# Kacee’s Fem AC Glenbrooks Edition

## \*\*\*AC\*\*\*

### Part 1: I am Done Being Quiet

#### Womxn are excluded from the debate space and used as pawns for circuit popularity.

**Perlman 18**

Perlman, Lindsey. [Byram Hills debater, graduated 2019] “Fighting for a Place at the Front by Lindsey Perlman.” *Girls Debate*, July 2018. SN

**The fact that the disparity initially appeared normal to many of the men I talked to is a testament to a broader, systemic problem: gender divisions have become so ordinary that they are not consciously recognized.** Ultimately, this phenomenon cannot be considered apart from a growing culture that operates in such an underhanded manner that many can’t even recognize it in its purest form: the **“bro culture**.” This culture is one of subtleties; it permits and **enables acts of sexism that aren’t severe enough to warrant punishment or condemnation, but prevalent enough to make women feel demeaned and excluded.** Although there is no single definition of “bro culture” in debate, it boils down to the same concept every time-- the systematic degradation of women by immature conglomerates of male debaters, coaches, and educators. And to those who ask, what about conglomerates of female debaters, coaches, and educators -- the reality is, there just aren't enough of us to have as powerful a social dynamic. Even today, the limited number of strong female groups that exist don’t get the same respect-- they are referred to as “cliques” that “just gossip.” Though not all sexism in debate is a result of the “bro culture,” **the prevalence of sexist mindsets, attitudes, and beliefs across younger members of the community can be attributed to it. When a woman witnesses or hears of the “locker room talk”** that her male counterparts say about her, **online or in person, it is a product of the bro culture.** When a young male coach or student winks at a female debater, it is a product of the bro culture. When a female debater has to deal with sexually suggestive comments, jokes, and gestures from younger men in the community, it is a product of the bro culture. These **aggressions encumber women of all ages, ethnicities, religions, social classes, and skill levels,** reducing them from the dignified people they are to objects of male pleasure**. The culture forces women into a paradox where they have a desire for success, but fear it at the same time; a woman’s debate success is often weaponized, giving the “bro squad” another reason to continue objectifying her. Debate stops being a place of empowerment and learning and instead becomes source of constant anxiety and stress.** And yet, time and time again, the community is stuck wondering why women don’t want to stand at the front of the room. The harsh reality is that in most cases, sexist behaviors are not penalized. In fact, quite the opposite occurs-- **a significant amount of the time, men who engage in these behaviors are idolized. By ridiculing women in the activity, men are able to move up the unspoken hierarchy that defines this communal “bro’s club.” Insular groups and entire networks of friends are often structured around the exclusion of women.** Whether it’s in an online group chat or in person, entire conversations among men begin where women are the punchline of shared jokes. In an activity where debaters bond over casually deriding other debaters, **women are easy targets. And since these friendships can be crucial for things such as prep sharing and practice rounds, many people are willing to look beyond flaws in character, choosing greater competitive success and popularity over human decency.** This entire process culminates in a cycle of younger, less experienced debaters lionizing upperclassmen that, although competitively successful, are devoid of morals -- and the formation of a “bro” club to which women will never be granted entry. It’s about time the community wakes up from its ignorant trance and begins to question the values that it endorses, consciously or unconsciously, and the consequences of such endorsements. **The reason that such a toxic culture is able to persist, despite the liberal views of debaters and coaches and their commitment to inclusion, is because of complicity.** Far too many people are comfortable being bystanders in the face of this subtle version of sexism. And because this version of sexism is so common, and sometimes so discreet, bystanders are able to get away with proclaiming innocence. **Every time that a man in a “locker room” conversation (in person or online) chooses not to refute the belittling and sexist comments his so-called friends are making, he enables the bro culture.** Every time that a person witnesses a coach winking at a female debater and pretends he didn’t see it happen, he enables the bro culture. And every time that a judge watches a male debater make his opponent uncomfortable (through his tone, commentary, or gestures) during cross-examination and doesn’t do anything about it, he enables the bro culture. This is the behavior that allows it to continue. Being complicit is no better than being the perpetrator. Perhaps most concerning is the message that **bystanderism** sends to women in the community. Whether they intend to or not, bystanders discourage them from calling people out; their behavior makes it very clear that sucking it up is preferable to standing up for what is right. It also **signals that they don’t think women are worth sticking up for. When women have the courage to confront these “bros,” the communal reaction is rarely ever positive. Many grow defensive and slander the women as people who are “overreacting” and “hypersensitive,” or trying to make things “all about gender.”** I’ve witnessed countless scenarios where male coaches and even staff members at camps audibly laugh at a woman when she speaks out. They find it amusing. Other times, in egregious situations where it is impossible to deny that the perpetrator is a sexist, men will support individuals who voice their concerns. But in record time, those same supportive men will have no issue offering the same sexist debater or coach a place at the front of the room as they celebrate. And once again, women remain in the back -- uncomfortable, demoralized, upset. I find it astonishing how so many men in debate jump at the chance to assert their concern for women’s equality and safety while they simultaneously permit and tolerate the same behaviors that prevent those goals from becoming possible. It’s as if something as trivial as having a Planned Parenthood sticker on your laptop or reading a fem K absolves you of all complicity. It’s not enough to claim that “you didn’t know” or that “it’s not your place.” Implicit biases may be somewhat uncontrollable, but bystanderism is a conscious choice. The burden shouldn’t lie on women’s shoulders to call people out. We deserve a place at the front of the room. And until ALL members of the community make an active effort to ensure that that happens, the front of the room will always be reserved for men.

