# NSD r2

**CW – discussions of sexual harassment and psychological violence**

#### “When we turn from anger we turn from insight,

#### saying we will accept only the designs already known,

#### deadly and safely familiar…

#### I speak here as a woman of Color who is not bent upon destruction,

#### but upon survival.”

#### – Audre Lorde

Adapted from “The Uses of Anger”, 1981 – https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/1981-audre-lorde-uses-anger-women-responding-racism/ - a speech written by [Audre Lorde](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Audre_Lorde), a woman who wrote from the particulars of her identity: Black woman, lesbian, poet, activist, cancer survivor, mother, and [feminist](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feminism) writer. // Dulles RB

#### Fuck your USFG – this is not a game. Our culture of complacency is the foundation of a community that routinely **exploits and abuses children** – I’m fucking exhausted. Every gender minority in debate that I know has experienced blatant sexism – every girl in this activity wakes up and has to compartmentalize that trauma just to exist. Being a gender minority in debate is being ashamed, being angry, being alone and being heartbroken.

Gray 20 Emma Gray - 10/01/2020 05:45 am ET <https://www.huffpost.com/entry/high-school-debate-me-too_n_5f7217fcc5b6f622a0c2ab94?fbclid=IwAR1LS2bbM2oRLm5XdV77Zh5Zv8jn5iODra7NCKW1ENpyL3wLaT9ghKiRhmQ> – [Emma Gray is a senior reporter at HuffPost focused on the intersection of gender, culture and politics, and the author A Girl's Guide To Joining The Resistance, a primer on young women and activism. She is also the co-host of the Webby-nominated Bachelor-themed podcast, Here To Make Friends, and has appeared as an expert on the Today Show, Good Morning America, MSNBC, Entertainment Tonight, NPR and WBUR. Her work has also appeared in Cosmopolitan, Nylon and Teen Vogue. Emma is based in New York City, and is an alum of McGill University in Montreal, which is probably why she has such a soft spot for poutine and St. Viateur bagels] // Dulles RB

