

## A.interpretation

Debaters must disclose contact information on the hs LD wiki

## B. violation

They don't

The image shows two side-by-side screenshots of the NDCA (National Debate Coaches Association) website. The left screenshot displays the 'Millard South Nehls Neg' page, and the right screenshot displays the 'Millard South Nehls Aff' page. Both pages feature a 'Quick Links' sidebar on the left, a main content area with a table of rounds, and a 'Round Reports' section at the bottom. The 'Neg' page has a table with columns for 'Tournament', 'Round', 'Opponent', 'Judge', 'Cites', 'Round Report', 'Open Source', and 'Add/Modify'. The 'Aff' page has a similar table. The 'Round Reports' section includes a table with columns for 'Tournament', 'Round', 'Opponent', 'Judge', 'Cites', 'Round Report', 'Open Source', and 'Add/Modify'. The 'Add/Modify' section includes a table with columns for 'Tournament', 'Round', 'Opponent', 'Judge', 'Cites', 'Round Report', 'Open Source', and 'Add/Modify'.

## C.Standards

Pre- Round prep and accommodations

a. I can't even contact you to ask questions about the aff. key to fairness bc aff gets infinite prep and i have no time to prep except for 5 minutes in round.

b. This is bad for accommodations because if debaters need highlighting in a certain color or can't understand spreading, there's no way for them to reach out to you. this is abuse in the debate space bc we can't get education until we can engage

1. Clash – Disclosure allows a simple debate instead of two teams shooting shots in the dark at each other

Fairness is a voter

1. Gateway issue – an unfair round skews my ability to respond, you can't vote for arguments if I don't have equal opportunity to contest
2. Debate is a competitive activity, no one would do it if it wasn't fair

Education is a voter

1. It's the only portable impact we gain from the debates we have
2. It's the reason schools fund debate, no education means no reason for debate as an activity to live

Use competing interps

1. Reasonability is arbitrary which causes intervention, there has to be an objective way to view rounds
2. It leads to a race to the bottom of abuse
3. Devolves to competing interps because we vote on the better brightline through offense/defense

3. No RVIs, we spend the same amount of time on theory, plus we are debating over models of debates. If you win that your model is good, we continue to use that model.

And if they get an RVI, i get RVI's on their RVI's, it's senseless and creates cyclical debates

# Trad NC semi kritik

[cards bracketed for gendered language]

definition of appropriation from Cambridge

“the act of taking something for your own use”

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/appropriation>

**Cornell defines Private entity:** (A) In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

**Observation: the word “appropriation” has no qualifier meaning the neg isn’t bound to just physical appropriation, thus non-physics appropriation in the sense of culture or ideas would also be topical under this resolution**

**The single standard is deconstructing the white future for a more intersectional one**

**First, suffering and oppression of minorities is the a priori to all ethics**

**Kang 97:**

(Yang Kang is a published philosophical writer in the Tijdschrift Voor Filosofie (Magazine for Philosophy). “LEVINAS ON SUFFERING AND SOLIDARITY. ”Tijdschrift Voor Filosofie, vol. 59, no. 3, 1997, pp. 495–500, JSTOR, September 1997, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40887754>).