#### Womxn in the debate space are essentially political candidates.

**Walters 16**

Waters, Anna. [Editorial Fellow at The Atlantic and former debater and coach, Northwestern University] “How Could Sexism Hurt Clinton in the Debates? These Female High School Debaters Know.” *The Washington Post*, September 2016. AZ

Here is what you need to know about presidential debates How long are the presidential debates going to be? Who chooses the moderators and the dates? Here is what you need to know. (Bastien Inzaurralde/The Washington Post) females are a clear minority within the boys’ club of public forum debate, in which pairs of students face off to argue about topics such as terrorism, welfare and health care. Last year, no females cracked the top 20 competitors in the national high school rankings. Just five made it to the top 40. This is unsurprising when one considers the ways **gender skews high school debate. The female high school debaters I know have been belittled by male opponents and told to shush. Judges and parents call these young females naggy, shrill and even bitchy.** They’re told to smile more and sometimes get more in-depth criticism of their hem length than their argumentation. Isabelle Bavis, a junior at Evanston Township High School in Illinois, who has been called “screechy” on ballots, puts it simply: “The language they use to correct us is not the same language used when correcting the boys.” [How Hillary can get that “presidential look”] Jeff Hannan, a fellow debate coach, noticed this, too, and began collecting ballots that showed sexist double standards in judging. In one case, two male competitors had debated two female ones. The judge’s comments for the men: “Very good, strong stance” and “very good, strong, forceful.” For the females? “Monitor your emotions in response to your opponent” and “make sure you are not too overly aggressive.” Another ballot he saved featured this feedback for a female debater that was sure to help her hone future arguments: “FLATS? NO HEELS?” I interviewed 10 current and former high school debaters to gather their stories from the field. Some of their experiences are so sexist, they teeter toward parody. “I’ve lost speaker points for my skirt being too short,” says Gigi Wade, an Evanston Township High junior. Honor McCarthy, a junior at Horace Mann High School in New York, was debating public subsidies for stadiums when an opponent asked her how she could know anything about sports culture. Some of their stories are downright ugly. After McCarthy made it to the final round of a tournament, male debaters in the audience, who had been knocked out of the competition, suggested she could win if she opened her legs. McCarthy did not overhear the comment, but her mother, watching in the audience, did. After one of her first elimination rounds at a national tournament, Georgetown freshman Caroline Wohl was approached by a coach who attempted to compliment her performance by saying, “You debate how a girl should.” Northwestern sophomore Gillian Grossen and her female debate partner were competing against an all-male team at a national tournament; during a segment in which all the competitors could simultaneously question one another, one of her opponents attempted to quiet the room by saying, “girls, girls, settle down.” During a debate about limits on free speech, a male opponent told Ellie Grossman, a senior at the Blake School in Minnesota, that she didn’t understand how misogyny worked. Mella says that she countered a “ridiculous argument about hormones and cows” with some scientific information, to which her male opponent replied, “You sure know your science, girl.” Male competitors in the Miami Beach area had a running joke that Mella was secretly a man, theorizing that she wrapped a penis around her leg. (How else to explain that a wom[o]n had beat them all and won the Florida state championship?) McCarthy once lost a round because a judge said she was not calm enough — even though her male partner is more aggressive than her. (I’ve judged them both before. She’s right.) **Similar gendered critiques and comments have clung to Clinton through every step on the campaign trail. Characters from Ted Nugent to Glenn Beck have called her a [“b”-word]** bitch**, and her facial expressions and voice, in particular, are under constant scrutiny. After a successful primary night in March, MSNBC host Joe Scarborough tweeted that Clinton should smile about it, and Brit Hume of Fox News asked why she was “shouting angrily in her victory speech.”