HuffPost has spoken to 11 former high school debaters — all of whom are deeply passionate about the activity, and many of whom have gone on to coach debate or compete at the collegiate level — who describe a community culture that tacitly allows sexist and racist abuses to go unchecked. And at its worst, it empowers abusive leaders and encourages such behaviors. They point to the activity’s exclusionary nature and its lack of clear, centralized governing structures as reasons that things haven’t changed, even as Americans have spent nearly three years in a national dialogue about sexual abuse and racism. These young people, all of whom are between the ages of 19 and 26, want to see competitive high school debate get its Me Too moment — a moment that they feel is long overdue. They want to see a real, sustained reckoning occur at all levels of the activity, and they want the leadership bodies that do exist to make clear, concrete changes to keep the most vulnerable members of the debate community safe. In a lengthy statement to HuffPost, Nicole Wanzer-Serrano, the director of development and diversity, equity, and inclusion at the NSDA, and J. Scott Wunn, the organization’s executive director, said they “take seriously any allegation of intimidation, racism, harassment, or bullying at our competitions.” “We believe that speech and debate can empower students to speak out against these injustices, which is why we have sought ways to empower victims to share their stories with the proper authorities so they can be addressed,” they said. They told HuffPost that they “encourage survivors to report to the appropriate individuals so that their situations could be addressed and could lead to removing bad actors from our communities. If an incident is reported at an NSDA-sanctioned event, we have processes in place to review and take appropriate action.” Welcome To Debate World For those uninitiated to the world of competitive debate, it’s a year-round activity that forms the social backbone of many debaters’ high school experiences. Debaters compete as individuals or in two-person units within a larger high school team. These teams send debaters to local and national tournaments throughout the school year, and competitive debaters often attend debate camps during the summer. “It’s hard to explain just how deep-seated debate is within the psyche of any prominent high school debater,” said Katie Hughes, 23. “But basically it becomes your entire life.” Carolyn, a former debater and coach who asked that her last name not be published, likened being an elite debater to being on a very intense sports team. “Your team becomes your social circle,” she said. “I’d be away almost every weekend and I’d have practice three times a week and not get home until 9 p.m. My whole social network was people from debate, and a lot of my friends were people at other schools who did debate. There’s this weird connection that’s hard to explain to other people.” It is also important to understand just how decentralized the structure of the activity is — and how big of a role that the lack of organization plays in allowing abusive behavior to go on without recourse. There are four major national high school speech and debate organizations, which act as very loose governing bodies. The National Speech and Debate Association, or NSDA, is widely considered the largest and most influential on the national circuit. “It’s the closest we have to a governing body in debate, even though it’s not really a governing body as it currently operates,” Potischman said, explaining why it’s the organization the creators of the Speech & Debate Stories account are focusing on. Wanzer-Serrano and Wunn told HuffPost that the NSDA primarily provides organizational support, educational resources and training for 3,500 middle and high school debate teams. Debate teams spend the bulk of their time preparing for tournaments, which double as social activities for participants. Tournaments operate at the local and national level and can be hosted by a variety of institutions, including national organizations and schools. For example, the University of Kentucky hosts the Tournament of Champions, an annual national high school debate tournament that is widely considered the championship of the national circuit. To qualify for the TOC, debaters need at least two bids, which they can earn by placing highly in specific national and regional tournaments throughout the year. There is currently no centralized formal accreditation process to become a debate coach or tournament judge, which means that many coaches and judges are simply elite debaters who recently graduated from high school. The NSDA announced in August that it had created a committee to develop a comprehensive accreditation process for tournament judges. The former high school debaters who spoke with HuffPost all expressed how entrenched they were in the community at one time. The all-encompassing nature of high school debate makes it particularly tricky to acknowledge and report abuse. A lot of debaters “join because they don’t feel exactly accepted in their high school,” Carolyn said. “So [debate] is kind of your outlet and your safe place. And then that safe place is no longer safe.” ‘Not Uncommon’: Harassment And Assault Allegations In Competitive Debate Many of the people HuffPost interviewed said the cultural issues within the high school debate community make debaters — especially women and gender nonconforming people —[are] vulnerable to sexual harassment, sexual assault or rape. They all say that the diffuse nature of the community and its various leadership bodies makes it hard to report these incidents in a safe way, and nearly impossible to ensure lasting consequences for people who behave in predatory ways. To protect the people who spoke to HuffPost from legal retaliation — something that many of them expressed fear about — we will not be naming any alleged assailants. Victims of sexual harassment and abuse often encounter barriers to reporting. But there can be an extra layer of difficulty when the harassment or assault is being perpetrated by people who hold power, either formally (judges, coaches, camp instructors) or informally (debaters who are highly successful). “There’s a huge hero-worshiping culture that surrounds the most successful debaters,” Potischman said. “They’re immune to criticism in a lot of ways. And I think they feel empowered to do whatever they want.” Raphaelson said this was widely known as “Good Debater Syndrome,” or GDS for short. “A lot of men who do well in debate will use their success [to get access to women],” she said. “And kind of use it to call out other girls to say, ‘Oh, well, I have X amount of bids to the Tournament of Champions, so you should come hang out with me.’” In 2014, Carolyn attended an overnight tournament. She and one of her teammates, who was considered a “rising star,” stayed in a hotel block that had been organized by the tournament hosts. Carolyn said she didn’t know this boy particularly well, but she had been told that he was specifically “interested in East Asian girls.” Carolyn was 16 years old at the time and barely 100 pounds. The boy, who is white, was 15, but more than 6 feet tall. Carolyn, who is now 23, says this boy texted her one night during the tournament and asked her to meet him at his hotel room. He didn’t say why he wanted her there, and she didn’t ask. When she arrived at the room, she says, he ushered her inside, immediately turned off the lights, and led her to a bed. “He told me to get on my knees, and then he pulled his pants down and said, ‘You need to go down on me,’” she said. Carolyn was fairly sexually inexperienced at the time and told him she didn’t know what that meant. He pushed her head down toward his penis, and she did what he told her to do. “I don’t know why I did it,” Carolyn said. “I just felt really small. I was so young and small.” A few months later, Carolyn told a close male friend on her team about the encounter but didn’t go into detail. When she was in college, she told her best friend. HuffPost spoke to both of these friends, and they each confirmed that Carolyn had told them about the incident. She ultimately chose not to report the incident because she feared that she would face repercussions since her assailant was “really good at debate” and from a wealthy family of lawyers. She was also afraid that she would not be allowed to participate in debate if her coach told her parents what had happened. “I’m Chinese and I come from a very strict family,” Carolyn said. “So it was a lot for them to allow me to travel every weekend and help pay for the tournament.” Looking back, she feels certain that race and class played a role in her initial reaction to the incident. “I didn’t say no or fight,” she said. “I didn’t feel like a survivor.” This incident and the casual racism that Carolyn says she faced in debate fundamentally shaped the way she feels about her entire time in high school. “I don’t have any memories of, like, prom,” she said. “My experience is so colored by a few sets of experiences that really just made me think so negatively about my high school experience.” There’s a huge hero-worshiping culture that surrounds the most successful debaters. They’re immune to criticism in a lot of ways. And I think they feel empowered to do whatever they want.Nina Potischman, co-creator of the Speech & Debate Stories Instagram account Nicole Nave, a former high school and college debater who is now the executive director of the [Women’s Debate Institute](https://womensdebateinstitute.org/), an organization dedicated to facilitating a more inclusive environment for women and gender minorities within speech and debate, said instances of sexual harassment and assault within the competitive debate community are “not uncommon.” “Coaches actually harass you, coaches and judges sexually harass kids,” Nave said. “And when you speak out, you really pay the price.” Multiple people told HuffPost that they have faced litigation or the threat of litigation for speaking up about alleged abuses. Nave’s own experiences, in both high school and college, have driven her to want to make competitive debate a safer activity. In 2014, when Nave was a 19-year-old college freshman, she went to a party during a tournament at which she was debating. According to Nave, most of the party attendees were under the legal drinking age, but two older men supplied alcohol for them. One of the men had been a judge at the debate tournament, and Nave says he raped her when she was intoxicated. “I did not report it to my team because he told me that he had videos and was willing to show everyone in the community. And that I was his new girlfriend for the rest of the debate season,” Nave said. “So for three months at tournaments, he would text me and tell me when we were going to have sex, and tell me what to do.” That summer, Nave worked at a debate camp with LaToya Williams Green, a woman Nave considered to be a mentor. Green was about to become the debate director at a college in Kansas, and during the summer, Nave told her what had happened at the party. Nave told HuffPost that Green helped her report the alleged rape to the debate director at the alleged assailant’s university. Nave says the man confessed to having a consensual sexual relationship with her but denied raping her or providing alcohol to students under the legal drinking age. Both Nave and Green recall him being removed from the university’s debate program, and according to public records, he does not appear to have judged in a debate tournament since 2014. Green, who is now the director of debate at Cal State Fullerton and a board member of the WDI, told HuffPost that her exact memory of how the reporting occurred is a bit fuzzy because incidents like this one are not uncommon. However, she does remember the removal of Nave’s alleged abuser happening “covertly and discretely,” which she sees as part of the larger issue. “These guys get to be informally accosted,” Green said, which allows abusers to hop between programs and tournaments fairly easily, even when consequences are levied by one program. She said this quiet way of dealing with harmful behavior ultimately “allows the ability to replicate the behavior.” College debate is run separately from high school debate, and not governed by the NSDA. However, because recent graduates and collegiate debaters so often become high school coaches and judges, problems at the high school level that go unchecked can come back again. Debaters who display abusive behavior in high school can go on to staff camps, as well as coach and mentor their former teammates and future generations of debaters. And former high school debaters who have seen discrimination and abuse firsthand, like Nave and Green, see it as part of their responsibility to protect the kids coming through the activity now. “You go back and you go coach your high school team, you mentor high school students, you go do private tutoring,” Green said. “And a lot of that work, especially when [coaches] deal with women and feminized students, trans students, queer students, [they] deal with, ‘OK, we got the arguments down. Now close your laptop and let’s have a real conversation … so you can be prepared to defend yourself and protect yourself, not just physically but also argumentatively, socially. Let us get you ready.’” Green doesn’t think cis white male coaches necessarily [aren’t] having those same conversations with the cis white male debaters they work with. “Which, of course,” she said, “is a microcosm of what we see in the real world.” Looking back, Nave sees how key it was to have older people in the community believe her when she disclosed allegations of abuse. She also says it helped that she was already out of high school and had a greater understanding of what had happened to her. “With kids [who are in high school debate], they don’t know … how to even explain what’s happening,” Nave said. “A lot of times they don’t even know there’s something wrong that has occurred.” Coaches actually harass you, coaches and judges sexually harass kids. And when you speak out, you really pay the price.Nicole Nave, executive director, Women’s Debate Institute The people interviewed for this piece also told HuffPost that some community leaders, including judges and coaches, engage in abusive behavior. Kathleene Humphries, 21, recalled being sexualized by a tournament judge, who was a coach at another school, when she was a sophomore in high school. (Humphries now coaches debate in Ohio.) When she was 15, several of her friends decided to observe her participating in a debate round one day. She was wearing a shirt she loved — purple with a gem on it — that her mother had given her. She felt both confident and pretty. During the round, Humphries says the other school’s coach was staring at her chest so noticeably that both her debate partner and her friends who were watching commented on it later. She says her debate partner, a male high school student, joked that they probably won the round because the coach had found her sexually attractive. “When we won the round, I felt entirely disgusted because I didn’t even know if it was because of me being a good debater or because this 20-[something]-year-old person was sexually attracted to a 15-year-old and was making it visibly known,” she said. “It was so obvious that everyone in the room was picking up on it.” In March 2015, Jon Cruz, a well-known debate coach at The Bronx High School of Science in New York City, was [arrested by the FBI](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/11/nyregion/teacher-in-pornography-case-asked-students-for-photos-prosecutors-say.html) for “communicating online and via text message with several minor teenage boys around the country and paying them to send him photographs of themselves, some of which were sexually explicit.” In 2017, he was sentenced to [seven years in prison](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/20/nyregion/bronx-science-coach-sentenced-to-7-years-in-child-pornography-case.html). Cruz’s arrest left a lasting impression on the students who knew of him, including several of the former debaters interviewed for this piece. He was prolific within the debate world and, as someone in his 30s, was sort of known as the resident adult in the room. “I was at a lot of tournaments [during high school], and I could probably count on one hand the number of actual adults — as in 30-plus — that are prominent in this community,” said Marie-Rose Sheinerman, 20, who was involved in debate at Hunter College High School with Potischman. “And one of those adults was arrested for child pornography in 2015.” ‘Debate Is An Exclusionary Activity’ High school debate has long been extolled as an extracurricular activity that can prepare students to be leaders and enhance academic and professional opportunities later on. (Famous former high school and college debaters include Elizabeth Warren, Richard Nixon, Kamala Harris, Nelson Mandela, Oprah Winfrey, Karl Rove, Malcolm X and Antonin Scalia.) There has been some research that backs up the idea that participating in debate can have a real impact on students. A [2009 study](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/AN-INVESTIGATION-INTO-THE-RELATIONSHIP-BETWEEN-IN-L-Peters/81218643480070be779ccf8d7f4368b3c3e5161f) found a positive correlation between participation in competitive speech and standardized test scores. And a [2012 study](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22633913/) found that at-risk high school students in the Chicago Public School District who participated in a debate program were three times more likely to graduate from high school than students who did not. Despite the potential benefits of competitive debate, the former high school debaters HuffPost interviewed said elite debating tends to be dominated by white, financially privileged students. This affects who has access to the boost that involvement in competitive debate can bring and dictates the culture of the debate community. One factor that contributes to the marginalization of certain groups from the get-go is that competitive debate requires a substantial amount of money. Teams and individual students need to be able to pay for tournament registration fees, travel to tournaments, accommodations, and summer camps. Depending on the location of the school, just going to one national tournament can cost as much as $1,000 per student. Although students can sometimes find funding through outside sources such as team grants, individual families or school endowments usually end up paying the majority of fees — meaning schools and families with greater resources are more likely to be able to participate in competitive speech. “It makes me sad that more people don’t have access to debate,” said Carolyn, adding that she was only able to participate in high school because of heavy subsidization. “There [are] a lot of private schools [and] all-boys schools that compete. I feel like if there were more people with different backgrounds, the arguments that we would be having in the tournament themselves would look different.” Carolyn described the way certain debate topics — like “Should we have a living wage?” — can easily become fraught when most debaters are looking at the question as a theoretical thought experiment and others see it as deeply personal. “When people say, ‘Hey, we shouldn’t have a living wage’ or, ‘People who make a minimum wage, they don’t deserve certain things,’ then I think of my mother who makes minimum wage,” Carolyn said. “And I think, ‘Hey, that’s not right.’” The lack of socioeconomic, racial and gender diversity can prove particularly harmful to debaters of color, according to Nave. “Debate is an exclusionary activity that creates lines, especially for Black women, that are extremely dangerous,” Nave said. She said the lack of racial diversity creates an environment where debaters of color experience higher levels of tone-policing and harassment. The former high school debater, now 26, coached four of the six Black girls who qualified for the annual Tournament of Champions in 2019. Nave says she has witnessed numerous instances of casual racism, both personally and against her students. During one tournament, she said, a group of white debaters was caught sending group texts about a Black student, mocking her and referring to her as “aggressive” and “manly”-looking. At another tournament, she said, a coach and his students were making fun of her student’s inability to pronounce French philosopher Michel Foucault’s name correctly. “They were laughing at her and saying that she didn’t know how to talk and that they were certain that she was going to lose this debate,” Nave said. Carolyn said she was called “China lady” during debate competitions and heard other students make racist comments about the hair of her best friend, who is a Black woman. “I grew up in an all-Asian community, so I feel like the only time that I really felt conscious of my race and my gender was when I was at a debate tournament,” Carolyn said. On the Speech & Debate Stories Instagram account, debaters have shared stories about experiencing transphobia and homophobia, including being dinged by judges [for bringing up the LGBTQ+ community](https://www.instagram.com/p/CDXlFshlaA3/) in their arguments and being [harassed with violent, anti-queer language](https://www.instagram.com/p/CDRjyU2FqYw/) by other students without consequence. Sophia Dal Pra, 18, said she had been called a “bitch” during tournaments and told that her arguments were “too emotional.” At one tournament, she recalls male debaters dismissing her and her teammate. “Oh, we’re just debating some girls,” Dal Pra remembers them saying. “If you’re passionate during a round and you’re a man, you’re passionate,” Sheinerman said. “If you’re a woman, you’re bitchy and aggressive and annoying.” This dynamic is well-known among debaters who are women and gender minorities. In 2019, Ella Schnake won the National Speech & Debate Tournament Championship in the Program Oral Interpretation category with her 13-minute spoken word performance, “Debate Like A Girl.” The video of that performance has since gone viral. In that piece, Schnake calls o.”

#### Debate is a slow, numbing poison – we pretend to save the world while ignoring that it’s crumbling around us. To keep going as we are is to revel in violence directed towards our most vulnerable.

