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### OFF

#### Technology has created an age of constant information and signifiers floating through our phones and computers as media. This creates a dyslexia – reduced attention spans, no time for true human interaction – this leads to information overload, which is too fast for our organic minds to keep up with – that causes depression and drug use. It’s no coincidence that the rise of tech in the 80s was complimented with a drug epidemic. These signifiers come prior to action, thus the role of the ballot is to disrupt semiocapitalism.

**Berardi 09** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism Precarious Rhapsody, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2009. P. 40-42 // LEX JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The acceleration of information exchange has produced and is producing an effect of a pathological type on the individual human mind and even more on the collective mind. Individuals are not in a position to consciously process the immense and always growing mass of information that enters their computers, their cell phones, their television screens, their electronic diaries and their heads. However, it seems indispensable to follow, recognize, evaluate, process all this information if you want to be efficient, competitive, victorious. The practice of multitasking, the opening of a window of hypertextual attention, the passage from one context to another for the complex evaluation of processes, tends to deform the sequential modality of mental processing. According to Christian Marazzi, who has concerned himself in various books with the relations between economics, language and affectivity, the latest generation of economic operators is affected by a real and proper form of dyslexia, incapable of reading a page from the beginning to the end according to sequential procedures, incapable of maintaining concentrated attention on the same object for a long time. And dyslexia spreads to cognitive and social behaviors, leading to rendering the pursuit of linear strategies nearly impossible. Some, like Davenport and Beck , speak of an attention economy. But when a cognitive faculty enters into and becomes part of economic discourse this means that it has become a scarce resource. The necessary time for paying attention to the fluxes of information to which we are exposed and which must be evaluated in order to be able to make decisions is lacking. The consequence is in front of our eyes: political and economic decisions no longer respond to a long term strategic rationality and simply follow immediate interests. On the other hand, we are always less available for giving our attention to others gratuitously. We no longer have the attention time for love, tenderness, nature, pleasure and compassion. Our attention is ever more besieged and therefore we assign it only to our careers, to competition and to economic decisions. And in any case our temporality cannot follow the insane speed of the hypercomplex digital machine. Human beings tend to become the ruthless executors of decisions taken without attention. The universe of transmitters, or cyberspace, now proceeds at a superhuman velocity and becomes untranslatable for the universe of receivers, or cybertime, that cannot go faster than what is allowed by the physical material from which our brain is made, the slowness of our body, the need for caresses and affection. Thus opens a pathological gap and mental illness spreads as testified by the statistics and above all our everyday experience. And just as pathology spreads, so too do drugs. The flourishing industry of psychopharmaceuticals beats records every year, the number of packets of Ritalin, Prozac, Zoloft and other psychotropics sold in the pharmacies continually increases, while dissociation, suffering, desperation, terror, the desire not to exist, to not have to fight continuously, to disappear grows alongside the will to kill and to kill oneself. When, towards the end of the 1970s, an acceleration of the productive and communicative rhythms in occidental metropolitan centers was imposed, a gigantic epidemic of drug addiction made its appearance. The world was leaving its human epoch to enter the era of machinic posthuman acceleration: many sensitive organisms of the human variety began to snort cocaine, a substance that permits the acceleration of the existential rhythm leading to transforming oneself into a machine. Many other sensitive organisms of the human kind injected heroin in their veins, a substance that deactivates the relation with the speed of the surrounding atmosphere. The epidemic of powders during the 1970s and the 1980s produced an existential and cultural devastation with which we still haven’t come to terms with. Then illegal drugs were replaced by those legal substances which the pharmaceutical industry in a white coat made available for its victims and this was the epoch of anti-depressants, of euphorics and of mood regulators. Today psychopathy reveals itself ever more clearly as a social epidemic and, more precisely, a socio-communicational one. If you want to survive you have to be competitive and if you want to be competitive you must be connected, receive and process continuously an immense and growing mass of data. This provokes a constant attentive stress, a reduction of the time available for affectivity. These two tendencies, inseparably linked, provoke an effect of devastation on the individual psyche: depression, panic, anxiety, the sense of solitude and existential misery. But these individual symptoms cannot be indefinitely isolated, as psychopathology has done up until now and as economic power wishes to do.

