

PROG FILE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THEORY	3
2nd Constructive Response Theory	4
Contingent Standards Theory	6
Contingent Standards Counter Theory	7
Contradictions Theory	8
Counterplan Theory	10
DA in 2nd Rebuttal Theory	11
Deontological Framework Theory	13
Disclosure Theory	15
Disclosure Theory (Shorter)	17
Email Chain Theory	18
Game Over Theory	20
LEGO Profile Picture Theory	21
Multiple Worlds Bad Theory	23
Multiple Worlds Good Counter Theory	25
Neg Can Prove Falsity Theory	26
Reject the Neg/Aff K ALT Theory	27
Severance Theory	29
Solvency Author Theory	31
Taint Theory	33
Theory during Round Theory	35
F2 THEORY	37
A2 Substance Theory (Drop ARG)	38
A2 RVI	39
A2 RVI Bad	40
A2 Fairness Not a Voter	41

A2 Text > Fairness	42
A2 Logic > Fairness	43
A2 Fairness Brightline	44
A2 I'll Kick Arg So No Abuse	45
A2 Theory Leads to Intervention	46
A2 They Got Theory Offense, Reciprocate	47
A2 I Don't Know Theory Don't Run It On Me Boo Hoo	48
A2 Theory is Just an EZ Win Not to Check Abuse	49
A2 Theory Makes People Act Unfair When They Get Mad	50
Fairness > Education	51
Education > Fairness	52
A2 K's	53
A2 Illusory Truth K (Brought to you by Alex Shan)	54
A2 Surveillance K	57
A2 Privacy Rights K	59
A2 Terror Talks K	61
A2 Rights Are Absolute K	63
A2 Islamophobia K	65
A2 Ocean Management K	67
A2 Anthropocentrism K	68
A2 Sustainable Development K	70
A2 Science Frontier K	72
A2 AfroPes K	73
A2 White Supremacy K	75
A2 Personalizing Debate	78
A2 Narratives	80

THEORY

2nd Constructive Response Theory

- A. Interpretation - The second speaking team should fully respond to all of the arguments made in the first speaking team's constructive or concede the arguments. To clarify, respond to everything from the first speech and don't read any new responses afterwards.
 - B. Violation - They read new responses to our case in second rebuttal. Specifically, ____ response was new.
- C. Standards
- 1. Predictability - If they can respond in the second rebuttal they can sandbag DAs and we wouldn't know what they are going for in summary.
 - 2. Time skew - Not responding in the next speech means that we have to wait until summary to frontline. This puts us at a 4:3 disadvantage on time skew.
 - 3. Clash - Responding early would give us all more clash on the arguments because they're being discussed in more speeches.

- D. Voters
- 1. Education, it's the entire point of debate and it increases our ability to have better policy making and solves back for all case issues.
 - 2. Fairness, it's necessary for the judge to choose who won the debate. The lack of fairness means that debate is always tilted and it loses its meaning.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Contingent Standards Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters may only advocate one standard throughout the round, or they may concede their opponents' standard.
- B. Violation - they have a contingent standard of ____
- C. Standards
 - 1. Strategy skew, these two moral frameworks contradict and are cancelling conditions on each other. First, I can't answer these arguments without contradicting myself because I have to draw relevant comparisons between my standard and another ethical theory. Moreover, he will just go for the standard I underplay the least and use it to kick offense I make to the other standard. I can't form a coherent strategy because I can't determine how much offense that I should allocate to each standard since he can kick whatever offense I put.
 - 2. Education, debaters don't have to commit to a coherent advocacy. He destroys clash because the function of a contingent standard is to minimize the amount of work he has to do on the aff standard.
- D. Voters
 - 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater, and education, which precedes substance because it is the fundamental goal of debate.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Contingent Standards Counter Theory

- A. Counter-Interpretation: debaters may advocate offense to a standard that is not either their own or their opponents.
- B. Reasons to Prefer
 1. Critical thinking skills: These arguments add educational benefit by forcing you to think about argument interaction and how different arguments operate when contested or turned by responses. It also teaches you strategy for setting up even scenarios, which means you have thought about the arguments that respond to your arguments. This also provides an internal link of research education by promoting thinking and researching about common ways to respond to your advocacy. Critical thinking skills provide education in the form of life-long skills in argumentation.

Contradictions Theory

A. Interpretation - Debaters may not contradict themselves.

B. Violation - X arguments contradict.

C. Standards

1. Strategy skew: I can never form a coherent strategy because I have no idea which side of the contradiction they will go for in the next speech; this also allows him to kick turns because he can choose whichever side of the contradiction I undercovered, making it impossible to win. Also, I can't answer the contradictions without contradicting myself, which means the abuse has already occurred.

2. Contradictions are uneducational because they don't bind debaters to a stable advocacy, thus minimizing clash, and allow debaters to spew logically inconsistent arguments without any consequence.

D. Voters

1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Counterplan Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters must not advocate counterplans.
- B. Violation - S/he does.
- C. Standards
 - 1. It's literally against the rules of public forum debate. Violating the rules violates fairness because the rules are made to keep fairness in the round.
- D. Voters:
 - 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

- 1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
- 2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

DA in 2nd Rebuttal Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters should not present any new contentions in 2nd rebuttal. To clarify, all contentions should be presented in the team's first speech.
- B. Violation their ____ is a contention because it fundamentally has no direct correlation to our arguments so you can't evaluate it as a turn.
- C. Standards
 - 1. Time Skew. We only have three minutes in summary to frontline whatever new contention they're running and also extend responses to their first constructive and also extend our case and do weighing which massively skews time to them because we'll inevitably undercover one of their contentions on the flow. The first speaking team is already at a disadvantage because we have less time to frontline, their abuse only serves to make the debater literally impossible to win.
 - 2. Strategy Skew. Since we'll undercover one argument on the flow it's so easy for them to kick all the other contentions and go for the one we drop to pick up an easy ballot, there's massive summary strategy skew for them which makes the debate essentially impossible.
 - 3. Clash. Since they never read this contention in constructive there's no way we can give multiple extensive responses to their argument because there's no time which reduces clashes on the contention.
- D. Voters
 - 1. Fairness. Our first two standards link in cleanly here because there's no way for us to fairly debate the round anymore since they literally read new offense. Fairness is a voter because we assume fair adjudication of arguments as we present them.
 - 2. Education. Our third standard links in because there's no education to be gained from introducing an argument that can't be properly responded to. Clash ensures education by presenting both perspectives on an argument but reading totally new arguments takes that out. Education is the only portable skill we take away from debate and it's why schools fund debate.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Deontological Framework Theory

- A. Interpretation - If the aff runs a deontological standard, then the contention must include only one violation of the standard.
- B. Violation - There are multiple offensive arguments impacting to his deontological standard, <...>
- C. Standards
 - 1. Reciprocity - Each contention functions as an independent no-risk issue. Even if I prove nukes don't, he can still win by proving that nukes . This allows him to kick turns, giving him a structural advantage, and creates a moving target because I can never know which piece of offense he will extend.
- D. Voters
 - 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

- 1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Disclosure Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters must, on a page on the NDCA PF 2019-2020 wiki with their name and the school they attend, disclose the full citations, and the full text of the card of any pieces of evidence which they have read in their case in a previous round at least 30 min before the round. To clarify, disclose your broken cases.
- B. Violation - They have not posted cites: we can provide screenshots if necessary.
- C. Standards:
 - 1. Argument quality – Two internal links:
 - a. Foreknowledge – A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.
 - b. Cross-pollination — Debaters can use and modify the best ideas from each other's wikis, ultimately leading to development of the best version of the argument. Argument quality is a voter because debate is a unique space in which we need to have in-depth education about important issues.
 - 2. Inclusion - Two internal links:
 - a. Intel – otherwise schools with big programs who bring more students and judges and are better connected will scout more rounds and have more flows; disclosure equalizes that intel disparity.
 - b. Research – disclosure forces big, wealthy programs to put their prep on the wiki – that means everyone has access to the best, paywalled evidence, and also keeps smaller programs up-to-date on the meta.
- D. Voters
 - 1. Education – it's the reason schools find debate and the only portable skill of debate.
 - 2. Inclusion – it prevents teams from accessing any benefit of debate in the first place.
 - 3. Evidence ethics – misconstruing evidence is academic dishonesty and prevents actual engagement with the literature.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

If they don't respond to this in their constructive, it's conceded for the round because theory is inherently prefat and thus the more important argument, meaning that before we can even debate in substance there needs to be an attempt from both sides to resolve theory

Disclosure Theory (Shorter)

- A. Interpretation - Teams should disclose on the NDCA wiki 30 minutes before the round.
- B. Violation - They didn't. (screenshots prove in the doc)
- C. Standards
 - 1. Small schools. Disclosure compensates for research disparities created by coaching staff and also checks back for the cost of extra coaching, briefs, and scouting benefits enabled by larger pool entries.
 - 2. Argument transparency. Disclosure establishes what arguments are being run on the topic and allows more presentation and ensuring substantive debates rather than tricky anti-educational arguments and also prevents evidence abuse as it discourages unethical miscut sources.
- D. Voters
 - 1. Education. It's the reason schools find debate and the only portable skill of debate.
 - 2. Fairness. They have prevented an argument clash and have gained an advantageous imbalance from teams that disclosed on the Wiki.

If we win that disclosure is a good practice you drop the debater because it sets a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate because wins and losses determine the direction of activity.

If they don't respond to this in their constructive, it's conceded for the round because theory is inherently prefat and thus the more important argument, meaning that before we can even debate in substance there needs to be an attempt from both sides to resolve theory

Email Chain Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters must agree to send their constructive evidence and doc in email chain
- B. Violation - Our opponents refused an email chain
- C. Standards:
 - 1. Evidence Comparison: By allowing debaters to read evidence as rebuttals are being read, it enables on the spot evidence verification and opens time in preparation to better plan strategy and organize clash. By restricting time to review evidence, you encourage abusive and mis-constructive evidence standards. This skew debaters position of reality
 - 2. Clash: As public forum becomes more speed-based, the probability of missing a warrant becomes much higher. Debaters who have trouble keeping up are provided an aid to follow along at their own pace which allows for a deeper understanding of their opponent's case. By creating a better warrant understanding, better warrant comparison and clash occurs creating a more educational debate.
- D. Voters:
 - 1. Education: Debate only matters in the sense it provides education. If we just stand around and argue about things that never end up happening, debate is a waste of time and feeds a false perception of reality into its participants that hurts them in the future.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

If they don't respond to this in their constructive, it's conceded for the round because theory is inherently prefiat and thus the more important argument, meaning that before we can even debate in substance there needs to be an attempt from both sides to resolve theory

Game Over Theory

- A. Interpretation - Debaters may not say the phrase “Game Over”
- B. Violation - They said “Game over”
- C. Standards
- D. Voters

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

- 1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
- 2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

E.