**Bjork 92** (Rebecca, debater and university coach, “Symposium: Women in Debate: Reflections on the Ongoing Struggle”, Effluents and affluence: The Global Pollution Debate, 1992”) // Dulles RB

While reflecting on my experiences as a woman in academic debate in preparation for this essay, I realized that I have been involved in debate for more than half of my life. I debated for four years in high school, for four years in college, and I have been coaching intercollegiate debate for nine years. Not surprisingly, much of my identity as an individual has been shaped by these experiences in debate. I am a person who strongly believes that debate empowers people to be committed and involved individuals in the communities in which they live. I am a person who thrives on the intellectual stimulation involved in teaching and traveling with the brightest students on my campus. I am a person who looks forward to the opportunities for active engagement of ideas with debaters and coaches from around the country. I am also, however, a college professor, a "feminist," and a peace activist who is increasingly frustrated and disturbed by some of the practices I see being perpetuated and rewarded in academic debate. I find that I can no longer separate my involvement in debate from the rest of who I am as an individual.Northwestern I remember listening to a lecture a few years ago given by Tom Goodnight at the University summer debate camp. Goodnight lamented what he saw as the debate community's participation in, and unthinking perpetuation of what he termed the "death culture." He argued that the embracing of "big impact" arguments--nuclear war, environmental destruction, genocide, famine, and the like-by debaters and coaches signals a morbid and detached fascination with such events, one that views these real human tragedies as part of a "game" in which so-called "objective and neutral" advocates actively seek to find in their research the "impact to outweigh all other impacts"--the round-winning argument that will carry them to their goal of winning tournament X, Y, or Z. He concluded that our "use" of such events in this way is tantamount to a celebration of them; **our detached, rational discussions reinforce a detached, rational viewpoint**, when **emotional and moral outrage may be a more appropriate response**. In the last few years, my academic research has led me to be persuaded by Goodnight's unspoken assumption; language is not merely some transparent tool used to transmit information, but rather is an incredibly powerful medium, the use of which inevitably has **real political and material consequences.** Given this assumption, I believe that it is important for us to examine the "discourse of debate practice:" that is, the language, discourses, and meanings that we, as a community of debaters and coaches, unthinkingly employ in academic debate. If it is the case that the language we use has real implications for how we view the world, how we view others, and how we act in the world, then it is imperative that we critically examine our own discourse practices with an eye to how our language does violence to others. I am shocked and surprised when I hear myself saying things like, "we killed them," or "take no prisoners," or "let's blow them out of the water." I am tired of the "ideal" debater being defined as one who has **mastered the art of verbal assault** to the point where accusing opponents of lying, cheating, or being deliberately misleading is a sign of strength. But what I am most tired of is how women debaters are marginalized and rendered voiceless in such a discourse community. Women who verbally assault their opponents are labeled "bitches" because it is not socially acceptable for women to be verbally aggressive. Women who get angry and storm out of a room when a disappointing decision is rendered are labeled "hysterical" because, as we all know, women are more emotional then men. I am tired of hearing comments like, "those 'girls' from school X aren't really interested in debate; they just want to meet men." We can all point to examples (although only a few) of women who have succeeded at the top levels of debate. But I find myself wondering how many more women gave up because they were tired of negotiating the **mine field of discrimination, sexual harassment, and isolation they found in the debate community.** As members of this community, however, we have great freedom to define it in whatever ways we see fit. After all, what is debate except a collection of shared understandings and explicit or implicit rules for interaction? What I am calling for is **a critical examination** of how we, as individual members of this community, characterize our activity, ourselves, and our interactions with others through language. We must become aware of the ways in which our mostly hidden and unspoken **assumptions about what "good" debate is** function to **exclude** not only women, but ethnic minorities from the amazing intellectual opportunities that training in debate provides. Our nation and indeed, our planet, faces incredibly difficult challenges in the years ahead. I believe that it is not acceptable anymore for us to go along as we always have, assuming that things will straighten themselves out. If the rioting in Los Angeles taught us anything, it is that complacency breeds resentment and frustration. **We may not be able to change the world, but we can change our own community, and if we fail to do so, we give up the only real power that we have.**

#### These exclusive forms of argumentation have made debate technocratic and elitist – it desensitizes debaters to violence and racism, and teaches us to care more about nuclear war than solving the structural violence within our own community. Thus, the role of the judge is to vote for the debater who best performatively and methodologically provides a resistance strategy for the oppressed - (Check doc for a ROJ spec list + CSA if needed)

**Fine 13** Todd; Founder of project Khalid and coaches the debate team at Washington Latin Public Charter School in Washington, D.C. and is Vice President of the High School D.C. Urban Debate League and writes for the huff post; “Qatar Conference on Scholastic Debate Examines Activity's Role in Empowerment”; Huffington Post; 3/10/13 @ 5:12 am; Accessed 2/17/15 @ 12:43 pm; [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/todd-fine/qatar-conference-on-schol\_b\_2429645.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/todd-fine/qatar-conference-on-schol_b_2429645.html%7dAvP)

Spec : pre fiat offense matters and comes first but post fiat can be weighed provided it meets the burden of being methodological resistance; in so far as theoretical objections hinder accessing the roj you can uplayer, it's determined by the flow however the performance is on the flow as it counts as methodological offense due to the net benefits; weigh under the roj by proving you do this best (scope, feasibility, micro vs. macro politics, etc.) any more specifications should be asked for in cx – I am clearly willing to comply. CSA - http://www.feministcurrent.com/2015/12/22/all-i-want-for-christmas-is-liberation-from-the-capitalist-patriarchy/ accessed - 1-28-2017

Meanwhile, the National Association of Urban Debate Leagues (NAUDL), a nonprofit headquartered in Chicago, has supported the expansion of this policy format into urban school districts across the country, with large nonprofit leagues in Atlanta, Chicago, Baltimore, Boston, and other cites. Because the sponsors are mostly college debaters, many of them now accomplished lawyers, who believe in the "**policy debate**" format **and its transformative power as an intense**, total **experience**, the association has largely focused on the establishment of leagues based exclusively on this policy format. These developments, combined, have created an inverse bell curve of wealth in the policy debate community, with a handful of elite schools and a growing cohort of extremely poor schools being all that remains. Middle class suburban schools and rural schools, overwhelmed by the rising costs of travel to far-away tournaments as the total numbers in policy debate dwindle, are hard to find at all.This unusual socioeconomic makeup has prompted more than just a culture shock, but a highly-contested and ongoing ideological war in the debate rounds themselves. Poorer schools, largely black and other **minority**, now often **argue that debate itself reflects the racism and inequalities of** the broader **society. The year-long national topics**, which **serve the highly-specific technical needs of the elite national circuit, are often "critiqued" as symptomatic of a training system that forms cynical technocrats who will tolerate injustice as part of a never-ending, brutal game where real consequences are always "debatable."** As the American economy continues to flounder and urban schools face heavy challenges and criticisms, **these violent communication collisions in** debate **rounds are causing some** young **participants to question the possibility of ever addressing racism or structural inequality** in America. Yet, without some direct link between Urban Debate Leagues and activism itself, **even these** potent and uncomfortable **challenges** float without resolution and **are reduced to a win/loss statement** written by a judge on a ballot. In exasperation, many of the urban league debaters, and their coaches, now argue that **policy debate** can only **ha[s]ve value as a** fierce **training ground for blacks to gain survival skills to engage a hopelessly irredeemable America.**

#### Debate’s exclusion is a microcosm of White Patriarchy. Beneficiaries of white cisheteropatriarchy don’t notice friction – but any deviation from the Western man are disoriented. This is why debate tournaments are full of white guys in suits, because when I, a Brown Queer Woman, enter the cafeteria, I am immediately marked as out of place. Discourse must start from the nexus of disorientation – it is the only way to create new affective dialougues.

Ahmed 07 Sara Ahmed "A Phenomenology of Whiteness" Goldsmiths College, University of London 2007 [www.rainbow-season.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Feminist\_Theory-2007-Ahmed-149-68.pdf //](http://www.rainbow-season.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Feminist_Theory-2007-Ahmed-149-68.pdf%20//) kf

