Interpretation: Debaters, including Esha Venkat, who inform their opponents that they will be reading new non-T affirmatives must disclose open source if operative phrases in the advocacy text generate only five hits on Google scholar.To clarify, if the aff does not defend that member nations of the WTO ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicine, then they must fully disclose their positions osource. Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

Violation: Esha Venkat informed me that they would read a non-T affirmative, but did not disclose open source. The advocacy text was “I affirm a model of invitational logic for debate.” They disclosed the authors as “Michaelson, Swift, and Engels.” They did not dicslose first names. The phrase “invitational logic” generates only FIVE hits on Google scholar, and NONE of those articles are authored by Michaelson, Swift, or Engels.

Standards:

Engagement: There’s literally no way to engage. I don’t have access to the topic, since the aff is disclosed as non-T. I don’t have access to any literature base, since the phrase in the advocacy that isn’t just a debate buzz word is used in only a vanishingly small number of texts, and of the five two are repeats. There is literally nothing I can access that will give me any idea of what the aff will be. This kills education because the unique character of debate education is the ability to engage with ideas; springing a non-T aff that isn’t based in identifiable literature means I will gain nothing from the round. This kills fairness because they have the arbitrary advantage of knowing their position ahead of time while I

Further, internet searches are the only way we can access lit during a tournament. If non-T advocacy text uses phrases that are not founded in SEARCHABLE lit, the debate becomes impossible for the opponent.

This is the truest theory shell you’ve ever heard because (A) there was literally no way for me to prepare against this aff. And (B ) since the aff is non-T there’s no way for me to link any topical prep to it. And © since the K is completely obscure based on advocacy text I can’t even prepare against it based on foundational knowledge of critical literatgure.

SSD:Switch-Side Debate: Switch-side is the best form of debate because it uniquely allows for both perspectives. Prevents us from gaining dogmatic attitudes that are only one-sided. If we are forced to contest both sides of the topic we are more likely to be open to discussions and learn critical thinking skills from it. Multiple Impacts:

a. Switch side solves your educational impacts because you can still read this K on the neg.

b. Dogmatism is bad under your ROB because it just ends up reifying the problems you attempt to solve, gaining a different perspective on your arguments allows us to form our own independent opinions in the future.

3) TVA:  A) Defend an invitational model for debate as form of reducing ipp protections because they exclude women and POC B

Clash:

Access to lit: There’s no lit on “affirming invitational logic” it only has 5 hits on google scholar which is the most accessible site for critical literature. This is an independent voter because reading positions like these without disclosing them.

Fairness is voter since its an intrinsic good to the activity. Debate requires effective competition to give meaning to the work we do, and the only way to actualize any benefit of the activity is if the judge can make a decision. Filter impacts via intrinsicness—Debate does not make us loyal to any content and isn’t a final consensus about any question – the only thing that happens is that one of us wins and the other loses. That means even if the impacts they’re claiming quantitatively outweigh my fairness impacts, fairness still acts as a gateway issue. It extrinsically comes first a) there’s a skew in your evaluation if they were unfair since I wasn’t able to properly respond to any of their arguments b) inclusivity, otherwise ppl read 1000s nibs and c) double bind, if they say reject fairness, then you don’t need to evaluate their args– all control the internal link to case crosapps

And no RVIs

a) Incentivizes debaters to read abusive arguments and then win off the RVI

b) You shouldn’t get to win just by proving you were topical, this is specific to the topic

Competing Interps first

a) Reasonability is arbitrary and begs judge intervention to determine what is reasonable

b) Reasonability creates a race to the bottom incentivizing debaters to come as close to the brightline as possible

Drop the Debater to set a norm for debate, revaluation kills the 1NC and 2NR can never recover.

Impact turns to T are bad a) ideological flexibility – we should encourage debaters to introduce different types of arguments, otherwise no arg refinement b) it’s a dialogue not an enforcement – i.e. im just proposing a different method for how we should engage in your aff and your method.

***The subject is unstable: they change through experiences over time, I’m not the same Shreya I was 10 years ago***

***That means affect is constitutive to the subject: We affect others just as much as we are affected, thus changing over time.***

***Therefore, fluidity is the only determiner of the subject, the only thing constant is that we are always changing***

***Habeas corpus has failed – the notion that humans are included in the state perpetually creates groups who are excluded, to be included you must be akin to the Wester Man. Thus, the role of the ballot is to deconstruct the Western Man.***

**Weheliye 1**Alexander Weheliye; Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University; 2014; “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human”

