Cheryl. 1995. “Whiteness as Property.” Harvard Law Review 106: 1707–1791. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]) explicates the fundamental principle behind this position, that whiteness is property and in contrast to the lack of embodied property found in non-whiteness. This indicates that when Locke (1690Locke, John. 1690/1952. The Second Treatise of Government. Edited by ThomasP. Peardon. New York: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]/1952) says, “every man has a property in his person,” he is operating from a particular racialized and gendered conception of personhood (17). The Lockean person is a “self-owning, nature-appropriating, rights-bearing being,” so the absence of property fixed to non-whiteness ultimately equates to non-personhood, thus positioning folks of color into the realm of nature and all things potentially appropriable (Mills 1998Mills, CharlesW. 1998. Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [Google Scholar], 154). According to Locke (1690Locke, John. 1690/1952. The Second Treatise of Government. Edited by ThomasP. Peardon. New York: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]/1952), “God gave the world to men in common; but since he gave it to them for their benefit and the greatest conveniences of life they were capable to draw from it, it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational—and labor was to be his title to it” (20; emphasis added). The freedom of the Lockean man is both rooted in and has helped formulate liberal capitalistic principles—in his “natural state” man has the right to dispose of (trade) his possessions (his property, including his own labor power and all things appropriated through his labor power) only bound by the laws of nature without being impeded by the will of any other man (Locke, 1690Locke, John. 1690/1952. The Second Treatise of Government. Edited by ThomasP. Peardon. New York: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]/1952, 4). The laws of nature informing Locke's work are predicated on the assumption that the rational actor is predisposed toward the industrious appropriation of nature, meaning that the rational social actor, in his natural state, will endeavor to accumulate and cultivate property. Pursuit of property is accompanied by the need to cultivate, to instill one's labor into the property. The Lockean sense of nature considers land to be “almost worthless,” because “it is labor then, which puts the greatest part of the value upon land” (Locke, 1690Locke, John. 1690/1952. The Second Treatise of Government. Edited by ThomasP. Peardon. New York: Macmillan. [Google Scholar]/1952, 26). Man is situated as superior to nature carrying, within the only potential worth for the natural world. This scenario elevates men to a status of dominion over the entire ecological world and all inferior beings (which, horrifically, includes communities of color and women, as well as all more-than-human animals). The desire of men to actualize this potential dominion results in a social understanding in which white propertied male individuals must utilize their “industrious talents” to accumulate private property to become “rational” men of substance (Mills 1998Mills, CharlesW. 1998. Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [Google Scholar], 154). The sense-of-self produced by this ethic is imbued with this desire to not only accumulate property but to cultivate, alter, and commodify the natural world. Contained within the limits of the natural world and potential property are non-white, female, and animal bodies, which links the racialized conception of personhood and a white ontology with white male supremacy and the rampant exploitation of the natural world. Historically, of course, Lockeanism of this Herrenvolk, racialized kind has justified both native American expropriation and African slavery, giving rise to a white moral consciousness accustomed to full or partial ownership first of nonwhite land and bodies and later of differential opportunities vis-à-vis nonwhites, with baseline expectations constructed accordingly. The Europeans who conquered and settled the continent represented aboriginal economies as virtually nonexistent, an assessment that gave rise to the notion of a New World arising ex nihilo through the labor of the [whites]. (Mills 1998Mills, CharlesW. 1998. Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [Google Scholar], 162, emphasis in original) Whites are given personhood within this system; non-whites are labeled as non- or subpersons. Within the white settler epistemology, a person's state of being and identity is correlated with exercising power over (appropriating and cultivating) the Earth and those marked as inferior. This means that within this structure of white supremacy, any individual actor operationalizing this epistemology, in line with normalized differential opportunities, are encouraged to aggressively exploit non-white bodies and the natural world, because doing so is rational and the pathway to fully realizing the extent of one's personhood. Consider this in relation to the example cited previously of settler actors aggressively pursuing Indigenous plants, seeds, and knowledges for purpose of genetic engineering and the mass accumulation of profit.

#### 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.

It means recognizing that “the movement” is not (only) about the present but rather demands both history and a ground(ing) that is both literal and metaphoric. The guiding vision is not human centered or derived but rather comes from land and all that sustains it. The less quoted, second half of Coulthard’s (2014) assertion is, “for capitalism to die, we must actively participate in the construction of Indigenous alternatives to it” (p. 173). The Indigenous project is not defined by liberal or juridical notions of justice. Indeed, liberalism’s reliance on the fantasy of the benevolent state and its refusal to relinquish the idea of a “new social order, built in the shell of the old,” ultimately solidifies the settler state. The so-called progressive movements built on liberal ideas give rise to organizing strategies held captive to the “reign of the perpetual present.” Such politics were epitomized by the Occupy Wall movement – its never-ending process of agenda building, leaderless and lateral structure and non-prescriptive slogan, “What is Our One Demand?” – all suggest an allegiance to the liberal ideal of freedom as individual liberty.

In contrast, Indigenous struggle is built on history and ancestral knowledge. It is informed by original teachings and the responsibility to uphold relations of mutuality. Attention to these teachings requires resistance and refusal of the fast, quick, sleek, and spectacular in favor of the steady, tried, consistent, and intergenerational. It is the replacement of “to each his own” and “may the best man win” with “we are all related.” As Debord observes, the spectacle is “the reigning social organization of a paralyzed history, of a paralyzed memory, of an abandonment of any history founded in historical time” and, thus, “is a false consciousness of time” (158). We must refuse this false consciousness.

In the end, refracting liberal, social justice movements through an Indigenous lens compels us to be attentive to both the larger ontological and epistemic underpinnings of settler colonialism; to discern the relationship between our struggles and others; to disrupt complicity and ignite a refusal of the false promises of capitalism. This level of clarity removes the messy and participatory work of agenda setting that liberal movements insist upon, because, the agenda has already been set – a long time ago. It is about land and defense of land. Land is our collective past, our present, and our future. This is our one demand.