## 1NC

### K – Academe

#### They criticize the way norms function in the status quo, and how debate is anti-black and debate is patriarchal. This is a *systemic problem* – the aff is a piecemeal solution which focuses on constitutional norms but disregards stylistic norms. Stylistic norms control the patriarchy and heteronormativity.

Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley explains: Shanara rose reid-brinkley 2008 “the harsh realities of “acting black”: how african-american policy debaters negotiate representation through racial performance and style” [es]

**The stylistic norms of** the policy **debate community are inextricably attached to the social performance of identity**. In other words ,if **the stylistic norms privilege the stylistic choices of white, straight, economically privileged males, as is clearly indicated by their statistical representation at the heights of competitive success, then difference marks one as other unless the individual performs according to those stylistic and identity-based norms. Racially and/or ethnically different bodies must perform themselves according to the cultural norms of the debate community. For UDL students it can often mean changing one’s appearance, standardizing language practices, and eschewing cultural practices at least while participating in debate. In essence, students of color are performatively “whitened” in order to have an opportunity for achieving in debate competitions. “Acting black” or brown is problematic because those performative identities are not privileged in terms of successful participation.** In fact, **they signify a difference, an opposite, a negative differential.** It is not that the debate community actively operates to exclude based on race, instead it is an exclusion based on racial performance, in other words, how the differentially colored body chooses to style itself.

Impacts:

**A. Guts 1AC solvency – presuming that judges will adhere to the 1AC’s paradigm or they will accept performance disregards the history of how stylistic norms operate in the debate space.**

**B. Impacts back to exclusion of debaters *and outweighs*  - this is in the context of college policy debate as well as UDL debaters in high school which is an external impact.**

#### They serve as a way in which dominant epistemologies are *replicated* – claiming adherence to the CEDA constitution legitimizes the performative dominance of whiteness.

Dr. Reid-Brinkley 2(Shanara Reid-Brinkley 2009, "The Harsh realities of Acting Black: How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate representation through racial performance and style")

Genre Violation One: Sonic Disturbance and Displacing Spatial Privilege. **The space in which debate[s] tournament competition and training occur are critical to the performative strategies of community members. Debates are held in spaces marked by whiteness**.85 Debate tournaments are held over long weekends at varying college campuses around the country. The vast majority of tournaments are held at majority white colleges and universities. **The college classroom represents the space of the ivory tower, space that has historically excluded racial others, particularly Blacks.** **College classrooms are characterized by sanitized spaces where the body is rendered absent in order to focus on the mind and intellectual development. College classrooms are institutional spaces, a void in our social reality that mutes the body; a void that mutes sound and bright colors. Such a void encourages students to think of the educational environment as an intellectual laboratory that allows for experimentation outside of the real world and thus avoids real world responsibilities or consequences.** College is the place to try on new ideas, a place where students are encouraged to explore. **Yet, the college environment simultaneously serves as a critical space by which the dominant hegemonies of American culture are replicated, producing individuals within and through discourses of privilege and subjugation**. It is clear from discourses surrounding race and achievement gaps, retention and graduation rates of students of color, conflicts over affirmative action, etc., that the college environment and the intellectual enlightenment it represents are painted with the brush of European colonialism and American slavery. **It is colored by the bodies that are traditional, normative to its spaces. In the traditional space of the American classroom, the cultural practices of subjugated communities are often excluded as either not relevant or not universal to the subject matter being taught.**

#### Minority debaters win debate rounds not by *following rules* as the 1AC claims but by radicially breaking those rules – clearly proven in CEDA rounds.

Cooper in ’14, [Brittney Cooper(), “I was hurt”: How white elite racism invaded a college debate championship, Salon, 5-13-2014, 14, http://www.salon.com/2014/05/13/%E2%80%9Ci\_was\_hurt%E2%80%9D\_how\_white\_elite\_racism\_invaded\_a\_college\_debate\_championship/, 2-19-2017. SK]