** She received extensive criticism from those who thought she didn’t smile enough while accepting the nomination at the Democratic National Convention, and again during a national security forum this month. **After a 2008 primary debate, an all-male panel on MSNBC concluded that Clinton had looked “like everyone’s first wife standing outside a probate court.” [Why Clinton’s perceived corruption echoes louder than Trump’s actual corruption] Student debaters know as well as Clinton does that** debating while females is a series of balancing acts**. Let male** opponent**s talk over you, and may be seen as submissive; stand up for yourself, and you may be viewed as over**bearing and **aggressive. Maureen Dowd once described Clinton as a “debate dominatrix.”** Though sexist stereotypes haven’t always worked against Clinton. Her opponent in the 2000 New York Senate race, Rick Lazio, was leading in the polls until their debate, when he approached her lectern and, finger jabbing, demanded she sign a pledge against soft money. Voters came to perceive him as a bully, and he ended up losing the race by 12 points . **Anyone on a debate stage has an audience to convince, whether it’s a single judge or the entire American public, and persuading that audience as a wom[o]n comes with unique challenges, starting with their voices. Both men and females associate lower-pitched voices with leadership and prefer leaders with deeper voices.** But vocal tone’s effect on attractiveness depends on gender: Men with deeper voices are considered more attractive, but the opposite is true for females. It can feel impossible to come out on top. Many **female debaters have learned to modulate their voices and temper their emotions to win** with**in this structure, something Clinton discussed doing in a recent interview with Humans of New York.** Ella Fanger, a senior at Oakwood School in Los Angeles, says she has to moderate her tone to resist falling into gendered traps. “I have to think about things in a way my male counterparts don’t, like toeing the line between passionate and hysterical,” Fanger says. “It’s harder for females to have the freedom to be emotional, like to tap into the anger that’s getting Trump and [Bernie] Sanders votes. If [Clinton] gets up and waves her arms around and screams, people will feel like they’re being yelled at by their mom.” (Incidentally, this is exactly how then-CNN commentator Jack Cafferty described Clinton’s primary debate performance in 2008, saying that she had showed a “softer side” in one round against Barack Obama but later “morphed into a scolding mother.”) **“Clinton faces similar challenges in terms of trying to both confront stereotypes but at the same time being weirdly beholden to them, because she needs voters to vote for her in the same way I need a judge to vote for me,” Fanger says.** “I don’t have full freedom to fight the patriarchy in the way I want to because it’s a competitive activity. I’m in that room to get the ballot.” Which, come November, is exactly what another wom[o]n seeks to do. **And whether or not these young debaters want Clinton to be president, they are hoping her candidacy helps change what it means to be a wom[o]n in debate — and what it means to be “presidential.”**

**Marginalized people need to find a way to survive in the space. Thus, the Role of the Judge is to Reject the Act of Being a Bystander – This means to call out sexism.**

#### The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Debater who Provides the Better Coping Strategy Against Oppression in Male Dominated Spaces.

