## 1

## Framework

#### [Reid-Brinkley] CURRENT DEBATE RENDERS BLACK SCHOLARSHIP INVISIBLE – it distances us from the real-world violence of white power structures.

Reid-Brinkley: Reid-Brinkley, Dr. Shanara. [Ph.D., Assistant Professor and Co-Director of Forensics at California State University, Fullerton] “The Harsh Realities of ‘Acting Black’: How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate Representation Through Racial Performance and Style.” University of Georgia, Spring 2008. CV/CH

Genre Violation Four: Policymaker as Impersonal and the Rhetoric of Personal Experience. Debate is a competitive game. 112 It requires that its participants take on the positions of state actors (at least when they are affirming the resolution). Debate resolutions normally call for federal action in some area of domestic or foreign policy. Affirmative teams must support the resolution, while the negative negates it. The debate then becomes a “laboratory” within which debaters may test policies. 113 Argumentation scholar Gordon Mitchell notes that “Although they may research and track public argument as it unfolds outside the confines of the laboratory for research purposes, in this **approach** students witness argumentation beyond the walls of the academy as spectators**, with little or no apparent recourse to directly participate or alter the course of events.**” 114 Although debaters spend a great deal of time discussing and researching government action and articulating arguments relevant to such action, **what happens in debate rounds has limited or no real impact on contemporary governmental policy making. And participation does not result in the majority of the debate community engaging in activism around the issues they research**. Mitchell observes that the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture.” 115 In other words, its **participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like torture, terrorism, genocide and nuc**lear **war without blinking. Debate simulations can only serve to** distance **the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about**. As William Shanahan remarks: …the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. When we blithely call for United States Federal Government policymaking, **we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent**. **We cannot wish away the horrific atrocities** perpetrated everyday in our name simply **by refusing to acknowledge** these implications” (emphasis in original). 116 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona. The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts. As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is **integrally** **linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression.** In other words, the discursive practices of policyoriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege. Thus, these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony. So, rather than seeing themselves as government or state actors, Jones and Green choose to perform themselves in debate, violating the more “objective” stance of the “policymaker” and require their opponents to do the same.

#### [ROJ] The Role of the Judge is to Promote Access to Black Scholarship, meaning they must prioritize Black authors in their approach to the topic.

#### [King] This is a prereq to any understanding of IPPs, since anything else results in serial policy failure by ignoring why violence happens –Band-Aid solutions don’t work.

King: King, Colbert I. [Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for *The Washington Post*] “The key reason why racism remains alive and well in America.” *The Washington Post*, June 26, 2015. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/why-racism-still-flourishes/2015/06/26/d0e1f2e4-1b6e-11e5-ab92-c75ae6ab94b5\_story.html CH