In March of this year, **Korey Johnson and Ameena Ruffin**, college students at Towson University, **became the first African-American women to win the Cross-Examination Debate Association college championship**. Cross-examination debate, also known as policy debate, is a notoriously elite, white academic sport. Unfortunately, Johnson’s and Ruffin’s auspicious victory has been marred by right-wing trolls in the debate community and well-meaning white liberals, too, who have mischaracterized and minimized their victory, attributing their win to white liberal guilt, rather than meritorious performance. The Council of Conservative Citizens, a contemporary iteration of the racist White Citizens Councils of eras past, penned an article called “Black female debate team wins national tournament to make up for white privilege.” The Council of Conservative Citizens appears on the Southern Poverty Law Center’s list of racist hate groups. The Daily Caller accused the “far left” judges who voted for these women of destroying college debate clubs via false accusations of racism. I shared news of Ameena’s and Korey’s championship in my social networks with special pride because this coming fall will mark my 20th anniversary as part of the policy debate community. I made the debate team as a precocious 13 year-old high school student, and have remained a part of that community in one form or another as debater, coach, debate camp instructor and tournament judge, for the last two decades. Other than the influence of my fourth grade teacher, I give no other academic experience more credit for informing how I think, write, research and communicate. But when I debated in high school in Louisiana in the 1990s, my debate partner and I were the only all-Black girl debate team that I ever encountered, and one of only a handful of all-Black teams we ever encountered at either the state or national level. The rise of the Urban Debate League movement in the late 1980s helped to diversify debate at both the high school and college level by providing debate instruction and attendance at camps and tournaments for free or for significantly reduced costs. I have worked with three such leagues in Baltimore, Atlanta and Washington, D.C. Korey and Ameena learned to debate in the Baltimore Urban Debate League, many years after my tenure as a volunteer there. VIDEOWATCH: KHRUSHCHEV’S GRANDDAUGHTER ON PUTIN: “HE MADE US RESPECTED” Play Mute Current Time 0:28 / Duration Time 1:02 Loaded: 0%Progress: 0% Fullscreen The increasing racial diversity of college debate is directly attributable to the work of these leagues, but of course the presence of more Black folks in any space also fundamentally challenges the ground upon which business proceeds. Black students have not only excelled at traditional debate, but they have invented new modes of competitive forensics, including a more performative style of debate that incorporates rap music, poetry and personal anecdotes. Pioneered in college debate programs like that at the University of Louisville, this more performative style of debate has productively disrupted the traditionalist forms of debate centered on spouting, at the highest rates of speed, copious amounts of academic literature in order to prove a point. When I spoke with Korey by phone about this piece, she was hesitant to characterize her and Ameena’s style in a singular way, since they tend to incorporate both traditional elements like the reading of arguments published in academic journals and books with newer elements like poetry. Korey told me, “The word ‘traditional,’ the word ‘performative,’ the word ‘k-debater’ (which refers to “critique” or “kritik” debaters, who argue more philosophical rather than policy positions) will never actually capture what we are trying to do here.” **That resistance to labels, and ambivalence about “the violence labels perform,” are hallmarks of the speech of young thinkers, searching to find their way in the world**. However, as my own scholarly research about Black female public intellectuals in the 19th and 20th centuries indicates, we live in a world that still struggles to see Black women as serious thinkers and intellectuals who have something to contribute to our national grappling with social problems. Frequently for young Black women thinkers, particularly those who invoke a clear Black feminist perspective, there is a resistance to donning a stance of detached objectivity. Korey asked me rhetorically, “How can we talk about policy if we don’t know [the] social location of the people?” When I watch Ameena’s and Korey’s final round (video here), in which they are debating against two young Black men from the University of Oklahoma, I am struck by the courage of their propositions. This year’s topic, as are the topics for every year, is situated right at the heart of both national and global political conversations. It reads: Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President of the United States in one or more of the following areas: targeted killing, indefinite detention, offensive cyber operations, or introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities. In the final round, the Oklahoma team, who took the affirmative side, offered a performative argument that “war powers should not be waged against niggas.” Using the colloquial form of the n-word, they sought to disrupt the very assumptions of the resolution, by placing the relationship between race and U.S. militarism front and center. The intrinsic moxie and audacity of this kind of argument exposes the flaws in traditional forms of debate performativity. In part, they demonstrate that an investment in cool, detached, dispassionate forms of speech about political matters of such import could in their own way be considered pathological and imperialist. SPONSORED STORIES Get a head start on tax season with 2017 tax software! Get a head start on tax season with 2017 tax software! Yahoo Search Stock to