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#### Interpretation: “workers” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government recognizes a specific group of workers unconditional right to strike

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions.

Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window.

So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why.

“Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons.

First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural.

Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals.

Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universitiesz generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize workers unconditional right to strike” doesn’t entail that a just government ought to recognize peoples unconditional right to strike because it doesn’t prove all people should strike, 2] adverb test – adding “always” doesn’t change its meaning because recognition is unconditional.

#### Violation: They spec sex workers

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them doing away with random words in the rez which decks ground and prep because the aff is no longer bounded by the rez. Voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from teachers to doctors to the police— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and implications — that explodes prep and leads to random worker of the week affs which makes neg prep impossible.

#### 3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy.

#### Fairness – debate is an activity that requires fairness for evaluation – and fairness is an I/L to education – need a fair enough playing field - - education is the impact – only reason people do debate and it’s the only spillover from debate

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse and set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention but we creates a race to the top where we create the best norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

#### Reject 1AR theory and independent voters – sandbagging o/w, irresolvable o/w, splitting o/w

## K

#### Settler colonialism structures the world in a settler-native-slave relationship, erasing indigenous peoples, causing constant ontological violence.

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck is an award winning Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. She is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. Yang is a Ph.D. Social and Cultural Studies in Education, University of California, Berkeley] “Decolonization is not a metaphor”, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society //AA

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound **epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence**. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that **settler colonialism is a structure and not an event.** In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for **the settlers** to make a place their home, they must **destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there.** **Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place**. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For **the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource.** Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. **The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit**. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. **Settlers are not immigrants**. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white **European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts**. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### The 1AC imposes itself on indigenous businesses which decks indigenous sovereignty --- their pro-Union arguments are used to reify indigenous violence

Harvard Law Review 21 “Tribal Power, Worker Power: Organizing Unions in the Context of Native Sovereignty.” Harvardlawreview.org, 11 Jan. 2021, harvardlawreview.org/2021/01/tribal-power-worker-power-organizing-unions-in-the-context-of-native-sovereignty/. Accessed 7 Nov. 2021.

Since 1990, employees of businesses owned and operated by Native nations have increasingly sought to amplify their voices in the workplace through union representation. Many of these (primarily non-Native ) workers have invoked the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The protections of federal labor law have been crucial to building worker power in private-sector enterprises. But to many tribal governments, this invocation of a federal statute is an affront to the inherent sovereignty of Native nations. Labor organizing in tribal enterprises uncovers a seemingly intractable tension between two classes of power-building institutions: unions and tribes. Unionizing workers, often members of non-Native minority groups, feel disenfranchised in their workplaces, while Native governments perceive intervention into their internal affairs as threatening their inherent sovereignty — sovereignty that has been weakened through congressional action and Supreme Court decisions. 7 This tension is especially acute in the ideological context of the modern labor movement, which casts unionism as rooted in values of progressivism and social justice.

#### The aff sanitizes and obscures the broader system of coloniality – stating that governments have an “obligation” is a settler move to innocence

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 13 – University of South Africa Archie Mafeje Research Institute head and professor

[Sabelo J., D.Phil in African Historical Studies from University of Zimbabwe, he is a National Research Foundation (NRF) rated social scientist, a member of the Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf), a Fellow of the African Studies Centre (ASC) in the Netherlands, and a Research Associate of the Ferguson Centre for African and Asian Studies at The Open University in the United Kingdom, “Perhaps Decoloniality is the Answer? Critical Reflections on Development from a Decolonial Epistemic Perspective,” Africanus, 43(2), 2013]