In our faltering efforts to deal with race in this country, a great deal of time is devoted to responding to symptoms rather than root causes. That may help explain why racism keeps repeating itself. Exhibit One is the recurring cases of racism at colleges. In February 2013, Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity was suspended by Washington University in St. Louis after the fraternity’s pledges were accused of singing racial slurs to African American students. Last November, the University of Connecticut suspended Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity after a confrontation with members of the historically black Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority in which AKAs were called racially and sexually charged epithets. This year in March, a University of Maryland student resigned from Kappa Sigma fraternity after being suspended for sending an e-mail containing racially and sexually suggestive language about African American, Indian and Asian women. Also this year, disciplinary action was taken against members of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity at the University of Oklahoma who participated in a racist chant, caught on video, about lynching African Americans. We have not seen the end of racist fraternity and sorority actions on college campuses. That’s because the actions taken in response to these incidents by well-meaning universities were directed at symptoms. Epithets, chants and derogatory language about African Americans are indicators of an underlying problem within the offending white students, namely an antagonism against blacks based upon feelings of white superiority. With suspensions and expulsions, the college community rids itself of a particular manifestation but not the underlying problem, which is racial prejudice. The United States has been treating evidence of racism, and not the causes, since the Civil War. Slavery; “separate but equal”; segregated pools, buses, trains and water fountains; workplace and housing discrimination; and other forms of bias and animus have served as painful barometers of the nation’s racial health. They have been, however, treated like the pain that accompanies a broken leg. The effort was to treat or reduce the agonizing symptoms of the break rather than fix it. The 13th, 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution extended civil and legal protections to former slaves. They eased the pain, but the leg was still broken. Anti-lynching laws scattered the lynch mobs. But the pain flared up again with beatings, bombings and assassinations. Our nation responded to racial anguish with a variety of measures: the 1954 Brown school desegregation decision, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1965 Voting Rights Act and numerous rules and regulations to address those things that caused generations of African Americans — when the shades were drawn — to groan, weep, grit their teeth and swear that their children would not experience the demeaning, disrespectful and immoral treatment that they had to endure. However, these legal remedies, while addressing the excruciating racial pain, didn’t deal with the enduring problem: the racism itself that caused the South to secede from the Union; that led state legislatures and governors to birth Jim Crow laws; that sparked the KKK’s reign of terror; and that encouraged school districts and town zoning officials to institutionalize barriers against black citizens in housing, education and employment. And racism is still at it in the 21st century. All you have to do is look at those frat boys cited above to see that it’s going strong. Witness, too, the enactment of laws passed since President Obama’s 2008 election to make it harder for African Americans to vote. And then there is Dylann Roof, the alleged Charleston, S.C., assassin who takes his place among storied anti-black murderers such as James Earl Ray, who killed the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.; the Klansmen who bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Ala., killing four little black girls; and Samuel H. Bowers Jr., the imperial wizard of the Mississippi White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, who with his KKK brethren murdered three civil rights workers. Oh, yes, Roof has plenty of company; not necessarily in his homicidal rage but in his ideology. The manifesto that he purportedly wrote is replete with bigoted remarks common to right-wing talk radio and posted on Web sites. Dylann Roof is this week’s manifestation of our racial sickness. But Roof and his ideological forbear President Jefferson Davis of the Confederate States of America and those Sigma Alpha Epsilon brothers are symptoms of the same problem. Until we get at the root cause, the problem lives on.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Confront Root Causes of Anti-Blackness. This requires endorsing a method for deconstructing anti-Blackness in our approach to the topic, since we can’t solve what we don’t understand.

## A. Link

**[Link]** They rely on **ABSTRACT PHILOSOPHY –** their framework assumes a neutral, universal starting point. I’ll isolate specific links: **[INSERT SPECIFICS –** e.g., “practical reason,” appeals to Kant, etc.]

## B. Impacts

#### 1. [Curry & Curry 1] First, MISDIAGNOSIS: their assertion of universal humanistic principles reduces systemic racism to a problem of recognition that prevents mobilization against White supremacy.

**Curry & Curry 1:** Curry, Tommy J. [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244 GC/CH

We begin with the first author’s reflections on philosophy and its recurring problem of denying the realities of race and racism, reflections that have arisen as a Black (male) philosopher whose life has been threatened for doing Black philosophy. The experience of confronting death, being fearful of being killed doing my job as a critical race theorist, and being threatened with violence for thinking about racism in America has a profound effect on concretizing what is at stake in our theories about anti-Black racism. Whereas my work on race and racism in philosophy earlier in my career was dedicated to the problems created by the mass ignorance of the discipline to the political debates and ethnological history of Black philosophers in the 19th and 20th centuries, I now find myself thinking more seriously about the way that **philosophy**, really theory itself—our present categories of knowledge, such as race, class, and gender, found through disciplines—actually **hastens the deaths of subjugated peoples in the U**nited **S**tates. **Academic philosophy routinely abstracts away from**—directs thought to not attend to the realities of death, dying, and despair created by—**antiBlack racism. Black, Brown, and Indigenous populations are routinely** rationalized as disposable flesh. The deaths of these groups launch philosophical discussions of social injustice and spark awareness by whites , while the deaths of white people direct policy and demand outrage. **Because racialized bodies are confined to inhumane living conditions that nurture violence** and despair **that become attributed to the savage nature of nonwhites and evidence of their inhumanity, the deaths of these** **dehumanized peoples are** often **measured against the dangers they are thought to pose to** others. The **interpretation of the inferior position that racialized groups occupy in the U**nited **S**tates **is grounded in how whites often think of themselves in relation to problem populations. This relationship is** often **rationalized by avoidance and by** the **denials** of whites **about being causally related to the harsh conditions imposed on nonwhites in the world. Philosophy, and its glorification of the rational individual, ignores the complexity of anti-Black racism by blaming the complacency**, if not outright hostility, **towards Blacks on the mass ignorance of white America**. To remedy this problem, Black philosophers are asked to respond by gearing their writings, lectures, and professional presence to further educate and dialogue with white philosophers in order to enable them to better understand anti-Black racism and white supremacy (Curry 2008, 2015). This therapy is often rewarded as scholarship. **Philosophical positions that analyze racism as a problem of miscommunication, misunderstanding, and ignorance** (philosophies predicated on the capacity of whites to change) **are rewarded and praised as the cutting edge and most impactful theories about race and racism. Reducing racism to a problem of recognition** and understanding **allows white philosophers to remain absolved of their contribution to the apathy that white America has to the death** and subjugation **Black Americans endure** at the hands of the white race.

