### 1AC Story

## Part 1: It’s Not Funny Anymore

#### [ROJ] The Role of the Judge is to Promote Access to the Debate Space. Judges can no longer pretend that they’re “just part of the game” and don’t impact the players.

#### [Alston et al] Since fairness and education *can’t exist* if debate targets some people from the outset, judges’ first duty is to address barriers to our being here.

Alston et al, bracketed for gendered language: Alston, Jonathan [Director of Debate, Science Park High School], Aaron Timmons [Director of Debate, Greenhill School], and Anthony Berryhill [Ph.D. candidate in Political Theory, Yale University]. “Protecting All of the Children in the Auditorium.” VBriefly.com, October 5, 2014. CH

“Close the doors!” Richard Sodikow would bellow across the auditorium at the top of his lungs. His voice rang through the enormous room and his order was immediately followed. The doors would be closed and the hundreds of high school students who attended the prestigious fall debate tournament at the Bronx High School of Science would be locked in, together. The fire alarm would sound, but we would not leave. We did not have to. We were already protected. The alarm was for the people outside of Richard’s purview. The children around him—high school students who came from across the United States to compete in academic debate—did not have to worry. The race, class, or gender of the debaters did not matter. We were all inside, together. Protected by the adult who took responsibility for our care. That type of care, that type of concern for all children is missing from contemporary Lincoln-Douglas debate. Our community stands idly by while certain children, coaches, judges and programs are blatantly bullied online by institutions the debate community actively supports. While the research on the bystander effect is over 50 years old, the internet and social media has exacerbated the extent, and the impact, of inaction on online mediums. Professor Vincent Hendricks explains the 21st century bystander effect when he elucidated: The bystander effect occurs because people observe each other before assisting. And the more people observing each other the stronger the signal that help is neither required nor appropriate. Once you take such public signals to social media in terms of, say, aggregated likes, you may just reinforce bystander behavior even more. In the case of cyberbullying, by innocently “liking” you may be part of movement to establish a strong public signal about what the correct collective response is. You register your “like” with no obligation to actually intervene and non-intervention may just become the norm. (Hendricks) High school debate, a uniquely educational and academic activity fostering the promotion of civil discourse, ought to reflect the basic principle that children — of all races, classes, genders, sexual orientations — are sacrosanct, and that their participation should be encouraged. The circuit Lincoln-Douglas virtual community, however, has proven that despite our focus on philosophy and morality in debate rounds, we are willing to watch some children be slaughtered online. In this note we highlight the importance of a fully inclusive debate space, warning that the community’s reluctance to create virtual norms and its refusal to speak out against often racist, always destructive online bullying endangers not only the few students and programs who are publicly sacrificed, but that this unchallenged online behavior threatens the legitimacy of our activity as a whole. One or more of the authors were directly involved in many of the incidents described in this essay.

They add:

If a teacher witnessed someone terrorizing a child in another classroom, he [they] would be morally and legally obligated to act. If he [they] tried to excuse his [their] silence by saying that he is [they’re] only responsible for those in his [their] own classroom, he would [they’d] appropriately lose his [their] job and face legal sanction. We are ethically, and legally, responsible to take care of all the students in our collective auditorium. Many may believe that only students, judges and coaches of color (or other marginalized groups) are affected by the scenarios we describe. Witnesses to these online mob attacks would be well served to remember the analogy of the miner’s canary. Historically, coal miners carried canaries with them as a warning signal against the invisible, deadly fumes within. If the canary died, the miners knew to get out before it was too late. We believe that this analogy fits the situation of the online mob attacks in LD. Those who foolishly assume that the students we have described earlier are the only ones who have been under threat are making a dangerous error in judgment. Like the TOC Explosion of Entitlement of 2014, the mine will eventually explode. A famous poem that began circulation in the 1950s describes the dangers of intellectuals avoiding conflict and refusing to take action in Germany during WWII: First they came for … and I did not speak out – because I was not … It concludes, Then they came for me – and there was no one left to speak for me. The hesitance of the majority of members of the debate community to speak out, either because they do not perceive hostile messages unless personally directed or because they fear reprisal, leads to a world where civil discourse is replaced with hate speech. If we believe in the power of speech, we cannot afford to allow some to be silenced by the antipathy of others. Maybe no one ever comes. Maybe a coach’s team excels to the highest levels of success on the National Circuit. The question remains, at what cost? Some may see our analogies and examples as hyperbolic. We disagree. Many of the online mob attacks are arguably illegal in nature. But the real crime here is that these mobs continue to be empowered by both the silence of bystanders and the pitchforks held by those coaches and camp instructors who spearhead (or tolerate) the abuse. As a community we cannot claim to care about education while we allow children and other educators to be under siege at tournaments and in online forums. VI. Acting on Our Obligation to Protect All of the Children in the Auditorium Coaches must be proactive and stop being cowards–they ought to make protecting all of the children in the auditorium top priority because they have the pedagogical and moral duty to stamp out online bullying. Here are a few places to start: 1. Stop Supporting Institutions that Allow/Encourage Rhetorical Violence that Hurts Children Adult educators must stop supporting institutions that tolerate attacks on minors, judges and coaches. While pedagogical disagreements are acceptable, continued support of environments which show disregard for student, judge, and coach welfare should face financial consequences. Refusing to intervene is morally callous and indicates tacit acceptance of the abuse/bullying of children. Child welfare should determine where coaches and students allocate their resources. If not, we are insincere hypocrites in our claims to want debate to be a safe space for all children.

#### [ROB] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Debater who Better Performatively Resists In-Round Inequalities. Performative resistance refers to our in-round speech acts.

#### [Griffin & Raider] And we shouldn’t use traditionally male-centered calculi to weigh the round – non-cismale debaters are often discredited on security issues, as judges assume they know less about those matters.

Griffin & Raider: Griffin, J. Cinder and Holly Jane Raider. “Women in High School Debate.” *Punishment Paradigms: Pros and Cons*, 1989. CH

Perceptually, women lack the levels of confidence present in males; their expectations of success are lower, and the pressures placed upon them are higher. As a result of socialization, women lack confidence in their public speaking skills. This coupled with the lack of role models leads female debaters to view themselves as tokens and outsiders in the activity very early. This self perception as token "females" creates a performance pressure. 9 For example, if it is assumed that a female debater is not as competent as her male counterpart there is additional pressure on the female to overcome the (not necessarily overt) expectation that she will be inadequate. For many persons this stress is so counterproductive that it interferes with one's judgment, and ultimately the predication that the token will be inadequate may become a fulfilled prophecy. Thus, in some situations performances failure is linked to performance pressure, and not the objective validity of the female debater's inabilities. This performance pressure does not require the explicit low expectations of the dominant group, but results as a consequence of simply being unique.10 This phenomena of performance pressure is especially prevalent on specific topics in high school debate, for example military issues. It is usually presumed that a female does not have a good grasp of military issues. Therefore, a female debater must debate not only as well as her male counterparts, but feels a need to command an even greater level of expertise in this area. Performance pressure effects selection of events and argument preference as well.11 In general, women are not encouraged to discuss military and political issues. Women prefer social and theoretical arguments to military issues, and this is reflected in women's choices of debate arguments. On the collegiate level, more women participq4e in CEDA debate as compared to NDT debate.12 On the high school level the ratio of male to female participants in individual events activities is nearly one to one.13 Therefore, even if a female is not discouraged from entering debate itself, she will not remain in the activity for long because the argument discourse either does not interest her or she is actively discouraged from becoming fluent in it. The overall rate of attrition of women in debate and their decision not to enter college debate after high school may also be related to more noticeable and determinable sexism in the debate community. Sexism is a word that has not been used thus far. Given the charged nature of this issue we have opted to focus discussion on less "sensitive" or "more objective" measures. However, as women in debate who have interviewed and surveyed other women in debate, there are several general statements we can make regarding this issue.