LEGO Profile Picture Theory

A is the interpretation debaters must set their discord profile picture as a LEGO figurine in the debate space

B is the violation they don't (screenshots in the doc prove)

C is the standards

1. Awareness. On April 18th, The LEGO Foundation has donated 27.5 million dollars to Education Cannot Wait for COVID-19 response, the first global fund dedicated to education in emergencies. This wouldn't happen without the support for LEGO products, and setting your profile picture as a LEGO figure increases the overall awareness and support of LEGO.
2. Happiness. I am very sad because they didn't switch their profile picture to a LEGO figure.

D is the voters

1. Education. Setting your profile picture as a LEGO figure improves the awareness for LEGO as a whole, which in turn helps the education of children during the COVID-19 crisis. Secondly, I'm not getting an education anymore because I'm so sad

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Multiple Worlds Bad Theory

A. Interpretation - Debaters should be limited to advocating for one world or scenario

B. Violation - aff/neg advocates multiple worlds.

C. Standards:

1. Reciprocity - Multiple advocacies make it harder for me to win. Qualitatively it's harder since I have to completely shut out the offense off of all of the possible outs otherwise my opponent could collapse into one of the worlds and just win off of that one. It quantitatively makes it harder since I have only one way to win whereas my opponent has numerous ways to win. Reciprocity is key to fairness because both debaters need an equal structural capacity to win the ballot.

2. Strat Skew - I have to answer back all of my opponent's arguments because there is no way that I can know which argument that he/she is going to go for. It's unrealistic for me to win every single argument that he/she puts on the flow and still get enough offense to win the round. In multiple worlds my opponent can just kick the arguments that he/she is losing which completely destroys any sense of strategy I have going into the round. Even if this is just potential abuse it is still enough to vote off since if potential abuse were not sufficient then the aff could run the same AC until they didn't hit theory, which justifies running an abusive case then kicking the abuse parts just because potential abuse isn't sufficient. Strat Skew is key to fairness because forming an effective strategy is the only way I have the option to win, without strategy I would lose every round because I would have to do way more work than my opponent.

D. Voter:

1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Multiple Worlds Good Counter Theory

- A. Counter-interp - Debaters should be able to advocate for multiple worlds.
- B. Violation - I meet
- C. Ground - The multiple worlds that my opponent describes are merely pieces of offense. Obviously these are independent reasons to vote for me, that's the definition of offense. Saying that I can not have multiple worlds indicates that I can only ONE argument and that I create other ways for the judge to adjudicate the round. My opponent's interpretation destroys the ability for both sides to generate offense. Ground is key to fairness because both debaters need an equal and reasonable structural capacity to make offensive arguments in order to have an equal chance at gaining the ballot.

Neg Can Prove Falsity Theory

- A. Interpretation - debaters may negate the resolution by proving the falsity of the resolution.
- B. Violation - They say I must prove the desirability of negating the resolution.
- C. Reasons to prefer:
 - 1. To negate is “to deny the truth of”, thus the negative textually should be able to win by disproving the truth of the resolution rather than being forced to prove that a different claim is true. Text is a litmus test for other theory standards. Theory is a way of resolving textual interpretations, but if his interpretation is not textual, he doesn’t meet the litmus test for evaluating theory debates. His is not based in the text of the resolution because of the definition of negate.

Reject the Neg/Aff K ALT Theory

- A. Interpretation - K alternatives must have implications outside of the debate round.
(Debaters must have a realistic alternative with implications outside of the debate round.)
- B. Violation - Their alternative is vote neg/aff.
- C. Standards:
 - 1. Ground. They are not defending a world so I can't run disadvantages such as alternate harms that would happen from not doing the aff. Also, I can't perm their advocacy which skews my strategy and makes it harder for me to win if I cannot concede to any part of their advocacy. The affirmative has a 4 minute speech to their 7 and I can't co-opt any of their ground. Ground is key to fairness because it determines what arguments we can make which determines how we win. This also is not real world because policy makers use different things to create the optimal policy, while we can't perm to advocate for the best policy which is less educational.
 - 2. Real world application. Simply critiquing the resolution won't provide us with valuable education because it doesn't teach us about possibilities in the real world. First, policy makers don't just discuss it they take actions, and second there is no way to actually change people's mindset. And, even if we aren't policy makers that type of policy making will still affect us every day. The education we get from debate is valuable only because we can use it in the future.
- D. Voters:
 - 1. Fairness - It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.
 - 2. Education - Debate only matters in the sense it provides education. If we just stand around and argue about things that never end up happening, debate is a waste of time and feeds a false perception of reality into its participants that hurts them in the future.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Severance Theory

- A. Interpretation - debaters must advocate their standard and initial constructive throughout the entire round.
- B. Violation - they severed the AC in the rebuttal by kicking their standard.
- C. Standards:
 - 1. Time skew – severance lets them start the debate over in the rebuttal, while I don't get my prep back. Because times are the only explicit rules of debate, strategies that invalidate portions of time are unfair.
 - 2. Ground – severing the standard lets him kick all the turns on the Standard. I could be killing them on the framework debate right now, meaning I was denied ground that would have otherwise won me the round. Ground is key to fairness because an unequal distribution of ground makes it easier for one side to win.
- D. Voters
 - 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

- 1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Solvency Author Theory

- A. Interpretation – solvency arguments must have a solvency author
- B. Violation – their plan text is not advocated by an author from the literature.
- C. Standards:
 - 1. It's unpredictable - There's no literature on this argument so I can never predict it coming up while they have infinite access to it since they came up with it themselves. This hampers my ability to engage the argument since there's no real world lit to answer non-real world arguments. Predictability is key to fairness since they have infinite pre round preptime to develop their arguments so I need to be able to predict them to engage them.
 - 2. It explodes their ground since they can claim unrealistic advantages that would never happen in the real world. This puts me at a structural disadvantage since any shred of a warrant is sufficient to get them any impact scenario they want, even when it would never be endorsed by topic lit. Also, since his argument lacks real-world bearing, it's uneducational. Real world education is key because it's the only applicable thing outside of the debate round.

- D. Voters:
 - 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater, and education, which precedes substance because it is the fundamental goal of debate.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.

2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.
2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Taint Theory

- A. Interpretation - The aff must prove the resolution true as an on-balance statement, while the neg must prove the resolution false on balance.
- B. Violation - he says that he only must prove a 1% chance that the resolution is true/false.

C. Standards

- 1. Giving the aff/neg the burden of proving a taint of injustice makes affirming/negating impossible and is not reciprocal because he only needs to win a risk of a link whereas I need to win 100% impact. Every system will have some flaw, so I can never win under this framework as it presents an impossible burden. This allows him to extend through link and ignore all my arguments and still win with some marginal impact, which skews time and nullifies all my speeches. Reciprocity is key to fairness as it allows each side a structurally equal chance to win by ensuring equal advocacies.

D. Voters

- 1. It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

No RVIs, 2 warrants:

- 1. Don't give someone a medal for being fair. We don't arrest someone for following the law. Theory in debate is a floor not a ceiling they shouldn't garner any offense.
- 2. By granting RVIs, debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it

Default to competing interps. 2 warrants:

- 1. No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2. Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

Theory during Round Theory

They made a really big mistake by running theory before looking at our NDCA wiki page, where we tell you that if you have any specific norms you want us to fill, such as disclosing or paraphrasing, then they must tell us before the round begins to accommodate for it. If they don't, we auto fill any interp they read. With that being said:

- A. Interpretation - teams must email or text us before the round with any specific interpretations they would like us to fill
- B. Violation - they read theory on us during the round without telling us beforehand
- C. Standards. Prefer settling theory before the round over settling it during the round for 4 reasons.
 - 1. Avoiding violations. Asking us to fulfill an interpretation before the round prevents it from being violated in the first place, which overall provides a fairer round from the beginning
 - 2. Friv theory. It prevents frivolous shells with really obscure interpretations from being ran that don't actually set any norms
 - 3. More substance. It allows discussion on the actual substance to take place rather than progressive argumentation, which is a lot more educational
 - 4. Small Schools. Us, as a small school, never got any teaching on progressive argumentation. Avoiding it from the very beginning helps combat the already huge disadvantage between big schools and small schools.
- D. Voters
 - 1. Fairness - It's a voter for fairness, which precedes substance because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round towards the unfair debater.
 - 2. Education - Debate only matters in the sense it provides education. If we just stand around and argue about things that never end up happening, debate is a waste of time and feeds a false perception of reality into its participants that hurts them in the future.

Drop the debater to prevent further abuse. **Sigel in 84** writes that in the same way that we punish criminals for breaking the law, we should punish those who injure debate. While one

round doesn't immediately cause a change it creates a trend that shows debaters who face abuse can still win.

F2 THEORY

A2 Substance Theory (Drop ARG)

1. Only arguments extended into the next speech affect your evaluation of the debate. His fairness voter says that fairness precedes substance because otherwise your evaluation has been skewed, so dropping the argument is sufficient. Dropping the argument hasn't skewed his time because I invested time answering his theory shell.
2. Dropping the argument is more realistic. In the real world, we don't give the death penalty for every minor offense; rather, the punishment is reciprocal to the crime. Real world is key because it's the only relevant impact that debate has on our lives.
3. There's no warrant to vote me down in the voter; don't let him make any new arguments because
 - a) my strategy was premised on knowing theirs, i.e. I only choose to read drop the argument, not the debater because he underwarrants this part of the debate, so new arguments skew neg strategy
 - b) I don't have another rebuttal to answer back their arguments, so default to rejecting the argument, not the debater.