To some readers, speaking about races as different groups with opposite, if not antagonistic, social lives seems to run contrary to the idea that there are no real races, just people, only the human race. This is the core of **race-neutral theory** in academic philosophy. Race neutrality **asserts that while race, class, and gender may** in fact **differentiate bodies, the capacity for reason—the human essence beneath it all—is what is ultimately at stake in the recognition of difference**. While **this mantra** has been offered to whites since the integrationist strategies of the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1950s under Chief Justice Earl Warren, it **has had little effect in restructuring the psychology of white individuals or remedying** the **institutional** practices of **racism that continue to exclude** or punish **Black Americans**. How are Black scholars to speak about racism, specifically the violence and death that seem to gravitate towards Black bodies if the rules of philosophy and the fragility of white Americans insist that racism is not the cause of the disproportionate death Black Americans suffer and race is not a significant factor in Black people’s lives? This article is an attempt to debunk the seemingly neutral starting point of academic philosophy. **For decades, Black philosophers have attempted to** educate white philosophers and **reorient the philosophical anthropologies of the discipline. Black, Brown, and Indigenous philosophers have dedicated their lives** and careers **to educating white philosophers** and students, **with little to no effect on the composition** and disposition **of the discipline**. While it is not uncommon for philosophy departments to say they support diversity, the reality is that many, if not most, Black philosophers continue to write about the problem of racism, their experiences of marginalization, and the violence they suffer from white colleagues, disciplinary organizations, and universities. **This article should be read as an attempt not to amend the Western metaphysical tradition but to reveal the obstacles that indicate its perennial** failure. It is the position of the authors that many of the demands for disciplinary change are often expressed as politics, when in reality **there are issues of metaphysics** (the concerns of being) **and philosophical anthropology** (the concerns about the (non)being capable of thinking) **that are unaddressed in much of the current literature**. Section I of this article describes what Black philosophy has taken to be the problem of racism in academic philosophy more broadly. Since the 1970s Black philosophers have criticized, attacked, and attempted to reform the discipline with little effect. This section interrogates why that is the case. Section II argues that the failure of philosophy to change is a problem of metaphysics or the illusion that Blackness is compatible with the idea of the white human. Section III presents the social scientific evidence demonstrating the seeming permanence of anti-Black racism and the dangerous nature of colorblind ideology, which does not recognize that societal organization and racism determine the life chances of Blacks. This article ends with a suggestion of what Black philosophy would look like if its primary mandate were not to persuade whites to remedy their own racist practices, but to diagnose and build strategies against the present problems of racism in philosophy before us.