The articles constituting this volume of Africanus are diverse but they all emphasize the need for decoloniality as another perspective from which development could be interrogated and understood as discourse. What the majority of authors argue for is decolonization of the discourse of development through indigenization of the concept. An un-decolonized discourse of development presents Africans as objects rather than subjects of development. African people feature in development discourse as a problem to be solved. A humanitarian perspective has always permeated development discourse in the process hiding the structural causes of lack of development in Africa. A decolonial perspective is grounded in world-systems approach. It maintains that the modern world system that emerged in 1492 has remained racially hierarchized, Euro-American-centric, sexist, hetero-normative, Christiancentric, Western-centric, capitalist and colonial in orientation (Grosfoguel 2007). Africa and other parts of the Global South have remained peripheral and subaltern. This is why decolonial thinkers understand development as involving the decolonization of the modern world system. Decoloniality cascades from the context in which the humanity of black people is doubted and their subjectivity is articulated in terms of lacks and deficits (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013a; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013b). Lacking development is constitutive of a Western articulation of African subjectivity. This point is well articulated by Ramon Grosfoguel, a leading Latin American thinker and theorist who understood the articulation on subjectivity of non-Western people as unfolding in this way: We went from the sixteenth century characterization of ‘people without writing’ to the eighteenth and nineteenth century characterization of ‘people without history,’ to the twentieth century characterization of ‘people without development’ and more recently, to the early twenty first century of ‘people without democracy’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 214). During the same period, those in the ‘Zone of Being’ were systematically gaining more and more fruits of modernity ‘from sixteenth century ‘rights of people,’ to ‘eighteenth century ‘rights of man,’ and to the ‘late twentieth century human rights’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 214). Decoloniality is against all vestiges of colonialism and realities of coloniality. It is a redemptive epistemology which inaugurates and legitimates the telling the story of the modern world from the experiences of colonial difference. Decoloniality materialized at the very moment in which imperialism and colonialism arrived in Africa. Decoloniality ‘struggles to bring into intervening existence an-other interpretation that bring forward, on the one hand, a silenced view of the event and, on the other, shows the limits of imperial ideology disguised as the true (total) interpretation of the events’ in the making of the modern world (Mignolo 1995: 33). Decoloniality is both an epistemic and a political project seeking liberation and freedom for those people who experienced colonialism and who are today subsisting and living under the boulder of global coloniality. Development is linked to liberation and freedom from domination and exploitation. This is why decoloniality is distinguished from the imperial version of history through its push for shifting of a geography of reason from the West as the epistemic locale from which the ‘world is described, conceptualized and ranked’ to the ex-colonised epistemic sites as legitimate points of departure in describing the construction of the modern world order (Mignolo 1995: 35). Decoloniality identifies coloniality as a key hindrance to development in Africa. Nelson Maldonado-Torres, a leading philosopher in decolonial thought, grapples with the meaning of coloniality and this is how he defined it: Coloniality is different from colonialism. Colonialism denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation, which makes such a nation an empire. **Coloniality**, instead, **refers to** long-standing **patterns of power** thatemerged **as a result of colonialism**, but **that define culture, labour, intersubjectivity relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations.** Thus, coloniality survives colonialism. It is maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day (Maldonado- Torres 2007: 243). Decolonial thinkers understand the Global South as that epistemic site that received the negatives of modernity. **Coloniality is a** name for the ‘darker side’ of modernity that needs to be unmasked because it exists as ‘an embedded **logic that enforces control, domination, and exploitation** disguised **in the language of** salvation, **progress**, modernization, **and being good for everyone’** (Mignolo 1995: 6). Walter D. Mignolo argued that ‘Coloniality names the experiences and views of the world and history of those whom Fanon called les damnes de la terre (“the wretched of the earth,” those who have been, and continue to be, subjected to the standard of modernity)’ (Mignolo 1995: 8). He elaborated on the meaning of the wretched of the earth in this way: The wretched are defined by the colonial wound, and the colonial wound, physical and/or psychological, is a consequence of racism, the hegemonic discourse that questions the humanity of all those who do not belong to the locus of enunciation (and the geo-politics of knowledge) of those who assign the standard of classification and assign to themselves the right to classify (Mignolo 1995: 8). Unlike coloniality, decoloniality names a cocktail of insurrectionist-liberatory projects and critical thoughts emerging from the ex-colonised sites such as Latin America, Caribbean, Asia, Middle East, and Africa. It seeks to make sense of the position of ex-colonised peoples within the