#### Blackness moves past their social position and into a position of signification of semiotics – their movements get fractalized and pushes minority groups against each other

Ferguson 12 Ferguson, Roderick A. The Reorder of Things: the University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference. University of Minnesota Press, 2012.//DHS NJ

“Unbranded” develops the claims of the Smithsons’ essay by assembling ads that feature black people, styles, and vernaculars, collecting them to illustrate how mass culture was turning to minority difference in the 1960s, turning to it as a way to establish a standard of living ordered around an explicit engagement with minority culture. “Unbranded” also recalls 1960s pop art as a medium that—in Kobena Mercer’s words—responded “to the cycle of modernisation that introduced mass consumerism, youth culture, and anti-establishment attitudes into the mainstream of western capitalist democracies.”83 As “[pop] encouraged audiences to look again at everyday images that were mostly overlooked on account of their ‘ordinariness,’”84 “Unbranded” mobilizes pop imagery to inspire investigations of how capital in the sixties and onwards was so roused by marginal cultures and anti ­ establishment movements that it would resolve to make black minority difference one of the principles of mass culture. In addition to having roots in pop art, “Unbranded” is also part of what art critic Hal Foster calls the “archival impulse” in contemporary art. De ­ scribing such work, Foster says, “the work is archival since it not only draws on informal archives but produces them as well. Further it often arranges these materials according to a quasi-archival logic, a matrix of citation and juxtaposition, and presents them in a quasi-archival architecture, a complex of texts and objects.”85 As an archival project, “Unbranded” points the viewer to how contemporary capital has produced an archive of black cultural and racial difference. Moreover, “Unbranded” asks the viewer to reflect on capital’s archival practice by illuminating the matrix of capital’s own interest in black culture. “Unbranded,” therefore, compels the viewer to confront the fact that we recognize black cultural difference as part of corporate culture even when the visible markers of that affiliation have been removed. Hence, it goes without saying that these photographs of black culture are advertisements as well. Demonstrating the links between the direction of advertising and interest in black culture, “Unbranded” attempts to mobilize the viewer’s awareness of capital’s affirmation of black culture as a means to question capital’s integration with minority difference. As a pop and archival installation, the series cites advertisements for hair and skin-care products, shoes, slacks, stockings, underwear, movies, automobiles, cigarettes, airlines, McDonald’s, jeans, gasoline, food, liquor, breath mints, and more. Rather than concentrate on a single advertisement, “Unbranded” observes dozens of ads as a way to underline capital’s rolling attention to all things black. In doing so, the series suggests that capital did not retreat from marginality and heterogeneity at all; instead, capital was investing in those very formations. Discussing the ways in which corporate capital absorbed the critiques of the European ’68, Tim Griffin argues that contributors for the special issue of Art Forum “repeatedly underline the ways in which the very creative models and concepts that propelled ’68—from the Xexible, structuralist thought underlying institutional critique . . . to the pedagogical endeavors presenting viable alternatives to social bureaucratization . . . ; from principles of individual autonomy steeped in aestheticism . . . to applied ideas of difference . . . are now threads in the vast fabric of commerce and industry.”86 Similarly, Thomas’s “Unbranded” also critiques the ways in which American capital absorbed the creative models and concepts emerging from the U.S. social movements. But “Unbranded” underlines a crucial element that was relatively neglected in the European context but thoroughly poked and probed in the American setting—minority culture. For example, there is an ad in “Unbranded” from 1968 that captures the simultaneous interest in U.S. social movements and black culture. The ad features a group of young black [people]men and women wearing jeans ranging from deep denim to pastel blues and pinks and wildly patterned shirts that are just as colorful. Despite their very hip attire, the young African Americans are congregated on a sidewalk littered with trash and crates that some of them use for stools. What goes without saying is that this is an advertisement for jeans that mobilizes the images of the peace movement and the familiar image of black urbanism. While the image in the series is unmarked, Willis’s Web site attributes the ad to Levi’s and notes that the advertisement is aptly titled “The Oft-Forgotten Black Flower Children of Harlem.”87 The ad im ­ plies that Levi’s—and, by extension, capital—will reveal and celebrate those hybrid elements of African American culture, detailing how that culture intersects with other countercultural formations. As “The Oft-Forgotten Black Flower Children of Harlem” and the other images in “Unbranded” suggest, American capital was studiously relaxing its dependence on a conventional mode of abstraction responsible for capitalist exchange, circulation, and valorization, a mode that would abstract particularity and difference. Indeed, “Unbranded” points to how minority difference was beginning to revolutionize the very nature of exchange value. According to Marx, exchange value suggests an illusory quality that presumably inheres within the commodity itself. He says that the exchange value of the commodity is what accounts for the “mystical character of the commodity,” how it “transcends sensuousness, . . . [evolving] out of its brain grotesque ideas far more wonderful than if it were to begin dancing of its own free will.”88 As the commodity transcends sensuousness, it attempts to hide its “real” and “objective nature” from the consumer, that real and objective nature known as the history of abstract labor.89 Pointing further to the constitutive nature of labor for the commodity’s value, Marx states, “The determination of the magnitude of value by labour-time is therefore a secret hidden under the apparent movements in the relative values of commodities.”90 But if we take Thomas’s “Unbranded” to be a history of commodities, we are confronted with the curious exchange values of black hair-care products that promise to make your hairdo right, hip new jeans that shine in funky colors, and ground beef sold in the language of the street. These products and their values turn us to the history of the very social movements that rearticulated minority difference in the Wrst place rather than to the presumably abstract history of labor. As an archive of capital’s rearticu ­ lation of black culture, the ads redirect us to a new strategic situation, an emerging mode of power that was trying to use the social movements of the sixties and seventies to reimagine minority difference and put it to ample use. If rearticulation was, as Omi and Winant suggest, the “labor” of those social movements, then the products of that “labor”—the evolving meanings of race and gender—would become capital’s new domain of articulation. In terms of capital, the sixties encounter with minority culture was nothing less than the period in which new secrets were injected into the commodity form, secrets that reveal not only the history and time of labor but the history and time of student protests as well. During that time, companies would recalibrate exchange value so that the value of the commodity would be gauged in terms of its potential