But how does whiteness hold its place? In this section I explore how whiteness ‘holds’ through habits. **Public spaces take shape through the habitual actions of bodies,** such that **the contours of space could be described as habitual**. I turn to the concept of habits to theorize not so much how bodies acquire their shape, but how **spaces acquire the shape of the bodies that ‘inhabit’ them**. We could think about the ‘habit’ in the ‘in-habit’. Weneed to examine not only how bodies become white, or fail to do so, but also how spaces can take on the very ‘qualities’ that are given to such bodies. In a way, we can think about the habitual as a form of inheritance. It is not so much that we inherit habits, although we can do so: rather **the habitual can be thought of as a bodily and spatial form of inheritance**. As Pierre Bourdieu (1977) shows us, **we** **can link habits to what is** unconscious, and **routine**, or what becomes **‘second nature’**.3 To describe whiteness as a habit, as second nature, is to suggest that whiteness is what bodies do, where the body takes the shape of the action. Habits are not ‘exterior’ to bodies, as things that can be ‘put on’ or ‘taken off’. If habits are about what bodies do, in ways that are repeated, then they might also shape what bodies can do. For Merleau-Ponty, the habitual body is a body that acts in the world, where actions bring other things near. As he puts it: **my body appears to me as an attitude directed towards a** certain existing or possible **task**. And indeed **its spatiality is not**, like that of external objects or like that of ‘spatial sensations’, **a spatiality of position, but a spatiality of situation**. **If I stand in front of my desk and lean on it with both hands, only my hands are stressed and the whole of the body trails behind them** like the tail of a comet. **It is not that I am unaware of** the whereabouts of **my shoulder or back**, **but these are** simply **swallowed up in the position of my hands, and my whole posture can be read so to speak in the pressure they exert on the table**. (2002: 114–5, emphasis in original) Here, **the directedness of the body towards an action** (which we have discovered also means **an orientation towards certain** kinds of **objects**) **is how the body ‘appears’**.4 **The body is ‘habitual’** not only in the sense that it performs actions repeatedly, but **in the sense that when it performs such actions, it does not command attention**, apart from at the ‘surface’ where it ‘encounters’ an external object (such as the hands that lean on the desk or table, which feel the ‘stress’ of the action). In other words, the body is habitual insofar as it ‘trails behind’ in the performing of action, insofar as it does not pose ‘a problem’ or an obstacle to the action, or is not ‘stressed’ by ‘what’ the action encounters. For Merleau-Ponty, the habitual body does not get in the way of an action: it is behind the action. I want to suggest here that **whiteness** **could be understood as ‘the behind’**. **White bodies are habitual** insofar as **they ‘trail behind’ actions: they do not get ‘stressed’ in their encounters** with objects or others, **as their whiteness ‘goes unnoticed’**. Whiteness would be what lags behind; **white bodies do not have to face their whiteness; they are not orientated ‘towards’ it**, and **this ‘not’ is what allows whiteness to cohere**, as that which bodies are orientated around. When bodies ‘lag behind’, then they extend their reach. It becomes possible to talk about the whiteness of space given the very accumulation of such ‘points’ of extension. Spaces acquire the ‘skin’ of the bodies that inhabit them. What is important to note here is that it is not just bodies that are orientated. **Spaces also take shape by being orientated around some bodies**, more than others. **We can** also **consider ‘institutions’ as orientation devices**, **which take the shape of ‘what’ resides within them**. After all, institutions provide collective or public spaces. When we describe institutions as ‘being’ white (institutional whiteness), we are pointing to how institutional spaces are shaped by the proximity of some bodies and not others: **white bodies gather**, **and cohere to form the edges of such spaces**. When I walk into university meetings that is just what I encounter. Sometimes I get used to it. At one conference we organize, four black feminists arrive. They all happen to walk into the room at the same time. Yes, we do notice such arrivals. The fact that we notice such arrivals tells us more about what is already in place than it does about ‘who’ arrives. Someone says: ‘**it is like walking into a sea of whiteness**’. This phrase comes up, and it hangs in the air. The speech act becomes an object, which gathers us around. So yes they walk into the room, and I notice that they were not there before, as a retrospective reoccupation of a space that I already inhabited. I look around, and re-encounter the sea of whiteness. As many have argued, whiteness is invisible and unmarked, as the absent centre against which others appear only as deviants, or points of deviation (Dyer, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993). **Whiteness is only invisible for those who inhabit** **it**, **or those who get so used to its inhabitance that they learn not to see it**, even when they are not it (see Ahmed, 2004b). **Spaces are orientated ‘around’ whiteness**, insofar **as whiteness is not seen**. We do not face **whiteness**; it **‘trails behind’ bodies**, as what is **assumed** **to be given. The effect of this ‘around whiteness’ is the institutionalization of a certain ‘likeness’, which makes non-white bodies feel uncomfortable,** exposed, **visible, different, when they take up this space**. The institutionalization of whiteness involves work: **the institution comes to have a body as an effect** of this work. It is important that we do not reify institutions, by presuming they are simply given and that they decide what we do. Rather, **institutions become given**, **as an effect of the repetition of decisions** made over time, **which shapes** the surface of **institutional spaces**. Institutions involve the accumulation of **past decisions about how to allocate resources, as well as ‘who’ to recruit**. Recruitment functions as a technology for the reproduction of whiteness. We can recall that Althusser’s model of ideology is based on recruitment: ideology ‘acts’ or ‘functions’ in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by the very precise operation which I have called interpellation or hailing, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: ‘Hey you there.’ (1971: 163, emphasis in original) The subject is recruited by turning around, which immediately associates recruitment with following a direction, as the direction that takes the line of an address. To recruit can suggest both to renew and to restore. The act of recruitment, of bringing new bodies in, restores the body of the institution, which depends on gathering bodies to cohere as a body. **Becoming a ‘part’ of an institution**, which we can consider the demand to share in it, or even have a share of it, hence **requires** not only that one inhabits its buildings, but also **that we follow its line**: we might start by saying ‘we’; by mourning its failures and rejoicing in its successes; by reading the documents that circulate within it, creating vertical and horizontal lines of communication; by the chance encounters we have with those who share its grounds. To be recruited is not only to join, but to sign up to a specific institution: to inhabit it by turning around as a return of its address. Furthermore, recruitment creates the very ego ideal of the institution, what it imagines as the ideal that working ‘at’ the institution means working towards or even what it imagines expresses its ‘character’. As scholars in critical management studies have shown us, organizations tend to recruit in their own image (Singh, 2002). The ‘hey you’ is not just addressed to anybody: some bodies more than others are recruited, those that can inherit the ‘character’ of the organization, by returning its image with a reflection that reflects back that image, what we could call a ‘good likeness’. It is not just that there is a desire for whiteness that leads to white bodies getting in. Rather whiteness is what the institution is orientated ‘around’, so that even bodies that might not appear white still have to inhabit whiteness, if they are to get ‘in’. Institutions too involve orientation devices, which keep things in place. The affect of such placement could be described as a form of comfort. To be orientated, or to be at home in the world, is also to feel a certain comfort: we might only notice comfort as an affect when we lose it, when we become uncomfortable. The word ‘comfort’ suggests well-being and satisfaction, but it can also suggest an ease and easiness. Comfort is about an encounter between more than one body, which is the promise of a ‘sinking’ feeling. To be comfortable is to be so at ease with one’s environment that it is hard to distinguish where one’s body ends and the world begins. One fits, and by fitting the surfaces of bodies disappears from view. White bodies are comfortable as they inhabit spaces that extend their shape. The bodies and spaces ‘point’ towards each other, as a ‘point’ that is not seen as it is also ‘the point’ from which we see. In other words, whiteness may function as a form of public comfort by allowing bodies to extend into spaces that have already taken their shape. Those spaces are lived as comfortable as they allow bodies to fit in; the surfaces of social space are already impressed upon by the shape of such bodies. We can think of the chair beside the table. It might acquire its shape by the repetition of some bodies inhabiting it: we can almost see the shape of bodies as ‘impressions’ on the surface. So spaces extend bodies and bodies extend spaces. The impressions of the surface function as traces of such extensions. The surfaces of social as well as bodily space ‘record’ the repetition of acts, and the ‘passing by’ of some and not others. It can be problematic to describe whiteness as something we ‘pass through’: such an argument could make whiteness into something substantive, as if whiteness has an ontological force of its own, which compels us, and even ‘drives’ action. It is important to remember that whiteness is not reducible to white skin, or even to ‘something’ we can have or be, even if we pass through whiteness. When we talk about a ‘sea of whiteness’ or ‘white space’ we are talking about the repetition of the passing by of some bodies and not others, for sure. But non-white bodies do inhabit white spaces; we know this. Such bodies are made invisible when we see spaces as being white, at the same time as they become hypervisible when they do not pass, which means they ‘stand out’ and ‘stand apart’. You learn to fade into the background, but sometimes you can’t or you don’t. The moments when the body appears ‘out of place’ are moments of political and personal trouble. As Nirmal Puwar shows us, when bodies arrive who seem ‘out of place’ in such institutional worlds we have a process of disorientation: people blink, and look again. The proximity of such bodies makes familiar spaces seem strange: ‘People are “thrown” because a whole world view is jolted’ (Puwar, 2004: 43). Bodies stand out when they are out of place. Such standing re-confirms the whiteness of the space. Whiteness is an effect of what coheres rather than the origin of coherence. The effect of repetition is not then simply about a body count: it is not simply a matter of how many bodies are ‘in’. Rather, what is repeated is a very style of embodiment, a way of inhabiting space, which claims space by the accumulation of gestures of ‘sinking’ into that space. If whiteness allows bodies to move with comfort through space, and to inhabit the world as if it were home, then those bodies take up more space. Such bodies are shaped by motility, and may even take the shape of that motility. It is here that we can begin to complicate the relationship between motility and what I call ‘institutional lines’. Some bodies, even those that pass as white, might still be ‘out of line’ with the institutions they inhabit. After all, institutions are meeting points, but they are also where different lines intersect, where lines cross with other lines, to create and divide spaces. We can recall here the importance of ‘intersectionality’ [in] black feminist theory. Given that relationships of power ‘intersect’, how we inhabit a given category depends on how we inhabit others (Lorde, 1984: 114–23; Brewer, 1993; Collins, 1998; Smith, 1998). There are ‘points’ in such intersections, as the ‘points’ where lines meet. A body is such a meeting point. To follow one line (say whiteness) will not necessarily get you too many points, if you do not or cannot follow others. How you can move along institutional lines is affected by other lines that you follow. What happens in these ‘points’ of intersection – whether we are knocked off course if we do not follow a given line – might not be determined before we arrive at that point, and might also depend on what else is behind us. In a way, whiteness itself is a straightening device: bodies disappear into the ‘sea of whiteness’ when they ‘line up’. This is not to make ‘the fit’ between bodies and spaces natural: white bodies can line up, only if they pass, by approximating whiteness, by ‘being like’. To say that all bodies have to pass as white is not to neutralize the difference between bodies. Whiteness is also a matter of what is behind, as a form of inheritance, which affects how bodies arrive in spaces and worlds. We accumulate behinds, just as what is behind is an effect of past accumulations. Some of us have more behind us than others at the very moment in which we arrive into the world. If you inherit class privilege, for instance, then you have more resources behind you, which can be converted into capital, into [which] can ‘propel’ you forward and up. Becoming white as an institutional line is closely related to the vertical promise of class mobility: you can move up only by approximating the habitus of the white bourgeois body (see Skeggs, 2003). Moving up requires inhabiting such a body, or at least approximating its style, whilst your capacity to inhabit such a body depends upon what is behind you. Pointing to this loop between the ‘behind’ and the ‘up’ is another way of describing how hierarchies get reproduced over time. We could say that bodies ‘move up’ when their whiteness is not in dispute. And yet, whiteness does not always lag behind in the temporality of a life course. When someone’s whiteness is in dispute, then they come under ‘stress’, which in turn threatens bodily motility, or what the body ‘can do’. We could consider, for instance, how Husserl’s phenomenology seems to involve an ease of movement, of being able to occupy the space around the table. Perhaps we could also see this mobile body as a body that ‘can do’ things, in terms of whiteness. This is not to locate such whiteness in the body of the philosopher. Husserl’s biography might indeed help us here. For when Husserl’s whiteness came into dispute, when he was read as being Jewish, he literally lost his chair: he temporarily lost the public recognition of his place as a philosopher.5 It is no accident that such recognition is symbolically given through an item of furniture: to take up space is to be given an object, which allows the body to be occupied in a certain way. The philosopher must have his seat, after all. If we said that phenomenology is about whiteness, in the sense that it has been written from this ‘point of view’, as a point that is ‘forgotten’, then what phenomenology describes is not so much white bodies, but the ways in which bodies come to feel at home in spaces by being orientated in this way and that, where such bodies are not ‘points’ of stress or what we can call stress points. To make this point very simply: whiteness becomes a social and bodily orientation given that some bodies will be more at home in a world that is orientated around whiteness. If we began instead with disorientation, with the body that loses its chair, then the descriptions we offer will be quite different.