**Carpenter 16**

Carpenter, Julia. “6 tips for surviving a sexist workplace.” Pay Up, 2016. EM

**When the daily microaggressions, Mad Men-style harassment, offhand sexist remarks and constant male favoritism had driven them crazy, Jess Bennett and her female friends formed a support group — they called it “The Feminist Fight Club.” They met to talk about the systematic sexism plaguing their workplaces, the strategies and tactics to fix it and the personal coping mechanisms they needed to survive it.** Now, Bennett has written about that time and those strategies, but she isn’t calling her latest book a memoir — she’s calling [“Feminist Fight Club”](https://www.harpercollins.com/9780062439789/feminist-fight-club)a “manual.” More specifically, “an office survival manual for a sexist workplace.” She modeled the title and the structure off the club she and other female coworkers formed at the start of her career, when she was fighting harassment from the bottom rung of the corporate ladder. **Bennett says she wishes the younger version of herself had had a manual like “Feminist Fight Club*,”*to be deployed in workplace battle. She joined our Pay Up community to share some advice on those everyday workplace battles, talking about how to detect — and fight! — the sexism women still face in offices throughout the country.**

**Prefer framing that talks specifically about womxn two warrants-**

**While this framework is open to multiple forms of oppression, it’s time to specifically talk about womxn since traditional pedagogy like util actively tells us to sit down and shut up.**

Matsuda 86

Matsuda, Mari. [Assistant Professor of Law, University of Hawaii] “Liberal Jurisprudence and the Abstracted Visions of Human Nature: A Feminist Critique of Rawls’s Theory of Justice.” *New Mexico Law Review*, Vol. 16, Fall 1986. KK

The body of emerging scholarship known as feminist theory, as rich and diverse as it is, is characterized by some basic tenets. First is the charge of androcentrism in mainstream scholarship--the charge that traditional scholarly discourse largely ignores the lives and voices of women. Second is the charge of dualism. Dualism is the oppositional understanding of intuition, experience, and emotion as the inferior antitheses of logic, reason, and science, coupled with a tendency to equate women with the former grouping and men with the latter.3 A related dualism places men in the public domain-politics, law, paid work-and women in the private-home, absence of law, unpaid work.32 From these critiques of mainstream scholarship, feminists have derived two insights. The first is that the personal is political.33 By this it is meant that what happens in the daily lives of real people has political content in the same way as does what we normally think of as politics – the structure of economic systems and governments. That is, who makes breakfast, who gets a paycheck, who gets whistled at in the street – all the experiences of daily life are a part of the distribution of wealth and power in society. The second insight is that consciousness raising – collective focus on the particularities of real-life experience – is essential to truth-seeking.

#### Womxn are statistically less likely to succeed in LD debate. **Tartakovsky 16:**

#### **Daniel Tartakovsky "New Evidence On Gender Disparities In Competitive High School Lincoln-Douglas Debate". Briefly, 2016, https://www.vbriefly.com/2016/05/15/new-evidence-on-gender-disparities-in-competitive-high-school-lincoln-douglas-debate/. Accessed 11 Nov 2021. AVKAW**

Summary statistics and two empirical models yield similar conclusions: men are substantially more likely than women to win preliminary debate rounds at National Circuit Lincoln Douglas debate competitions. The basic linear model puts the gap at 4 percentage points while the full linear regression with individual, tournament, and year fixed effects, as well the individual-fixed effects model, suggest a gap of 2.5 to 3 percentage points. Including a control variable for debaters’ graduation year seems to account for some of the gap’s narrowing. This is not necessarily a positive sign for those concerned about female success, for it suggests that women tend to be younger (and therefore less experienced) than male debaters. A simple analysis of debaters graduating in 2016 who debated at least once as sophomores confirms that women are over 2 percentage points less likely than men to debate the following season, which could explain the experience-based component of the gender gap. To be clear, these findings are suggestive rather than causal and leave many questions unanswered. For instance, the research does not shed light on whether judge biases are an important factor at debate competitions. The lack of evidence that having more female judges improves female performance suggests that tournament administrators and coaches concerned with female success should not expect to eliminate the gender gap by hiring female judges. Of course, female representation at tournaments may have positive effects on female debaters outside the narrow context of individual wins and losses associated with the judge’s gender. Future research could explore this possibility by tracking female success across different kinds of competitions, perhaps examining whether women benefit from there being a higher fraction of female judges, from peer effects, or from other policies tournaments adopt to reduce the gender gap. Gaining a more nuanced understanding of why men enjoy more competitive success than women would help stakeholders in the community minimize the likelihood that women are denied opportunities and treated unfairly in an activity that is meant to empower everyone instead of leaving some people behind.

