## A. Link

#### [Link] They wouldn’t disclose anything about the aff because they said it’s new – I didn’t know anything about the advocacy, whether it was whole res, etc. Screenshot in the doc.

Graphical user interface, text, application, email, Teams

Description automatically generated

## B. Impacts

#### 1. [Rury & Rife] First, OPPORTUNITY HOARDING: I have NO idea what they’re going to read. And they can’t say they didn’t do so because it was new – they’re benefiting from it, which is EXCLUSIVE CAPITALISM.

Rury & Rife: Rury, John L. [Professor of Education and History, University of Kansas], and Aaron Tyler Rife [Assistant Professor, Wichita State University]. “Race, Schools, and Opportunity Hoarding: Evidence From a Post-War American Metropolis.” *History of Education*, *Journal of the History of Education Society*, Vol. 47, Issue 1, 2018. CH

Opportunity hoarding was originally articulated and defined by sociologist Charles Tilly. In his words, it represents a mechanism of social inequality that ‘operates when members of a categorically bounded network acquire access to a resource that is valuable, renewable, subject to monopoly, supportive of network activities, and enhanced by the network’s modus operandi’.4 4 Charles Tilly, Durable Inequality (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 10. View all notes Such a resource could be an occupational designation, a residential area, an educational credential, a lifestyle classification, or other categories that convey distinction, exclude other groups and are subject to conditions described above. Consequently, the concept of opportunity hoarding is applicable to a range of social settings and circumstances, contributing advantages to members of both elites and non-elites who can restrict access to resources and opportunities to eligible participants. Tilly employs the term somewhat differently from others, however, and distinctions in its definition and use are important.

**TURNS CASE – THEIR PERFORMANCE ACTIVELY PROPS UP STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE/UNDERMINES LIBERATION STRATEGIES [OR: alternate link to framework]. INDEPENDENT REASON TO DROP THEM –** they’re not consistent with their own framework, and they don’t get to weigh substance against the K, since I question their ability to read it in the first place.]

**TURNS CASE –** if their method is good, that’s ALL THE MORE REASON they should disclose it and modify it to withstand well-researched objections. **AND** turn the “think on your feet” advantage – they had weeks to prep this aff and I had 4 minutes. They had time to script an answer to every possible response to the aff – that’s WAY LESS independent thinking.

## C. Implication

#### [Implication] REJECT THEIR PERFORMANCE AND DROP THE DEBATER – they should lose for performatively contradicting their benefits AND for making debate less educational. A loss at least creates a risk that they’ll disclose in the future – that’s worth it if it improves the quality of in-round education.