Euro- America-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, capitalist, hetero-normative, racially hierarchized, and modern world-system that came into being in the fifteenth century (Mignolo 2000; Grosfoguel 2007). Decoloniality seeks to unmask, unveil, and reveal coloniality as an underside of modernity that coexisted with the rhetoric of progress, equality, fraternity, and liberty. It is a particular kind of critical intellectual theory as well as political project that seeks to disentangle ex-colonised parts of the world from global coloniality (Mignolo 2011). What distinguishes decoloniality from other existing critical social theories is its locus of enunciations and its genealogy – which is outside Europe. Decoloniality can be best understood as a pluriversal epistemology of the future – a redemptive and liberatory epistemology that seeks to delink from the tyranny of abstract universals (Mignolo 2007: 159). Decoloniality informs the ongoing struggles against inhumanity of the Cartesian subject, ‘the irrationality of the rational, the despotic residues of modernity’ (Mignolo 2011: 93). As a critical social theory, decoloniality is constituted by three main concepts. The first is coloniality of power. It is a useful concept, which delves deeper into the roots of the present asymmetrical global power relations and how the present modern world order was constituted. It boldly enables a correct naming of the current ‘global political present’ as a racially hierarchized, Euro-American-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, sexist, capitalist, hetero-normative, hegemonic, and modern power structure that emerged in 1492. At the centre of the construction of this power structure was the bifurcation of the world into ‘Zone of Being’ and ‘Zone of None-Being’ maintained by invisible ‘abyssal lines’ (Gordon 2005; Santos 2007). The Portuguese sociologist and leading decolonial thinker had this to say about the making of the ‘Zone of Being’ and the ‘Zone of Non- Being’: Modern Western thinking is an abyssal thinking. It consists of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones. The invisible distinctions are established through radical lines that divide social reality into two realms, the realm of “this side of the line” and the realm of “the other side of the line.” The division is such that the “other side of the line” vanishes as reality, becomes nonexistent, and is indeed produced as nonexistent. Nonexistent means not existing in any relevant or comprehensive way of being. Whatever is produced as nonexistent is radically excluded because it lies beyond the realm of what the accepted conception of inclusion considers to be its other. What most fundamentally characterizes abyssal thinking is thus the impossibility of the copresence of the two sides of the line (Santos 2007: 45). To the ‘Zone of Being’ (Euro-American world) modernity deposited its fruits of progress, civilization, modernization, industrialization, development, democracy and human rights while at the same time imposing the slave trade, imperialism, colonialism and apartheid into Africa (the Zone of None-Being). The second concept is that of coloniality of knowledge. Epistemology and methodology are inextricably intertwined with imperial power. This is why Claude Ake wrote about ‘social science as imperialism’ that enabled development in Europe and America while disabling development in Africa (Ake 1979). Research into development cannot ignore delving into epistemological issues, into the politics of knowledge generation, and the fundamental question of who generates which knowledge and for what purposes. How knowledge has been used to assist imperialism and colonialism and to inscribe Euro- American-centric epistemology that consistently appropriated what was considered progressive, and displacing what was considered repugnant aspects of endogenous and indigenous knowledges remains a fertile area of research. The same is true of the important question of relevance and irrelevance of knowledge, particularly how some knowledges disempowered communities and peoples, and how others empowered individuals and communities. The point that emerges poignantly from decoloniality is that current knowledges, epistemologies and methodologies are for equilibrium rather than transformation. They are for the status quo rather than for change. The fundamental challenge facing Africa is how knowledges, epistemologies and methodologies of equilibrium can be expected to enable development in Africa. Decoloniality speaks to this quandary. The third concept is that of coloniality of being, which was articulated by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007). This concepts enables us to delve deeper into the pertinent questions of the making of modern subjectivities, into issues of humanism, and into questions of the role played by philosophers such as Rene Descartes and the long-term implications of his motto, ‘Cogito ergo sum/I think, therefore, I am’) on conceptions of subjectivity. What is evident is that modernity endowed whiteness with ontological density far above blackness as identities. This happened as the notions of ‘I think, therefore, I am’ were mutating into ‘I conquer, therefore, I am’ and its production of ‘colonizer and colonized’ articulation of subjectivity and being (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013a). From these imperial and colonial articulations of African humanity, there was a permanent questioning of the humanity of black people and this attitude and practice culminated in processes of ‘objectification’ / ‘thingification’ / ‘commodification’ of Africans as slaves (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013b). Therefore, the response to the question of why decoloniality in the 21stcentury, the answer is simply **that coloniality is still operative and active and needs to be decolonized**. The post-1945 juridical decolonization did not succeed