We NEED strategies to fight against this exclusion for debate to remain an educational and safe space

### Part 2: Harms

#### The pandemic has exacerbated the atrocious working conditions, and these are magnified for womxn workers.

Salas-Nicás et. al 21

Sergio Salas-Nicása, Salvador Moncada, Clara Llorensabc, Albert Navarroad, Working conditions and health in Spain during the COVID-19 pandemic: Minding the gap," Foreign Affairs, 5-8-2021, <https://doi.org/10.1177/10482911211011605>

The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on **all spheres of life** have been **enormous**, and that of occupation has been no exception. Our study estimates that approximately a third of Spanish employees **continued to attend their company** or institution regularly, some lost their jobs, others were affected by temporary lay-offs, others had to telework from home, etc. It is obvious that this abrupt break with the occupational routine can have important consequences on working conditions and the health of workers. The unexpected emergence of the pandemic surprised those responsible for Public Administrations, Social Agents and even most researchers, something which, together with initial doubts regarding the severity of the disease and how it is transmitted within workplace settings or to the usefulness of personal protective equipment (Semple and Cherrie, 2020), could explain to a large extent why almost three out of four workers who continued going to their workplace consider that they had done so **without** **adequate protection measures**. Furthermore, it appears that **working conditions worsened notably**. Thus, based on the ERP-2016 we may estimate, using exactly the same methodology, certain figures which permit a comparison with observations made during the pandemic. For example, in 2016 the percentage of workers in a situation of high strain (according to the conceptualisation of the “demand-control” model) (Karasek et al., 1981) was 22.3%, 58.1% were concerned about losing their jobs, 68.4% about not finding another job if the present one were to be lost, or 63% about their salary being reduced (unpublished data). Therefore, during the pandemic, the number of workers in conditions of high strain (high demands but low control) has doubled, while in the case of insecurity there are also increases, although not so pronounced, of around 6–7% in terms of fear about not finding another job or about a decrease in wages, which were already very high in 2016, the result of a context of high insecurity that can almost be considered a characteristic feature of the Spanish labour market (Sora et al., 2014). In contrast, there is a **decrease in concern over job loss** of more than 15%. As observed in 2010 in the context of the financial crisis (Utzet et al., 2014), part of this decrease could be due to the fact that part of the most vulnerable group (young people and temporary workers) would have already been expelled from the labour market when the survey began, a few weeks after the state of alert was declared, leaving the “survivors”, typically workers with more stable jobs. Another part could be due to the application of temporary lay-off procedures by the administration and the requirement for companies adopting this measure of not firing anyone during the six months following its termination (requirement that was relaxed for ERTEs implemented after June 30 and which does not affect our sample). In addition to “classic” job insecurity regarding employment or its fundamental conditions, a majority (seven out of ten workers), express uncertainty and concern related to the possibility of becoming infected in the workplace or being themselves a transmission vector. The **worsening of workers' health is considerable**: more than a third of the salaried population affirms that their **general health status worsened during** **the pandemic** (only 5.2% stated that it improved); the use of tranquilizers and opioid analgesics more than doubled compared to the pre-pandemic situation and, in addition, a very significant percentage of those who were already users increased the dose or switched to a stronger drug; on the other hand, in the ERP-2016 it was estimated that the percentage of subjects who reported often or almost always sleeping badly in the last month was 12.3% (Salas-Nicás et al., 2020) and those who were at risk of poor mental health 23.7% (Salas-Nicás et al., 2018). This means that workers with very frequent sleep problems have almost quadrupled compared to 2016 and those at risk of poor mental health have more than doubled. This worsening in **poor mental health in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic** is due to multiple causes. Among work-related causes will surely be the increase in exposure to high strain (Harvey et al., 2017), uncertainty related to job insecurity and financial concern (Wilson et al., 2020), fear of becoming infected, etc., but also the increase in social isolation and loneliness (Holmes et al., 2020). In any case, it is evident that if this situation continues over time, the damage to the health of workers may be very significant. Although for the set of indicators studied the level of harmfulness is generally high, **there are also considerable inequalities: manual workers, women, young people and those with lower wages are undoubtedly worse off.** As in the 2008 crisis (Utzet et al., 2015), manual workers, occupations less prepared for teleworking and many “front-line” workers face the high demands deriving from staff cuts, from shortcomings in technologies and processes aggravated by the pandemic, or are unable to influence their daily work situation due to the authoritarian or neo-Taylorist forms of work-organisation that characterise Spanish labour management practices in this segment of workers (Llorens et al., 2019). Young people, already with the highest levels of precariousness and suffering the attendant job insecurity and job destruction, are probably the main victims of the pandemic from an occupational point of view, since they run the risk of their entire working life being affected by the current situation, becoming “the lockdown generation” (ILO, 2020). In addition to the usual unfavorable situation of women, the pandemic has a **high feminization of many of the** **so-called ”front-line“ occupations** (Wenham et al., 2020), which have been more exposed and have suffered more intensely from the effect of working in very stressful conditions, with high quantitative demands and with a higher probability of being infected. Salary is also revealed as a powerful axis of inequality, being strongly associated with most of the items studied, for example, going to work with symptoms compatible with COVID-19, which surely indicates that for many people staying home is not an option, for economic reasons. Moreover, other studies have shown the vulnerability of other occupational groups, for example migrant workers, many of them employed in low-skilled occupations and with poor housing conditions (Koh, 2020).