**Thus,** simply debating the topic as written does nothing for me.

## Part 2: Dropping Bombs

#### [Bello] The logic of the WTO was built to further US neoliberal hegemony.

**Bello:** Bello, Walden [Filipino academic, environmentalist, and social worker who served as a member of the House of Representatives of the Philippines] “Why Reform of the WTO is the Wrong Agenda” *Focus on Trade, No. 43*, December 1999, <https://www.tni.org/my/node/6851>

In the wake of the collapse of the Seattle Ministerial, there has emerged the opinion that reform of the WTO is now the program that NGOs, governments, and citizens must embrace. The collapse of the WTO Ministerial is said to provide a unique window of opportunity for a reform agenda. Cited by some as a positive sign is United States Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky's comment, immediately after the collapse of the Seattle Ministerial, that the WTO has outgrown the processes appropriate to an earlier time. An increasing and necessary view, generally shared among the members, was that we needed a process which had a greater degree of internal transparency and inclusion to accommodate a larger and more diverse membership'. (1) Also seen as an encouraging gesture is UK Secretary of State for Trade and Industry Stephen Byers' recent statement to Commonwealth Trade Ministers in New Delhi that the WTO will not be able to continue in its present form. There has to be fundamental and radical change in order for it to meet the needs and aspirations of all 134 of its members. (2) These are, in our view, damage control statements and provide little indication of the seriousness about reform of the two governments that were, pre-Seattle, the stoutest defenders of the inequalities built into the structure, dynamics, and objectives of the WTO. It is unfortunate that they are now being cited to convince developing countries and NGOs to take up an agenda of reform that could lead precisely to the strengthening of an organization that is very fundamentally flawed. What civil society, North and South, should instead be doing at this point is radically cutting down the power of the institution and reducing it to simply another institution in a pluralistic world trading system with multiple systems of governance. Does World Trade Need the World Trade Organization? This is the fundamental question on which the question of reform hinges. World trade did not need the WTO to expand 17-fold between 1948 and 1997, from $124 billion to $10,772 billion. (3) This expansion took place under the flexible GATT trade regime. The WTO's founding in 1995 did not respond to a collapse or crisis of world trade such as happened in the 1930's. It was not necessary for global peace, since no world war or trade-related war had taken place during that period. In the seven major inter-state wars that took place in that period-the Korean War of 1950-53, the Vietnam War of 1945-75, the Suez Crisis of 1956, the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, the 1982 Falklands War, and the Gulf War of 1990-trade conflict did not figure even remotely as a cause. GATT was, in fact, functioning reasonably well as a framework for liberalizing world trade. Its dispute-settlement system was flexible and with its recognition of the 'special and differential status' of developing countries, it provided the space in a global economy for Third World countries to use trade policy for development and industrialization. Why was the WTO established following the Uruguay Round of 1986-94? Of the major trading powers, Japan was very ambivalent, concerned as it was to protect its agriculture as well as its particular system of industrial production that, through formal and informal mechanisms, gave its local producers primary right to exploit the domestic market. The EU, well on the way of becoming a self-sufficient trading bloc, was likewise ambivalent, knowing that its highly subsidized system in agriculture would come under attack. Though demanding greater access to their manufactured and agricultural products in the Northern economies, the developing countries did not see this as being accomplished through a comprehensive agreement enforced by a powerful trade bureaucracy but through discrete negotiations and agreements in the model of the Integrated Program for Commodities (IPCs) and Commodity Stabilization Fund agreed upon under the aegis of UNCTAD in the late seventies. The founding of the WTO served primarily the interest of the United States. Just as it was the US which blocked the founding of the International Trade Organization (ITO) in 1948, when it felt that this would not serve its position of overwhelming economic dominance in the post-war world, so it was the US that became the dominant lobbyist for the comprehensive Uruguay Round and the founding of the WTO in late eighties and early nineties, when it felt that more competitive global conditions had created a situation where its corporate interests now demanded an opposite stance. Just as it was the US's threat in the 1950's to leave GATT if it was not allowed to maintain protective mechanisms for milk and other agricultural products that led to agricultural trade's exemption from GATT rules, so was it US pressure that brought agriculture into the GATT-WTO system in 1995. And the reason for Washington's change of mind was articulated quite candidly by then US Agriculture Secretary John Block at the start of the Uruguay Round negotiations in 1986: [The] idea that developing countries should feed themselves is an anachronism from a bygone era. They could better ensure their food security by relying on US agricultural products, which are available, in most cases at much lower cost. (4) Washington, of course, did not just have developing country markets in mind, but also Japan, South Korea, and the European Union. It was the US that mainly pushed to bring services under WTO coverage, with its assessment