#### We are stopped and interrogated when we do not fit into the constraints of white patriarchy. Feminine speech in spaces of white supremacy becomes the incessant nag. This inequality makes debate impossible – unconscious and informal mechanisms of exclusion mean that participants aren’t on an even playing field.  Even when minoritarian subjects do speak, we are not heard – addressing this social inequality is a prerequisite for further deliberation.
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Habermas's account of the bourgeois conception of the public sphere stresses its claim to be open and accessible to all. Indeed, this idea of open access is one of the central meanings of the norm of publicity. Of course, we know, both from the revisionist history and from Habermas's account, that the bourgeois public's claim to full accessibility was not in fact realized. Women of all classes and ethnicities were excluded from official political participation precisely on the basis of ascribed gender status, while plebeian men were formally excluded by property qualifications. Moreover, in many cases, women and men of racialized ethnicities of all classes were excluded on racial grounds. Now, what are we to make of this historical fact of the non-realization in practice of the bourgeois public sphere's ideal of open access? One approach is to conclude that the ideal itself remains unaffected, since it is possible in principle to overcome these exclusions. And, in fact, it was only a matter of time before formal exclusions based on gender, property, and race were eliminated. This is convincing enough as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The question of open access cannot be reduced without remainder to the presence or absence of formal exclusions. It requires us to look also at the process of discursive interaction within formally inclusive public arenas. Here we should recall that the bourgeois conception of the public sphere requires bracketing inequalities of status. This public sphere was to be an arena in which interlocutors would set aside such characteristics as differences in birth and fortune and speak to one another as if they were social and economic peers. The operative phrase here is "as if." In fact, the social inequalities among the interlocutors were not eliminated, but only bracketed. But were they really effectively bracketed? The revisionist historiography suggests they were not. Rather, discursive interaction within the bourgeois public sphere was governed by protocols of style and decorum that were themselves correlates and markers of status inequality. These functioned informally to marginalize women and members of the plebeian classes and to prevent them from participating as peers. Here we are talking about informal impediments to participatory parity that can persist even after everyone is formally and legally licensed to participate. That these constitute a more serious challenge to the bourgeois conception of the public sphere can be seen from a familiar contemporary example. Feminist research has documented a syndrome that many of us have observed in faculty meetings and other mixed sex deliberative bodies: men tend to interrupt women more than women interrupt men; men also tend to speak more than women, taking more turns and longer turns; and women's interventions are more often ignored or not responded to than men's. In response to the sorts of experiences documented in this research, an important strand of feminist political theory has claimed that deliberation can serve as a mask for domination. Theorists like Jane Mansbridge have argued that "the transformation of 'I' into 'we' brought about through political deliberation can easily mask subtle forms of control. Even the language people use as they reason together usually favors one way of seeing things and discourages others. Subordinate groups sometimes cannot find the right voice or words to express their thoughts, and when they do, they discover they are not heard. [They] are silenced, encouraged to keep their wants inchoate, and heard to say 'yes' when what they have said is 'no.''""6 Mansbridge rightly notes that many of these feminist insights into ways in which deliberation can serve as a mask for domination extend beyond gender to other kinds of unequal relations, like those based on class or ethnicity. They alert us to the ways in which social inequalities can infect deliberation, even in the absence of any formal exclusions. Here I think we encounter a very serious difficulty with the bourgeois conception of the public sphere. Insofar as the bracketing of social inequalities in deliberationmeans proceeding as if they don't exist when they do, this does not foster participatory parity. On the contrary, such bracketing usually works to the advantage of dominant groups in society and to the disadvantage of subordinates. In most cases, it would be more appropriate to unbracket inequalities in the sense of explicitly thematizing them-a point that accords with the spirit of Habermas's later "communicative ethics." The misplaced faith in the efficacy of bracketing suggests another flaw in the bourgeois conception. This conception assumes that a public sphere is or can be a space of zero degree culture, so utterly bereft of any specific ethos as to accommodate with perfect neutrality and equal ease interventions expressive of any and every cultural ethos. But this assumption is counterfactual, and not for reasons that are merely accidental. In stratified societies, unequally empowered social groups tend to develop unequally valued cultural styles. The result is the development of powerful informal pressures that marginalize the contributions of members of subordinated groups both in everyday life contexts and in official public spheres.7 Moreover, these pressures are amplified, rather than mitigated, by the peculiar political economy of the bourgeois public sphere. In this public sphere, the media that constitute the material support for the circulation of views are privately owned and operated for profit. Consequently, subordinated social groups usually lack equal access to the material means of equal participation.'" Thus, political economy enforce structurally what culture accomplishes informally. If we take these considerations seriously, then we should be led to entertain serious doubts about a conception of the public sphere that purports to bracket, rather than to eliminate, structural social inequalities. We should question whether it is possible even in principle for interlocutors to deliberate as if they were social peers in specially designated discursive arenas, when these discursive arenas are situated in a larger societal context that is pervaded by structural relations of dominance and subordination. What is at stake here is the autonomy of specifically political institutions vis-,i-vis the surrounding societal context. Now, one salient feature that distinguishes liberalism from some other political-theoretical orientations is that liberalism assumes the autonomy of the political in a very strong form. Liberal political theory assumes that it is possible to organize a democratic form of political life on the basis of socio-economic and socio-sexual structures that generate systemic inequalities. For liberals, then, the problem of democracy becomes the problem of how to insulate political processes from what are considered to be non-political or pre-political processes, those characteristic, for example, of the economy, the family, and informal everyday life. The problem for liberals, thus, is how to strengthen the barriers separating political institutions that are supposed to instantiate relations of equality from economic, cultural, and socio-sexual institutions that are premised on systemic relations of inequality.'9 Yet the weight of circumstance suggests that in order to have a public sphere in which interlocutors can deliberate as peers, it is not sufficient merely to bracket social inequality. Instead, it is a necessary condition for participatory parity that systemic social inequalities be eliminated. This does not mean that everyone must have exactly the same income, but it does require the sort of rough equality that is inconsistent with systemically-generated relations of dominance and subordination. Pace liberalism, then, political democracy requires substantive social equality.20 So far, I have been arguing that the bourgeois conception of the public sphere is inadequate insofar as it supposes that social equality is not a necessary condition for participatory parity in public spheres. What follows from this for the critique of actually existing democracy? One task for critical theory is to render visible the ways in which societal inequality infects formally inclusive existing public spheres and taints discursive interaction within them.