Crash, Presidential Advisor Warns Stock to Crash, Presidential Advisor Warns Banyan Hill Publishing What A Possible Repeal Of The Estate Tax Means For Your Finances What A Possible Repeal Of The Estate Tax Means For Your Finances BNY Mellon Wealth Management Recommended by Using a range of academic work, Johnson and Ruffin offered a counter argument that “we should not present scenes of suffering within the academy… because the academic machine will become a spectator that merely feeds its libido by consuming pain narrations.” Furthermore, Johnson writes, “we said that when we tell narrations of pain and suffering to black youth as a means of survival, this inhibits their political imagination because they can only envision similar violences happen[ing] to them.” So here’s the thing: I am not litigating here whether Ameena and Korey are right, although I do find their arguments compelling. Pushing for alternative ways for Black people to exist and thrive in hyper-militarist regimes is important political work, work that both final round teams are engaged in. Still, this is a conversation about how it is the case that in the face of such clearly sophisticated argumentation from two second-year college students, those on the right could then conclude that they won the debate out of white liberal guilt. To mischaracterize and diminish their accomplishment is the height of white elitist racism, and it is deeply rooted in an anxiety about the ways that Black people and Black forms of knowledge production fundamentally shift the terms of political discussion. In addition to hyperemotional rants from middle-aged white men and dishonest journalistic coverage from right-wing sites, some white members of the debate community have even gone so far as to try to start a new, segregated “policy-only” debate league. Jessica Carew Kraft notes in a piece at The Atlantic that one of the effects of these new forms of debate is that traditionally dominant teams from elite universities like Harvard and Northwestern are now routinely unseated by teams from smaller colleges, with smaller budgets. After a strident backlash within the debate community, this attempt at race and class-based segregation thankfully failed. Korey noted that the initial move sounded like something straight out of the “Civil Rights Movement.” And she is right. **The move to segregate debate, not on the explicit basis of race, but on the basis of supposedly “race-neutral” ideas about style and substance is part and parcel of a larger more insidious national backlash against integrated education.** Not only has the Supreme Court suggested implicitly through its gutting of affirmative action that the success of these programs means federal oversight is no longer mandated and vigilance about ameliorating racial inequality is no longer required, but Nikole Hannah-Jones also lays out quite profoundly the ways that the white middle class have responded to decades of federally mandated integration by pulling their children out of successful public schools and enrolling them in elite private schools. The thinking seems to be that when programs to reduce racially disparate impacts actually work, then it’s time to kill them. ADVERTISEMENT **Ameena and Korey are being targeted because they mastered the rules of the debate world and then** broke the rules masterfully**.** In a world where many of their college counterparts believe the myth of meritocracy, it is incredibly important to point to incidents like this to demonstrate that even when African-American college students are meritorious, their qualifications are challenged, and accomplishments maligned. Frequently, Black success is met with white temper tantrums and passive aggressive attempts to resituate power through calls for a return to “tradition.” It is not coincidental that this backlash has reached a crescendo over the last two years when African-American debaters won the championship both times and when, in the case of the 2014 tournament, both the semifinal and final rounds featured all-Black debate teams, using both traditional and performative methods of debate. Rather than seeing these recent successes as evidence of successful integration of a traditionally exclusionary sport, sponsors of elite programs now advocate for a return to exclusionary practices. Although Korey and Ameena won their championship by challenging their opponents not to engage in copious narrations of Black suffering, it bears noting that racism hurts. When I asked Korey how she felt about all the negative attention she received, in classic strong Black woman fashion she told me, “Haters gon’ hate.” That is of course true. But then, as she grappled with the “material reality of anti-Blackness,” another truth set in. “I was hurt,” she told me, “because I had that little bit of bad faith,” by which she meant, a little bit of awareness that there were going to be people not happy about her victory. “We did so much to be here,” she said and then recounted the two months she spent preparing an argument by reading doctoral dissertations and academic journals, to find the perfect set of arguments to wage in response to one team, her final round opponents from Oklahoma. **Incivility now dominates U.S. public culture**. But the critiques that these Black debaters make about the falsity of civil discourse, about the ways that calls to civility mask fundamental relations of power and acts of violence, is deeply in the center of our national conversations in this moment about how we engage in every space from politics to social media. Though the styles and arguments these debaters bring to the table absolutely disturb the peace, the reality is that Black people who speak up in white spaces are an intrinsic disruption to the status quo. We should recognize and applaud the courage of these young thinkers who boldly step into inhospitable spaces and speak truth to power. Our nation certainly needs more people like them. SK