that the in the new burgeoning area of international services, and particularly in financial services, its corporations had a lead that needed to be preserved. It was also the US that pushed to expand WTO jurisdiction to the so-called 'Trade-Related Investment Measures' (TRIMs) and 'Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights' (TRIPs) The first sought to eliminate barriers to the system of internal cross-border trade of product components among TNC (transnational corporations) subsidiaries that had been imposed by developing countries in order to develop their industries; the second to consolidate the US advantage in the cutting-edge knowledge-intensive industries.And it was the US that forced the creation of the WTO's formidable dispute-resolution and enforcement mechanism after being frustrated with what US trade officials considered weak GATT efforts to enforce rulings favorable to the US. As Washington's academic point man on trade, C. Fred Bergsten, head of the Institute of International Economics, told the US Senate, the strong WTO dispute settlement mechanism serves US interests because we can now use the full weight of the international machinery to go after those trade barriers, reduce them, get them eliminated. (5) In sum, it has been Washington's changing perception of the needs of its economic interest-groups that have shaped and reshaped the international trading regime. It was not global necessity that gave birth to the WTO in 1995. It was the US's assessment that the interests of its corporations were no longer served by a loose and flexible GATT but needed an all-powerful and wide-ranging WTO. From the free-market paradigm that underpins it, to the rules and regulations set forth in the different agreements that make up the Uruguay Round, to its system of decision-making and accountability, the WTO is a blueprint for the global hegemony of Corporate America. It seeks to institutionalize the accumulated advantages of US corporations. Is the WTO necessary? Yes, to the United States. But not to the rest of the world. The necessity of the WTO is one of the biggest lies of our time, and its acceptance is due to the same propaganda principle practised by Joseph Goebbels: if you repeat a lie often enough, it will be taken as truth. Can the WTO Serve the Interests of the Developing Countries? But what about the developing countries? Is the WTO a necessary structure - one that, whatever its flaws, brings more benefits than costs, and would therefore merit efforts at reform When the Uruguay Round was being negotiated, there was considerable lack of enthusiasm for the process by the developing countries. After all, these countries had formed the backbone of UNCTAD, which, with its system of one-country/one-vote and majority voting, they felt was an international arena more congenial to their interests. They entered the Uruguay Round greatly resenting the large trading powers' policy of weakening and marginalizing UNCTAD in the late seventies and early eighties.Largely passive spectators, with a great number not even represented during the negotiations owing to resource constraints, the developing countries were dragged into unenthusiastic endorsement of the Marrakesh Accord of 1994 that sealed the Uruguay Round and established the WTO. True, there were somedeveloping countries, most of them in the Cairns Group of developed and developing country agro-exporters, that actively promoted the WTO in the hope that they would gain greater market access to their exports, but they were a small minority. To try to sell the WTO to the South, US propagandists evoked the fear that staying out of the WTO would result in a country's isolation from world trade ('like North Korea') and stoked the promise that a 'rules-based system' of world trade would protect the weak countries from unilateral acts by the big trading powers. With their economies dominated by the IMF and the World Bank, with the structural adjustment programs pushed by these agencies having as a central element radical trade liberalization, much weaker as a bloc owing to the debt crisis compared to the 1970's, the height of the 'New International Economic Order', most developing country delegations felt they had no choice but to sign on the dotted line. Over the next few years, however, these countries realized that they had signed away their right to employ a variety of critical trade measures for development purposes. In contrast to the loose GATT framework, which had allowed some space for development initiatives, the comprehensive and tightened Uruguay Round was fundamentally anti-development in its thrust. This is evident in the following: Loss of Trade Policy as Development Tool In signing on to GATT, Third World countries were committed to banning all quantitative restrictions on imports, reduce tariffs on many industrial imports, and promise not to raise tariffs on all other imports. In so doing, they have effectively given up the use of trade policy to pursue industrialization objectives. The way that the NICs, or 'newly industrializing countries', made it to industrial status, via the policy of import substitution, is now effectively removed as a route to industrialization. The anti-industrialization thrust of the GATT-WTO Accord is made even more manifest in the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs). In their drive to industrialize, NICs like South Korea and Malaysia made use of many innovative mechanisms such as trade-balancing requirements that tied the value of a foreign investor's imports of raw materials and components to the value of his or her exports of the finished commodity, or 'local content' regulations which mandated that a certain percentage of the components that went into the making of a product was sourced locally. These rules indeed restricted the maneuvering space of foreign investors, but they were successfully employed by the NICs to marry foreign