equivalence not only to other commodities but also to principles asserted by student-led social movements. American capital would begin to use the revolutions of the sixties and seventies to suggest to consumers that they were buying ideals such as safety, hipness, and difference when they bought products, and therefore participating in revolutions that did not antagonize capital but presumed it. Another way of observing this phenomenon would be to say that if— as Hong puts it—“the fetishization of difference” came to characterize capital in the post-Fordist era, then the genealogy for that fetishization lies in capital’s employment of social movement aims and principles. In such a context, state and capital’s campaign for a new legibility would not be based only on the suppression of minority difference but also on its selective activation. This campaign was quite different from other conquests of illegibility in that it did not seek to impose the same universal standard that everyone had become so familiar with. Capital and state’s operation did not presume that anthropologization that Foucault talks about in The Archaeology of Knowledge, an anthropologization that took man as history’s lead character and sovereign consciousness, the character who would time and again look down on difference. It was also not the development of a false consciousness about the meanings of minority cultures and histories. If “false consciousness” assumes a contrast between the real meaning of minority difference and how that difference is put into practice, then what we have in this moment is a period in which the various ideas about minority difference and culture would put a variety of practices into play.91 Sometimes minority difference would be hegemonic; at other times it would be oppositional; many times it would be both. Each proWle would be available for articulation, and neither one would be “false.” Europe may have regarded minority difference as an element external to its borders and history, as that which its subjects were told to ignore, dismiss, and extinguish. But in the United States, power would not instruct spectators to look away from minority difference and its contradictions. There, power would say to viewers far and wide, “This is what minority difference is. Come quick and see.” As the commercials, advertisements, television shows, billboard hits, and political strategies of that moment suggest, power was maturing a simultaneously afWrmative and regulatory agenda, a plan that was not a wholesale turn away from difference but a discrimina ting turn toward it. This strategic situation was not the typical disciplinary ordeal that most had become used to; it was an interdisciplinary experience that took minorities as crucial cast members of a “hegemonic” saga, a saga over whether subjects would give their consent to the institutions of state, academy, and capital. 02 Chapter 2\_Ferguson 10/9/2012 3:34 PM Page 74 74 The Proliferation of Minority Di¤erence Minority difference, as a mode of reorganization, would permeate all spheres of activity within the United States. It would be a mode that yielded contradictory articulations. Formations like Lumumba-Zapata would rearticulate minority difference as a way to achieve new forms of access, critique, and community while a new strategic situation would rearticulate forms of difference as a means to expand what institutions could claim as their own. The college was approved as Third College rather than the name that the students intended, but, as Mariscal notes, “between 1970 to 1972 . . . [it] was a bold experiment in multiracial organizing and the democratic reform of higher education.”92 The College’s black and Chicano alumni would remember that coalition as a grand agreement to begin to trust one another; the Wrst dean of the college would talk about it as “the creation of a learning community that [was] concerned with the process of continual growth—where there is an effort to probe and to search for better ways of living for all human beings, particularly those formerly left out altogether.”93 But the UCSD administration would ensure that this multiracial experiment—at least as the students intended it—would come to an end. As Maris cal notes, the university attempted to drive a wedge in the coalition between blacks and Chicanos by appointing administrators who would use black nationalist rhetoric to speak out against antiblack racism without addressing the administrative exclusion of Chicanos in recruitment and hiring. In addition, the university began a campaign to cut back the recruitment of underrepresented students and the development of a racially diverse faculty, a campaign that would ensure that Third College would be 60 percent white by 1976.94 Angela Davis reXects on that moment: We had put up a Werce struggle. Large numbers of UCSD students had experienced the radicalization that was occurring on campuses throughout the country. The university hierarchy decided, apparently, that it was best to make the concessions we were demanding, rather than risk a prolonged disruption of campus activities. To tell the truth, we had not really expected them to agree so readily to our notion of the third college. And when they did, those of us leading the movement knew that despite our victory—of which all of us were proud—LumumbaZapata College would never become the revolutionary institution we had originally projected.95 02 Chapter 2\_Ferguson 10/9/2012 3:34 PM Page 75 The Proliferation of Minority Di¤erence 75 The local circumstances of UCSD illustrate a larger mode of power that was trying to determine how best to manage insurgent articulations of minority difference, without absolute suppression but through selective revision and deployment. What happened at that university just above the sea is a microcosm of the chronicles of minority difference, a chronicle of how minority difference was deployed against institutional hegemony and a report of how it was claimed by and managed within the province of institutions and thereby alienated from its originary mission. To be sure, the repression of minoritized communities was concerted and systematic, yielding programs and institutional formations designed to quell even the possibility of revolutionary fervor. For instance, in 1968 the FBI instituted its counterintelligence program (COINTELPRO) to “neutralize militant Black nationalists.”96 Around that time, the FBI also worked to inWltrate the American Indian Movement.97 State repression of minority communities was expressed through rapid prison expansion. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore argues, after the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr., federal and state governments responded to the rioting taking place in U.S. cities by investing monies into what would eventually become the U.S. prison-industrial complex.98 Without question, there was a new policing of minority difference by federal, state, and local governments. But alongside that repression was a veritable explosion in the afWrmation of minority difference in both grassroots and ofWcial venues. AfWrmation and regulation would become bound up with one another like never before, producing minority difference as the site of a new contradiction that straddled valorization and devaluation, change and status quo, a contradiction that would become more elaborate in the years to come. Yes, Zeus and Mnemosyne bore a tenth muse, an illegitimate child blotted out but now raised to prominence, a left-out daughter who would become a Wgure of contingency in the sixties and thereafter, representing the capacity of minority difference to move in the way of ruptures and hegemonies. In the next chapter we will see how new hierarchies and regulations were established through the seductions of excellence.