to decolonize the modern world order that was formed since 1492. This is why Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni argued that: What Africans must be vigilant against is the trap of ending up normalizing and universalizing coloniality as a natural state of the world. It must be unmasked, resisted and destroyed because it produced a world order that can only be sustained through a combination of violence, deceit, hypocrisy and lies (Ndlovu- Gatsheni 2013b: 10). It is a question that Ramon Grosfoguel gave a more comprehensive response: One of **the most powerful myth**s of the twentieth century was the notion that the elimination of colonial administrations amounted to the decolonization of the world. This led to the myth of a “postcolonial” world. The heterogeneous and multiple global structures put in place over a period of 450 years did not evaporate with the juridical-political decolonization of the periphery over the past 50 years. We continue to **live under the same “colonial power matrix**.” With juridical-political decolonization we moved from a period of ‘global **colonialism’** to the current period of “global **coloniality**.” Although “colonial administrations” have been almost entirely eradicated and the majority of the periphery is politically organized into independent states, non-European people are still living under crude European/Euro- American exploitation and domination. The old colonial hierarchies of European versus non-Europeans remain in place and are entangled with the “international division of labour” and accumulation of capital at a world-scale (Grosfoguel 2007: 219). The celebration of ‘juridical-political’ decolonization obscures the continuities between the colonial past and coloniality – it leads to illusions of possibilities of enjoyment of ‘independence’ and ‘freedom’, ‘national sovereignty’ and ‘national identity’, as well as ‘national development’ and ‘progress’. Decoloniality pushes for transcendence over narrow conceptions of being decolonized and consistently gestures towards liberation from coloniality as a complex matrix of knowledge, power, and being. Decoloniality consistently reminds decolonial thinkers of ‘the unfinished and incomplete twentieth century dream of decolonization’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 221). Decoloniality announces the ‘the decolonial turn’ as a long existing ‘turn’ standing in opposition to the ‘colonizing turn’ underpinning Western thought (Maldonado-Torres 2011: 1). Decoloniality announces the broad ‘decolonial turn’ that involves the ‘task of the very decolonization of knowledge, power and being, including institutions such as the university’ (Maldonado-Torres 2011: 1). Maldonado-Torres elaborated on the essence of ‘decolonial turn’: The decolonial turn (different from the linguistic or the pragmatic turns) refers to the decisive recognition and propagation of decolonization as an ethical, political, and epistemic project in the twentieth century. The project reflects changes in historical consciousness, agency, and knowledge, and it also involves a method or series of methods that facilitate the task of decolonization at the material and epistemic levels (Maldonado-Torres 2006: 114). For Maldonado, ‘By decoloniality it is meant here the dismantling of relations of power and conceptions of knowledge that foment the reproduction of racial, gender, and geo-political hierarchies that came into being or found new and more powerful forms of expression in the modern/colonial world’ (Maldonado-Torres 2006: 117). Like all critical social theories of society, the decolonial epistemic perspective aims to critique and possibly overcome the epistemological injustices put in place by imperial global designs, and questions and challenges the longstanding claims of Euro-American epistemology to be universal, neutral, objective, disembodied, as well as being the only mode of knowing. It is ‘an-other thought’ that seeks to inaugurate ‘an-other logic,’ ‘an-other language,’ and ‘an-other thinking’ that has the potential to liberate ex-colonised people’s minds from Euro-American hegemony (Mignolo 2005: 56). Decoloniality helps in unveiling epistemic silences, conspiracies, and epistemic violence hidden within Euro-American epistemology and affirms the epistemic rights of the African people that enable them to transcend global imperial designs. **Decoloniality is re-emerging during the current** age of ‘**epistemic break’**. The term ‘epistemic break’ is drawn from the French theorist Michel Foucault. It refers to **a ‘historical rupture which occurs when one epistemic system breaks down and another** begins **to take its place’** (Mills 1997: 145). It is a very relevant concept that captures the epistemic crisis haunting the modern world order today and encapsulates the enormity of the crisis of Euro-American epistemologies unleashed on the world by modernity. This epistemic rupture is well captured by Immanuel Wallerstein who argued that: It is quite normal for scholars and scientists to rethink issues. When important new evidence undermines old theories and predictions do not hold, we are pressed to rethink our premises. In that sense, much of nineteenth-century social science, in the form of specific hypotheses, is constantly being rethought. But, in addition to rethinking, which is “normal,” I believe we need to “unthink” nineteenth-century social science, because many of its presumptions—which, in my view, are misleading and constrictive – still have far too strong a hold on our mentalities. These presumptions, once considered liberating of the spirit, serve today as the central intellectual barrier to useful analysis of the social world (Wallerstein 1991: 1). The key point is that Euro-American epistemologies predicated on fundamentalist rationalism are in a deep crisis. In his recent book titled The end of conceit: western rationality after postcolonialism, Patrick Chabal admitted that whenever Europeans try to make sense of the current problems facing Europe it becomes clear that ‘the instruments we use are no longer fit for the job. The instruments – that is, the social sciences we employ to explain what is happening domestically and overseas – are both historically and conceptually out of date’ (Chabal 2012: viii). **The whole world is at an epistemological crossroads** characterised by the end of Euro-American conceit that created some form of epistemological certainty. As argued by Chabal (2012: 3), ‘**Western societies are no longer sure of how to see themselves.’ This uncertainty opens the way for projection of decoloniality** as the first humanistic-oriented philosophy of liberation gesturing towards another world that is pluriversal, another logic that is freed from racism and the birth of a new humanism. This volume of Africanus is inspired by this new utopic-decolonial momentum gesturing towards deeper structural decolonization and pluriversalism freed from racial hierarchization of human beings. The first article is by the language specialist Finex Ndhlovu and is focused on the important question of African regional integration and pan-African unity. He deploys decoloniality to argue the crossborder languages that have been promoted as vehicles for African economic and political integration are actually carrying dominant ideologies of Westphalian statism and the Berlin consensus that are not easily amenable to regional integration. He challenges the conventional view of the African Academy of Languages (Acalan) of projecting vehicular cross-border languages as a means by which such problems as disunity could be resolved. Ndhlovu argues that ‘One of the biggest challenges that come with these developments is that of cultivating intercultural communication, cross-linguistic understanding and social cohesion among the hitherto linguistically and culturally multiverse peoples of the African continent.’ He goes further to note that vehicular cross-border languages (those languages that are common to two or more states and domains straddling various usages) suffer from the same limitations as those currently besetting national languages because they are ‘conceived as isomorphic, monolithic and countable entities that do not accommodate other language forms’ and their ‘cross-border status is defined in terms of existing nation-state boundaries that they purport to transcend’. Ndhlovu’s intervention begins to reveal coloniality hidden in some of the celebrated mechanism chosen as levers for achieving regional integration and pan-African unity. This critical thinking is very important as it enable Africans to avoid another false start that is not informed by genuine decoloniality. What epistemologies and knowledges underpin mainstream development discourse? This question is directly addressed by Seth Opong from Ghana who argues for indigenizing knowledges as the first step towards attainment of endogenous development. He defines endogenous knowledge ‘as knowledge about the people, by the people and for the people’. This definition is important as it distinguishes those knowledges imposed on Africa from outside those knowledges generated by Africans. Opong’s contribution proposes that ‘the African scholar should adopt a problem-oriented approach in conducting research as opposed to the current method-oriented approach that prevent the African from examining pertinent African problems’. Opong correctly notes that ‘contextually relevant knowledge is the basis for national development’. His article is therefore a most relevant intervention on the level of epistemology, pedagogy and methodology as they impinge on the question of development in Africa. Morgan Ndlovu’s article on the pertinent theme of production and consumption of cultural villages in South Africa addresses the question of coloniality that is hidden within the tourism industry. He begins with questioning whether those who fought against colonialism really understood the complexity of the structure of power they were fighting against and the character of the modern world system that enabled colonialism. This becomes a pertinent question when one considers that today decolonization exists as myth and an illusion. The reality is that of coloniality on a global scale. His core argument is the concept of cultural villages in South Africa cannot be understood outside the broader global experiences of ‘museumification’ of identity and ‘culturalization’ of politics’. Morgan Ndlovu’s article takes us to the tourist industry as a component of development in Africa and consistently reveals how staging culture is shot through by coloniality, which makes it impossible for Africans to reap any tangible developmental dividends. This is why he concludes that ‘The manner in which the establishment of cultural village is produced and consumed in South Africa microcosmically represents the general picture of how cultural identity and the political economy are hierarchical ordered in the non-existent post-apartheid dispensation.’ Sarah Chiumbu’s contribution targets the media as another domain of coloniality that needs decolonization. When decolonial thinkers use the term decolonization they do not confine it to decolonial issues of juridical-political independence. They extend it to issues of power, knowledge and being. This is why Chiumbu’s specific focus is no media reform in southern Africa that continues to generate animated debates between agents of neo-liberalism and those of African liberation is very important. Coloniality of power is causing a lot of confusion in the debates on media reform and democracy, with the neo-liberal paradigm continuing to work towards obscuring the workings of power and disguising its ideological underpinnings. Chiumbu correctly notes that ‘This masking does not leave room to problematize global structures directing knowledge production and media policy reforms.’