Alternative is to decolonize the debate space – this entails a radical rejection of the way in which debate itself promotes ideologies and entails a rejection of the squo of debate.

Fanon in ‘61, [THE WRETCHED OF THE EARTH By FRANTZ FANON Preface by JEAN-PAUL SARTRE Translated by CONSTANCE FARRINGTON GROVE, WEIDENFELD NEW YORK CONCERNING VIOLENCE, published post hum in 1961, SK.]

National liberation, national renaissance, the restoration of nationhood to the people, commonwealth: whatever may be the headings used or the new formulas introduced, **decolonization is always** a **violent** phenomenon. **At whatever level we study it**--relationships between individuals, new names for sports clubs, the human admixture at cocktail parties, in the police, on the directing boards of national or private banks--decolonization is quite simply the replacing of a certain "species" of men by another "species" of men. Without any period of transition, there is a total, complete, and absolute substitution. It is true that we could equally well stress the rise of a new nation, the setting up of a new state, its diplomatic relations, and its economic and political trends. But we have precisely chosen to speak of that kind of tabula rasa which characterizes at the outset all decolonization. Its unusual importance is that it constitutes, from the very first day, the minimum demands of the colonized. To tell the truth, **the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changed from the bottom up**. **The extraordinary importance of this change is that it is willed, called for,** demanded**.** The need for this change exists in its crude state, impetuous and compelling, in the consciousness and in the -35- lives of the men and women who are colonized. But the possibility of this change is equally experienced in the form of a terrifying future in the consciousness of another "species" of men and women: the colonizers. **Decolonization**, **which sets out to change the** order of the **world**, **is**, obviously, **a program of** complete disorder. **But it cannot come as a result of** magical practices, nor of a **natural shock**, nor of a friendly understanding. Decolonization, as we know, is a historical process: that is to say that it cannot be understood, it cannot become intelligible nor clear to itself except in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give it historical form and content. Decolonization is the meeting of two forces, opposed to each other by their very nature, which in fact owe their originality to that sort of substantification which results from and is nourished by the situation in the colonies. Their first encounter was marked by violence and their existence together--that is to say the exploitation of the native by the settler--was carried on by dint of a great array of bayonets and cannons. The settler and the native are old acquaintances. In fact, the settler is right when he speaks of knowing "them" well. For it is the settler who has brought the native into existence and who perpetuates his existence. The settler owes the fact of his very existence, that is to say, his property, to the colonial system. Decolonization never takes place unnoticed, for it influences individuals and modifies them fundamentally. It transforms spectators crushed with their inessentiality into privileged actors, with the grandiose glare of history's floodlights upon them. It brings a natural rhythm into existence, introduced by new men, and with it a new language and a new humanity. Decolonization is the veritable creation of new men. But this creation owes nothing of its legitimacy to any supernatural power; **the** -36- **"thing" which has been colonized becomes [hu]man during the same process by which it frees itself. In decolonization, there is therefore the need of a complete calling in question of the colonial situation.** If we wish to describe it precisely, we might find it in the wellknown words: "The last shall be first and the first last." Decolonization is the putting into practice of this sentence. That is why, **if we try to describe it, all decolonization is successful**. **The naked truth of decolonization evokes for us the searing bullets and bloodstained knives which emanate** from it. For if the last shall be first, this will only come to pass after a murderous and decisive struggle between the two protagonists. That affirmed intention to place the last at the head of things, and to make them climb at a pace (too quickly, some say) the well-known steps which characterize an organized society, can only triumph if we use all means to turn the scale, including, of course, that of violence. You do not turn any society, however primitive it may be, upside down with such a program if you have not decided from the very beginning, that is to say from the actual formulation of that program, to overcome all the obstacles that you will come across in so doing. The native who decides to put the program into practice, and to become its moving force, is ready for violence at all times. From birth it is clear to him that this narrow world, strewn with prohibitions, can only be called in question by absolute violence. The colonial world is a world divided into compartments. It is probably unnecessary to recall the existence of native quarters and European quarters, of schools for natives and schools for Europeans; in the same way we need not recall apartheid in South Africa. Yet, if we examine closely this system of compartments, we will at -37- least be able to reveal the lines of force it implies. SK

No Perms:

1. Perms would delegitimize the performance of the 1CN by claiming that performacnes can be replicated which is essentialism and must be rejected

Judges must sign the ballot in favor of the critique of Eurocentrism- this is your role as an educator. Independent of whether or not the alternative solves, the act of critique is what you as the judge are endorsing as this opens up the space for imagining alternatives. Reject your Eurocentric white privilege.