A2 RVI

1. Theory functions on a different level than substance: it frames substantive issues, rather than acting as one. You can't "theory" a theory argument.
2. RVIs kill education because there is NO substantive debate – every debate would devolve into theory once theory is run because it functions on a higher plane than substantive issues and whoever wins theory automatically wins the round. This educational loss outweighs because there's never any substantive debate whereas even when theory is not an RVI, the debater still has a good chance at winning just by covering theory. This means that even if fairness outweighs education in a vacuum, we get marginal loss of fairness when I run theory, whereas we get NO educational benefit when theory is an RVI.
3. RVIs cause a chilling effect on theory debates because
 - a) debaters will be more afraid to read theory even when there's actual abuse when they know they can lose on it
 - b) they don't want to be held culpable for starting a theory debate. The number 2 above explains why: debaters don't want the entire debate to devolve into theory, and judges will not want to listen to theory debates. This outweighs his RVI abuse story because even if the theory argument is not reciprocal in this particular round, RVIs justify infinite abuse because theory will never be run as a check on abuse.
4. RVIs are illogical: the aff has the necessary burden of being fair and shouldn't win just because he is fair or topical.
5. We both have the burden of being fair; he could have run theory on me if I had been unfair, and then weighed abuse stories, meaning that theory is reciprocal because we both have access to it as a check on abuse.

A2 RVI Bad

A2 Chilling Effect

1. There's no reason this is bad; the RVI forces people to run theory only when they are confident that their interpretation is actually the best rule for debate, which is the point of topicality.
2. Turn: More RVIs promotes discussion about whether RVIs are good for debate and makes theory even more relevant.

A2 Theory Frames Substance

1. Even if theory frames substance, it does not follow that theory thus does not also have to be fair.
2. Theory frames substance, but the RVI frames how you evaluate theory. The view of theory as an infallible issue is exactly what the RVI is criticizing.

A2 Illogical to vote just because he's topical

1. That's not responsive. My argument isn't that you vote for me because I'm topical; instead, extend the warrants in the RVI.

A2 Fairness Not a Voter

1. (Re Explain the voter. . . the warrants are preclusive of all responses)
2. His/her arguments concede fairness is still necessary as a check on argumentation because fairness frames all discussions. Since he/she concedes that fairness is necessary for an objective evaluation of the round as otherwise everything is skewed, all of his/her answers are defensive at best. Also, this outweighs all my opponent's technical responses because fairness is necessary to evaluate the flow at all.
3. Even if fairness is flawed, there must be some meta-standard by which we evaluate the rules of debate because there have to be conditions that demonstrate what's sufficient to prove or disprove the resolution. He doesn't leverage an alternative metastandard like education, so default to fairness regardless of their responses.
4. Many of their arguments rest on shared assumptions, which are taken out by various line-by-line arguments I am going to make, so you should cross apply all of the answers I am going to make to their entire position

A2 Text > Fairness

1. There are an infinite number of grammatically correct ways to interpret any given statement, but we need fairness to determine which ones are legitimate in order to establish conditions that allow us to debate the resolution.
2. Textual interpretations are always justified in terms of reasons to prefer that ultimately terminate in some theoretical reason. Fairness is the only theoretical reason that is being justified in this round so default to it as a filter for textual interpretations.

A2 Logic > Fairness

1. Theory arguments are also derived from logic; this isn't a unique reason to default to substance. If his arguments are logically unfair, then you [affirm/negate].

A2 Fairness Brightline

1. The bright line to fairness is structural abuse – the point at which they can do something that I cannot, fairness has been violated. This is established by my theory standard of (...) because. . .
2. Exact bright lines are unnecessary. If I handed you a color gradient you could not tell me exactly where it changes from yellow to orange but that does not mean they are not distinct colors.
3. A clear bright line is unnecessary in this instance because the in round abuse is so bad, thus we know he has crossed the bright line even if we don't know exactly where that is.
4. There's no warrant why brightlines matter anyway – seriously, is there any debate argument or even anything in the real world that has a brightline!? Stop fooling yourself, this argument sucks.

A2 I'll Kick Arg So No Abuse

1. The abuse happens once the unfair argument is read; punishment is critical since I have already invested a substantial amount of my time on theory. Otherwise, the [aff/neg] can spew abusive args then kick them to gain the positive time tradeoff on theory, meaning my only check on abuse is skewed against me since it's being manipulated by their abusive strategies in order to disadvantage me even more.
2. Kicking the argument proves the abuse. If I never ran theory they'd be going for the abusive interp. This is demonstrated by the fact that they acknowledge that their argument is abusive and then claim kicking it avoids the abuse. I already had to alter the way I approach rebuttal in order to preempt the abuse, meaning the abuse has already skewed my strategy and you must vote now.

A2 Theory Leads to Intervention

1. Theory is objectively evaluated just like any other argument on the flow – the judge looks at each argument and evaluates the quality of the responses in relation to the original argument.
2. You're intervening more if you disregard theory and evaluate the post-theory debate, because the rest of the debate has already been skewed by the abuse.

A2 They Got Theory Offense, Reciprocate

1. It's their fault - I had no choice other than to run theory in order to check the abuse. Whereas they could have just not run the unfair arguments in the first place, they forced me to make theory an advocacy.
2. Theory is a gateway issue that must be evaluated prior to the rest of the substantive debate. It frames how we view arguments on the case debate, so it doesn't have to function in the same way they do; it logically must precede substance because of the second warrant in the fairness voter – if theory is true, everything else is skewed towards the unfair debater.
3. Theory is reciprocal because both of us have to be fair in order to win, meaning I have to meet the burden of being fair also.
4. They can get offense on theory by winning that it is a reverse voting issue – they could have just argued that if I can win on theory, in the interests of reciprocity that defense should be sufficient for them to win on it. It's their fault for not framing theory as a two way street.

A2 I Don't Know Theory Don't Run It On Me Boo Hoo

1. Turn: Theory is least exclusionary because
 - a) it's all analytical. Theory merely involves thinking about what would make an argument fair or unfair
 - b) there are tons of articles online about theory from a simple Google search, whereas topical research requires massive card-cutting and access to databases like Lexis or JSTOR, advantaging larger teams with multiple coaches.
2. Double bind: either
 - a) "Exclusion" has no impact to any debate meta standard, or
 - b) exclusion does link to some meta standard, which means it's contradictory because theory bad appeals to theory itself.
3. No in-round abuse: even if theory is exclusionary, it's not excluding him because he's participating in the theory debate by making answers to it

A2 Theory is Just an EZ Win Not to Check Abuse

1. Punishing the abusive debater with a loss is key to restoring competitive equity. Simply rejecting the argument, docking speaker points, or getting didactic in the oral critique is not enough – only the ballot sends a meaningful message.

A2 Theory Makes People Act Unfair When They Get Mad

1. Losing acts as a competitive check – people will stop running abusive positions no matter how aggravated they are if they continually lose.
2. Even if a small minority of individuals is aggravated, theory on balance deters the proliferation of abusive arguments. The disappearance of ellipsis, the rise of counter-interpretations, and generally fairer practices in PF all attest to the deterrent value of theory.

Fairness > Education

1) Education requires fairness to prevent all the knowledge from just becoming arbitrary knowledge- any education-related standards they have are linked specifically into topic-specific education. For this sort of education to happen, we have to have a framework of fairness existing such that we know what is topic specific and what is just arbitrary. 2) They may win that the overall quantity of education may increase, however, quality is determined by fairness. We need to have a framework of fairness to guide the in-depth research required for good debates- in other words, fairness is key to making sure that research creates an in-depth debate that our education applies to and is used. Thus, even if they win that education is more important, I'll win that fairness is the key internal link to any benefits from education. 3) Fairness is more important than education because what constitutes structural fairness is much more objective than what promotes education, so it is much easier to evaluate the theoretical legitimacy based on its fairness than its education. 4) Education is a subjective standard. The judge can evaluate how easy it is for each debater to win the round, and yet any standard of education is based upon a subjective idea of what is important to know about, and different judges have educations in differing fields making them biased to what is educationally important. Also, theory standards help us determine what fairness means, but they can't help us determine what is educational. Preferring fairness prevents intervention and for you to vote on something you need to know exactly what you're voting on. 5) Debate is distinct from other academic pursuits because of its competitive nature. Instead of just doing research on potential topics in a friendly setting, we choose to engage in a more adversarial activity in which we have the opportunity to be evaluated and win recognition. The educational benefit of debate stems from its adversarial nature and the critical thinking it creates. These are best preserved through fairness because it ensures that both sides can engage in the discussion. 6) We have a fundamental moral obligation to treat others fairly, while we do not have a moral obligation to constantly educate and be educated. Even though we are debaters, we are still humans, so we should still treat others fairly. Fairness links to the fundamental basis of our relationships with others. 7) There are an infinite number of educational arguments that can be made, but not all educational arguments are fair. When we foster a system in which people can make countless unfair arguments as long as they are educational, people no longer engage in the substance of the arguments and can only ever turn to theory. If my opponent wants to further education, then he/she must accept that fairness precludes education for this reason. 8) Empirically we care about fairness more than education. We go for strategies that will help us win more but we don't necessarily always go for the most educational arguments. For example, theory is not the most educational argument because it doesn't teach us about the topic, but debaters go for it because it allows them a better chance to win the round. What debaters care about is most consistent with the true goal of debate because it reveals why people do debate in the first place. This link turns their participation argument.