**2. [Curry & Curry 2] Second, PERPETUATING RACISM:** their philosophy isactively used to rationalize Black deaths.

**Curry & Curry 2:** Tommy J. [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244 GC/CH

Whereas white philosophers often share a similar language with other whites, namely, that all people are human beings and rational individuals, Black philosophers who study race often speak in terms of their negations: non-being. Harris (2018) refers to this as “necro-being.” Curry (2016, 2017, 2018a, 2018b) speaks of the Man-Not. Wilderson (2009) writes of the slave. **To be Black is to render the very grammar of the academy delusional. To speak of impending death and sub-personhood** and explain the experiences of violence and dehumanization that accompany this position to white individuals who only think of their existence in terms of always being human and persons is ineffable. **Perhaps** the theorist Calvin **Warren best captures this problem in his book Ontological Terror**: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation. Warren (2018: 2) argues: **The human being provides an anchor for the declaration, and since the being of the human is invaluable, then Black life must also matter, if the Black is a human** (the declaration anchors mattering in the human’s Being). **But we reach a point of terror with this syllogistic reasoning. One must take a step backward and ask the fundamental question: is the Black, in fact, a human being?** Or **can Black(ness) ground itself in the being of the human? If** it can**not, then** on what bases can we assert the mattering of Black existence? The consequence of attending to the problem of Blackness and the realities of death is that **the theories that emerge to account for what is taken to be the accidental positionality of whites who are thought to be human**, individuals, citizens, and persons **must make sense of a reality where to be Black is to be nonhuman, savage, alien, and reified and consequently subject to violence and wished dead. As** the late Critical Race Theorist, **Derrick Bell** (1997: 23) **once said**: **We have never understood that the essence of the racism we contended against was not simply that we were exploited in slavery**, degraded by **segregation, and** frustrated by **the unmet promises of equal opportunity. The essence of racism in America was the hope that we who were Black would not exist**. Instead of racism being defined as a set of attitudes or beliefs about racial groups held by biased individuals, the authors prefer to understand racism as a complex nexus, a cognitive architecture used to invent, reimagine, and evolve the presumed political, social, economic, sexual, and psychological superiority of the white races in society, while materializing the imagined inferiority and hastening the death of inferior races. Said differently, racism is the manifestation of the social processes and concurrent logics that facilitate the death and dying of racially subjugated peoples. (Curry 2017a: 4) **Racism is a social process that demands the extinguishing of Black life. Racism craves death**. It is constructed, then legitimized through cultural and individual complacency. **When a young Black boy is killed, the instruments of the state, the authority of the police, and the vulnerability of the Black male body converge in the ultimate expression of violence** that results in death. **The public then rationalizes this exercise of state violence** and the individual will of the police officer who killed the Black boy **through empathy**. The white individual who sees the dead Black male body understands the need to kill the Black boy because Blackness socially expresses criminality, danger, and the possible death of a white life. **This fear of Blackness creates empathy for the officer who killed the Black boy**. He is thought of by the white interpreter who is watching the dead Black male body as a corpse. The fear shared between the officer and white onlooker is legitimated by the state because the state offers its society security from this Black male threat. **This is how populations feared by the society are simultaneously constructed and destroyed**. This brief example describes the depth of the problem involved with racism. **Black philosophers are not simply objecting to the thoughts individuals hold about different groups of people, but how the thoughts that white individuals hold can be supported and expressed in violence against** Black men and women in the world. Because a white supremacist world supports the fears of the white racist, the individual racist’s anti-Blackness is aspirational. It is expressed as a will for there to be no Black bodies there. As such, the human becomes an untenable account of **Black life, given this disposability**. The world is simply not organized in such a way that allows Blackness to not be seen, perceived, and dehumanized in relation to whites. **No amount of evidence** or argument **seems to be able to displace the faith philosophers have in education, dialogue, and mutual understanding** between Blacks and whites as the remedies of racism (Curry 2008). Generations of nonwhite philosophers have spent their careers and research showing the discipline the horrors of racism, xenophobia, and ethno-nationalist thinking, but there has been little to no change in departments or the discipline at large. For many philosophers, the idea that racism is permanent is unthinkable. Despite the words and works of Black political theorists like the lawyer Robert F. Williams or Dr. Huey P. Newton, or even more canonically established Black figures like W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, Frantz Fanon, or Derrick Bell, philosophy as a discipline and **philosophers** more generally **refuse to acknowledge that racism** remains the core and most determining aspect of America’s social processes. Enamored by the stories of Blacks suffering, many scholarly conversations about Blackness and racism focus on the harm that Black individuals suffer at the hands of whites or the discipline of philosophy. Relatively few works actually analyze racism structurally or beyond identity at all. **Philosophical analyses do not revolve around death or the material consequences of anti-Blackness**. Instead, the fear and anxiety that Black philosophers and graduate students share with whites become more worthwhile topics.

## Thus, C. Alternative

**[Curry & Curry 3] Vote negative to reject their Western metaphysical tradition and recognize the permanent failure of White philosophy. Instead, endorse Black philosophy as a site to engage in radical theorizations – attempts at integration commodify Black philosophers as extensions of White thinkers, which waters down Black philosophy to something for White philosophers to deem respectable scholarship. A fundamental reorientation of the discipline away from universal reason is key.**