#### The only ethical response is decolonization.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework.

We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36).

To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.

*when you take away the punctuation*

*he says of*

*lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land*

*its acreage and location*

*you take away its finality*

*opening the possibility of other futures*

-Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### The ROB is to center indigenous knowledge production -- Our epistemology is a pre-requisite – they don’t get to weigh the case or their framing if we win their starting point is flawed

Ballantyne 14 [Erin Freeland, Dechinta Bush U, *Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization*, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 3, No. 3, 2014, pgs 67-85,]

As the conversation of Dechinta grew, the ugly politics of education on a broad political scale quickly surfaced. It became clear that education is a domain of power and privilege that is fiercely protected. Questions relating to control over its content, production and process were, apparently, not open for discussion. Curricula were deeply homogenized, deterritorialized and standardized. Post-secondary in the territory was overtly geared toward training people for industry and the endless promise of mining, pipeline and oil and gas booms (and busts). People were either emphatically supportive of the notion of ‘Elders as professors’ being recognized as equals and collaborating with university professors, or incensed by its disruption of typical academic power. The creation of Dechinta was polarizing, and reactions were telling of the deeply embedded sense of entitlement and power that the state, and existing institutions, had over determining what did and did not count as ‘education’. Rather than support spaces where academic and Indigenous knowledge would overlap, Indigenous knowledge was viewed as curriculum that should be relegated to ‘culture camps’. That processes like hunting and moose-hide tanning could draw parallels, or even inform governance, consensus building and self-determination, continue to elude most mainstream reporters, critics and institutions. Coming back to the land is a battle. ‘Education’ on the land is a direct hit to the exoskeleton of continued colonial power. By specifically disrupting education as a domain of settler colonial control to be deconstructed and re-imagined, Dechinta has challenged the most comprehensive, yet skilfully cloaked machine of settler colonial capitalism - the prescriptive education process, which produces more settler colonial bodies, thinkers, and believers. Building strong relationships of reciprocity with the land results in the crumbling of settler capitalism because it fundamentally shifts the relationships people experience and what they believe about who they|||people||| are, how they are in relation to and with land, and what they believe to be true. Being together on the land, learning with the land, and having a strong relationship with the land is antithetical to settler capitalism itself. The power of settler colonization relies on the total deterritorialization of people’s relationship with land. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1972) work on deterritorialization, ‘the process whereby colonization leads not just to the loss of territory but also to the destruction of the ontological conditions of the colonized culture’s territoriality,’ is a fitting philosophical conjecture to Dene expressions of how they are dislocated from their relationships with land due to process of nation-building and capitalism, and how this deterritorialization separates people from practices with the land that keeps them healthy, even if they still live on the land (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 192; Hipwell, 2004, p. 304). As Said (1993) has stated: land, in the final instance, is what empire is about. In this way, our relationships with land are central to the great unsettling. Reconnection, and the exchange of skills, knowledge and practice with land, thus directly threaten the settler colonial project. It removes bodies from the forces designed to encode the body as capital. The foremost space of enclosure, of encoding, is the ‘school’. The ongoing trend in Indigenous and Northern settler education since its earliest colonial intrusion has been to train Indigenous bodies to serve the needs of industry. Education has happened in Denendeh since time immemorial. It has been the settler prerogative to dismantle Indigenous ways of knowing and being, of education. Returning learning to an intergenerational exchange, on the land - which has at its very core the fundamental teachings that, if we take care of the land, the land takes care of us - will shake the foundation of settler colonization by breaking the dependency that has been created on capitalism through deterritorialization. Transformational learning supports intergenerational learners and teachers to think critically and re-imagine what the purpose of learning is. Learning on the land is healing and being in community on the land is challenging, pulling our attention to the hard work of decolonization. The year after our initial gathering, Dechinta launched a pilot semester with three courses nested within an interdisciplinary approach. Student evaluations of the program indicated it was profoundly ‘transformative’, and was for some the first ‘safe space’ of education that they had encountered (Luig et al, 2011). Interdisciplinary and collaborative, the pilot set the stage for the following four years. Dechinta now has 8 original courses, and a two semester-long program growing into a full degree that operates from -50 winters to the steamy height of summer. The challenges have been substantial. Conflict between academics and Indigenous students have made real the tensions of working on decolonization in concert, even with those who identify, or who are identified as allies. Solving conflict and difficulties through shared governance circles, while combating ingrained reactions of lateral violence and other social expressions codified in settler colonization are truly challenging, but deeply rewarding. Through the building of relationships we have a growing cohort of faculty dedicated to not just teaching but sharing in the creation of safe spaces, where the hard mental work of decolonizing in theory is met with the even harder work of decolonizing as practice. When students and faculty create a community where their relationships are ordered through their relationships with land, the work of decolonization move from a discussion in theory to practice of being and becoming a source of decolonial power. At Dechinta we debate this, and experiment with its meaning in tangible ways. Here, skills categorized as ‘subsistence’ or ‘arts and crafts’ are fundamental in forming and understanding theory. Such practices are themselves theory in action.