Education > Fairness

1. Education is the ultimate aim of debate: The point of debate is to educate debaters on global issues, how to research, critical thinking – not how to be fair. Otherwise, topics would be about issues like multiple a prioris or time skew rather than real-world political issues. 2. Fairness is subjective, different people have different ideas as to what arguments and practices are fair so we can never know when fairness is being achieved. Further, people have different conceptions of what it means to be fair. For instance, we don't know if fairness is procedural or if it is substantive, ie if fairness means correcting the neg win skew or not. 3. Unfairness is non-unique because there's always some aspect of an interpretation that isn't as a good as another. 4. Education is something we take away from debate: It is impossible to take fairness away from debate because we never know what it truly is and how to apply it; whereas, education is something that can be applied in any situation. Fairness has no impacts outside of round compared to education that shapes how we understand and operate in the world. Real world impacts come first because we're humans before we're debaters and thus should prioritize helping society over winning debate rounds. Strait and Wallace¹ write, The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories [of] learning like "policy education" and "kririk education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are conductively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.) 5. Schools fund debate for its educational value, not because it's competitive, meaning that if debate is no longer educational it dies as an activity. Debate is often regarded as an educational club, like Science Olympiad, rather than a sport, like tennis, and is funded as such. 6. Debate was created as an educational activity, therefore it should reward the skills it values. If it was solely based on fairness, participants would have no reason for joining debate over a coin flipping contest. The reason debate was created and the reason people join it is because it emphasizes critical thinking and argumentative skills. Debate should reward educational benefits because of its function, otherwise the activity becomes pointless. 7. As we become more educated, we better understand how things interact, and thus can come to better conclusions about what is fair, making education a necessary internal link to fairness.

A2 K's

A2 Illusory Truth K (Brought to you by Alex Shan)

Preface: this is pretty informal because it's from a google hangouts message, but Alex Shan said it so it's really good:

ok so

I can go really in depth about this later but

i think the easiest way to refute this K

is to first dodge the link

that means

establishing that your case is not illusory truth

second

you have a lot of options here

you can attack the alt

How does dropping two debaters in an online tournament get rid of illusory truth

or

you can attack the ideology of their argument as a whole

who gets to decide what illusory truth is?

If we are just throw out all

opinions because they are rooted in biases

then we have policy paralysis because all actions are biased or can be portrayed to seem so
impact turn the K

the alt leads to extinction

we take no action for anything

because guess what

what if something is illusory truth

we don't do it

like its just stupid

to say we must reject repetition of "illusory truths"

when we don't even know what it is

they just say illusory truth hides discourse and kills progress

ok anyways

that should be enough to think about for questioning the text of the K
let's talk now about

how do we beat the K on a different strategy

I would first

dodge the link

prove my case is not illusory truth

that my links into impacts are not fathomed

and exist in reality

perhaps with historical precedent

then I would definitely run theory on them

in this case

they just say their K attacks debate as a whole

run theory on that

Debaters shouldn't run Ks that do not find fault with the rhetoric or arguments of the other team

Standards are easy

Ground skew

they don't have to argue for anything substantive or anything productive, they just read a few articles

and make this K

run it on all sides

second is research burden

we spend all this time

combing through evidence

finding what is real and what likely isn't

they clearly don't do that

come in here and say

wow its all fake because authors are biased

how would they know?

How would they even know if their own authors don't have their own agenda and are illusory truth-tellers themselves?

like this K doesn't make sense because it attacks all

evidence

all forms of debate

and promotes discourse based on the same faulty principles

A2 Surveillance K

1. Surveillance is inevitable, the only question is who will have access to it.

Jerry Brito (senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University), REASON, Nov. 18, 2013. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from

<http://reason.com/archives/2013/11/18/sousveillance-turns-the-tables-on-the-su>

“Being monitored in everyday life has become inescapable. So, as David Brin points out in *The Transparent Society*, the question is not whether there should be pervasive monitoring, but who will have access to the data. Will it only be the powerful, who will use the information to control? Or will the rest of us also be able to watch back? Ideally, perhaps, we would all be left alone to live private lives under no one’s gaze. Short of halting all technological progress, however, that ship has sailed. Mass surveillance is the inevitable result of smaller cameras and microphones, faster processors, and incredibly cheap storage. So if I can’t change that reality, I want to be able to watch back as well

2. Local surveillance is inevitable even if the affirmative checks federal government surveillance.

Tom Engelhardt, (staff writer) HUFFINGTON POST, June 26, 2014. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tom-engelhardt/surveillance-worse-than-youthink_b_5533215.html

“Now, let’s add rule two: However bad you think it is, you don’t know the half of it. Yes, you’ve been following the Snowden NSA revelations, but no Snowden has stepped forward (yet) to reveal what the CIA or FBI or Defense Intelligence Agency or Department of Homeland Security or National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency is doing. And as far as the national security state is concerned, the less you know, the better. Take, for example, a recent Associated Press story with this revelation: citing “security reasons” (as always), the Obama administration “has been quietly advising local police not to disclose details about surveillance technology they are using to sweep up basic cellphone data from entire neighborhoods.”

3. Surveillance isn’t a problem in itself—it can be used for good or ill.

Eugene Volokh, (teaches and writes about constitutional law at UCLA School of Law), Fall 2002. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from <http://www2.law.ucla.edu/volokh/camerascomm.htm>

“Cameras are not cause for concern, then, when it comes to individual privacy, fairness, or accuracy; the real issue is government power. Cameras are a tool that can be used for good—to enforce good laws—or for ill: to enforce bad laws, to track the government’s political enemies, to gather ammunition for blackmail, and so on”

4. Surveillance technologies can be used from below to check the police.

David Bollier, (Senior Fellow at the Norman Lear Center at the USC Annenberg School for Communication), Nov. 24, 2013. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from <http://bollier.org/blog/sousveillance-response-surveillance>

Mann argues that sousveillance is an inevitable trend in technological societies and that, on balance, it “has positive survival characteristics.” Sousveillance occurs when citizens record their encounters with police, for example. This practice exposed the outrageous police brutality against Occupy protesters (blasts of pepper spray in their faces at point-blank range) and helped transform small citizen protests against Wall Street into a global movement

5. Surveillance from below sustains a free civil society.

David Bollier, (Senior Fellow at the Norman Lear Center at the USC Annenberg School for Communication), Nov. 24, 2013. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from <http://bollier.org/blog/sousveillance-response-surveillance>

Sousveillance at least has the virtue of empowering ordinary people to protect themselves and to hold power accountable. One need only look at a few cautionary examples of “people’s recordings” that have altered history: the Zapruder film (undermining the Warren Commission’s and news media’s “lone gunman” claims), the Rodney King video (documenting L.A. police brutality), the videos of police violence against Occupy protesters and anti-Iraq War demonstrators. At a time when powerful corporations and government agencies are savagely violating our privacy with impunity, sousveillance is entirely comparable to the use of personal cryptography: a defense of our individual autonomy and our ability to sustain a free civil society.

A2 Privacy Rights K

1. Privacy merely protects male power.

Patricia Boling (associate Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley) PRIVACY AND THE POLITICS OF INTIMATE LIFE, 1996, p. 10

"In sum, MacKinnon identifies the private, intimate realm as the realm of politics from women's point of view, which is consistent with her view that sexual objectification is the normative way men treat women. Sex becomes politics and privacy merely a tool for obscuring and protecting male power."

2. Right of privacy endangers rather than empowers women

Karen Struening, (professor at City College of New York) NEW FAMILY VALUES: LIBERTY, EQUALITY, DIVERSITY, 2002, p. 40

MacKinnon's rejection of privacy doctrines rests on her conviction that women exercise very little self-determination in their personal relationships with men. She argues that the right of privacy endangers rather than empowers women, because it always benefits the more powerful person in a relationship.

3. Privacy reinforces unconstrained power of men

Zoya Hasan, (former professor of political science and the dean of School of Social Sciences at the Jawaharlal Nehru University), INDIA'S LIVING CONSTITUTION: IDEAS, PRACTICES, CONTROVERSIES, 2002, p. 255

Thus, appeals to the alleged privacy of the home have routinely accompanied defenses of the marital rape exemptions, and of non-interference with domestic violence and with child abuse. It is not that in principle people don't sometimes grant that a showing of coercion voids the presumption of non-interference. However, as MacKinnon says, 'the problem is getting anything private to be perceived as coercive'. In the marital home, there is a presumption of consent. What this means is that there is a presumption that anything a man does in the marital home is all right. As MacKinnon states: it is not women's privacy that is being protected here, it is the male's privacy. Recognizing a sphere of seclusion into which the state shall not enter means, simply, that males may exercise unconstrained power

4. Patriarchy risks nuclear war

Betty Reardon, (Director, Peace Education Program, Columbia,) WOMEN AND PEACE, 1993, pp. 30-1.

"A clearly visible element in the escalating tensions among militarized nations is the macho posturing and the patriarchal ideal of dominance, not parity, which motivates defense ministers and government leaders to "strut their stuff" as we watch with increasing horror. Most men in our patriarchal culture are still acting out old patterns that are radically inappropriate for the nuclear age. To prove dominance and control, to distance one's character from that of women, to survive the toughest violent initiation, to shed the sacred blood of the hero, to collaborate with death in order to hold it at bay all of these patriarchal pressures on men have traditionally reached resolution in ritual fashion on the battlefield. But there is no longer any battlefield. Does anyone seriously believe that if a nuclear power were losing a crucial, large-scale conventional war it would refrain from using its multiple-warhead nuclear missiles because of some diplomatic agreement? The military theater of a nuclear exchange today would extend, instantly or eventually, to all living things, all the air, all the soil, all the

water. If we believe that war is a “necessary evil,” that patriarchal assumptions are simply “human nature,” then we are locked into a lie, paralyzed. The ultimate result of unchecked terminal patriarchy will be nuclear holocaust.”

5. Failure to solve gender discrimination guarantees extinction:

Mary E. Clark (PhD and professor of biological studies @ Berkeley), 2004. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4005307/Rhetoric-patriarchy-warexplaining-the.html
“I thus conclude that the language of international politics today is “gendered” by the political insecurity experienced by leaders of earlier patriarchies, and that the presence of women in such governments has little effect on the framework of public dialogue. (I recall hearing Geraldine Ferraro, when running for Vice-President in 1984, assure an interviewer that she would not hesitate to push the “nuclear button” if necessary.) Hence, it is not our X and Y chromosomes that are at issue here; it is the gendered world view that underpins our institutions and frames our behaviors. As long as those in power “think” in this patriarchal box, we will live in a globallyarmed camp, where war-leading even to the annihilation of our species-is a constant, real possibility.”