#### \*Womxn cannot continue to sit pretty and deal with hazardous working conditions, ESPECIALLY the womxn working on the frontline of the pandemic

#### Subpoint B: Sexual Harassment

#### Sexual harassment of womxn in the workplace is rampant.

EEOC 16

The EEOC, "Select Task Force On The Study Of Harassment In The Workplace | U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission". Eeoc.Gov, 2016, https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#\_Toc453686300. Accessed 4 Nov 2021. AVKAW

The most widely used survey of harassment of women at work, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), not only asks respondents whether they have experienced unwanted sexual attention or sexual coercion, but also asks whether they have experienced sexist or crude/offensive behavior.[[19]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn19) Termed "gender harassment" in the SEQ, these are hostile behaviors that are devoid of sexual interest. Gender harassment can include sexually crude terminology or displays (for example, calling a female colleague a ''c\*nt'' or posting pornography) and sexist comments (such as telling anti-female jokes or making comments that women do not belong in management.) These behaviors differ from unwantedsexual attention in that they aim to insult and reject women,rather than pull them into a sexual relationship. As one researcher described it, the difference between these behaviors is analogous to the difference between a ''come on'' and a ''put down.''[[20]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn20)

When sex-based harassment at work is measured by asking about this form of gender harassment, almost 60% of women report having experienced harassment in surveys using probability samples.[[21]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn21) Indeed, when researchers disaggregate harassment into the various subtypes (unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion, and gender harassment), they find that gender harassment is the most common form of harassment.[[22]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn22)

Whether or not women label their unwanted experiences as sexual harassment appears to have little influence on the negative consequences of these experiences.[[23]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn23) As one group of researchers pointed out, data from three organizations "demonstrate that whether or not a woman considers her experience to constitute sexual harassment, she experiences similar negative psychological, work, and health consequences."[[24]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn24)

#### These aren’t nameless statistics, these are the real-life experiences of real womxn.

EEOC 16

The EEOC, "Select Task Force On The Study Of Harassment In The Workplace | U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission". Eeoc.Gov, 2016, https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#\_Toc453686300. Accessed 4 Nov 2021. AV KW

Jacquelyn Hines was a single mother, born and raised in Memphis, Tennessee. She didn't finish high school, but she earned her G.E.D. and worked a series of temporary jobs through various staffing agencies to support herself and her family.

In 2008, she found herself working for New Breed Logistics, a supply-chain logistics company with a warehouse in Memphis. Her supervisor made a habit of directing sexually-explicit comments to Jacquelyn and her female coworkers. Indeed, it wasn't only sexually-explicit comments - there were lewd and vulgar gestures, and some days physical harassment as well, like the day he pressed his stomach and private parts into one woman's back. When these women asked him to "stop talking dirty to me" or "leave me alone," his response was that he "wasn't going to get into trouble, he ran the place"and if anyone complained to HR, they would be fired.