#### & Prefer our ROTB – it allows us to make direct change in the debate space because our Balatanye evidence has a real spillover argument – we can shift education where as your ROTB doesn’t – also we aren’t util

## Case

1. Dunt – Re-openning discussion =/ you need to win of it – key to understand that discussions can be good but not a need for the ballot
2. Interrogating violence is not enough – your in round advocacy has 0 spillover and feigns progress being made
3. Sanofka – The 1AC does not stop transgender people from being attacked by the police and stereotyped – the 1AC does not fiat a mindset shift and thus cannot solve for this – By reading Sankofa you have pointed out violence but done nothing to address it\\
4. Womens strike card isn’t a solvency advocate – it doesn’t argue that sex worker strikes should be unconditional merely should happen which the 1AC does not suddenly make them happen
5. Lister 1 – Sex strikes don’t cause tangible change – a single instance of it working does not indicate that sex strikes create large-scale change. Check the card here’s an non-highlighted quote:

#### [Lister 1] Sex strikes bolster national support for sex workers causing tangible change – *Pereira shows*.

Lister 1: Lister, Kate [Dr Kate Lister is a university lecturer, a writer, blogger, and curates the online research project Whores of Yore - a digital public engagement project that works to make research on sexuality and the history of sex work accessible to the public. Kate is a campaigner for sex worker rights and is a board member for the sex work research hub and the Vagina Museum. In 2017, Kate won the Sexual Freedom Award, Publicist of the Year.]. “Yes, sex strikes have been successful. But not because women simply withheld sex” *iNews*, August 2020. AC