investment to national industrialization. They enabled the NICs to raise income from capital-intensive exports, develop support industries, bring in technology, while still protecting local entrepreneurs' preferential access to the domestic market. In Malaysia, for instance, the strategic use of local content policy enabled the Malaysians to build a 'national car', in cooperation with Mitsubishi, that has now achieved about 80 per cent local content and controls 70 per cent of the Malaysian market. Thanks to the TRIMs accord, these mechanisms used are now illegal. The Restriction of Technological Diffusion Like the TRIMs agreement, the TRIPs regime is seen as effectively opposed to the industrialization and development efforts of Third World countries. This becomes clear from a survey of the economic history not only of the NICs but of almost all late-industrializing countries. A key factor in their industrial take-off was their relatively easy access to cutting-edge technology: The US industrialized, to a great extent by using but paying very little for British manufacturing innovations, as did the Germans. Japan industrialized by liberally borrowing US technological innovations, but barely compensating the Americans for this. And the Koreans industrialized by copying quite liberally and with little payment US and Japanese product and process technologies. But what is 'technological diffusion' from the perspective of the late industrializer is 'piracy' from that of the industrial leader. The TRIPs regime takes the side of the latter and makes the process of industrialization by imitation much more difficult from hereon. It represents what UNCTAD describes as 'a premature strengthening of the intellectual property system... that favors monopolistically controlled innovation over broad-based diffusion'. (6) The TRIPs regime provides a generalized minimum patent protection of 20 years; increases the duration of the protection for semi-conductors or computer chips; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. The TRIPs accord is a victory for the US high-tech industry, which has long been lobbying for stronger controls over the diffusion of innovations. Innovation in the knowledge-intensive high-tech sector - in electronic software and hardware, biotechnology, lasers, opto-electronics, liquid crystal technology, to name a few - has become the central determinant of economic power in our time. And when any company in the NICs and Third World wishes to innovate, say in chip design, software programming, or computer assembly, it necessarily has to integrate several patented designs and processes, most of them from US electronic hardware and software giants like Microsoft, Intel, and Texas Instruments. (7) As the Koreans have bitterly learned, exorbitant multiple royalty payments to what has been called the American 'high tech mafia' keeps one's profit margins very low while reducing incentives for local innovation. The likely outcome is for a Southern manufacturer simply to pay royalties for a technology rather than to innovate, thus perpetuating the technological dependence on Northern firms.Thus, TRIPs enables the technological leader, in this case the United States, to greatly influence the pace of technological and industrial development in rival industrialized countries, the NICs, and the Third World. Watering Down the 'Special and Differential Treatment' Principle The central principle of UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) - an organization disempowered by the establishment of the WTO - is that owing to the critical nexus between trade and development, developing countries must not be subjected to the same expectations, rules, and regulations that govern trade among the developed countries. Owing to historical and structural considerations, developing countries need special consideration and special assistance in leveling the playing field for them to be able to participate equitably in world trade. This would include both the use of protective tariffs for development purposes and preferential access of developing country exports to developed country markets. While GATT was not centrally concerned with development, it did recognize the 'special and differential status' of the developing countries. Perhaps the strongest statement of this was in the Tokyo Round Declaration in 1973, which recognized the importance of the application of differential measures in developing countries in ways which will provide special and more favourable treatment for them in areas of negotiation where this is feasible. (8) Different sections of the evolving GATT code allowed countries to renegotiate tariff bindings in order to promote the establishment of certain industries; allowed developing countries to use tariffs for economic development and fiscal purposes; allowed them to use quantitative restrictions to promote infant industries; and conceded the principle of non-reciprocity by developing countries in trade negotiation. (9) The 1979 Framework Agreement known at the Enabling Clause also provided a permanent legal basis for General System of Preferences (GSP) schemes that would provide preferential access to developing country exports. (10) A significant shift occurred in the Uruguay Round. GSP schemes were not bound, meaning tariffs could be raised against developing country until they equaled the bound rates applied to imports for all sources. Indeed, during the negotiations, the threat to remove GSP was used as a form of bilateral pressure on developing countries. (11) SDT was turned from a focus on a special right to protect and special rights of market access to one of responding to special adjustment difficulties in developing countries stemming from the implementation of WTO decisions. (12) Measures meant to address the structural inequality of the trading system gave way to measures, such as a lower rate of tariff reduction or a longer time frame