**Curry & Curry 3:** Tommy J. [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244

The debate about what constitutes or is real philosophy continues to dominate the discussions concerning race and racism. Drawing from the inclusion/exclusion or integrationist/segregationist paradigms, the problem of race and racism in philosophy is routinely understood as what is allowed to stand within or excluded from the discipline. The integrationist or post-civil-rights understanding of racism in philosophy routinely misses that **racism involves a complex and denaturing dynamic regarding the thought and perceptions of oppressed groups**. This is a paradigmatic and methodological problem introduced by Curry (2011a, 2011b) as signs of Black philosophy’s “derelictical” crisis. As Curry (2011a: 144) explains: At its most basic level, philosophy is an activity of inquiry into the world which is supposed to guarantee its practitioners some level of assuredness in the ways we interpret the realities before us. If we take African American philosophy to be philosophical activity, then we should expect, by necessity of being philosophy, that Africana philosophy should result in the same methodological rigor—some assuredness in the ways that Africana people have used to interpret their realities. Unfortunately, the present day crisis of African American philosophy makes this simple formulation an impossibility. By making the methodological rigor of Africana philosophy dependent on its popular acceptance; its closeness to the political dogmas of our racial era, we condemn our area of study to under-specialization whereby our works of philosophical genius, past and present, will be judged solely by the degree to which they extend the universalizing character of Europe and her theories. To t**he extent that African American philosophy chooses to** abandon **the genealogical patterns of Black thought for philosophically privileged associations with white thinkers, it remains derelictical—continuing to neglect its only actual duty**—the duty **to inquiry into the reality of African-descended people as they have revealed it**. We begin with the premise that **racism permeates the discipline of philosophy**. We are attempting to bring attention to the ways in which **authentic Black philosophy has been revised and denatured into a form that whites in the discipline accept as** philosophical. Whereas all disciplines have norms or rules of scholarly rigor, **philosophy demands that Black thinking and thought tend towards specific political ends in order to be considered philosophy**. Whether or not the thought and texts of Black philosophers are correctly interpreted, understood, or even read ultimately becomes irrelevant to the larger political orientation of the discipline. **Black philosophers are read as extensions of white thought. A Black philosophical figure is relevant only to the extent that he or she can be understood as the unrealized intentionality of canonical white figures.** Black historical figures are made philosophical by the extent to which their voice can be imagined as what Dewey, Hegel, Addams, or Foucault would have said if they thought more seriously about race and racism. Consequently, writes Curry (2011b: 141): Black thinkers function as the racial hypothetical of European thought whereby Black thought is read as the concretization of European reflections turned to the problem of race, and Black thinkers are seen as racial embodiments of white thinkers’ philosophical spirits. In this vein, the most studied Black philosophers are read as the embodiment of their white associates; W. E. B. Du Bois is read as the Black Hegel, the Black James, the Black Dewey, and Frantz Fanon as a Black Sartre, or Black Husserl. This demonization of Black thinkers by the various manifestations of the European logos as necessary to the production of AfricanAmerican philosophy is a serious impediment to the development of a genuine genealogy of the ideas that actually define Africana philosophy’s Diasporic identity.

**They add:**

**Black philosophy has a responsibility to engage the Black experience as a genuine site of existential reflection and epistemological tool** making. The idea that Black experience and reality must be accounted for by white theories of causality or aim towards the same ends of white philosophy is delusional. Black **philosophy must engage in radical theorizations that can be traced back to the problems tackled in the texts and debates of Black** thinkers. The **social prognoses suggested** by Black philosophers **should also have some accountability to the realities that Black people are facing in the U**nited **S**tates, **if not the world**. There is no time for idle thought that simply attempts to imitate white theories of causality and canonical traditions in order to be accepted. How can we demonstrate the importance of Black philosophy, if not for what we observe and verify in the lives of Black people in the world? **Its ability to express the full complexity of Black life and death in theory at the most abstract levels of thought is what is at stake in the Black philosophical project**.

## 2

## A. Links

#### [Links] MULTIPLE LINKS COMING OUT OF THE AFF

1 multiple spikes that are read briefly and preempt every arguments

Hidden a prioris

Attempts to shut out different conversations

1] Presumption and permissibility affirm

autoaffirm

## B. Impacts

#### 1. [Thompson] First, ABLEISM: banking on people missing arguments in order to win is ableist.

Thompson: Thompson, Marshall. [Former Debater and Coach] “Miscellaneous Thoughts from the Disorganized Mind of Marshall Thompson.” NSD Update, April 21, 2015. CH

The second use of spikes is the attempt to win an argument by not having to defend it. To win the argument because it was conceded rather than because you were able to answer your opponents objections effectively. It seems to me, that the skill set that this reward are not the same skill sets that we want to be assessing when we consider who was the ‘better debater.’ Now I acknowledge that many will disagree about what it mean to be the ‘better debater’ and thus my intuition pump may not generate universal appeal, but it seems to me that being the better debater should track more closely with your ability to defend your arguments, than your ability to hide your arguments. For those to whom that is not intuitive, perhaps the following arguments will provide it more credence (these are more illustrative than anything, I personally think the above intuition pump is just as basic as these). 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.)