Ahlquist and Hudson, [Contesting the curriculum in the schooling of indigenous children in Australia and the USA: from Eurocentrism to culturally powerful pedagogies. Anne Hickling-Hudson (University of Queensland) & Roberta Ahlquist (California State University at San Jose) Comparative Education Review, Vol 47, No. 1, 2003, pp. 64-89. SK]

**Educational systems in white dominated countries**, and what is recognised as formal knowledges, **are shaped by ‘whiteness’**. In the literature on whiteness, it is pointed out that **white and European are viewed as the norm and thus not named,** as other ‘races’ and ethnicities are named. The political agenda involved in this ‘color-blind’ construct denies the link between socio-economic privilege and whiteness. It erases dangerous historical memories ‘in a way that severs the connection between white people’s contemporary privileged social location with historical patterns of injustice’10. White blindness to the difference race makes in people’s lives has a powerful effect on schools and other institutions in white dominant societies. It keeps white people from learning about the role that their privilege plays in personal and institutional racism. **If** white **teachers want to challenge the authority of the** white, **western worldview**, **and build** **a**n anti-racist, **socially just and global curriculum**, **they need to acknowledge their power and privilege**. **This is the foundation for learning to give up that power and instead working to build** anti-racist **alliances across ethnic, racial, and cultural differences**. A key component of such alliances is the principle of self-determination for indigenous peoples and peoples of color in public schooling. The goal is not to elicit feelings of guilt for white racism but to encourage insight into the racialized nature of oppression, as a foundation for working towards the redistribution of power and resources along more equitable lines11. **A postcolonial perspective** puts this process of ‘unmasking whiteness’12 into global context. It **explores the ways in which the Eurocentric curriculum, which includes the practices and assumptions of ‘whiteness’, is often so accepted as the norm that it is invisible and beyond question for many teachers.** **It is rarely admitted at any level of the education system that today’s curriculum still draws from the white imperialist projects** of ‘fostering a science and geography of race, renaming a good part of the world in homage to its adventurers’ homesick sense of place, and imposing languages and literatures on the colonized in an effort to teach them why they were subservient to a born-to-rule civilization’13. **The Eurocentrism of the North American** and Australian **curriculum offered to many indigenous students is not officially recognised, does not meet their educational needs, yet it is, in our view, an important factor explaining their relative lack of success in the educational system**. **This sort of education** **takes it for granted that Eurocentric learning with all its ethnocentric and racial ideologies is, and should be, the norm, the assumption being that all children, regardless of ethnicity, language, class, gender, will benefit from this curriculum.** **A postcolonial perspective names and challenges the legacies of colonialism and their continuation through neocolonial practices.** **This perspective therefore investigates the assumptions underlying discourses of Eurocentrism** including ‘whiteness’, **and explores approaches for constructing alternatives**14

## DA –

#### The 1AC’s intersection of critiquing institution and performing their resistance creates academic paralysis – the only solution for the researcher-debater is more criticism to fulfill a further rejection of other works as a means to academic legitimacy such as winning the ballot. These brings the 1AC into the greater neoliberal fold of ruling institutions.

Rita Felski, The Limits of Critique, 145-146, 2015 [Google Books] bcr

Robbins takes aim at this myth of the unattached critic, suggest- ing that a programmatic animus toward institutions, combined with a misguided embarrassment about their status as professionals, has hin- dered scholars from thinking clearly about the politics of intellectual work-a politics that will, of necessity, take place within structures of higher education rather than outside them. The ethos of critique, I've been suggesting, often encourages this conviction that connection is synonymous with co-option and that social and institutional bonds are signs of bondage-a conviction that often remains in place even while critique is being called into question. In a recent essay, for ex- ample, Robyn Wiegman assails the hopes of American studies schol- ars (including her former self) who see their solidarity with oppressed groups as some kind of challenge to the status quo. The performance of such a critical stance, she points out, has become virtually obliga- tory for those anxious to appear in the pages of Critical Inquiry or American Quarterly. In other words, the appeal of progressive schol- ars to a political principle outside their academic field only confirms the extent of their immersion within this field and their co-option by its professional norms and values. In the language used by Wiegman, the scholars performance of a stance of "critical non-complicity" both cements and conceals her actual complicity-not just with the con- ventions of an academic discipline but also with the larger structures of economic and political injustice that sustain them. Suspicion gives way to metasuspicion, critique to the critique of critique."