for implementing decisions, which regarded the problem of developing countries as simply that of catching up in an essentially even playing field. STD has been watered down in the WTO, and this is not surprising for the neoliberal agenda that underpins the WTO philosophy differs from the Keynesian assumptions of GATT: that there are no special rights, no special protections needed for development. The only route to development is one that involves radical trade (and investment) liberalization. Fate of the Special Measures for Developing Countries Perhaps the best indicators of the marginal consideration given to developing countries in the WTO is the fate of the measures that were supposed to respond to the special conditions of developing countries. There were three key agreements which promoters of the WTO claimed were specifically designed to meet the needs of the South: The Special Ministerial Agreement approved in Marrakesh in April 1994, which decreed that special compensatory measures would be taken to counteract the negative effects of trade liberalization on the net food-importing developing countries; The Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, which mandated thart the system of quotas on developing country exports of textiles and garments to the North would be dismantled over ten years; The Agreement on Agriculture, which, while 'imperfect', nevertheless was said to promise greater market access to developing country agricultural products and begin the process of bringing down the high levels of state support and subsidization of EU and US agriculture, which was resulting in the dumping of massive quantities of grain on Third World markets. What happened to these measures? The Special Ministerial Decision taken at Marrakesh to provide assistance to 'Net Food Importing Countries' to offset the reduction of subsidies that would make food imports more expensive for the 'Net Food Importing Countries' has never been implemented. Though world crude prices more than doubled in 1995/96, the World Bank and the IMF scotched an idea of any offsetting aid by arguing that the price increase was not due to the Agreement on Agriculture, and besides there was never any agreement anyway on who would be responsible for providing the assistance. (13) The Agreement on Textiles and Clothing committed the developed countries to bring under WTO discipline all textile and garment imports over four stages, ending on January 1, 2005. A key feature was supposed to be the lifting of quotas on imports restricted under the Multifiber Agreement (MFA) and similar schemes which had been used to contain penetration of developed country markets by cheap clothing and textile imports from the Third World. Developed countries retained, however, the right to choose which product lines to liberalize when, so that they first brought mainly unrestricted products into the WTO discipline and postponed dealing with restricted products till much later. Thus, in the first phase, all restricted products continued to be under quota, as only items where imports were not considering threatening-like felt hats or yarn of carded fine animal hair - were included in the developed countries' notifications. Indeed, the notifications for the coverage of products for liberalization on January 1, 1998 showed that even at the second stage of implementation only a very small proportion" of restricted products would see their quotas lifted. (14) Given this trend, John Whalley notes that the belief is now widely held in the developing work that in 2004, while the MFA may disappear, it may well be replaced by a series of other trade instruments, possibly substantial increases in anti-dumping duties. (15) When it comes to the Agreement on Agriculture, which was sold to developing countries during the Uruguay Round as a major step toward providing market access to developing country imports and bringing down the high levels of domestic support for first world farming interests that results in dumping of commodities in third world markets, little gains in market access after five years into developed country markets have been accompanied by even higher levels of overall subsidization-through ingenious combinations of export subsidies, export credits, market support, and various kinds of direct income payments. The figures speak for themselves: the level of overall subsidization of agriculture in the OECD countries rose from $182 billion in 1995 when the WTO was born to $280 billion in 1997 to $362 billion in 1998! Instead of the beginning of a New Deal, the AOA, in the words of a former Philippine Secretary of Trade, has perpetuated the unevenness of a playing field which the multilateral trading system has been trying to correct. Moreover, this has placed the burden of adjustment on developing countries relative to countries who can afford to maintain high levels of domestic support and export subsidies. (16) The collapse of the agricultural negotiations in Seattle is the best example of how extremely difficult it is to reform the AOA. The European Union opposed till the bitter end language in an agreement that would commit it to 'significant reduction' of its subsidies. But the US was not blameless. It resolutely opposed any effort to cut back on its forms of subsidies such as export credits, direct income for farmers, and 'emergency' farm aid, as well as any mention of its practice of dumping products in developing country markets. Oligarchic Decision-Making as a Central, Defining Process Is the system of WTO decisionmaking reformable? While far more flexible than the WTO, the GATT was, of course, far from perfect, and one of the bad traits that the WTO took over from it was the system of decision-making. GATT functioned through a process called 'consensus'. Now consensus responded to the same problem that faced the IMF and the World Bank's developed country members: how to assure control at a time that the numbers gave the edge to the new countries of the South. In the Fund and the Bank, the system of decision-making evolved had the weight of a country's vote determined by the size of its capital subscriptions, which gave the US and the other rich countries effective control of the two organizations. In the GATT, a one-country one-vote system was initially tried, but the big trading powers saw this as inimical to their interests. Thus, the last time a vote was taken in GATT was in 1959. (17) The system that finally emerged was described by US economist Bergsten as one that does not work by voting. It works by a consensus arrangement which, to tell the truth, is managed by four - the Quads: the United States, Japan, European Union, and Canada.