#### 2. [McGinnis & Damerdji 1] Second, CAPITALISTIC TECHNOCRACY: their performance turns LD into an incomprehensible game, as knowledge of infinite random “rules” is required for competitive success.

**McGinnis 1:** McGinnis, Dave. [Debate Coach, Valley] “Has LD Become Too Esoteric?” NSD Update, 2012. AZ/LC

LD debate is too esoteric. The skills necessary to be a top-flight national LD debater are increasingly so hyper-specific that they appear arcane to anyone outside the activity — including novices who aspire to it. In the past two years I have had over a dozen potentially talented novices either quit debate entirely or shift to public forum because the idea of spending countless hours learning how to engage the hyper-specific aspects of debate seems pointless to them. Some of the brightest potential students are turned away because (A) they don’t have time to engage in the activity when they are also pursuing a challenging course curriculum, and (B) they recognize that much of the material they learn in LD is of limited-to-no use outside the activity. The increasingly esoteric nature of the activity is a natural result of students and coaches pushing the envelope. LD is no longer simply an application of concepts from other disciplines. With the proliferation of camps and the institutionalization of a continuous national circuit where last year’s top competitors become mentors to (and judges of) this year’s students, LD debate has long engaged in a process of generating its own unique knowledge and meanings. Consider this list of “varsity concepts” that we brainstormed today: Fiat, its uses and abuse Theory spikes in the AC Identifying and responding to NIBs Counter-plans in LD, their use and abuse DAs: Structure and response Plans: How to run them, how to deal with them Meta-ethics: Practical reason Meta-ethics: Naturalism Meta-ethics: Emotivism Truth-testing vs Comparative Worlds Skepticism Ontology generally Epistemology generally Multiple sufficient aff standards – identifying and addressing Meta-theory (and meta-meta-theory, for that matter) Education vs Fairness A few of these topics are of general benefit to critical thinkers, particularly those who plan to study philosophy. [b]ut many of these issues — particularly the theoretical ones — have application only in LD debate. I think the problem can break down into three rough areas: 1) **The theoretical issues debated in rounds have become so finely detailed that they are taking over the activity;** 2) The level of philosophical inquiry has become so sophisticated (and in many cases, ill-conceived) that **non-philosophers feel inadequate to the task of coaching or start**ing **programs; and** 3) All of this happens at speeds of 300-400 WPM so that **any non-debate person** unlucky enough to stumble into a round **has** absolutely no **idea** (A) **what’s going on or** (B) **how it could possibly be** of **educational** benefit**.**

**AND THOSE NOT IN THE KNOW ARE LEFT IN THE COLD.** Spending THOUSANDS of dollars a year to go to debate camp is a requirement to compete at the top levels: if you don’t go, you **can’t** engage.

Damerdji 2: Damerdji, Salim. [Private Debate Coach; Student, University of California, Berkeley] “A Pessimistic View of Norms in LD.” NSD Update, January 2, 2017. CH

First, it is quite literally a waste of time to learn how to adapt to frivolous rules. The problem is especially poignant for newcomers or anyone with better things to do because every additional wrinkle in the activity increases the learning curve for LD [6]. It takes practically two years for debaters to just get the hang of the activity. While there is value in some norms that make LD more insular – like speed and philosophy debate – our activity as a whole is excessively intimidating. A less esoteric, more streamlined activity would turn fewer prospective students off. Even for the debaters who are willing to invest their time to learn debate esoterica, they have more important things to do! LD enjoys the participation of some of the smartest kids in the country. There’s value to them pursuing their academic obligations and other interests. The second disadvantage is that LD becomes less enjoyable when it operates on complicated and unpredictable informal rules. Games are enjoyable primarily because we get to see our efforts pay off in victory. But unpredictable and complicated rules make us more likely to lose unpredictably in virtue of not knowing all the rules. Thus, debate is less enjoyable for as long as you don’t know all the informal norms involved and so lose unpredictably. Third, I worry about the sort of people LD creates when our activity pressures newcomers to embrace many bizarre, highly questionable norms in order to be taken seriously and, consequently, in order to win. Do you remember when you were first told that you must always, always clarify the status of CPs in CX? Or that the magic words “prefer competing interpretations because reasonability is arbitrary” unlocks a trove of easy ways to win on theory? Personally, I pretended this stuff made sense and just went along. Like most LDers who last through senior year, I was deeply invested in LD, saw success in LD as the metric for intelligence, and was willing to jump through all these esoteric hurdles to prove myself. This isn’t good. It has been difficult to change debate’s overly-competitive culture, but it could be easier to ditch the endless number of informal rules and norms that young debaters are pressured to conform to in order to win. LD right now creates fantastic bureaucrats who can cite and manipulate norms to their ends, but there surely would be more value in encouraging real creativity rather than conformity. Of course, many great LDers do creatively re-imagine segments of LD, but this is currently a privilege reserved for the best, while the rest are asked to comply.