## Framing

#### The top level framing for the round is that resistance strategies for the oppressed must be grounded in material realities and must defend a post-fiat implementable strategy for the oppressed.

Curry, [Dr. Tommy J. Curry The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century. 2014. SK]

**Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity and intellectual exercise pointing to the real world consequences of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues** **of racism**, sexism, **economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other.** In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and **value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglas are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies.** At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set] against factual/descriptive issues.” At the most general level, **the conceptual chasm between what emerges as actual problems in the world** (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) **and how we frame such problems theoretically—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for** an anti-ethical paradigm, since such **a paradigm [which] insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively.** Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. **This gap between what is actual (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds** threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures **which necessitate** tangible policies **and reorienting changes in our value orientations.** As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. **Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning we cannot suggest that the various complexities of social problems** (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) **are totalizable** **by any one set of theories within an ideological frame** **be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like.** At best, **theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world,** but even this awareness does not command us to only do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics.SK

### UQ

#### Overview – there is no uniqueness for the aff – if debate rounds violate the CEDA constitution, then they would cease to exist as they would be a violation of tournament rules.

#### Their only uniqueness is that judge paradigms restrict speech. A couple responses

1. Judge paradigms do not preclude the ability for you to have speech, but rather the ability for you to win on that speech – there is a distinction which is crucial for the aff and guts solvency.

### Adv 1 Turns

#### Turn – the CEDA constitution says that competitors should listen to judges so either (a) the constitution should be restricted or (b) it is incoherent as a document.

CEDA constitution,

Students participating in CEDA debate are obligated to adhere to high ethical standards. Such an ethical commitment by debaters is essential because the value of tournament activity is directly dependent upon the integrity of those involved. For that reason, it is the duty of each debater to participate honestly and fairly. Furthermore, students should remember that debate is an oral, interactive process. It is the debater's duty to aspire to the objective of effective oral expression of ideas. Behaviors which belittle, degrade, demean, or otherwise dehumanize others are not in the best interest of the activity because they interfere with the goals of education and personal growth. The ethical CEDA debater recognizes the rights of others and communicates with respect for opponents, colleagues, critics and audience members. Communication which engenders ill-will and disrespect for forensics ultimately reduces the utility of forensics for all who participate in it and should, therefore, be avoided. **Students should recognize the importance of judges to the debate activity. Students should be willing to listen to judges' statements regarding conduct of rounds suggestions** for improvement and reasons for decisions. While debaters should feel free to ask questions of judges, they should be wary of badgering judges for decisions and comments during the course of a tournament; they should recognize that the written ballot is the primary means of communicating reasons for decision and that tournament rules often prohibit revelation of decisions.

#### Also, it is just a suggestion not a tournament rule so college debate is not creating a rule that violates the CEDA constitution.

#### Turn – not adhering to judges’ suggestions sparks new movements for debate as it directly fights back against the institutional violence

#### Turn – prefs solve, and if they don’t, then we can critique prefs – Blake Quarters from two years ago proves – it sparked widespread discussion about striking black judges – outweighs because we spark actual tangible change

#### Terminal Defense – paradigms are not strictly enforced, open to interpretation, and *not that important for judges* – case study of CEDA and NDT proves. Paradigms are not enforced *restrictions on CEDA speech* which guts uniqueness for the aff.

Snowball ’94, [David Snowball Augustana College Rock Island, Illinois , THEORY AND PRACTICE IN ACADEMIC DEBATE, No Publication, xx-xx-xxxx, xx, http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/jbruschke/theory\_and\_practice\_in\_academic\_.htm, 2-19-2017. SK]