#### Thus, the alternative is to symbolically take the system hostage through it’s own method of exhaustion. We do this through radical passivity and a method of the Wu Wei – only radical passivity can escape the infosphere

**Berardi 11** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism “Chapter 4 Exhastion and Subjectivity.” After the Future, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2011. P. 107-108 // LEX JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The process of collective subjectivation (i.e. social recomposition) implies the development of a common language-affection which is essentially happening in the temporal dimension. The semiocapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the social possibility of sensitive elaboration of the semio-flow. The proliferation of simulacra in the info-sphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination. Advertising and stimulated hyper-expression (“just do it”), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and exhaustion is the only way of escape: Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist, the hostage’s death for the terrorist. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. (Baudrillard 1993a: 37) In these impressive pages Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action which will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism where he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy the only strategy can be catastrophic: all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003: 6) This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order’s benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order: No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – inexorably – the increase in the power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was party to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003: 6-7) In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion. In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed. The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan. The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death, murder, and suicide, towards a new kind of autonomy, social creativity and of life? I think that it is possible only if we start from exhaustion, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be deserted, and exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from the sphere of economic exchange. A new refrain could emerge in that moment, and wipe out the law of economic growth. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good. The global recession started officially in September 2008 and lasted officially until the summer of 2009. Since the summer of 2009 the official truth in the media, in political statements, in economic talk was: recovery. The stock exchange began to rise again and the banks started again paying huge bonuses to their managers and so on. Meanwhile, unemployment was exploding everywhere, salaries were falling, welfare was curtailed, 90 million more are expected to join the army of poverty in the next year. Is this recovery? Our conditional reflex (influenced by the Keynesian knowledge that recovery is the recovery of the “real economy”) answered: no, this is not recovery, capitalism cannot recover only by financial means. But we should reframe our vision. Finance is no longer a mere tool of capitalist growth. The financialization of capitalism has made finance the very ground of accumulation, as Christian Marazzi (2010) has explained in recent works such as The Violence of Financial Capitalism. In the sphere of semiocapitalism, financial signs are not only signifiers pointing to some referents. The distinction between sign and referent is over. The sign is the thing, the product, the process. The “real” economy and financial expectations are no longer distinct spheres. In the past, when riches were created in the sphere of industrial production, when finance was only a tool for the mobilization of capital to invest in the field of material production, recovery could not be limited to the financial sphere. It took also employment and demand. Industrial capitalism could not grow if society did not grow. Nowadays we must accept the idea that financial capitalism can recover and thrive without social recovery. Social life has become residual, redundant, irrelevant.
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### OFF

#### Disclosure is a tournament rule they agreed to adhere to when they decided to participate at the Glenbrooks.

**Greenstein and Corrigan N.D.** Michael Greenstein and Alyssa Corrigan, [Director of Debate at GBS since 2019, assistant coach for a year before that. Her job mostly involves teaching (novice debate + varsity policy + English/Social Studies), admin work, and coaching novices. Former coach at USC/UNLV/UNT/Notre Dame High School] Tournament Directors of the Glenbrooks 2021 Invitational N.D. "Rules, Policies, and Procedures,"Tabroom, https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/index.mhtml?webpage\_id=14418&tourn\_id=20143, 11-22-2021//Aanya breh