A2 Terror Talks K

1. Terrorism must be denounced without equivocation.

Jeff Jacoby, (staff writer) BOSTON GLOBE, May 14, 2013. Retrieved May 30, 2015 from <http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2013/05/14/terrorism-neverjustified/m6tgScnTFAXx9vIO9oX4YK/story.html>

But it is not part of constructive self-criticism to make excuses for those who commit acts of terrorism, or to explain why their victims, as citizens of the United States, had it coming. You don't demonstrate sensitivity to other cultures by treating willful savagery against ours as something less than savagery. Terrorism is never justified. Perpetrators are not victims. In the wake of a bloody atrocity like the one in Boston last month, the first duty of civilized people — regardless of politics or ideology — is not to start asking why the evildoers hate us, or how they became so angry. It is to call their actions evil, and denounce them without equivocation.

2. Victims of terrorism are real people who deserve respect for their humanity.

Jean Bethke Elshtain, (Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics at the University of Chicago Divinity School), WAR AGAINST TERROR: THE BURDEN OF AMERICAN POWER IN A VIOLENT WORLD, 2008

People who routinely insist on the illegitimacy of blaming victims now do it. No one deserved what happened to them on September 11, neither the immediate victims and their families nor the country itself. Cannot a powerful country bleed? Are not its citizens as mortal as those anywhere? Simple human recognition along these lines does not deter the literary theorist Frederic Jameson from seeing in these horrific events "a textbook example of dialectical reversal." Rather, what we are being treated to in such comments is a textbook example of what Hannah Arendt called the handy magic of "the dialectic," which puts "to sleep our common sense, which is nothing else but our mental organ for perceiving, understanding, and dealing with reality and factuality."

3. Terrorism should be rejected for what it is.

Igor Primoratz, (emeritus professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem), Oct. 31, 2012. Retrieved May 31, 2015 from <http://www.polity.co.uk/blog/post.aspx?id=146>

Yet, surely it can't be right that life and limb of ordinary citizens should be fair game whenever it is expedient that it should be so. Here, as elsewhere, consequentialism proves much too permissive with regard to questionable and even downright repugnant means. Terrorism can't be judged solely by its consequences; first and foremost, it is wrong intrinsically, because of what it is.

4. Terrorism increases racism and causes a US-Russia nuclear war

Jerome Corsi, (Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard), 2005, ATOMIC IRAN, Pg. 176-178

Still, the president, members of Congress, the military, and the public at large will suspect another attack by our known enemy—Islamic terrorists. The first impulse will be to launch a nuclear strike on Mecca, to destroy the whole religion of Islam. Medina could possibly be added to the target list just to make the point with crystal clarity. Yet what would we gain? The moment Mecca and Medina were wiped off the map, the Islamic world—more than one billion human beings in countless different nations—would feel attacked. Nothing would emerge intact after a war between the United States and Islam. The apocalypse would be upon us. Then,

too, we would face an immediate threat from our long-term enemy, the former Soviet Union. Many in the Kremlin would see this as an opportunity to grasp the victory that had been snatched from them by Ronald Reagan, when the Berlin Wall came down. A missile strike by the Russians on a score of American cities could possibly be preemptive. Would the U.S. strategic defense system be so in shock that immediate retaliation would not be possible? Hard-liners in Moscow might argue that there was never a better opportunity to destroy America.

5. US-Russian war risks extinction.

Nick Bostrom, (PhD, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford University), JOURNAL OF EVOLUTION AND TECHNOLOGY, March 2002

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind's potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted.

Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

A2 Rights Are Absolute K

1. Even rights in the Bill of Rights come with limitations and restrictions.

Michael Tomasky, (staff writer), May 5, 2013. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/05/05/there-are-no-absolute-rights.html>

Nearly every idea in the Bill of Rights comes with restrictions and limitations. To think that the Second Amendment should be any different is absurd, writes Michael Tomasky.

2. Rights should not be absolute for three reasons.

Mark D. Rosen, (Illinois Institute of Technology - Chicago-Kent College of Law), Mar. 25, 2015. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2585063 Moving beyond Dworkin, Part I then identifies three strong arguments against rights absolutism: rights absolutism (1) wrongly presumes rights cannot conflict, (2) mistakenly posits that rights should categorically trump all competing non-rights interests, and (3) is contrary to the widespread and longstanding practice in today's constitutional democracies.

3. No right is absolute.

Michael Tomasky, (staff writer), May 5, 2013. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/05/05/there-are-no-absolute-rights.html>

Every time I write a column on guns, the howl arises that I am talking about a right that is enshrined in the Constitution, buddy, and I better watch myself. The howl then transmutes into an extended harangue that this right is absolute, and no libtard fascist, whether me or the Satanesque Dianne Feinstein, is going to limit the right in any way. The first soldier to charge across this rhetorical veld is followed by hundreds harrumphing their assent. The only problem is that it's an ahistorical, afactual, and barbaric argument. No right is absolute.

4. Rights are merely principles—they can be restricted.

Mark D. Rosen, (Professor, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law), WILLIAM & MARY LAW REVIEW, Apr. 2015. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from Lexis/Nexis.

In other words, principles are non-absolute. While Dworkin's argument in TRS that law contains principles and rules is now widely accepted as correct, his discussion there did not primarily concern constitutional law. The question for our purposes is whether constitutional rights may be principles. Dworkin considered the possibility, without definitively deciding, that free speech might be a principle. He recognized that such a possibility conflicted with the views of Justice Black and Meiklejohn, "who claim that the first amendment is 'an absolute,' " that is to say, "a rule." In what surely will be an immensely influential work, the prominent constitutional theorist Jack Balkin contends that many of our country's most important rights--including free exercise, free speech, and equal protection--are principles. Once it is accepted that constitutional rights are principles rather than rules, it automatically follows that rights are non-absolute. Furthermore, "rights as principles" likely licenses more rights restrictions than would Schauer's metaphor of rights as shields, and perhaps his "non-rights devaluers" as well.

5. Because rights conflict with each other, no right can be absolute.

Mark Cooray, (Phd from Cambridge), 1996. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from
<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/cooray/btof/chap225.htm>

The right to freedom of association must be exercised so as not to interfere with the rights of others to move about the streets or go about their business. Where there is a clash of rights, methods must be devised through rational analysis, political avenues and the courts so that the rights of all parties could be exercised so as not to inconvenience each other. If this is not possible (as it often is not) there must be a compromise or one must be restricted and give way to the other

A2 Islamophobia K

1. Americans are very tolerant of Muslims—there is no anti-Muslim backlash.

Douglas Murray (Associate Director of the Henry Jackson Society) May 30, 2013. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from http://www.thecommentator.com/article/3666/forget_islamophobia_let_s_tackle_islamism

No "anti-Muslim" backlash has ever occurred. Americans, like the British, are infinitely more tolerant and opposed to bigotry than our politicians and media seem to realise. But the warning of such a backlash always serves the same end — to confuse public opinion over who is the perpetrator and who is the victim. Warnings of "backlash" — as in Boston — take attention away from the actual, specific victims (such as the eight-year-old Bostonian Martin Richard and his family) and towards a generalised sense of potential guilt.

2. Statistics illustrate a lack of Islamophobia.

Kenan Malik, (Indian-born English writer, lecturer and broadcaster), Feb. 2005. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from http://www.kenanmalik.com/essays/prospect_islamophobia.html

The claims of Islamophobia become even less credible if we look at all stop and searches. Stop and searches under the Terrorism Act form only a tiny proportion of the 900,000 stop and searches that took place last year. If there was widespread Islamophobia within the police force we should expect to find Asians in disproportionate numbers in the overall figures. We don't. Asians are stopped and searched roughly in proportion to their population once age structure is taken into account. All these figures are in the public domain and easily available. Yet not a single reputable journalist challenged the claim that Asians were being disproportionately stopped and searched. So pervasive is the acceptance of Islamophobia, that no-one even bothers to check if it is true.

3. Claims of Islamophobia are hypocritical.

Father Raymond J. de Souza, (Roman Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Kingston, Ont), NATIONAL POST, Dec. 4, 2014. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from

<http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/father-raymond-j-de-souza-islamophobia-is-not-theproblem>
Like most countries that have government departments for religious affairs, Turkey does not permit full religious liberty. The Orthodox Patriarchate, present in Constantinople since before Islam existed, is being strangled by the state, with heavy restrictions placed on its institutions and freedom of governance. So it is a bit much to hear from Turkey about "Islamophobia" inflaming public opinion abroad when "Christophobia" is practiced by law at home. Moreover, it is hardly phobic or paranoid for Christians on Turkey's borders in Syria and Iraq to fear the jihadism that is slaughtering their communities.

4. Charges of Islamophobia are meant to sow confusion.

Father Raymond J. de Souza, (Roman Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Kingston, Ont), NATIONAL POST, Dec. 4, 2014. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from

<http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/father-raymond-j-de-souza-islamophobia-is-not-theproblem>
Drawing moral equivalence between lethal jihadism and people who say nasty things about the co-religionists of such jihadis is meant to be disabling, as was the case in the days of the anti-anti-communists. It sows confusion by suggesting that any challenge even to Muslim pathologies is ill-motivated and illegitimate.

5. Charges of Islamophobia stoke resentment in Muslim communities.

Kenan Malik, (Indian-born English writer, lecturer and broadcaster), Feb. 2005. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from http://www.kenanmalik.com/essays/prospect_islamophobia.html

Pretending that Muslims have never had it so bad might bolster community leaders and gain votes for politicians, but it does the rest of us, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, no favours at all. The more that the threat of Islamophobia is exaggerated, the more that ordinary Muslims come to accept that theirs is a community under constant attack. It helps create a siege mentality, stoking up anger and resentment, and making Muslim communities more inward looking and more open to religious extremism. Muslim leaders constantly warn that Islamophobia is alienating Muslims and pushing many into the hands of extremists. However, it's not Islamophobia, but the perception that it blights lives, that is often the bigger problem.