Levinas' whole philosophy is, I believe, nothing but a series of unceasing reflections of these questions. As is well-known, he changed the whole framework by which we can think the meaning of suffering, the meaning of God and faith, and the meaning of morality. As a motto for this new framework and a new direction of thinking, Levinas has chosen Plato's expression: the Good beyond Being (epekeina tes onsjai ; le Bien au dela de l'être). This means: **the ethical has priority over** the ontological, It could even be said that the ethical **{and} is the foundation of the ontological.** Levinasian distinctions, for instance, between the Same and the Other, Totality and Infinity, the Saying and the Said. Otherwise than Being and Being, all these distinctions indicate this fundamental insight of the priority of the ethical, The ethical, i.e., my responsibility for the Other, one-for-the- Other, is, for Levinas, the source of all and every meaning. After the end of theodicy, i.e., after the collapse of conventional faith and morality, **the ethical alone can give meaning to life, faith and moral goodness.** It isn't, therefore, surprising that Levinas **{it} approaches human pain and suffering from an ethical perspective.** As we mentioned earlier, the most primitive reaction to pain and suffering is a cry, a moan, and a groan. This is the spontaneous reaction of a wounded man. In the utmost pain, pain too painful to be expressed in articulated words, there is no other means to express the extreme painfulness of pain other than just crying, moaning, groaning or sighing. This reaction of the patient calls for action: action for help from the other. A cry, a moan, or a sigh is not locutionary, but perlocutionary (if I might make use of Austin's terminology): it does not describe a fact ; it is a call (appel) for help. Precisely at this point, Levinas is very keen to show that can observe the double face of suffering: suffering is, on the one hand, extreme passivity, impotence, abandonment and solitude (SI, 109/US, 158); it is an „enchainment to oneself" (T A, 36/ TO, 55), an „impossibility of detaching oneself from the instant of existence" „, the very irremissibility of being" „, the impossibility of retreat" „, an „absence of refuge", and in this sense the „impossibility of nothingness" (TA, 55/TO, 69). On the other hand, suffering is unassumable and unassumability itself. Unassumability, or unseizability, this tells us of the existence of an absolute exteriority or absolute alterity which cannot be reduced to oneself by any means whatever. Therefore, in the unassumability, there is a possibility of a half opening, an opening of alterity „, wherever a moan, a cry, a groan or a sigh happens there is the original call for aid from the other ego whose alterity, whose exteriority promises salvation. " (SL. 109-110/US, 158). This is to say that suffering, in its unassumability, in its groan and cry without any possibility of understanding and accepting it, opens up the possibility of a relation with the Other. The opening of a possibility of a relation with the Other is, however, in itself still a possibility, not an actuality. In this sense, Levinas calls this opening „, a half opening." **There must be, therefore, a reaction.** i.e., an action in answer **to the call of someone who is inflicted by pain.** This response to the call, to the appeal of the inflicted, the dispossessed, the poor, the persecuted or the stranger is to make oneself responsible for the other person. Being responsible for the other person is „ethical" in the pure sense of the word. **The ethical, or being ethical, implies exposing oneself to the other person's pain and suffering.** In this context, Levinas proposes two theses: first, suffering opens upon suffering the ethical perspective of the inter-human; second, the just suffering in me for the suffering of the other person makes suffering meaningful which is otherwise intrinsically useless and unjustifiable (See SI, 110-111/US, 159). This is Levinas' answer to the question: „, Is there any possibility to make suffering meaningful?" Levinas' answer has relevance, of course, to the question of the meaning of faith and morality after the collapse of theodicy. I think it is very important to notice the fact that Levinas does not say, first of all, that suffering can be meaningful, if it is seen from an ethical perspective. Of course, he is concerned with whether a meaning could be found in the intrinsically meaningless suffering. „, Ethics" could be an answer to that question: an ethical relation to the Other could provide meaning to suffering, Levinas here deviates from our expectation. He says instead: „, suffering opens upon suffering the ethical perspective of the inter-human." This means: suffering is not one of several themes which could be approached from an ethical perspective. Suffering is precisely the opening of the ethical perspective. This is to say: the ethical perspective can be opened, if and only if we listen to the cry and the groan of people afflicted with pain. I think this is the most fundamental message of Levinas. **The concern for the other person's suffering must be foremost ; all other factors,** for example, the respect for the moral law, happiness or the preservation of community **are of minor importance for ethics.** In **this context,** we can understand why Levinas **lays** so **much emphasis on the epiphany of face. The face of which** Levinas is speaking **is not the face of the king, the dictator or the rich, but** the face of the poor, the orphan, the widow, and the stranger: the face of a man or woman in suffering. As far as we are not confronted with this face which is in pain and suffering, we can live without any care for the other, we do our work, we can do business with people, we can have relations with other persons. This dimension of life is basically, „economic": our way of dwelling in the world (TI, 125-149/ Tal, 152-174). When we are confronted with the face of the Other, and listen to him, then ethics infiltrates our economic life. Levinas writes: „, Ethics is an optics" (TI, xii/Tal, 23; cf. TI, xvii/Tal, 29; TI 51 ; Tal 78). If ethics is an optics, that is, if ethics is a look, what is then the object of this looking? Stars in heaven and the moral law in me? I believe, Levinas (it) intends the suffering face **of the unprivileged** people. Ethics is doing justice. Isn't it strange that all the great ethical systems of Western tradition, for instance, utilitarianism and the Kantian ethics of the modern age, have neglected the suffering of other persons?