**Other sex strikes are successful because they drew media attention** to the cause, rather than because men were being denied the occasional roll in the hay. **In 2006, a group of Colombian women in the city of Pereira staged a sex strike to demand their gangster partners hand in their guns, stop shooting one another, and agree to attend vocational training programmes.** Reports estimate there were about **two dozen women taking part and the strike lasted for ten days.** **Clearly, a small group of women boycotting sex for 10 days is not going to affect cultural change on its own. There was much more going on. City authorities were already working with law enforcement to reduce gun crime, as one month before the strike, some 140,000 Pereirans had voted in favour of disarming civilians. The sex strike was symptomatic of a culture that desperately wanted change, rather than an instigator of it. The sex strike tactic drew global attention and boosted national support for their cause. By 2010, Pereira’s murder rate was reportedly** down by 26.5 per cent, but this is a result of a city wide, concentrated effort to reduce gun crime that utilised a multi-agency approach **and had international support, rather than a group of gangsters not getting any for ten days.**

**This card to be considered solvency requires evidence that countries are progressive enough to supplement change but that has not been proven – thus the 1AC does nothing and you can vote neg on presumption.**

1. The aff doesn’t organize a sex strike either – no card that proves allowing them to happen unconditionally makes them occur more often.
2. On Scott – this card says that labor rights and sex workers helps other groups but does not refer to a legal change
3. **CP: Sex workers should go on a 10 day strike – solves the AFF and forces a counter-legal strike that will see more overall attention as it is against the law**
4. **Sex strikes only work because they are not seen as legal and thus are more defiant – legalizing strikes ruins their effect because they become too common.**

#### 10 1AC Breitowich takes out solvency – the 1AC doesn’t make prostitution legal meaning even if the unconditional right to strike is granted, they would still be deemed illegal due to them not even being recognized as having those jobs OR they would be jailed as soon as they striked – the 1AC is cruel optimism.

#### A] Smith says Striking key 2 decriminalizing the industry but sex workers lack ability to strike if they are illegal itself ie the very act of a strike would be blocked not because of their right to strike but because their job is illegal – if not, then that means murders can strike to avoid jail

#### 11. Recognize means to acknowledge something

Oxford No Date [Oxford’s Learner’s Dictionary, No Date, “Recognize” Oxford’s Learner’s Dictionary, https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/recognize#:~:text=recognize%20to%20admit%20or%20be,to%20take%20the%20problem%20seriously]/Kankee

to admit or to be aware that something exists or is true SYNONYM acknowledge recognize something They recognized the need to take the problem seriously. Most of us recognize the importance of diet. The government does recognize the value of the arts in this country. You must recognize the fact that the situation has changed. recognize something as something Drugs were not recognized as a problem then. recognize somebody/something to be/have something Drugs were not recognized to be a problem then. recognize how, what, etc… Nobody recognized how urgent the situation was. recognize that… We recognized that the task was not straightforward. it is recognized that… It is widely recognized that driver fatigue is a problem on motorways. It was recognized that this solution could only be temporary. to accept and approve of somebody/something officially recognize somebody/something The UK has refused to recognize the new regime. These qualifications are recognized throughout the EU. internationally recognized human rights The court explicitly recognized the group's right to exist. be recognized as somebody/something The organization has not been officially recognized as a trade union. Such crimes are recognized by international law as crimes against humanity. be recognized to be/have something He is recognized to be their natural leader. be recognized (as something) to be thought of as very good or important by people in general The book is now recognized as a classic. She's a recognized authority on the subject. ​recognize somebody/something to give somebody official thanks for something that they have done or achieved His services to the state were recognized with the award of a knighthood.

#### ]12 Mgbako proves sex strikes happen in the squo – there’s no spillover ev & no solvency because they fail to prove that the lack of a unconditional right to strike creates these harms – strikes could fail for infinite reasons, so there’s no solvency or why the CP fails to solve

#### 13] Scott is just a funding spillover – they don’t have ev a) this funding does anything b) this spillover solves anything

#### **14] On Lister 2, Media is insufficient – texas abortion bad still exists AND this ev is women striking as a whole, not sex workers – means no 1AC solvency**

#### 15] Shure proves no material impact to sex worker strikes – who cares about a day of recognition – this is a way to reconciliate policy makers to prvent material change & the 1Ac is an instance of this – turns case

#### 16] They lack ev how the 1AC brings coalitions together that couldn’t have come together earlier for strikes, if strikes have occurred in the past – shure says strikes good but past strikes empircally disprove that