#### Bodies that don’t fit in the orientation of the space are forced to go against the flow of the institution, which causes psychic exhaustion, forced every day to spend energy getting up in the morning to keep fighting. Without proper survival strategies, women often lose this fight – girls are overwhelmingly likely to drop out of debate or be underrepresented compared to their male counterparts.
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[there is a] 4:1 ratio of male to female debaters at the national tournament and Tournament of Champions. “As a society, our expectations for females in public speaking put women in a double bind,” Schnake says in her performance. “Either conform to societal expectations of submission and lose credibility, or demonstrate intensity and be labeled too aggressive. This unwinnable bias is so deeply ingrained in our culture that we have often become blind to its consequences, reflected in countless reports of harassment toward young female debaters.” Hughes sees debate simply as “a very toxic microcosm of the general masculinity that presents itself in society.” And just as other industries needed their Me Too moments, so too does competitive debate. The debaters HuffPost spoke to said this toxicity can contribute to a culture that pushes women, gender minorities and people of color out before they even get a chance to reach the most elite levels, leaving those who do stay feeling like it’s their job to fix a broken system. “When I left the activity, [other female coaches told me], ‘Oh, it’s your job as a woman, as a woman of color, to stay in the activity because you grew up without role models and it’s important that you stay,’” Carolyn said. “So I ended up staying, but after two years I got really burnt out. It’s hard because it’s not my obligation to fix everything, [but] I felt a lot of pressure to.” ‘Literally Anyone Can Start A Debate Camp’ Another aspect of the high school debate community that organizers say is in need of reform are debate camps. These camps range from bigger institutions that are well-known within the community and have documented track records of producing champions, to small upstarts launched by groups of young people. Camps, which are often hosted at universities, generally run two- to three-week programs, though they can go as long as seven or eight weeks. Some camps have commuter options, but students who participate tend to stay overnight for the duration of the session. When Potischman was a rising sophomore during the summer of 2014, she attended a debate camp. A well-known rising senior, whom we will call John, approached her during camp and complimented her hair. He later sent her a series of DMs over Facebook Messenger that HuffPost has reviewed. In them, he asked her to come to his room (“wanna chill later tonight? im in room 416”). Over the course of the following year, John continued to message Potischman at tournaments. In a set of DMs from January 2015 reviewed by HuffPost, John interjected with commentary about Potischman’s looks while they were discussing a debate round: “the odd thing about the heat of competition is not looking your opponent in the eye,” he wrote to her, “which sucked in our round because I love your eyes.” “I felt really uncomfortable, but wasn’t sure if I could say anything because he was this huge figure,” Potischman said. “And then I found out that he’d done that to every woman in the community.” Potischman said this same person had sent similar messages to other young female debaters. HuffPost has seen three other sets of DMs that all use similar language and include John complimenting young women on their hair and repeatedly inviting them to his hotel room. When it comes to hiring camp staffers, Raphaelson and several other former debaters told HuffPost that camps tend to prioritize bids and rankings over a potential coach’s ability to be an ethical leader or effective teacher, which can leave room for abusive behavior to go unchecked. “The people who get hired at camps are people who are, a lot of the time, white men who get a shit-ton of bids to the Tournament of Champions,” Raphaelson said. “Doesn’t matter if they’re good people. Doesn’t matter if they’re good at coaching. They get hired.” Jane, who asked HuffPost not to use her real name out of fear of retribution, said she experienced sexual harassment and assault when she worked as a debate camp instructor in 2018. She was the only woman on staff, and told HuffPost that at 19, she was the youngest person working there. During the session, she said the counselors would regularly drink together after they finished with the students. Jane was under the legal drinking age, but she felt like it would be weird if she declined alcohol when everyone else was drinking. One night, she said, a male staffer began encouraging her to drink more, and at one point, poured alcohol into her glass. She says when she eventually went to the kitchen to get water because she was very intoxicated, the male staffer followed her and proceeded to grope her. At one point, she said, she pulled away from him and said, “No, we’re too drunk.” “He followed me and started touching me and kissing me,” Jane said. “I was not OK with it. He followed me around for the rest of the night.” Right after camp ended, a student told Jane that that man had also distributed drugs and alcohol to students on the last night of camp. Jane said she told the camp directors what she had heard about the man giving students drugs and alcohol. That fall, she also told them he had assaulted her. According to Jane, the directors were both disturbed by these allegations. But they were no longer his employers because camp was over, so they were limited in what they could do. Jane says they assured her that they would call the former staffer and tell him to stop going to tournaments as a judge or coach. Messages the camp directors sent to Jane, which HuffPost has reviewed, indicate that they followed up with various tournament directors to request the man be removed from judging lists. Because there is no centralized reporting system, camp directors — even those with the best of intentions — can only do so much. They can bar abusive staffers or campers from returning to their camp, but otherwise, they can only ask that those individuals abstain from attending other debate events. The lack of a clear system ― or really, any system at all ― leaves debaters who have witnessed or experienced abuse feeling helpless and frustrated. According to Jane, the man from camp continued to show up at debate events during the year and was a part of the coaching staff for a prestigious high school as recently as early 2020. That’s what we’re trying to do with Speech & Debate Stories, and this whole thing, is to finally give people a voice that’s been taken away from them for so long.Katie Raphaelson, co-creator of the Speech & Debate Stories Instagram account Debate camps run independently of the NSDA and of each other, and they do not necessarily communicate with each other when hiring and firing. Several former debaters told HuffPost that this structure makes it fairly easy for abusers who get fired from one camp to simply hop over to another ― especially because preference is often given to debaters who are considered particularly elite. (Yet another symptom of the “Good Debater Syndrome” Raphaelson referred to.) And because debate camps function differently than most traditional summer camps, the American Camping Association accreditation system does not necessarily apply. (The ACA suggests that all camps, regardless of structure or focus, become accredited to signal that they are “fully invested in understanding and implementing policies that reflect industry recognized standards in the health, safety, and risk management of camp operations.”) The NSDA, which does not operate any debate camps, confirmed to HuffPost that it does not have an accreditation process for camps. Instead, it pointed to the ACA, as well as the colleges and universities that often host these camps. “There’s no community-wide reporting system,” Potischman said. “Literally anyone can start a debate camp. There’s no way to report a camp for misconduct unless you go to the police

#### Thus, we affirm killjoys as manifestos – a symbol of willful deviance that refuses the requirement to be happy or complicit within systems of oppression. Our affective analysis contests hegemonic structures of deliberation that marginalize the oppressed and kills the joy of white comfortability. It’s time to kill the cop in your head – embrace radical self-care in the face of a debate space that would rather watch you burn.
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The figure of the feminist killjoy makes sense if we place her in the context of feminist critiques of happiness, some of which 1 discusses in chapter I (see also Ahmed 2010). Happiness is used to justify social norms as social goods. As Simone de Beauvoir described so astutely, "It is always easy to describe a, happy a situation in which one wishes to place [others] (1949] 1997, 28). Not to agree to stay in the place of this wish might be to refuse the happiness that is wished for. To be involved in political activism is thus to be involved in a struggle against happiness. The struggle over happiness provides the horizon in which political claims are made. We inherit this horizon. A killjoy becomes a manifesto when we are willing to take up this figure, to assemble a life not as her (I discussed the risks of assuming we are her in chapter 7) but around her, in her company. We are willing to killjoy because the world that assigns this or that person or group of people as the killjoys is not to world a want to be part of. To be willing to killjoy is to transform a judgement into a project. A manifesto: how a judgment becomes a project. To think of killjoys as manifestos is to say that a politics of transformation, a politics that intends to cause the end of a system, is not a program of action that can be separates from how we are in the worlds we are in. Feminism is praxis. We enact the world we are aiming for; nothing Iess will do. Lesbian feminism, as I noted in chapter 9, is how we organize our lives in such a way that our relations to each other as women are not mediated through our relations to men. A life becomes an archive of rebellion, this is why a killjoy manifesto will be personal. Each of us killjoys will have our own. My manifesto does not suspend my personal story it is how that story unfolds into action. It is from difficult experiences, or being bruised by structures that are not even revealed to others, that we gain the energy to rebel It is from what we conic up against that we gain new angles on what we are against. Our bodies become our tools; our rage becomes sickness. We vomit; we vomit out what we have been asked to take in. Our guts become our feminist friends the more we are sickened. We begin to feel the weight of histories more and more; the more we expose the weight of history, the heavier it becomes. We snap. We snap under the weight; things break. A manifesto is written out of feminist snap. A manifesto is feminist snap. And: we witness as feminists the trouble feminism causes. I would hazard a guess; feminist trouble is an extension of gender trouble (Butler 1990). To be more specific: feminist trouble is the trouble with women. When we refuse to be women, in the heteropatriarchal sense as beings for men, we become trouble, we get into trouble. A killjoy is willing to get into trouble. And this I think is what is specific about a killjoy manifesto: that we bring into our statements of intent or purpose the experience of what we come up against. It is this experience that allows us to articulate a for, a for that carries with it an experience of what we come up against. A for can be how we turn Something about a manifesto is about what it aims to bring about. There is no doubt in my mind that a feminist killjoy is for something; although as killjoys we are not necessarily for the same things. But you would only be willing to live with the consequences of being against what you come up against if you are for something, A life can be a manifesto. When I read some of the books in my survival kit, I hear them as manifestos, as calls to action; as calls to arms. They are books that tremble with life because they show how a life can be rewritten; how we can rewrite a life, letter by letter. A manifesto has a life, a life of its own; a manifesto is an outstretched hand. And if a manifesto is a political action, it depends on how it is received by others. And perhaps a hand can do more when it is not simply received by another hand, when a gesture exceeds the firmness of a handshake. Perhaps more than a hand needs to shake, If a killjoy manifesto is a handle, it flies out of hand. A manifesto thus repeats something that has already happened' as we know the killjoy has flown off. Perhaps a killjoy manifesto is unhandy; a feminist flight. When we refuse to be the master’s tool, we expose the violence of rods, the violences that built the master's dwelling, brick by brick. When we make violence manifest, a violence that is reproduced by not being made a manifesto, we will be assigned as killjoys. It is because of what she reveals that a killjoy he - comes a killjoy in the first place. A manifesto is in some sense behind her. This is not to say that writing a killjoy manifesto is not also a commitment; that it is not also an idea if how to move forward. A killjoy has her principles. A killjoy manifesto shows how we create principles from an experience of what we come up against, from how we live a feminist life. When I say principles here, I do not mean rules of conduct that we must agree to in order to proceed in a common direction. I might say that a feminist life is principled but feminism often becomes an announcement at the very moment of the refusal to be bound by principle. When I think of feminist principles, I think of principles in the original sense: principle as a first step, as a commencement, a start of something. A principle can also be what is elemental to a craft. Feminist killjoys and other willful subjects are crafty; we are becoming crafty. There are principles in what we craft. How we begin does not determine where we end up„ but principles do give shape or direction. Feminist principles are articulated in unfeminist worlds. Living a life with feminist principles is thus not living smoothly; we bump into the world that does not live in accordance with the principles we try to live. For some reason, the principles I articulate here ended up being expressed as statements of will; of what a killjoy is willing (to do or to be) or not willing (to do or to be). I think we can understand the some of this reason. A killjoy manifesto is a willful subject; she wills wrongly by what she is willing or is not willing to do. No wonder a willful subject has principles; she can be principled. She can share them if you can bear

**Our methodology contextualizes four net benefits:**

#### Collectivization - the killjoy creates spaces for marginalized populations to connect and heal. This allows us to cope with and resolve the exhaustion we feel.