# Case

### Afc

CI: converse of their interp

1. Predictability: I never know pre-round which framework I’ll have to debate, policy, deo, or performance and I can’t be expected to have in-case links to all of those.

2. Clash: He gains the ability to pick and one-sided framework that I couldn’t possibly link into, and he decreases clash also because I have to accept huge portions of his case, decreasing the number of arguments I can make significantly. This functionally gives him 5 extra minutes of speaking time.

3. Critical thinking- framework debate introduces multiple layers to the round--- forces

debaters to get better at strategic thinking and picking and choosing which args to go for-

-- you also destroy framework debate which is key to critical thinking b/c we have to

weigh nuanced ethical theories against each other and determine which impacts are most

important—critical thinking is a voter that o/w on portability b/c society is better off in

general if we can make rational choices

4. You can read a racist framework -

### TT

1. Discrouages debate if it’s already been won

#### Merriam-Webster] To affirm doesn't mean to prove true – it's to support.

**Merriam-Webster:** Merriam-Webster. [Dictionary] "Affirm." *Merriam-Webster*, 2018. EL

to show or express a strong belief in or dedication to (something, such as an important idea)

b. Jurisdictional issues shouldn’t matter judges go outside the scope of the resolution all

the time i.e. voting for a non-T aff and it wasn’t implicated as a voter or terminal impact

only that it might be important.

### fw

1. Ableist - what it means to be rational would exclude people who aren’t rational under their definition
2. Problematic because it shuts out all belief systems that don’t revolve around this model - it would be shut out
3. Racist FW because it assumes casualty between practical reason between moral law - its grounded in westernism and whiteness which is what the framework stands for
4. Doesn’t make sense because it assumes the only way to self govern is through moral law - people govern themselves by regulating their own behavior if they think their actions are harmful to others

Standard:

Not weighable - we don’t know what consistency looks like under the FW

No explanation for how it translates to states

This creates irresolvability -

This doesn’t link to a ROJ because they have no external reason the FW is good

Performativity arg is bad - I could reject an arg without accepting their form of freedom

pn 5 you read arguments taht function under two conseuctal fw means you do the thing you performatively criticize me for foinh

on 6 we posit an anti-ethical thoery our arguemnt is that western ethical fws are bad

=

NU: there are racist white supremacists

no - that’s not ideal theory looking at real world impacts on people

that assumes a white frame of reference wher eyou can eitehr only have wesrern ethics or ethical egoism but we propose something outside realm of ethics

### ov

their offense comes from conseuences

### offense

OVERVIEW - can’t universalize  something that has an end date or a time frame

1. Doesn't justify the waiver of IPP j says IPP bad -- not reverse casual doesn't justify the violation of ppls rights even if ipp is bad itself
2. T/ it is the only way for people to retain protection for goods they have that aren’t tangible
3. Kant would see waivers as a violation of the freedom of the actors in the resolution so he would favor those actors coming together but not other actors coercing them to do it
4. Only says patents barrier to entry not that IP itself is antithetical paten access increase free market principles because more people can get into the market

T/ infinte violaions if you univeralize ipp souldnt exist it justifed biopircayc when western kantians go into devliping countries and steal

#### 1] Presumption and permissibility affirm –

#### [a] Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me.

#### [b] Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason.

#### [c] Otherwise we’d have to have a proactive justification to do things like drink water.

#### [d] If anything is permissible, then definitionally so is the aff since there is nothing that prevents us from doing it.

Reject this