And sure enough, that's what happened. One of Jacquelyn's coworkers was fired when she complained about the harassment by way of the company's anonymous hotline. When Jacquelyn herself stood up to her supervisor and asked him to stop, suddenly she was contacted by the temporary agency concerning alleged attendance issues (which had never been mentioned before). Her hours were cut, she lost pay, and within a week she was fired. The male coworker who had stood up to the supervisor on behalf of his colleagues, and told him to stop making comments because the women didn't like it? He was fired, too.

And it didn't stop there. Some time later, Jacquelyn applied for and was hired at a different branch of the company, in Mississippi. She worked there for a few weeks and the job was going well, until one day she was abruptly escorted off the premises. The HR manager would later explain that she had recognized Jacquelyn's name from the Memphis plant and had her fired from her job in Mississippi.[[5]](https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace#_ftn5)

### Part 3: Solvency

**Corporate feminism fails and is only attainable by the elite, only full mobilization solves and unites feminists from all classes, we need strikes.**

**Davis et al 17**

Angela Davis[Professor at Emerita, University of California Santa Cruz] Barbara Ransby[professor at the University of Illinois, EIC of SOULS and President of the National Women’s Studies Association] Cinzia Arruzza[Associate Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research in New York and feminist, socialist activist] Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor[an assistant professor in Princeton University's Center for African American Studies] Linda Martín Alcoff[a professor of philosophy at Hunter College and the CUNY Graduate Center and author of Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self] Nancy Fraser[Loeb Professor of Philosophy and Politics at the New School for Social Research] Rasmea Yousef Odeh[associate director of the Arab American Action Network and leader of that group's Arab Women's Committee] Tithi Bhattacharya[teaches history at Purdue University] “Beyond Lean-In: For a Feminism of the 99% and a Militant International Strike on March 8,” 2-3-2017, [https://viewpointmag.com/2017/02/03/beyond-lean-in-for-a-feminism-of-the-99-and-a-militant-international-strike-on-march-8](https://viewpointmag.com/2017/02/03/beyond-lean-in-for-a-feminism-of-the-99-and-a-militant-international-strike-on-march-8/)]

The massive women’s marches of January 21st may mark the beginning of a new wave of militant feminist struggle. But what exactly will be its focus? In our view, it is not enough to oppose Trump and his aggressively misogynistic, homophobic, transphobic and racist policies; we also need to target the ongoing neoliberal attack on social provision and labor rights. While Trump’s blatant misogyny was the immediate trigger for the massive response on January 21st, the attack on women (and all working people) long predates his administration. Women’s conditions of life, especially those of women of color and of working, unemployed and migrant women, have steadily deteriorated over the last 30 years, thanks to financialization and corporate globalization**. Lean-in feminism and other variants of corporate feminism have failed** the overwhelming majority of us, who do not have access to individual self-promotion and advancement and whose conditions of life can be improved only through policies that defend social reproduction, secure reproductive justice, and guarantee labor rights. As we see it, the new wave of women’s mobilization must address all these concerns in a frontal way. It must be a feminism for the 99%. **The kind of feminism we seek is already emerging internationally**, in struggles across the globe: from the women’s strike in Poland against the abortion ban to the women’s strikes and marches in Latin America against male violence; from the massive women’s demonstration of the last November in Italy to the protests and the women’s strike in defense of reproductive rights in South Korea and Ireland. What is striking about these mobilizations is that several of them combined struggles against male violence with opposition to the casualization of labor and wage inequality, while also opposing homophobia, transphobia and xenophobic immigration policies. **Together, they herald a new international feminist movement with an expanded agenda–at once anti-racist, anti-imperialist, anti-heterosexist, and anti-neoliberal**. We want to contribute to the development of this new, more expansive feminist movement. As a first step, we propose to help build an international strike against male violence and in defense of reproductive rights on March 8th. In this, we join with feminist groups from around thirty countries who have called for such a strike. The idea is to mobilize women, including trans-women, and all who support them in an international day of struggle–a day of striking, marching, blocking roads, bridges, and squares, abstaining from domestic, care and sex work, boycotting, calling out misogynistic politicians and companies, striking in educational institutions. These actions are aimed at making visible the needs and aspirations of those whom lean-in feminism ignored: women in the formal labor market, women working in the sphere of social reproduction and care, and unemployed and precarious working women. In embracing a feminism for the 99%, we take inspiration from the Argentinian coalition Ni Una Menos. Violence against women, as they define it, **has many facets**: it is domestic violence, but also the violence of the market, of debt, of capitalist property relations, and of the state; the violence of discriminatory policies against lesbian, trans and queer women, the violence of state criminalization of migratory movements, the violence of mass incarceration, and the **institutional violence against women’s bodies** through abortion bans and lack of access to free healthcare and free abortion. Their perspective informs our determination to oppose the institutional, political, cultural, and economic attacks on Muslim and migrant women, on women of color and working and unemployed women, on lesbian, gender nonconforming, and trans-women. The women’s marches of January 21st have shown that in the United States too a new feminist movement may be in the making. It is important not to lose momentum. Let us join together on March 8 to strike, walk out, march and demonstrate. Let us use the occasion of this international day of action to be done with lean-in feminism and to build in its place a feminism for the 99%, a grass-roots, anti-capitalist feminism–a feminism in solidarity with working women, their families, and their allies throughout the world.