**The (Limited) Importance of Paradigms** The key function of a judging paradigm is to help judges sort through the strategic intricacies of each round. A judge's choice of paradigm helps resolve questions such as: can I vote for an affirmative who has no case significance but who has "turned" a disadvantage? can I vote for a disadvantage which applies to the resolution in general but not to the specific plan? can the negative disown a counterplan which has been shown to be disadvantageous? **The importance of paradigms has always been greater in the minds of debaters than in the minds of judges**. This is an understandable bias, since debaters are always looking for ways of increasing their chances of winning and understanding a judge's paradigm seemed to offer one such way. For debate scholars, the significance of judging paradigms is somewhat problematic. Some claim that "the choice of paradigms is now the dominant theoretical issue in debate," while other (equally respected) teachers allege "that paradigms are dead". These views (drawn, respectively, from Professors Rob Rowland of Kansas and Tom Goodnight of Northwestern) are indicative of the ongoing uncertainty among debate critics of how they can make the best and fairest decisions. Rowland's argument for the primacy of paradigms is that: Not only do disputes over debate theory increasingly focus on the contest among debate paradigms, but specific debate theories and tactics are often understandable only within the frame of reference provided by a paradigm. And in many cases, the justification for a theory or tactic comes from a paradigm or model of debate. For example, he explains, if an affirmative team is challenged to explain the motives behind the structures of their inherency, the importance of the challenge is determined by the paradigm applied: stock issues judges would see an interesting but non-crucial request for information, policy-making judges would see an irrelevant "press" which did not alter the nature of the policies defended, but the hypothesis-testing judge would see a key question which the affirmative must answer in order to claim inherency. Similarly, a justification argument (the negative challenge that the affirmative must show why, for example, their plan must be adopted at the federal level) is largely irrelevant to a policy-making judge since the question does not define a negative policy system, yet could well be a voting issue for a hypothesis tester who requires the affirmative to justify acceptance of the entire resolution. Judges on the other side of the dispute, however, claim that paradigm issues do not serve a true organizing function in debate but rather are mere elements in a strategic game. These judges believe that a negative does not choose to defend hypothesis testing because of the greater integrity and rigor of its method, but rather because it will allow them to run ten hypothetical counterplans and to concede nine. Unwilling to commit themselves to the consistent application of a single paradigm, these critics proclaim their willingness to evaluate all arguments in the round (including paradigmatic - pronounced "para-dig-matic" - ones) on the basis of a number of argumentative presumptions: they seek arguments which are clear, intelligent and well-defended, regardless of their particular labels. Surveys conducted in 1974, 1976, 1983 and 1994 give some indication of the frequencies with which particular paradigms occur. The percentages of coaches who could be classified by paradigm break down this way: 1974 1976 1983 1994 Policy-maker 43% 46 38 64 Hypothesis-tester 4 10 4 2 Stock Issues 32 14 8 3 Tabula Rasa 6 9 3 0 Argument Critic 15 10 31 19 Unclassifiable 16 11 While the results of one study may not be directly comparable to the others (since the authors may "code" responses somewhat differently and since the 1974, 1983 and 1984 surveys were of the N.D.T. only while the 1976 survey focused on four major tournaments), they do roughly reveal the continued dominance of the policy-making paradigm, the comparatively small number of adherents to the next three paradigms and the prominence of those who espouse a "critic of argument" perspective. Which paradigm is the best? This question may never be answered since we may never reach unanimity on the corollary query: the best at what? **Little agreement exists as to the concrete goals of competitive debate** beyond the hopelessly vague claim of "training students". Some perspectives which might be useful to you will, however, be offered. A set of functional standards for paradigm evaluation has been offered by Dr. Rowland. His claim is that a paradigm should meet five standards: 1. the paradigm should be clear and consistent; 2. the paradigm should be fair to both sides; 3. the paradigm should help the debaters focus more effectively on the substantive issues entailed by the resolution (as compared to the effectiveness of competing paradigms); 4. the paradigm should promote high-quality arguments; and, 5. the paradigm should work well within the constraints of academic debate. A debate on the validity of each of these criteria occurred in the pages of JAFA, the citation for which is in the bibliography. Fortunately, **the differences in paradigms mask underlying agreement between most judges**. In proposing five hypothetical situations to judges representing various paradigms, Matlon and Cross found a high degree of agreement as to the outcome of the round. Their conclusion: **the majority of judges in the academic debate community view debates with extraordinary consensus regardless of their stated judging philosophies**. This, of course, highlights the importance of using high quality, intelligent arguments regardless of the announced predispositions of the judge. Finally, **most judges view paradigms as debatable issues**. In each survey, **virtually all of the judges showed a willingness to suspend their predispositions in favor of the paradigm which could be settled during the course of the round**; at the 1983 N.D.T., for example, only one out of 110 judges announced his unwillingness to adapt his judging paradigm to the arguments made in the round (and, by 1994, even he surrendered on this issue). SK

#### Turn – their ability to not defend practical consequences is what fuels backlash and creates these stylistic norms in the first place