RULES, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES Glenbrooks Speech and Debate Tournament Rules, Policies, and Procedures All Event Information The Glenbrooks is an invitational tournament. We reserve the right to refuse entry of any school to compete in the tournament or judges to cover a commitment for any reason. By registering entries for the tournament you agree to adhere to all tournament rules, policies, and procedures found on our tabroom website, in the tabroom disclaimer, and in the school permission form. As a condition of participation at the tournament, participants and schools agree to accept and abide by the decision of and consequences(s) determined by the tournament directors on any issues that arise during the tournament regardless of if there is a written rule or policy regarding the decision or consequence(s). Only coaches who are school employees should contact the tournament with questions. We will not respond to inquires from students, parents, or private coaches. Online Platform The Glenbrooks will be using NSDA Campus as its online hosting platform. Under no circumstances should judges switch their debate's platform if tech issues occur (or for any other reason.) If tech issues occur, please email the help lines. The only exception to the NSDA Campus platform is extemp draw which will occur over Zoom. Room Check In All participants will be required to virtually “check in” to their NSDA Campus rooms prior to the start of their event. These times are listed on schedules. Failure to check in may result in disqualification from the round at the discretion of the tournament. Check-in is where disclosure will also take place. Disclosure (in relevant events) must take place within five minutes of the designated check in time. Observers We will be using NSDA Campus rooms with observers. Anyone observing from your school must have completed a successful background check conducted by the school or district that is allowing the observer. Harassment/Bullying Harassment/bullying of any sort will not be tolerated during the Glenbrooks tournament. Tournament administration reserves the right to disqualify a team or school if they are found to be engaging in bullying and/or harassing behavior. Equity Process The Glenbrooks will have an equity process to hear and act on any concerns regarding equity and inclusion. If you have a concern, please see the instructions on the equity process form here. Private Coaches Only school employees may communicate with the tournament on behalf of their school. Private coaches hired by individual students may not represent the school in any capacity during the tournament. It is the affirmative obligation of all individuals who are coaching, and/or sharing materials with other schools/debaters in private prep sharing arrangements to conflict themselves from judging those students/schools. Individuals found to have violated this norm will cause all individuals coached by those persons to have their judge preferences removed for the duration of the event and all judges and students involved may be removed from the tournament and forfeit payments to the tournament. Outside assistance Competitors should in no way accept or attempt to procure outside assistance during the course of a debate event. Any team or student found to be receiving coaching or other outside assistance during the course of said event will be disqualified at the discretion of the tournament. COVID-19 Safety Schools, and not the tournament, are responsible for making sure that competing individuals follow state, local, and national guidelines regarding COVID-19 safety during the tournament. Judge Background Checks All judges provided by schools to judge at this tournament must have completed a successful background check conducted by the school or district that provides the judge. Ballot Statement We are all influenced by implicit bias, or the stereotypes that unconsciously affect our decisions. When judging, our implicit biases negatively impact students who are traditionally marginalized and disenfranchised. Before writing comments or making a decision, please take a moment to reflect on any biases that may impact your decision making process. Please remember that the video quality of a student’s performance or speech may be impacted by lighting, internet, access to equipment, and other family members’ presence in the home. To ensure a more equitable experience for our participants, please be sure your decision-making process and comments are related only to the content and quality of the presentation or speech itself. DEBATE RULES Judges All judges in Policy and LD debate must have a paradigm on Tabroom.com. Judges without paradigms will not count towards a school’s judging obligation. Schools that have judges without paradigms may also lose judge preferences. It is an expectation that judges in Policy, LD, and PF will disclosure their decision to students. Technology We want to minimize the amount of technical glitches during the tournament. Therefore, we strongly encourage every debater to wear a headset with a mic. We also strongly encourage debaters to operate from ethernet connections instead of wifi. Debaters are required to have their cameras on during the time that they are speaking. Judges are required to have their cameras on while students are speaking, while sharing who they voted for, and while explaining their decision. It is the responsibility of each school attending the tournament to make sure the judges they hire for this tournament have working technology and adequate internet to judge with their camera on. If you encounter technical difficulties within the NSDA Campus system, you should email the help desk. We will provide an email address for technological help closer to the