A2 Ocean Management K

1. Ocean ecosystem management is inevitable and beneficial for ecosystem health.

Guy Martin, (Dir., Western Urban Water Coalition), NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY: COMMENTS ON ALL 9 STRATEGIC ACTION PLANS, Apr. 29, 2011. Retrieved Mar. 10, 2014 from http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ceq/comments_on_all_9_saps_1.24.11-4.29.11.pdf

The adoption of ecosystem-based management in the National Policy has many benefits. Numerous laws that apply to the activities of WUWC members, including portions of the Clean Water Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and the Endangered Species Act, already provide for ecosystem-based management. These, and other relevant laws, mean that the concept of ecosystem-based management is not a new one, or one without significant precedent and authority. However, it is important to avoid creating redundant procedures and regulations in pursuing a National Policy. The benefit to using existing legal authorities to implement this principle is that it will both be relatively easy to implement, and will have the result of continued regulatory consistency to parties and activities subject to those authorities. Ecosystem-based management also provides an opportunity for partnerships between different stakeholders over a combined larger interest to have positive impacts on the ecosystem; for example, environmental non-profits and water utilities are both interested in maintaining water quality, which is necessary both for ecosystem health and human use and consumption.

2. Ocean management data is crucial to human survival.

Ocean Tracking Network, 2013. Retrieved May 21, 2014 from <http://pwssc.org/research/marine/ocean-tracking-network/>

The climate is changing – of this we are sure. Marine life survival is becoming uncertain due to overfishing and changing migration patterns. Animals such as polar bears are becoming visibly anxious as their habitats begin to melt. Human survival is directly linked to stable ocean life, which is why the Prince William Sound Science Center is working with the Ocean Tracking Network to further research into our warming planet. The Ocean Tracking Network (OTN) is a \$168-million conservation project that is tracking thousands of marine animals around the world — from fish to birds to polar bears — using acoustic telemetry technology. They are also building a record of climate change — data that can be analyzed and then applied. Headquartered at Dalhousie University, OTN unites leading ocean scientists around the globe. OTN is conducting the world's most comprehensive and revolutionary examination of marine life and ocean conditions, and how they are changing as the earth warms. OTN data will lead to a global standard for ocean management in a way never before possible.

3. Ocean management is necessary for a healthy ocean.

Catherine Wilson, (staff writer) IPS NEWS, June 8, 2013. Retrieved May 20, 2014 from <http://www.ipsnews.net/2013/06/the-future-of-the-pacific-ocean-hangs-in-the-balance/>

Lack of up to date data is a major hindrance as we are always reacting to problems, such as depleting fisheries, damaged coral reefs and high pollution levels,” Veitayaki explained. “If assessments were better, management could be more preventive.” Capacity for implementation, which he acknowledges has always been a major challenge for developing nations in the region, whether in terms of financial, technical or human resources, will

demand more innovative and collaborative approaches by the diverse Pacific Island peoples whose survival depends on a healthy ocean.

4. The damage humans do to the oceans justifies management of the oceans.

Lawrence Judd, (professor of Marine Sciences @ University of Rhode Island) 1996. INTERNATIONAL LAW AND OCEAN MANAGEMENT. Accessed via Google Books, May 20, 2014.

Because of the pressure of growing population, particularly in coastal areas, and contemporary technology and associated effects, the human race is increasingly in a position to affect the workings of the oceans' natural systems, to deplete its renewable resources, and to detract from the natural beauty of the sea.

A2 Anthropocentrism K

1. Protecting the oceans is crucial to save non-human animals. Cataclysmic non-human animal species extinction will occur unless the oceans are protected.

World Oceans Day, 2014. Retrieved May 21, 2014 from <http://www.worldoceansdayhawaii.org/endangered-species/> In the oceans, the rate of biodiversity destruction is cataclysmic. The endangerment of whale, dolphin, manatee, tuna, sea turtle, and shark species are on the rise. UNESCO reports claim that if significant changes are not implemented, more than half of all marine species may stand on the brink of extinction.

2. Just because animal rights protections fall short of perfection does not mean they aren't worthwhile.

David Sztybel (Fellow with the Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics) JOURNAL FOR CRITICAL ANIMAL STUDIES. 2007. <http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/animal-rights-law.pdf> It may help to think of these options for the short-term as a dilemma in which none of the options deliver animals from speciesism, so we should choose the best one(s). Think of the classic burning house situation. In such a case, one can only rescue one animal from the fire, and so not everyone's right to life can be satisfied. This is an important way in which a rights proponent accepts that rights cannot dictate the outcome of every single decision. Perhaps we can likewise only choose in the short-term among laws that fall short of anything strongly resembling rights.

3. The permutation is the best option—we should try to maximize benefits for humans and animals alike.

David Sztybel (Fellow with the Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics) JOURNAL FOR CRITICAL ANIMAL STUDIES. 2007. <http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/animal-rights-law.pdf> I also reverse the charge of complicity. I argue that there is tacit or passive complicity in allowing the wrongs of cruelty to continue without effective challenge, or permitting them to continue longer than necessary, or failing to do what is most conducive to animal rights by failing to advocate such "welfarist" suffering-reduction laws (more on this below). Indeed, by not favoring what is best for sentient beings at every turn, one is in danger of being complicit in wrongdoing these beings. This is not to say that a pragmatist would automatically donate \$100 to groups promoting

larger cages. I might give it to a group promoting veganism. But I would not criticize but rather support the United Farm Workers, founded by Cesar Chavez, who are trying to improve conditions for workers and animals alike.

A2 Sustainable Development K

1. Sustainable development is necessary for human survival.

World Commission on Environment and Development, Nov. 24, 2010. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-ov.htm>

But the Commission's hope for the future is conditional on decisive political action now to begin managing environmental resources to ensure both sustainable human progress and human survival. We are not forecasting a future; we are serving a notice – an urgent notice based on the latest and best scientific evidence – that the time has come to take the decisions needed to secure the resources to sustain this and coming generations. We do not offer a detailed blueprint for action, but instead a pathway by which the peoples of the world may enlarge their spheres of cooperation.

2. Sustainable development is necessary to solve poverty.

World Commission on Environment and Development, Nov. 24, 2010. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-ov.htm>

This Commission believes that people can build a future that is more prosperous, more just, and more secure. Our report, Our Common Future, is not a prediction of ever increasing environmental decay, poverty, and hardship in an ever more polluted world among ever decreasing resources. We see instead the possibility for a new era of economic growth, one that must be based on policies that sustain and expand the environmental resource base. And we believe such growth to be absolutely essential to relieve the great poverty that is deepening in much of the developing world.

3. Poverty outweighs all other concerns.

Daniel Maguire (President, The Religious Consultation on Population, Reproductive Health, and Ethics) 1996. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from http://www.sacredchoices.org/population_poverty_sustainable_dev.htm accessed Poverty is genocidal and the malignant indifference and masked barbarity that underlie upper class virtue are complicit in the quiet slaughter of the poor. Poverty kills with an efficiency that could only be matched by all-out nuclear war. The wars that we have had are pikers in inflicting death compared to poverty. What war could kill 40,000 infants a day and do so with a silent efficiency that allows the polysaturated guilty to sleep comfortably in their beds, consciences fully anesthetized, with no rumble of distant guns to disturb their rest

4. Failure to embrace sustainable development leads to conflict.

Earth Institute at Columbia University, 2014. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/1776>

Ignoring the issues of sustainable development has many possible consequences, such as rising sea levels, extreme droughts, erosion and loss of forests, increases in slum populations, species extinctions and collapsing fisheries. There is also increasing evidence that issues such as water scarcity play a role in internal violence and regional conflict.

5. Poverty must be solved to save the global environment.

World Commission on Environment and Development, Nov. 24, 2010. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from
<http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-ov.htm>

There has been a growing realization in national governments and multilateral institutions that it is impossible to separate economic development issues from environment issues; many forms of development erode the environmental resources upon which they must be based, and environmental degradation can undermine economic development. Poverty is a major cause and effect of global environmental problems. It is therefore futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompasses the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality

A2 Science Frontier K

1. Scientific methodology is valid and prevents dangerous misconceptions.

Steven Newton Apr. 26, 2010. Retrieved May 23, 2014 from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-newton/in-defense-of-scientific-_b_552602.html

Students come to the classroom with a host of misconceptions about the world. If you ask first-year college students a few basic questions about the natural world, you will quickly discover pervasive ignorance. What causes the seasons? Most students think summer is caused by the Earth being closer to the Sun. Why is the sky blue? A very small percentage of students can answer in terms of wavelengths of light. Which falls faster, a heavy weight or a light weight? Most think the heavier object falls faster. It is the proper job of science educators to help these student see the world as it really is, rather than to reinforce their prejudices. Biology students should learn that the theory of evolution is correct and that vaccines do not cause autism; astronomy students should learn the world will not end in 2012; chemistry students should understand why homeopathic claims about "water memory" are not true. Science education can – and should – help students understand reality.

2. Scientific optimism is necessary for scientific advances.

Dr. Mark Casson (University of Reading Dept. of Economics) 2000. CULTURAL FACTORS IN ECONOMIC GROWTH. Retrieved via Google Books May 21, 2014. Since scientific optimism promotes scientific advances, the volatility caused by value shocks is likely to increase when scientific optimism is gaining ground.

3. Scientific methodology saves millions of people. Steven Newton Apr. 26, 2010.

And it's not just hunter-gatherers who benefit from scientific methodology. Although Dossey thinks the scientific method is the "main legacy of traditional science," I can point to another legacy: the millions upon millions of people alive right now because of medical advances made possible through scientific discoveries. From vaccines to anesthesia, science has reduced human suffering and needless deaths, and produced longer and better lives. It is hard to imagine why anyone would be against such a legacy.