**Ahmed 14** Sara Ahmed "Selfcare as Warfare" feministkilljoys <https://feminis> tkilljoys.com/2014/08/25/selfcare-as-warfare/ August 25 2014 // kf

“Caring for myself is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation, and that is an act of political warfare.” This is a revolutionary, extraordinary sentence. It is a much loved, much cited sentence. It is an arrow, which acquires its sharpness from its own direction. It is from the epilogue to Audre Lorde’s *A Burst of Light*, a piece of writing so profound, so moving, that it never fails to teach me, often by leaving me undone, beside myself. This writing is made up of fragments or notes put together as Audre Lorde learns that she has liver cancer, that her death could only be arrested; as she comes to feel that diagnosis in her bones. The expression “a burst of light” is used for when she came to feel the fragility of her body’s situation: “that inescapable knowledge, in the bone, of my own physical limitation.” *A Burst of Light* is an account of how the struggle for survival is a life struggle and a political struggle. Some of us, Audre Lorde notes were never meant to survive. To have some body, to be a member of some group, to be some, can be a death sentence. **When you are not supposed to live**, as you are, where you are, with whom you are with, **then survival is a radical action**; a refusal not to exist until the very end; a refusal not to exist until you do not exist. **We have to work out how to survive in a system that decides life for some requires the death or removal of others**. Sometimes: to survive in a system is to survive a system. We can be inventive, we have to be inventive, Audre Lorde suggests, to survive. Some of us. Others: not so much. kinds of political struggle. And yet, in *A Burst of Light*, she defends self-care as not about self-indulgence, but self-preservation. **Self-care becomes warfare.** This kind of self-care is **not about one’s own happiness**. It is **about finding ways to exist in a world that is diminishing**. Already: we have been given some tools to sharpen our understanding of how neo-liberalism can be used as a tool. There are differences that matter, differences that matter relating to differences of power. Neoliberalism sweeps up too much when all forms of self-care become symptoms of neo-liberalism. When feminist, queer and anti-racist work that involves sharing our feelings, our hurt and grief, recognising that power gets right to the bone, is called neo-liberalism, we have to hear what is not being heard. When feminism involves **recognising the suffering of** say, **an individual woman of colour at the hands of a** sexist, **heterosexist**, **and racist system** that is indiffe rent to the suffering it causes and that **is called neoliberalism, you would be repeating rather than challenging this structural indifference**. And you also negate other “other histories” that are at stake in her struggle for her suffering to matter. **Those who do not have to struggle for their own survival can** very easily and rather quickly **dismiss those who** have to struggle **for survival** **as “indulging themselves.”** As feminism teaches us: talking about personal feelings is not necessarily about deflecting attention from structures. If anything, I would argue the opposite: not addressing certain histories that hurt, histories that get to the bone, how we are affected by what we come up against, is one way of deflecting attention from structures (as if our concern with our own pain or suffering is what stops certain things from just “going away”). Not the only way, but one way. If you have got a model that says an individual woman who is trying to survive an experience of rape by focusing on her own wellbeing and safety, by trying to work out ways she can keep on going or ways she can participate in something without having to experience more trauma (by asking for trigger warnings in a classroom, for instance) is participating in the same politics as a woman who is concerned with getting up “the ladder” in a company then I think there is something wrong with your model. Sometimes, **“coping with” or “getting by”** or “making do” **might appear as** a way of **not attending to structural inequalities, as benefiting from a system by adapting to it**, even if you are not privileged by that system,even if you are damaged by that system. Perhaps we need to ask: who has enough resources not to have to become resourceful? When you have less resources you might have to become more resourceful. Of course: the requirement to become more resourceful is part of the injustice of a system that distributes resources unequally. Of course: becoming resourceful is not system changing even if it can be life changing (although maybe, just maybe, a collective refusal not to not exist can be system changing). **But to assume people’s ordinary ways of coping with injustices implies** some sort of **failure on their part** – or even an identification with the system – **is an**other **injustice** they have to cope with. **The more resources you have the easier it is to** make such a **critique** of **those whose response to injustice is to become more resourceful**. You might not be trying to move up, to project yourself forward; you might simply be trying not to be brought down. Heavy, heavy histories. Wearing, worn down. **Even if it’s system change we need**, that we fight for, **when the system does not change, when the walls come up, those hardenings of history into physical barriers in the present, you have to manage; to cope**. Your choices are compromised when a world is compromised. It is not surprising: some recent anti-feminist, anti-queer and anti-intersectionality (intersectionality as code for people of colour) statements from the “white male left” rest on charging us with being individualistic, as indulging ourselves, as being concerned with ourselves and our own damaged “identities.” I wonder if Audre Lorde might have had to insist that self-care was not self-indulgence because she had heard this charge. I wonder. I have read recently some critiques of feminists for calling out individuals for sexism and racism because those critiques neglect (we neglect) structures. Really? Or is that **when we talk about sexism and racism you hear us as talking about individuals**? Are you suddenly concerned with structures because you do not want to hear how you as an individual might be implicated in the power relations we critique? I noted in my book, *On Being Included* (2012) how there can be a certain safety in terms like “institutional racism” in a context where individuals have disidentified from institutions they can see themselves as not “in it” at all. And how interesting: the individual disappears at the very moment he is called to account. He will probably reappear as the saviour of the left. You can hear, no doubt, my tiredness and cynicism. I do not apologise for it. I am tired of it. Some of the glib dismissals of “call out culture” make my blood boil. I say glib because they imply it is easy to call people out, or even that it has become a new social norm. I know, for instance, how hard it is to get sexual harassment taken seriously. Individuals get away with it all the time. They get away with it because of the system. It is normalised and understood as the way things are. Individual women have to speak out, and testify over and over again; and still there is a system in place, a system that is working, that stops women from being heard. In a case when a woman is harassed by an individual man, she has to work hard to call him out. She often has to keep saying it because he keeps doing it. **Calling out an individual matters, even when the system is also what is bruising: the violence directed against you by somebody is a violence that leaves a trace** upon you whether that trace is visible or not. And: **there is a system which creates him, supports him, and gives him a sense that he has a right to do what he does. To challenge him is to challenge a system**. I read one anti-feminist article that implied feminists are being individualistic, when they call out individual men, because that calling out is what stops us working more collectively for radical transformation. Collectivity: can work for some individuals as a means for disguising their own interest as collective interest. **When collectivity requires you to bracket your experience of oppression it is not a collectivity worth fighting for.** And I have watched this happen with feminist despair: when women speak out about sexual harassment and sexual violence they are heard as compromising the whole thing: a project, a centre, a revolution. And the individuals they speak of are then presented as the ones who have to suffer the consequences of feminist complaint, the one’s whose damage is generalised (if “he” is damaged “we” are damaged). When her testimony is heard as damaging the possibility of revolting against a system, a system is reproduced. I will say it again: the individual seems to disappear at the moment he is called to account. We are the ones who then appear as individuals, who are assumed to be acting as individuals or even as being individualistic, while he disappears into a collective. From my study of will and willfulness, I learnt how those who challenge power are often judged as promoting themselves, as putting themselves first, as self-promotional. And maybe: the judgment does find us somewhere. We might have to promote ourselves when we are not promoted by virtue of our membership of a group. We might have to become assertive just to appear. For others, you appear and you are attended to right away. A world is waiting for you to appear. The one who can quickly disappear when called to account can then quickly re-appear when on the receiving end of an action that is welcomed or desired. I think of these differences as how we become assembled over and by tables. Two women seated together at a table, let’s say. Sometimes you might have to wave your arm, your willful arm, just to be noticed. Without a man at the table you tend not to appear. For others, to be seated is not only to be seen, *but to be seen to.* You can take up a place at the table when you have already been given a place. You do not have to become self-willed if your will is accomplished by the general will. This is why **the general dismissal of** feminism as **identity politics** (and there is a history to how identity politics becomes a dismissal) needs to be treated as a form of conservatism: it **is an attempt to conserve power by assuming those who challenge power are just concerned with or about themselves**. An individual is one who is not dividable into parts. In *Willful Subjects* (2014), I tied the history of the individual as the one who does not have to divide himself to a patriarchal, colonial and capitalist history. He can be an individual, not divided into parts, because others become his parts: they become his arms, his feet, his hands, limbs that are intended to give support to his body. When a secretary becomes his right hand, his right hand is freed. Your labour as support for his freedom. This is how the question of support returns us to bodies, to how bodies are supported. Willful parts are those who are unwilling to provide this support. So how quickly **those who resist their subordination are judged as being individualistic as well as willful**. In refusing to support him, by becoming his parts, we have become self-willed; in refusing to care for him, we are judged as caring for ourselves, where this “for” is assumed as only and lonely. Self-care: that can be an act of political warfare. **In directing our care towards ourselves** we are redirecting care away from its proper objects, we are not caring for those we are supposed to care for; **we are not caring for the bodies deemed worth caring about**. And that is why **in queer, feminist and anti-racist work self-care is about the creation of community**, [fragile communities](https://feministkilljoys.com/2014/06/14/fragility/), **assembled out of the experiences of being shattered**. We **reassemble ourselves through the ordinary**, everyday and often painstaking **work of looking after ourselves; looking after each other**. This is why when we have to insist, I matter, we matter, we are transforming what matters. Women’s lives matter;

black lives matter; queer lives matter; disabled lives matter; trans lives matter; the poor; the elderly; the incarcerated, matter. For those who have to insist they matter to matter: selfcare is warfare. Thank you Audre Lorde for your survival. Always.