## Contention 1 - futurism

**space is really white. We can only understand our present relation to space as a manifestation of the white, settler-colonial fantasies**

**McKinson 2020** (Kimberley D.- assistant professor of anthropology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice (CUNY). "Do Black Lives Matter in Outer Space?" Sapiens, September 30, 2020 <https://www.sapiens.org/culture/space-colonization-racism/> )

Though SpaceX is a private company with its sights fixated on colonizing an ecology beyond the bounds of Earth's atmosphere, it is nonetheless implicated in these contestations about racism. **Space exploration is not and has never been politically neutral.** As the history of the space race shows, **the dream of colonizing space has always been tied to narratives about domination and greatness. In the U.S., the historic NASA workforce has largely been White and male.** As writer Mark Dery noted in a groundbreaking essay about Afrofuturism, **such men seem to believe they possess the power to design, own, and control "the unreal estate of the future."** **These narratives are not unlike the ones of Euro-American colonization and imperialism on Earth, which are stories of the exploitation, exclusion, and dehumanization of Black people, other people of color, and Indigenous people in the name of exploration, adventure, and expansion by White people.** Today the scions of space colonization are the billionaire entrepreneurs who have founded commercial spaceflight companies—Musk (SpaceX), Jeff Bezos (Blue Origin), and Sir Richard Branson (Virgin Galactic). In other words, they are no longer political leaders from ideologically opposed nation-states, as they were during the Cold War. They are still, however, privileged and wealthy White men. (The combined net worth of Musk, Bezos, and Branson is over US\$273 billion.) **Their endeavors to colonize Mars and their fantasies for the future of humankind must be understood in the context of the racialized histories of colonization on Earth.**

**The characteristics of space and the future are made up of those which inhabit it; only 13 of the 553 people who have been to space are of Mexican descent.**

**Even in tv and media, the future is something we imagine as dominated by white people**

**Ramírez 2008**

Catherine S. Ramírez (Catherine S ramírez - Chair of latin american and latino studies department at the University of California Santa Cruz, [PhD in ethnic studies](#) and a BA in English from the University of California, Berkeley)

"Afrofuturism/chicanaafuturism" 2008

<http://homepages.wmich.edu/~acareywe/ramirez-afrofuturism-chicanafuturism.pdf>

I open this essay with a confession: I was a nerd when I was a kid and I expressed my nerdiness most clearly as a science fiction fan. I stood in line for hours to see Return of the Jedi the day it opened. Ewoks notwithstanding, I truly enjoyed this film. I also spent many an afternoon in my parents' backyard with my sisters, friends, and cousins reenacting scenes from our favorite movies and TV shows. We pulled apart transistor radios and stuffed their entrails into our socks to mimic the Bionic Woman and we held a fraying tennis racket over our faces to play the role of her formidable nemesis, the fembot. A rusty shopping cart, boosted from a supermarket parking lot, doubled as the Millennium Falcon and an old olla my mother had used for cooking beans was transformed into Darth Vader's helmet. Nobody told us that girls, much less Mexican girls, weren't supposed to like science fiction.

**Undeniably, few if any of the characters in the mainstream science fiction films and television programs of the 1970s and early 1980s looked like us.** As the African American science fiction writer Octavia E. Butler pointed out, **Star Wars featured "every kind of alien . . . but only one kind of human—white ones"** (Beal 1986, 17). Sadly, only Ricardo Montalban's Khan and Blade Runner's Gaff, played by our homie Edward James Olmos, resembled us. Moreover, **there was no mistaking me for any of the good guys—in the strictest sense of "guy."** Yet, **despite the genre's androcentrism and overwhelming whiteness, I found pleasure and meaning in science fiction.** It beckoned me to imagine a world—indeed a universe—beyond the freeways, strip malls, and smog-alert days of my Southern California childhood. **More than mere escapism, science fiction can prompt us to recognize and rethink the status quo by depicting an alternative world, be it a parallel universe, distant future, or revised past.**

Good science fiction re-presents the present or past, albeit with a twist. It tweaks what we take to be reality or history and in doing so exposes its constructedness. For this reason, the genre has proven fertile ground for a number of black and feminist writers, artists, and musicians, from Edgar Arceneaux to Marion Zimmer Bradley. These innovative cultural workers have transformed what was once considered the domain of geeky white boys into a rich, exciting, and politically charged medium for the interrogation of ideology, identity, historiography, and epistemology

The word “appropriation” in the topic has no qualifier, so affirming rejects all forms of appropriation. Not only the physical form the aff rejects but also the cultural psychic appropriation of space which we use as a conceptual device that chicanxfuturism takes. chicanxfuturism offers the possibility to subvert our traditionally white realm of space through a reimagining and appropriation of the past, present, and future of mexicans