(18) He continued: Those countries have to agree if any major steps are going to be made, that is true. But no votes. (19) Indeed, so undemocratic is the WTO that decisions are arrived at informally, via caucuses convoked in the corridors of the ministerials by the big trading powers. The formal plenary sessions, which in democracies are the central arena for decision-making, are reserved for speeches. The key agreements to come out of the first and second ministerials of the WTO-the decision to liberalize information technology trade taken at the first ministerial in Singapore in 1996 and the agreement to liberalize trade in electronic commerce arrived at in Geneva in 1998-were all decided in informal backroom sessions and simply presented to the full assembly as faits accompli. Consensus simply functioned to render non-transparent a process where smaller, weaker countries were pressured, browbeaten, or bullied to conform to the 'consensus' forged among major trading powers. With surprising frankness, at a press conference in Seattle, US Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, who played the pivotal role in all three ministerials, described the dynamics and consequences of this system of decision-making: The process, including even at Singapore as recently as three years ago, was a rather exclusionary one. All meetings were held between 20 and 30 keycountries...And that meant 100 countries, 100, were never in the room... [T]his led to an extraordinarily bad feeling that they were left our of the process and that the results even at Singapore had been dictated to them by the 25 or 30 privileged countries who were in the room. (20) Then, after registering her frustration at the WTO delegates' failing to arrive at consensus via supposedly broader 'working groups' set up for the Seattle ministerial, Barshefsky warned delegates: ...[I] have made very clear and I reiterated to all ministers today that, if we are unable to achieve that goal, I fully reserve the right to also use a more exclusive process to achieve a final outcome. There is no question about either my right as the chair to do it or my intention as the chair to do it.... (21) And she was serious about ramming through a declaration at the expense of non-representativeness, with India, one of the key developing country members of the WTO, being routinely excluded from private talks organized by the United States in last ditch efforts to come up with a face-saving deal. (22) In damage-containment mode after the collapse of the Seattle Ministerial, Barshefsky, WTO Director General Mike Moore, and other rich country representatives have spoken about the need for WTO 'reform'. But none have declared any intention of pushing for a one-county/one-vote majority decision-making system or a voting system weighted by population size, which would be the only fair and legitimate methods in a democratic international organization. The fact is, such mechanisms will never be adopted, for this would put the developing countries in a preponderant role in terms of decision-making. Should One Try to Reform a Jurassic Institution? Reform is a viable strategy when the system is question is fundamentally fair but has simply been corrupted such as the case with some democracies. It is not a viable strategy when a system is so fundamentally unequal in purposes, principles, and processes as the WTO. The WTO systematically protects and the trade and economic advantages of the rich countries, particularly the United States. It is based on a paradigm or philosophy that denigrates the right to take actvist measures to achieve development on the part of less developed countries, thus leading to a radical dilution of their right to 'special and differntial treatment'. The WTO raises inequality into a principle of decisionmaking.The WTO is often promoted as a 'rules-based' trading framework that protects the weaker and poorer countries from unilateral actions by the stronger states. The opposite is true: the WTO, like many other multilateral international agreements, is meant to instututionalize and legtimize inequality. Its main purpose is to reduce the tremendous policing costs to the stronger powers that would be involved in disciplining many small countries in a more fluid, less structured international system. It is not surprising that both the WTO and the IMF are currently mired in a severe crisis of legitimacy. For both are highly centralized, highly unaccountable, highly non-transparent global institutions that seek to subjugate, control, or harness vast swathes of global economic, social, political, and environmental processes to the needs and interests of a global minority of states, elites, and TNCs. The dynamics of such institutions clash with the burgeoning democratic aspirations of peoples, countries, and communities in both the North and the South. The centralizing dynamics of these institutions clash with the efforts of communities and nations to regain control of their fate and achieve a modicum of security by deconcentrating and decentralizing economic and political power. In other words, these are Jurassic institutions in an age of participatory political and economic democracy.