We need only to consult the history of **habeas corpus**, the “great” writ of liberty, which is anchored in the U.S. Constitution (Article 1, Section 9), to see that this type of reasoning **leads to reducing inclusion** and personhood **to ownership**. 6 The Latin phrase habeas corpus means “You shall have the body,” and a writ thereof requires the government to present prisoners before a judge so as to provide a lawful justification for their continued imprisonment. This writ has been considered a pivotal safeguard against the misuse of political power in the modern west. Even though the Military Commissions Act of 2006, which denied habeas corpus to “unlawful enemy combatants” imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay, remains noteworthy and alarming, habeas corpus **has been used both by and** frequently **against racialized groups throughout U.S. history**, as was the case when habeas corpus was suspended during World War II, allowing for the internment of Japanese Americans. The writ has also led to gains for minoritized subjects as, for instance, in the well-known Amistad case (1839), in which abolitionists used a habeas corpus petition to free the “illegally” captured Africans who had staged a mutiny against their abductors. Likewise, when Ponca tribal leader Standing Bear was jailed as a result of protesting the forcible removal of his people to Indian Territory in 1879, the writ of habeas corpus affected his release from incarceration as well as the judge's recognition that, as a general rule, Indians were persons before U.S. law, even though Native Americans were not considered full U.S. citizens until 1924. 7 Nevertheless, the benefits accrued through the juridical acknowledgment of racialized subjects as fully human often exacts a steep entry price, because **inclusion hinges on** accepting the codification of **personhood as property, which is**, in turn, **based on the comparative distinction between groups**, as in one of the best-known court cases in U.S. history: the Dred Scott case. In 1857, **the Supreme Court invalidated Dred Scott's habeas corpus**, since, as an escaped slave, Scott could not be a legal person. According to Chief Justice Taney: “Dred Scott is not a citizen of the State of Missouri, as alleged in his declaration, because he is a negro of African descent; his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as negro slaves.”8 In order to justify withdrawing Dred Scott's legal right to ownership of self, Chief Justice **Taney's opinion** in the decision **contrasts** the status of black subjects**[slaves] with the legal position of Native Americans** vis-à-vis the possibility of U.S. citizenship and personhood: “The situation of [the negro] population was altogether unlike that of the Indian race. These Indian Governments were regarded and treated as foreign Governments…. [Indians] may, without doubt, like the subjects of any other foreign Government, be naturalized…and become citizens of a State, and of the United States; and if an individual should leave his nation or tribe, and take up his abode among the white population, he would be entitled to all the rights and privileges which would belong to an emigrant from any other foreign people.”9 **While slaves were not** accorded the status of being **humans** that belonged to a different nation, Indians **[natives] could** theoretically overcome**their lawful** **foreignness**, but **only if they renounced previous** forms of **personhood and citizenship.** Hence, the tabula rasa of **whiteness**—which all groups but blacks can access—**serves as the prerequisite for the** law's magical **transubstantiation** of a thing to be possessed **into a property-owning subject**. 10

**The aff calls on the debate space to be inclusive, but inclusion within the structure is predicated on exclusion.**

**Weheliye 2**Alexander Weheliye; Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University; 2014; “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human”

Suffering, especially when caused by political violence, has long functioned as the hallmark of both humane sentience and of inhuman brutality. Frequently, **suffering becomes the defining feature of those** subjects **excluded from the law**, the national community, humanity, and so on due to the political violence inflicted upon them **even as it**, paradoxically, **grants** them access to **inclusion** and equality. In western human rights discourse, for instance, the physical and psychic residues of political violence enable victims to be recognized as belonging to the “brotherhood of Man.” Too often, **this tendency not only leaves** intact **hegemonic**ideas **of humanity as indistinguishable from** **western Man but demands comparing** different **forms of subjugation** in order **to adjudicate who warrants recognition** and belonging. As W. E. B. Du Bois asked in 1944, if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not offer provisions for ending world colonialism or legal segregation in the United States, “Why then call it the Declaration of Human Rights?”2 Wendy Brown maintains, “**politicized identity**” **operates** “only **by** entrenching, restating, **dramatizing, and inscribing its pain in politics; it can hold out no future…that triumphs over this pain**.”3 Brown suggests replacing the identitarian declaration “I am,” which merely confirms and solidifies what already exists, with the desiring proclamation “I want,” which offers a Nietzschean politics of overcoming pain instead of clinging to suffering as an immutable feature of identity politics. While I recognize Brown's effort to formulate a form of minority politics not beholden to the aura of wounded attachments and fixated almost fetishistically on the state as the site of change, we do well to recall that many of the political agendas based on identity (the suffragette movement, the movement for the equality of same-sex marriages, or the various movements for the full civil rights of racialized minority subjects, for instance) are less concerned with claiming their suffering per se (I am) than they are with using wounding as a stepping stone in the quest (I want) for rights equal to those of full citizens. Liberal **governing bodies**, whether in the form of nation-states or supranational entities such as the United Nations or the International Criminal Court **make particular forms of wounding the precondition for entry into** the hallowed halls of full **personhood**, only acknowledging certain types of physical violence. For instance, while the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees passed a resolution in 2008 that includes rape and other forms of sexual violence in the category of war crimes, there are many forms of sexual violence that do not fall into this purview, and thus bar victims from claiming legal injury and/or personhood. 4

***The color line defines the conception of the human, not-quite-human or non-human in relation to the Western Man. Bodies become defined by how close they are to this ideal in order to access their humanity.***