#### AND, this right must be unconditional – 2 warrants:

#### 1. History proves. The Farah strikes laid the essential groundwork for female factory workers unionization and proved women’s capabilities to request reform.
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Events at Farah since the strike show the continued difficulty of organizing in the Southwest. The right-to-work law, the consolidated opposition of powerful employers, the volatile nature of the garment industry, the threat of runaway shops, and the timidity of union officials are formidable obstacles in the way of a strong workers' organization. In addition, the abundant reserve army of labor and the resulting competition for jobs in the border area create divisions among workers which employers like Farah can use to their own advantage. It is clear from the Farah experience that successful unionization does not end when the union wins a contract. Organizing and training of workers in everything from rievance procedure to labor history must continue on a long-term basis. In addition a strong rank-and-file movement must be developed -one which can overcome divisions among the workers, build a democratic local union, and encourage women workers to acquire leadership skills. While the Farah strike did not produce a strong, mature rank- and-file movement, it did help to create the conditions in which one can develop. The workers who made the strike were irreversibly changed by it. All of them say that they would organize and strike again; most of them recognize the need for strong support from an international union like the ACWA, as long as it does not undermine the independent organization of rank-and-file workers. "We're sticking in there and we're not going to get out and we're not giving up!" one ex-striker insisted. The Chicanas who comprise the majority of strikers learned that they could speak and act on their own behalf as women and workers, lessons they will not forget. In the words of one striker: I believe in fighting for our rights, and for women's rights ... When I walked out of that company way back then, it was like I had taken a weight off my back. And I began to realize, "Why did I put up with it all these years? Why didn't I try for something else?" Now I want to stay here and help people to help themselves.

#### Conditions on the right to strike allow employers to use those conditions and justification for cruel and unwarranted punishment on strikers, Willie Farah proves.

The San Francisco Bay Area Farah Strike Support Committee. Chicanos Strike at Farah. United Front Press, 1974.

Willie Farah was shocked at the strikes being held at multiple Farah factories, mainly El Paso- his hometown. He used several tactics to stop the strike, such as, outdated Texas laws, denial of loans to strikers, and Fortress Farah. A couple of weeks after the Farah Strike broke out, Willie Farah obtained a court injunction that stated, "people picketing had to be 50 feet apart." This injunction was based on the 1880 Texas law. Picketers were being arrested for protesting Farah's company and being fined $4, which was a substantial amount of money to be forced to pay while not receiving wages. The 1880 Texas law did not hold-up in court and was later ruled as unconstitutional due to the United States’ first amendment's protection of peaceful assembly. Willie Farah was on the board of directors at the First National Bank of El Paso and utilized his power to "cut off all loans to strikers," which was another strategy to stop protesters. Fortress Farah was the name given to another Farah-scheme to end the strike, the plants were surrounded with barbed wire and telescopic cameras. Plant guards were issued guns and unmuzzled attack dogs.”

#### \*The right to strike MUST be unconditional. Even minimal, or seemly unrelated conditions are harmful, Willie Farah proves