tournament. Coin flip procedures The coin flip applies to all rounds in Public Forum and elimination rounds for Policy and LD. Tabroom.com will automatically flip a coin for the two teams where applicable. Prior to the round when teams are to report to their competition room for check-in, teams will be notified via text and email from Tabroom.com which team won the coin flip. In PF, the winner of the coin flip will choose either their side or speaker positions in Tabroom.com. For LD and Policy elimination rounds, the winner of the coin flip will choose their side. If the winner of the coin flip does not make a selection after a predetermined amount of time, the choice will revert to the other team. If no one makes a decision after a predetermined amount of time, Tabroom.com will randomly assign sides (all events) and speaking positions (for PF only). These choices will be locked on the judges’ ballots; judges will no longer need to tell Tabroom.com which debaters are on which sides in what order. The purpose of automating this coin flip is to avoid confusing procedures about who conducts the coin flip on video and guarantee that the judges’ ballots are always correct based on student decisions. In NPF the flight B coin flips will occur at the start of the check-in time listed on the schedule. Strike Card procedures Depending on judge availability, we will offer strike cards starting in the quarters of varsity policy and varsity LD. Please make sure you are ready to fill out your card when the schedule indicates they will come out. Failure to complete the strike card in a timely manner will result in the tabroom program randomly striking a judge or judges. Evidence Sharing (all debate events) All debate events should have an email speech doc chain set up BEFORE the competition begins (IE, it should be ready to go by the start time of the event.) The competitors and judges all must be included on the speech doc chain. Decision Time (all debate events) There will be a decision time in all debate events. Decision time simply means there will be a deadline by which the judge must make a decision in each debate. Each round’s decision time deadline is based on the Tabroom pairing start time. If the judge does not enter a decision in tabroom by the decision time, it is within the Tabroom’s power to flip a coin to determine the winner of that debate. We do intend to enforce this but hope we don't have to. For example, in a policy prelim with 120 minutes for decision time, if the Tabroom pairing start time is 8am, the judge must enter the decision into Tabroom by 10am or the tabroom will flip a coin to determine the winner. Oral critiques can still take place after the decision deadline and written feedback on Tabroom can be edited until the end of the entire tournament. It is very important to note that the decision time does not change if the debate starts late. There is an incentive for the students and judge(s) to begin the debate at the Tabroom pairing start time and to exchange evidence via email chains throughout the debate and after the debate in a timely manner. Coaches, please make sure the people judging for your school are aware of the use of decision times and start their debates on time. Decision times will be included on the schedules for all events. Use of decision time has been extremely successful in the high school and college debate communities. Of course, please feel free to vote well in advance of decision time too. The decision time includes grace time for tech issues. If a team’s technological issues take up more than 10 minutes total of the allotted decision time, the judge should forfeit the team experiencing the technical delays. Evidence/Ethics Violations If a team believes an opponent committed an evidence or other ethics violation, the accusing team should stop the debate and ask the judge to adjudicate the challenge. This type of challenge includes the following situations: · a team reads evidence is that fabricated · a team reads evidence that is meaningfully altered to change the author’s original meaning · a team misrepresents how much evidence they have read in a debate, such as improperly highlighting their evidence, “clipping cards” (the team says they read more than they actually did by clipping a card short of the indicated end), or “cross reading” (the team skips words or sentences in the middle of the text, but indicates that they read all the highlighted words) · a team receives argument assistance or reads or responds to communications from a coach or other person after the debate has commenced, whether verbal or electronic, including the transfer of evidence after the round starts. The accusing team will explain to the judge what alleged violation is being asserted. The judge will evaluate the violation based on the evidence available to the judge. The judge should remind the accusing team that if the judge does not believe the opposing side committed a violation or cannot determine it based on the evidence provided, the accusing team will lose the debate. At this point, the accusing team should have an opportunity to withdraw their challenge without consequence. Ultimately students need to be aware that if they raise an ethics challenge and the judge does not find or agree an ethics violation occurred or cannot determine if one occured, that the accusing students lose the debate. If the judge finds that an ethics or evidence violation was committed, the offending team will be assigned a loss. If a single team member committed the violation, that debater will receive zero speaker points. The judge may assign speaker points to the non-offending debater. If the violation occurs prior to the non-offending team member delivering a speech, the judge may award points based upon the