#### 2. This is a survival strategy net benefit – the aff functions as a prefiat strategy of endurance for me – later spills over into collective intersectional communities

#### 3. Our type of radical engagement with the institution of debate leads to portable education and real world endurance strategies after we leave debate – the Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle prove.

**Polson 12** 2012, Dana Roe Polson is a Co-Director, teacher, and founder of ConneXions Community Leadership Academy, ““Longing for Theory:” Performance Debate in Action”, <http://gradworks.umi.com/3516242.pdf>

I had long known Aaron as a loquacious talker—a student who always had a running commentary going on about events unfolding around him, his thoughts, what he found funny. I remembered joking with him about that once at an event outside of school: “Aaron just shut up a minute!” This came back to me during our interview, when he said: I guess, the thing that appealed to me the most was I could talk and nobody could, like, interrupt. Ummm, I think that was pretty cool, because I knew that people were gonna listen to what I had to say. And then later after that I figured, if people are gonna listen to what I have to say, why don’t I just say my own theories. (Aaron, interview, p. 2). As he points out, for him, being heard at all led to thinking more deeply about how he could use that hearing and listening more fully. He could be heard not just literally but as a thinker and generator of intellectual ideas. Having his own opinions about the world and having them be heard was tremendously important to Aaron. He mentioned this repeatedly in our interview. Traditional debate did not allow Aaron the kind of hearing he wanted. He preferred performance debate, in which [we are] continually encouraged to create arguments less tethered to the resolution or traditional norms. Referring to student debaters, he asked aloud, Why deny us... a place where they can make their own arguments? Especially if debate is a place where they c- ...that’s not really any true education. That’s not education. (Aaron, interview, p. 19). Aaron was developing opinions, researching, refining, testing, all the things that Scott Smith found so fabulous about debate in general—and that Charles Bernschein believes in as a basic pedagogy. Aaron is working from a more Freirian take on education than traditional debate pedagogues would, of course. Beginning with a validation of the voice, students can also start to use the voice as a tool for change. This style is distinct from more traditional policy styles, where debate is a game. For performance debaters, the voice in debate is used to call for change, often inside and increasingly outside the debate round. Aaron said: You have to tell, I guess people, or debaters that your voice is validated. It is important. Not only is it important, but it is a mechanism in which you can also make change. And I think, not only outside the debate community but inside it, and I think I taught, I had to teach myself that. (interview, p. 11). Janice Cooper, college debater, agreed, finding traditional norms of debate restrictive to being able to speak fully and freely: There’s a difference between a rule and a norm. ... But like the norm is speed reading, and spreading, and having to affirm the national government. Those are norms that we don’t abide by because we feel as though you should be able to, like that [there] should be a space where you should come in and be able to like speak your piece. And you shouldn’t have to conform to certain types of restrictions. (Janice Cooper, interview, p. 2). Here, Janice affirms, in a sense, her self-creation of a space in which she can speak freely. The interesting thing here is that no one has invited Janice to speak her mind in debate; the norms militate against that. However, Janice and other performance debaters thus create their own spaces through speech. The practice of performance debate is so difficult, in part, because it breaks some of many silences we construct around issues of power. Sometimes speaking your piece means not just saying what’s on one’s mind, but breaking silences constructed to protect the powerful from recognition. Bailey (1998) points out that “silence about privilege is itself a function of privilege and it has a chilling effect on political discourse” (p. 16).Whiteness, for example, is un-marked, normed, and therefore invisible and silent. Continuing to keep quiet about whiteness continues the privilege. The practice of speaking out, then, is not the joining of an in-progress conversation, or the addition of an alternative voice in some way. Instead, there is an overwhelming silence that has to be broached in order to do the practice. Even in schools where students of such marginalized social location are the majority, the misrecognition and the avoidance hold, and these things are rarely discussed. How are these metaphorical, conceptual silences seen in debate practice? How are they perpetuated?

#### They continue…

I think the Talented Tenth is actually the wrong metaphor for leadership in the performance debate community. Du Bois, later in his life, sharply criticized and disavowed a reliance on the Black elite to lead, believing that they were more preoccupied with individual gain than with group struggle, and willing to work within current structures rather than calling for radical change. They were becoming Americanized, Du Bois believed, and deradicalized. This deradicalization “occurs when more privileged African Americans (re) align themselves to function as a middle class interested in individual group gain rather than race leadership for mass development” (James, 1997, p. 24). Instead of his youthful belief in the Black elite, “Gradually, black working-class activists surpassed elites in Du Bois’s estimation of political integrity and progressive agency. He democratized his concept of race leaders through the inclusion of the radicalism of nonelites” (James, 1997, p. 21). The young people who have emerged as leaders in the performance debate community were definitely not those Du Bois would have identified as the Talented Tenth in 1903. **Du Bois was talking to and about the Black elite, the educated middle class. Earlier in Du Bois’s life, he assumed that those people, college-educated, were the natural leaders. My participants who might be seen as potential leaders do not come from such backgrounds**. Many do end up going to college and becoming potential leaders, but they are privileged through this process rather than prior to it. In addition, their focus is most definitely political as opposed to cultural. Nowhere in my research did I hear a Bill Cosby-esque injunction for Black people to shape up and work harder. Instead, **the critique is focused on “uplift as group struggle” for continued liberation.**. Finally, **these young leaders are most definitely radicalized as opposed to interested in incremental change that rocks no boats**. **From CRT and their open critique of white supremacy to their willingness to call for change openly in debate rounds these young leaders are contentious and bold**. **Two of my participants, and many of their former debate peers, are involved with a Baltimore group called Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle** (LBS). The website of the LBS establishes their identity: We are **a dedicated group of Baltimore citizens who want to change the city through governmental policy action. Our purpose is to provide tangible, concrete solutions to Baltimore’s problems and to analyze the ways that external forces have contributed to the overall decline of our city.** (“Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle,” n.d.) As we see in this statement of identity, then, LBS as one model of leadership is focused on the political and on an analysis of external influences; this focus is very different from a racial uplift position, and their model of leadership very different from the Talented Tenth. **LBS has developed platforms regarding jobs, education, incarceration, and many other issues facing Black people in the city**. They hold monthly forums for discussion of these topics, inviting guests and discussing the topics themselves. Further, one of the LBS members ran for City Council this year. He lost, but plans to run again. **The training my participants discuss, therefore, is not in the abstract: it is training for the real world, for their own empowerment and that of their communities**. This work is extending into local high schools, as well, and Paul Robeson High School now has students involved in LBS. They attend events and meetings not only to help out but as a form of leadership training.

#### 4 - Community Spillover - This is a debate about debate and the ballot has power to change our space for the better

**Reid-Brinkley 8**, Shanara Rose. The Harsh Realities of" acting Black": How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate Representation Through Racial Performance and Style. Diss. University of Georgia, 2008.

**But you see, I’m really just trying to change the halls of Congress, that meets on the Capitol Hill of debate tournament tab rooms where pieces of legislation or ballots signed by judges enact the policies of our community. My words right here, right now can’t 113 change the State, but they can change the state of debate. The University of Louisville enacts a full withdrawal from the traditional norms and procedures of this debate activity. Because this institution, like every other institution in society, has also grown from the roots of racism.** Seemingly neutral practices and policies have exclusionary effects on different groups for different reasons. These practices have a long and perpetuating history.108 Signifyin’ on institutional symbols of American democracy, Jones’ draws attention to the parallels in power structures between the federal government and the decision-making arms of the debate community. **The “halls of Congress” represent the halls of debate tournaments. “Capitol Hill” where the laws of this country are enacted is a metaphor for debate tournament tabrooms where wins and losses are catalogued. Tournament ballots metaphorically represent the signing of the judges ballot at the conclusion of debates. In facts, debaters often argue that the “impacts” they identify or the solvency for their plan happens “once the judge signs the ballot,” as if assigning a winner or loser actually results in the passage of a policy. Jones argues that it is the ballot that is the most significant tool in influencing the practices and procedures of the community. In other words, the competitive nature of debate guarantees that teams and coaches remain responsive to trends amongst the judging pool. Ultimately, debate competition is a run to capture or win the judges ballot. That the ballot “enacts” the “policies” of the debate “community,” makes the space of competition a critical arena from which to attempt community change.** Up until this point, the policy debate community had dealt with issues of diversity and inclusion outside of tournament competition. Directors, coaches, assistants, and debaters may have engaged in outreach and recruitment practices designed to diversify the debate community, but discussions and support for such actions were not generated from debate tournament competition. Those discussions occurred in collaborative versus competitive settings where stakeholders were encouraged to dialogue without concern for winners or losers. For example, OSI (the original non-profit arm of the UDL) sponsored Ideafests to bring stakeholders in the debate community together to discuss the national expansion of the UDL.