**Wynter** [Sylvia; 2003; “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument,” CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 3, Number 3,257-337]   
The Argument proposes that **the** new master code of the bourgeoisie and of its ethnoclass **conception of the human** - that is, the code of selected by Evolution/dysselected by Evolution- **was** now to be **mapped** and anchored **on** the only available "objective set of facts" that remained. This was the set of environmentally, climatically determined **phenotypical differences** between human hereditary variations as these had developed in the wake of the human diaspora both across and out of the continent of Africa; that is, as a set of (so to speak) totemic differences, which were now harnessed to the task of **projecting the Color Line drawn** institutionally and discursively **between whites/nonwhites** - and at its most extreme between the Caucasoid physiognomy (as symbolic life, the name of what is good, the idea that some humans can be selected by Evolution) and the Negroid phys- iognomy (as symbolic death, the "name of what is evil," the idea that some humans can be dysselected by Evolution)- as the new extrahuman line, or projection of genetic nonhomogeneity that would now be made to function, analogically, as the status-ordering principle based upon ostensibly differ- ential degrees of evolutionary selectedness/eugenicity and/or dysselected- ness/dysgenicity. **Differential degrees**, as **between** **the classes** (middle and lower and, by extrapolation, between capital and labor) as well as between **men and women**, and between the **heterosexual and homosexual** erotic preference - and, even more centrally, as between Breadwinner (job- holding middle and working classes) and the jobless and criminalized Poor, with this rearticulated at the global level as between Sartre's "Men" and Natives (see his guide-quote), before the end of politico-military colonial- ism, then postcolonially as between the **"developed"** First World, on the one hand, **and** the **"underdeveloped"** Third and Fourth Worlds on the other. The Color Line **was** now **projected as the new** "space of Otherness" **principle of nonhomogeneity**, made to reoccupy the earlier places of the motion-filled heavens/non-moving Earth, rational humans/irrational animal lines, and **to recode in new terms** their ostensible extrahumanly determined **differences of ontological substance**. While, if the earlier two had been indispen- sable to the production and reproduction of their respective genres of being human, of their descriptive statements (i.e., as Christian and as Mam), and of the overall order in whose field of interrelationships, social hierarchies, system of role allocations, and divisions of labors each such genre of the human could alone realize itself- and with each such descriptive state- ment therefore being rigorously conserved by the "learning system" and order of knowledge as articulated in the institutional structure of each order - this was to be no less the case with respect to the projected "space of Otherness" of the Color Line. With respect, that is, to its indispensability to the production and reproduction of our present genre of the human Mam, together with the overall global/national bourgeois order of things and its specific mode of economic production, alone able to provide the material conditions of existence for the production and reproduction of the ethnoclass or Western-bourgeois answer that we now give to the question of the who and what we are.

***The alternative is habeas viscus. We must reconfigure our view of the human to be framed by flesh, rather than the legal body to focus on affective bonds. By synthesizing our experiences and identities, we can embrace liminality to better strategize and dismantle systems of oppression while emphasizing collective action and collaboration. This alternative is unconditional.***

**-(suffering, actualized, material) instead of the legal body (legible, coherent, perceived)**

**Weheliye 4** [Alexander Weheliye; Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University; 2014; “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human”; LCA-BP]

The poetics and politics that I have been discussing under the heading of **habeas viscus** or the flesh are **concerned not with inclusion** in reigning precincts of the status quo **but**, in Cedric Robinson's apt phrasing, “ the continuing development of **a collective consciousness**informed by the historical struggles for liberation and **motivated by the shared sense of obligation to preserve** [and I would add also to reimagine] **the collective being**, the ontological totality.”31 Though the laws of Man place the flesh outside the ferocious and ravenous perimeters of the legal body, **habeas viscus defies domestication** both **on the basis of** particularized **personhood as a result of suffering**, as in human rights discourse,**and on the grounds of the** **universalized** version of **western Man. Rather, habeas viscus points to the terrain of humanity as a relational assemblage exterior to the** jurisdiction of **law** given that the law can bequeath or rescind ownership of the body so that it becomes the property of proper persons but does not possess the authority to nullify the politics and poetics of the flesh found in the traditions of the oppressed. As a way of conceptualizing politics, then, habeas viscus diverges from the discourses and institutions that yoke the flesh to political violence in the modus of deviance. Instead, **it translates the hieroglyphics of the flesh into a potentiality in any and all things**, an originating leap in the imagining of future anterior freedoms and new genres of humanity. To envisage habeas viscus as a forceful assemblage of humanity entails leaving behind the world of Man and some of its attendant humanist pieties. As opposed to depositing the flesh outside politics, the normal, the human, and so on, we need a better understanding of its varied workings in order to disrobe the cloak of Man, which gives the human a long-overdue extreme makeover; or, in the words of Sylvia Wynter, “the struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e. western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves.”32 Claiming **and dwelling in the monstrosity of the flesh present some of the weapons in the guerrilla warfare** to “secure the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species,” **since these liberate** from captivity **assemblages** of life, thought, and politics from the tradition of the oppressed and, as a result, **disfigure the centrality of Man as the sign for**the **human**. As an assemblage of humanity, **habeas viscus animates the elsewheres of Man and emancipates the true potentiality that rests in those subjects who live behind the veil of the permanent state of exception**: freedom; assemblages of freedom that sway to the temporality of new syncopated beginnings for the human beyond the world and continent of Man.