4. Current scientific methods do not discourage collaboration. Steven Newton (Public Information Project Director for the National Center for Science Education) HUFFINGTON POST, Apr. 26, 2010. Retrieved May 23, 2014 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-newton/in-defense-of-scientific-_b_552602.html

Dossey goes on to challenge the "image of science as an individual, solitary endeavor," claiming the "science community seems to go out of its way to conceal the collaborative, cooperative, team approach." Indeed, he claims that science is skewed toward the individual because the Nobel Prize is not awarded to teams. This might come as a surprise to the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change team, which in 2007 won the Nobel Prize. Some scientific discoveries are made by solitary individuals, and some are made by teams. Generalizing about this is almost meaningless. It is hard to picture why this would, in any event, be a problem for science education, since some science students will be drawn toward solitary work, others toward collaborative efforts. There is a place for everyone in science

5. Science solves natural disasters, disease, and bioterrorism. Puneet Opal (staff writer) THE ATLANTIC. Dec. 3, 2012. Retrieved May 23, 2014 from

<http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2012/12/in-defense-of-science-how-the-fiscal-cliffcould-cripple-research-enterprise/265749/> More visibly, the NIH provides grants to small businesses to exploit nascent areas of science for commercialization. Science provides the technology to deal with national disasters, epidemics and bioterrorism. And then there is, of course, health – the NIH'

A2 AfroPes K

1. Abandoning hope is the worst way to promote racial equality. Malik Miah (staff writer) 2014. Accessed May 23, 2014 from <http://www.solidarityus.org/node/3079>

In the chapter, "Nihilism in Black America," West observes "The liberal/conservative discussion conceals the most basic issue now facing Black America: the nihilistic threat to its very existence. This threat is not simply a matter of relative economic deprivation and political powerlessness – though economic well-being and political clout are requisites for meaningful Black progress. It is primarily a question of speaking to the profound sense of psychological depression, personal worthlessness, and social despair so widespread in Black America."

"Nihilism," he continues, "is to be understood here not as a philosophic doctrine . . . it is, far more, the lived experience of coping with a life of horrifying meaningless, hopelessness, and (most important) lovelessness." "Nihilism is not new in Black America. . . . In fact," West explains, "the major enemy of Black survival in America has been and is neither oppression nor exploitation but rather the nihilistic Threat – that is, loss of hope and absence of meaning. For as long as hope remains and meaning is preserved, the possibility of overcoming oppression stays alive. The self-fulfilling prophecy of the nihilistic threat is that without hope there can be no future, that without meaning there can be no struggle." (ellipses in original)

2. Anti-blackness isn't inherent or ontological—it's historically contingent and hence able to change Peter Hudson (professor of political studies – University of the Witwatersrand) 2013. SOCIAL DYNAMICS: A JOURNAL OF AFRICAN STUDIES. Accessed May 23, 2014.

Thus the self-same/other distinction is necessary for the possibility of identity itself. There always has to exist an outside, which is also inside, to the extent it is designated as the impossibility from which the possibility of the existence of the subject derives its rule. But although the excluded place which isn't excluded insofar as it is necessary for the very possibility of inclusion and identity may be universal (may be considered "ontological"), its content (what fills it) – as well as the mode of this filling and its reproduction – are contingent. In other words, the meaning of the signifier of exclusion is not determined once and for all: the place of the place of exclusion, of death is itself over-determined, i.e. the very framework for deciding the other and the same, exclusion and inclusion, is nowhere engraved in ontological stone but is political and never terminally settled. Put differently, the "curvature of intersubjective space" and thus, the specific modes of the "othering" of "otherness" are

nowhere decided in advance (as a certain ontological fatalism might have it). The social does not have to be divided into white and black, and the meaning of these signifiers is never necessary – because they are signifiers

3. Racial inequality isn't ontological—we can study this empirically and historically Leroy Clark (professor of law – Catholic University) DENVER UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW, 1995. Accessed May 23, 2014, Lexis. Second Qualitative Leap Forward The black-led, and white-supported, civil rights movement gathered momentum in the late 1950s and early 1960s through marches, "sit-ins" – which breached racial segregation in public establishments – and the development of legal strategies to provide cover and protection. White Americans were shocked by the vicious resistance of small pockets of rabid southern racists to the disciplined non-violent protests of blacks, and public opinion began to move toward support for racial equality. Key whites in the media, especially television, influenced this shift in public opinion by portraying black grievances in a sympathetic and appealing light. The movement culminated in 1960s legislation prohibiting racial segregation and discrimination in public accommodations, employment, voting rights, and housing. This was the next qualitative leap forward, and there has been no massive backsliding into the rank forms of segregation and discrimination that characterized the pre-1960 period

4. The civil rights movement disproves the claims of Afro-pessimists—progress within the system is possible. Leroy Clark (professor of law – Catholic University) DENVER UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW, 1995. Accessed May 23, 2014, Lexis.

Professor Bell treats the post-1960s claims of progress as an illusion: discrimination simply became more covert, but equally efficient. The facts, however, viewed with a holistic perspective, largely refute this claim. The most thorough analysis of black-American status since Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* in 1944, is *A Common Destiny – Blacks and American Society*. The report covers the period from 1940 through 1986, and is more comprehensive than the studies Professor Bell relied on in recent law review articles. *A Common Destiny* answers Professor Bell's central question in *Faces: Contemporary views of the status of black-white relations in America* vary widely. Perspectives range from optimism that the main problems have been solved, to the view that black progress is largely an illusion, to assessments that the nation is retrogressing and moving toward increased racial disparities. To some observers, the present situation is only another episode in a long history of recurring cycles of apparent improvement that are followed by new forms of dominance in changed contexts: the level of black status changes, it is said, but the one constant is blacks' continuing subordinate social position. To other observers, the opposite is correct: long-run progress is the dominant trend. *A Common Destiny*, however, concludes that the overwhelming majority of black-Americans made substantial progress since 1940: Over the 50-year span covered by this study, the social status of American blacks has on average improved dramatically, both in absolute terms and relative to whites. The growth of the economy and public policies promoting racial equality led to an erosion of segregation and discrimination, making it possible for a substantial fraction of blacks to enter the mainstream of American life.

A2 White Supremacy K

1. A focus on white supremacy as an explanation for inequality is counter-productive for four reasons. Mike Cole (Bishop Grosseteste University) POWER AND EDUCATION, 2009, Retrieved May 21, 2013 from <http://www.wwwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=power&aid=3522&doi=1>

Marxism, Racialization and Modes of Production From a Marxist perspective, 'white supremacy' used to describe current reality is inadequate for a number of reasons. Elsewhere (Cole, 2009a, b) I have identified and critiqued four problems with the concept of 'white supremacy'. The first is that it can direct critical attention away from modes of production ; the second is that it homogenizes all white people together as being in positions of power and privilege ; the third is that it inadequately explains what I have referred to as 'non-colour-coded racism' ; and the fourth is that it is totally counter-productive as a political unifier and rallying point against racism .

2. The deconstructive approach of critical race theory fails. Jeffrey J. Pyle, Boston College Law Review, 1999. Retrieved May 22, 2013 from <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclr/vol40/iss3/6> Critique, " however, never built anything, and liberalism, for all its shortcomings, is at least constructive. It provides broadly-accepted, reasonably well-defined principles to which political advocates may appeal in ways that transcend sheer power, with at least some hope of incremental success: ' Critical race theory would "deconstruct" this imperfect tradition, but offers nothing in its place.

B. THEORIES OF WHITE SUPREMACY UNDERMINE EFFORTS TO SOLVE CLASS-BASED OPPRESSION.

1. White supremacy undermines attempts to challenge capitalism: Mike Cole (research professor in education and equality at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln) 2009. ETHNICITIES, 246.

Anti-racists have made some progress, in the UK at least, after years of 'establishment' opposition, in making anti-racism a mainstream rallying point, and this is reflected, in part, in legislation (e.g. the 2000 Race Relations Amendment Act). Even if it were a good idea, the chances of making 'the abolition of whiteness' a successful political unifier and rallying point against racism are virtually non-existent. And yet, for John Preston (2007: 13), 'The abolition of whiteness is . . . not just an optional extra in terms of defeating capitalism (nor something which will be necessarily abolished post-capitalism) but fundamental to the Marxist educational project as praxis.' Indeed, for Preston (2007: 196) 'The abolition of capitalism and whiteness seem to be fundamentally connected in the current historical circumstances of Western capitalist development.' From a Marxist perspective, coupling the 'abolition of whiteness' to the 'abolition of capitalism' is a worrying development that, if it gained ground in Marxist theory in any substantial way, would most certainly undermine the Marxist project, even more than it has been undermined already (for an analysis of the success of the Ruling Class in forging consensus to capitalism in the UK, see Cole, 2008c). Implications of bringing the 'abolition of whiteness' into schools are discussed later. (ellipsis in original)

2. Diverting attention away from the modes of production ignores how poverty locks in racism in the United States: Mike Cole, 2009 (“Critical Race Theory comes to the UK : A Marxist response,” *Ethnicities*, <http://etn.sagepub.com.ezproxy.samford.edu/content/9/2/246.full.pdf+html>

For me, the Marxist concept of racialization is most useful in articulating racism to modes of production, and I have developed these links at length elsewhere (e.g. Cole, 2004a, 2004b). Manning Marable (2004) has used the concept of racialization to connect to modes of production in the US. He has described the current era in the US as ‘The New Racial Domain’ (NRD). This New Racial Domain, he argues, is ‘different from other earlier forms of racial domination, such as slavery, Jim Crow segregation, and ghettoization, or strict residential segregation, in several critical respects’. These early forms of racialization, he goes on, were based primarily, if not exclusively, in the political economy of US capitalism. ‘Meaningful social reforms such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were debated almost entirely within the context of America’s expanding, domestic economy, and a background of Keynesian, welfare state public policies.’ The political economy of the New Racial Domain, on the other hand, is driven and largely determined by the forces of transnational capitalism, and the public policies of state neoliberalism, which rests on an unholy trinity, or deadly triad, of structural barriers to a decent life. These oppressive structures are mass unemployment, mass incarceration and mass disfranchisement, with each factor directly feeding and accelerating the others, ‘creating an ever-widening circle of social disadvantage, poverty, and civil death, touching the lives of tens of millions of US people’. For Marable, adopting a Marxist perspective, ‘The process begins at the point of production. For decades, US corporations have been outsourcing millions of better-paying jobs outside the country. The class warfare against unions has led to a steep decline in the percentage of US workers.’ As Marable concludes: Within whole US urban neighborhoods losing virtually their entire economic manufacturing and industrial employment, and with neoliberal social policies in place cutting job training programs, welfare, and public housing, millions of Americans now exist in conditions that exceed the devastation of the Great Depression of the 1930s. In 2004, in New York’s Central Harlem community, 50 percent of all black male adults were currently unemployed. When one considers that this figure does not count those black males who are in the military, or inside prisons, it’s truly amazing and depressing. Moreover, the new jobs being generated for the most part lack the health benefits, pensions, and wages that manufacturing and industrial employment once offered.