cross-examination, if applicable. If the non-offending team member has not delivered a speech or participated in a cross-ex, then the tab room will assign the average of the non-offending debater’s speaker points from prior debates. Any decision to challenge evidence violations or unethical behavior must be made during the round in which the infraction occurred before the judge submits a decision. No challenge can be made to conduct committed in any round after the ballot has been submitted. The judge assigned to the round will decide the challenge made in the round based solely on the evidence submitted by the teams in the round. No appeal, modification or reversal of the judge’s decision regarding the challenge or the consequences resulting from the challenge is permitted. Policy Debate Varsity, junior varsity, and novice policy debate divisions will be switch-side, cross-examination style, with an 8-3-5 format, 10 minutes of prep time. Varsity debaters should only include your finest competitors. Policy debaters may not enter any other tournament event. The policy topic for the 2021 Glenbrooks is Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its protection of water resources in the United States. Right now, there will be seven preliminary rounds in varsity policy. Varsity policy will break to double-octofinals (sextos). Octafinals and subsequent elimination rounds will take place on Monday. Please note that the tournament has discretion to make changes to the schedule based on entries. Appropriate disclosure is required within five minutes of the check in time. Appropriate disclosure includes disclosure of the advantages and plan text if the affirmative has been read before. If not, the team should let the negative know that it is a new affirmative. Negative teams should disclose previous 2NRs. In order to increase the quality of the judging pool in policy, we are instituting an entourage rule for policy. Any adult who coaches teams at the tournament that is capable of judging must be in the pool for at least 2 rounds and available to judge elimination debates they are obligated for. Lincoln-Douglas Divisions Lincoln-Douglas will include Varsity and junior varsity divisions, with NSDA rules and time limits. Varsity LD debaters should include only your finest competitors. LD debaters may not enter into any other tournament event. The November/December NSDA Lincoln-Douglas topic will be used. There will be seven preliminary rounds in Varsity Lincoln-Douglas. Varsity LD will break to double-octofinals. Octafinals and subsequent elimination rounds will occur on Monday. Please note that the tournament has the discretion to change the schedule based on entries and other factors. There will be six preliminary rounds in the JV division of LD. This division will break to octofinals, assuming the numbers continue to remain consistent with previous years. We reserve the right to break to octos. Appropriate disclosure is required within five minutes of the check in time. Appropriate disclosure includes disclosure of the advantages and plan text if the affirmative has been read before. If not, the team should let the negative know that it is a new affirmative. Negative teams should disclose previous 2NRs. Given the need for LD judges over the last several years we are instituting an entourage rule for LD. Any adult who coaches teams at the tournament that is capable of judging must be in the pool for at least 2 rounds and available to judge elimination debates they are obligated for. Public Forum Public Forum will be an open division using NSDA time limits. Please note, we are using the new NSDA speech and prep time rules for Public Forum. All decisions made by the judge in the debate are final - we will not listen to protests. If you think you need to challenge something done by the other team, then do it in the debate through the judge. Public Forum debaters may not enter any other tournament event. The November NSDA public forum topic will be used. The Public Forum division will have seven rounds and will break to triple octafinals. This is subject to change based on entries and other factors. Congressional Debate There will be multiple chambers of approximately 10 to 12. After prelims there will be a semifinal and final session. NSDA rules and time limits will apply; see the NSDA website www.speechanddebate.org for further details. Each school may enter a maximum of twenty (20) Congressional debaters to start. Based on numbers, the tournament may grant extra spots per school. The Glenbrooks tabroom staff will apportion the chambers and assign committees. Congressional debaters may not enter any other event. Each school may submit a maximum of three (3) pieces of legislation, but no more than one (1) per committee (economics, public welfare, foreign policy). Legislation must be in the proper NSDA format and uploaded on Tabroom.com by October 20th. Please only upload legislation on Tabroom.com. We are unable to accept late legislation. Please see the template for Congress legislation on the NSDA website at: http://www.speechanddebate.org/congress. Legislation is expected to be of sound quality and the tournament personnel reserve the right to exclude legislation that does not meet that standard. Legislative packets will be posted on the website for each participating school to download by November 1st. It is each school’s responsibility to check the Tabroom.com website for the legislative packet. Congressional Debate competition will conclude on Sunday. It is each school’s responsibility to make sure they have adequate judging for Sunday regardless of whether their school is competing in the elimination rounds. We can not make exceptions to this policy. Speech Events Access all rules and procedures for speech events at this page.