**Ramírez 2** (Catherine S ramírez - Chair of latin american and latino studies department at the University of California Santa Cruz, [PhD in ethnic studies](#) and a BA in English from the University of California, Berkeley) “Afrofuturism/chicanaafuturism” 2008<sup>[BH]</sup>

<http://homepages.wmich.edu/~acareywe/ramirez-afrofuturism-chicanafuturism.pdf>

Finally, **Chicanxfuturism defamiliarizes the familiar.** Like good science fiction, **it brings into relief that which is generally taken for granted, such as tradition, history, or the norm, including normative gender and sexuality.** Martínez’s Catholic icons distort the santo tradition of which they are still a part. Set in the near future in the border region between the independent nation of Aztlán and Gringolandia (the former United States of America), Cherrie Moraga’s play *The Hungry Woman: A Mexican Medea* (2001) reinterprets ancient Greek and Mesoamerican myths as well as the promises and pitfalls of Chicano cultural nationalism. And Laura Molina’s 2004 painting *Amor Alien* (fig. 2) offers a sci-fi riff on mid-twentieth-century Mexican calendar art. **Like Anzaldúa’s theory, it points to the alien as a symbol for Chicana and Latina sexuality.**<sup>8</sup> **Taken as a whole, these works show that science fiction** is just as well suited for Chicanas and Chicanos as it is for African Americans. Some, like *Amor Alien*, are clearly science fiction. Yet for others, **such as *Los Vendidos* and Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La Frontera*, the connection to science fiction is probably less apparent at first.** Theories of Afrofuturism have taught me to see cultural products that would not necessarily be classified as science or science fiction, like the music of Parliament and Midnight Star, as, or at the very least through the lens of, science and science fiction. These theories have inspired me to ask: **What happens to Chicana/o texts when we read them as science fiction? To Chicana/o cultural identity? And to the concepts of science, technology, civilization, progress, modernity, and the human? These are the questions Chicanafuturism offers and confronts.**

I advocate for the appropriation of outer space by chicanxfuturists entities as a means to critically interrogate and undermine the whiteness of space.

The alt is Chicanxfuturism. Only Through an appropriation of borderless space through our imagination will us chicanos and chicana’s be able to stake a claim in the future, the future that was stripped from us by American and Spanish colonial forces. We must embrace the resurgence. Our land on earth was stolen but our dreams of the future are something that can never be taken from us

**Ramírez 3** (Catherine S ramírez - Chair of latin american and latino studies department at the University of California Santa Cruz, [PhD in ethnic studies](#) and a BA in English from the University of California, Berkeley) “Afrofuturism/chicanaafuturism” 2008<sup>[BH]</sup>

<http://homepages.wmich.edu/~acareywe/ramirez-afrofuturism-chicanafuturism.pdf>

**By appropriating the imagery** of science and technology, **Chican[x]futurist works disrupt age-old racist and sexist binaries that exclude Chicanas and Chicanos from visions of the future.** Examples include Yolanda M. López’s 1988 logo for the Chicana feminist organization *Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social*, which depicts a pre-Columbian goddess at a desktop computer; Alma López’s 2006 update, *La Luchadora*, in which a young, athletic brown woman cradles a laptop; and the collaborative projects of the MeChicano Alliance of Space Artists (M.A.S.A.) (fig. 1).<sup>5</sup> At the same time, **some of the most powerful Chican[x]futurist works,** such as Martínez’s *santos* and Guillermo Gómez-Peña and Roberto Sifuentes’s performances as *El Naftazteca* and *El Cybervato*, **throw into question** the link between **science, technology, civilization, and progress. In addition, Chican[x]futurism interrogates definitions of the human.** *El Teatro Campesino’s* *acto Los*

Vendidos, first performed in 1967 and thus one of the earliest examples of Chicanafuturism, offers a more expansive definition of “human” as it criticizes racist and classist perceptions of Chican[x] and Mexicans, especially Mexican workers, as automatons. Similarly, Gloria Anzaldúa’s 1987 theory of “alien” consciousness endeavors to undo the legacies of patriarchy, homophobia, and white supremacy in the United States by rejecting Enlightenment epistemology and ontology, as represented in great part by empiricism and the Cartesian subject.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for whoever better best deconstructs the structural violence of whiteness and colonialism. prefer because 1- this minimizes oppression and 2 the debate space is a site for resisting structural violence. It is a space where students build advocacy skills. There’s no such thing as fiat and plans aren’t passed just because we think it could, that means the only valuable thing that can come from the round is how to build resistance against oppression.