3. Must eliminate class discrimination to solve racial discrimination: Mike Cole (research professor in education and equality at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln) 2009. ETHNICITIES, 246.

In summary, I must reject the insistence of CRT to valorize ‘race’ over class. Marxism has the crucial benefit of contextualizing practices in capitalist relations of production. It gives priority to the abolition of class society because without its demise, racism (as well as other forms of discrimination) is likely to continue it in its various guises.

4. Capitalism props up racism and sexism: Mike Cole (research professor in education and equality at Bishop Grossetete University College Lincoln) 2009. ETHNICITIES, 246. A WAY FORWARD FOR CRITICAL RACE THEORY

As we have seen, for Mills (2003: 160), ‘White Marxism [is] predicated on colorless classes in struggle.’ Mills argues that if socialism is to come then ‘white supremacy/majoritarian domination’ must be overthrown first in ‘the struggle for social democracy’. Only after ‘white supremacy’ has been over-thrown and ‘social democracy’ established is the next stage – socialism – possible. This seems to be in line with Mills’ argument that ‘a

non-white-supremacist capitalism is morally and politically preferable to . . . white-supremacist capitalism' (Mills, cited in Pateman and Mills, 2007: 31), something with which I would totally concur. However, given the massive advantages to capitalism of racialized capitalism, capitalism without racism (or sexism), as I have suggested earlier, is almost inconceivable. (ellipsis in original)

A2 Personalizing Debate

1. Locating problems within individuals trades-off with policy formation. Mari Boor Tonn (Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Fall 2005, 405. Second, because the therapeutic bent of much public conversation locates social ills and remedies within individuals or dynamics of interpersonal relationships, public conversations and dialogues risk becoming substitutes for policy formation necessary to correct structural dimensions of social problems. In mimicking the emphasis on the individual in therapy, Cloud warns, the therapeutic rhetoric of "healing, consolation, and adaptation or adjustment" tends to "encourage citizens to perceive political issues, conflicts, and inequities as personal failures subject to personal amelioration

2. Personalization of argument undermines public deliberation. Matt Stannard (Dept. of Communication & Journalism at University of Wyoming) 2006. Retrieved May 22, 2013 from http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006_04_01_archive.html

But the Academy is not only under attack from "outsiders," and not merely because the postSeptember 11 world has given the nod to sterile and commodified forms of patriotic communication and safe, symbolic dissent. Both inside and outside college life, the value of discussion is increasingly under attack, under sabotage, sometimes unintentionally, sometimes violently, and the attackers are often not recognizable as such. We cower away from religious fanatics because we know they refuse to entertain the possibility of their incorrectness, but we fail to see our own failure to embrace the possibilities of our own incorrectness. We label other points of view "ideological" from vantage points we assume to be free of ideology, or we excuse our narrow-mindedness by telling ourselves that "ideology is inevitable." Part of this weakening of our commitment to open debate is our recent, seemingly liberating embrace of personal conviction over public deliberation, the self-comfort of personal narrative over the clumsy, awkward, and fallible attempt to forge consensus across the lines of identity and politics. The fetishization of personal conviction is no less threatening to the public forum than violent authoritarianism—both seek to render disagreement impossible, close off deliberation, and take us closer towards eventual, unnatural silence.

3. Privileging personal experience and personal opinion triggers the discounting of contrary, external evidence: no one wants to disagree with another's personal experience. Mari Boor Tonn (Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Fall 2005, 405.

Third, whereas in social and therapeutic talk, personal experience, opinion, and individual well-being reign supreme, the force of "opinion" in a democracy demands allegiance both to reasonableness and to the larger collective good. Unlike certain postmodern dialogic therapists, responsible public deliberators view neither facts as inescapably elusive nor appeals to the rational uniformly suspect. Rather, democratic arguers apply rigorous standards for evidence and, above all, writes Schudson, subscribe to "norms of reasonable- ness." A key groupthink feature—uncritical, self-righteous faith in the group's inherent morality and traditions—is nourished by privileging lived experiences and personal opinions, the primary content of social and therapeutic talk. As Donal Carbaugh points out, because the "self" becomes the "locus of conversational life," conversationalists may "disprefer consensual truths, or standards of and for public judgment," which they view to "unduly constrain 'self.'" Such an egocentric focus can enable members of deliberative bodies to discount

crucial, formal types of external evidence that counters existing personal and group assumptions, resulting in what Lisa M. Gring-Pemble characterizes as forming public policies such as welfare reform “by anecdote.”

4. Personalized evidence overshadows facts and statistics: Mari Boor Tonn (Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Fall 2005, 405.

Such personal evidence overshadowed the “facts” and “realities” Clinton also had promised to explore, including, for example, statistics on discrimination patterns in employment, lending, and criminal justice or expert testimony on cycles of dependency, poverty, illegitimacy, and violence. Whereas Clinton had encouraged “honest dialogue” in the name of “responsibility” and “community,” Burke argues that “The Cathartic Principle” often produces the reverse. “[C]onfessional,” he writes, “contains in itself a kind of ‘personal irresponsibility,’ as we may even relieve ourselves of private burdens by befouling the public medium.” More to the point, “a thoroughly ‘confessional’ art may enact a kind of ‘individual salvation at the expense of the group,’ ” performing a “sinister function, from the standpoint of overall-social necessities.”

5. Taking the perspective of others is necessary to solve for the interests of everyone. Matt Stannard (Dept. of Communication & Journalism at University of Wyoming) 2006. Retrieved May 22, 2013 from http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006_04_01_archive.html

Under the pragmatic presuppositions of an inclusive and noncoercive rational discourse among free and equal participants, everyone is required to take the perspective of everyone else, and thus project herself into the understandings of self and world of all others; from this interlocking of perspectives there emerges an ideally extended we-perspective from which all can test in common whether they wish to make a controversial norm the basis of their shared practice; and this should include mutual criticism of the appropriateness of the languages in terms of which situations and needs are interpreted. In the course of successfully taken abstractions, the core of generalizable interests can then emerge step by step.

A2 Narratives

1. The privileging of emotional responses in narratives re-entrenches racial hegemony. Mari Boor Tonn (Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Fall 2005, 405.

Furthermore, identification intrinsic in narrative experiences is double-edged; while identification can neutralize domination by creating empathy, identification also can fortify hegemony. As Cornell West warns, the privileging of emotional responses to racism and racial self-identities over other data can contribute to “racial reasoning,” which blacks employ to their peril. To illustrate, he points to the failure of black leadership to challenge the qualifications by typical measures of black Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas, opting instead to submit to deceptive racial solidarity built upon premises of “black authenticity.” Second, because the therapeutic bent of much public conversation locates social ills and remedies within individuals or dynamics of interpersonal relationships, public conversations and dialogues risk becoming substitutes for policy formation necessary to correct structural dimensions of social problems. In mimicking the emphasis on the individual in therapy, Cloud warns, the therapeutic rhetoric of “healing, consolation, and adaptation or adjustment” tends to “encourage citizens to perceive political issues, conflicts, and inequities as personal failures subject to personal amelioration

2. The move toward individual examples moves away from statistical information. Lisa Gring-Pemble (Professor of Communication Studies @ George Mason University) QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. Nov. 2001, 359.

A second contribution of this study is that it provides insight into a process currently overlooked in studies of public moral argument and policymaking, and that is the role of depictions in policy formation. In so doing, this study contributes to a clearer understanding of the role and function of depictions in public moral argument. In his study of American views on welfare reform, Martin Gilens demonstrates that the public’s perceptions “are influenced more by vivid examples than by statistical information, even if the evidentiary value of the statistical information is far higher”. Similarly, as this study on welfare reform suggests, social policy deliberations are anecdotal in nature because the depictions vivify problems that are difficult to quantify. Although they warn against the dangers inherent in basing public policy on depictions, legislators prefer the depictions as evidence to warrant public policy changes because the depictions tap into deep cultural reservoirs

3. Solutions to racism require data beyond personal narratives: Mari Boor Tonn (Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Fall 2005, 405.

Because the problems plaguing contemporary black America, West writes, result from a complex amalgam of structural and behavioral factors, weaving solutions demands analysis of data beyond subjective personal narratives and performances of self-identity.

4. Individual micro-narratives discourage groups from finding common interests. Matt Stannard (Dept. of Communication & Journalism at University of Wyoming) 2006. Retrieved May 22, 2013 from http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006_04_01_archive.html

The complexity and interdependence of human society, combined with the control of political decisionmaking—and political conversation itself—in the hands of fewer and fewer technological "experts," the gradual exhaustion of material resources and the organized circumvention of newer and more innovative resource development, places humanity, and perhaps all life on earth, in a precarious position. Where we need creativity and openness, we find rigid and closed non-solutions. Where we need masses of people to make concerned investments in their future, we find (understandable) alienation and even open hostility to political processes. The dominant classes manipulate ontology to their advantage: When humanity seeks meaning, the powerful offer up metaphysical hierarchies; when concerned masses come close to exposing the structural roots of systemic oppression, the powerful switch gears and promote localized, relativistic micronarratives that discourage different groups from finding common, perhaps "universal" interests

5. Narrative stories facilitate elite discourse and lock out the views of the marginalized. Lisa Gring-Pemble (Professor of Communication Studies @ George Mason University) QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. Nov. 2001, 343. Ultimately, I show in this essay how depictions of welfare recipients and their families form the basis of the enacted welfare legislation. Although communication theorist Walter Fisher would contend that legislator reliance on depictions frees policymakers to evaluate the validity of the stories "inimical to elitist politics," this case study suggest otherwise. In contrast, I argue that the depictive forms facilitate elite discourse, discourage the inclusion of alternative public views, and delegitimize particular public voices. In making this argument, I first outline the theoretical approaches that inform this study. Next, I describe the historical context in which the welfare reform hearings and debates occurred. This background provides the framework within which I analyze representations of welfare recipients. I conclude with a discussion of the rhetorical implications of this study.