#### If they can’t prove that their disclosure was appropriate, this is an auto-loss for them which is a tournament rule that they knowingly agreed to when they registered and signed up to compete. Keep flowing the 1NC just in case they prove that they did disclose – if they don’t care about rules the 1AR has to concede that “I don’t want to win” because it’s tournament rule for the judge to vote for the winner. If there’s no impact to rules they should also personally email glenbrooks to have their bid taken away because it’s rule to award bids to octofinalists
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## 3

### OFF

#### 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 – they violate – they haven’t disclosed a single round
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#### 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. Debaters 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.

#### Paradigm Issues –

#### [1] DTD on disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence

#### [2] Reject RVIs, impact turns, and case cross applications – a) disclosure is a procedural that questions whether I should be debating this aff b) justifies infinite abuse through baiting theory and winning off a prepped out counterinterp

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL

#### [5] Fairness is a voter because debate is a game governed by rules and you can’t tell who actually won if the layer was skewed – procedural fairness is a mtaconstraint on competitive activities

#### [6] Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### [7] T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time. B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether. Reading T isn’t psychic violence – that was above, but especially if we’re not going for it since reading T can be used to prevent aff shiftiness and make substance a viable option.

## Case

### OV

New 2nr responses – they extempted tricks idk

### AT: Debate Bad

#### 1] No solvency and turn – debate as a communicative act may be violent, but they’re authors don’t differentiate it from the rest of the world it’s just an institution inside the anti-black world. They misread their authors the 1AC is a “band-aid” solution their authors don’t treat debate nihilistically in isolation BUT the world and eradicating debate doesn’t change the master-slave dialectic that recreates violence in different forms – proves it’s not endurance. ALL they actually do is generate cruel optimism that links to 1AC Gillespie since it creates a feel good solution that places blackness in a not yet but maybe to come social order where black infiltration of tournaments occurs.

#### 2] Even if debate is bad it can tactically be used to teach Black people their correct positioning in the world so they can approach the world without investing hope in it – the alternative is Black people not learning this position and investing hope in everything which recreates cruel optimism and turns the case.

#### 3] Debate is good, double bind either the AC performance is strong enough to destroy debate which should have been done x bids ago or the Ac’s performance doesn’t have anything to prove which means the squo is quite strong and that causes presumption.