#### [Waters] AND, – debate culture uses violent white cismasculinity like the WTO: white cismale debaters speak of “hitting,” “beating,” and “owning” opponents. The “power talks” and “cult of personality” created around successful white cismales, along with aggressive “post-rounding,” are symptoms of a larger problem. Just like nukes, these problems are CONCEALED and sprung on targets before they can resist.

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

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

#### [Smith] This exclusion also applies to black debaters – they too are targeted and ignored by white cismales.

Smith: Smith, Elijah. [Director, Rutgers University–Newark Debate Team] “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” Victory Briefs, September 2013. SN

**At every tournament you attend this year look around the cafeteria and take note of which students are not sitting amongst you and your peers. Despite being some of the best and the brightest in the nation, many students are alienated from and choose to not participate in an activity I like to think of as homeplace.** In addition to the heavy financial burden associated with national competition, **the exclusionary atmosphere of a debate tournament discourages black students from participating. Widespread awareness of the same lack of participation in policy debate has led to a growing movement towards alternative styles and methods of engaging the gatekeepers of the policy community, (Reid-Brinkley 08) while little work has been done to address or even acknowledge the same concern in Lincoln Douglas debate.** Unfortunately students of color are not only forced to cope with a reality of structural violence outside of debate, but within an activity they may have joined to escape it in the first place. We are facing more than a simple trend towards marginalization occurring in Lincoln Douglas, but a culture of exclusion that locks minority participants out of the ranks of competition. It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand.** It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. **Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. **Current coaches and competitors alike dismiss concerns of racism and exclusion, won’t teach other students anything about identity in debate other than how to shut down competitors who engage in alternative styles and discourses, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting.**

## Thus:

#### [Chandran] I affirm that WTO – meaning judges and debaters – ought to reduce IPP, the violent practices that make debate unsafe for non-cismales. I endorse a non-cismale occupation of the debate space as a form of counter-hegemonic resistance, modeled on Indian women’s occupation movements.

**Chandran:** Chandran, Rina. [Business journalist in the U.S. and India, Johns Hopkins] “Indian wom[x]n reclaim public spaces, defying male critics” *Reuters*, March 2016. AZ

MUMBAI (Thomson Reuters Foundation) - **It began with two Indian women hanging out on Mumbai streets in defiance after a series of violent crimes against women. It has since grown and even spread** to Pakistan**, as women assert their right to public spaces in male-dominated societies.** A wom[o]n walks past a police officer stands guard at a security barricade in Mumbai The Why Loiter? street campaign was inspired by a book of the same name, that examined the risks for wom[x]n on Mumbai’s streets. It came as an intense spotlight fell on wom[x]n’s safety in India following the 2012 fatal gang rape of a student on a bus in Delhi and the 2014 rape of a wom[o]n by her Uber taxi driver in Delhi. While the 2012 gang rape triggered massive protests and led to the tightening of rape laws in India, some of the reaction to it and the Uber rape blamed the victims, said Sameera Khan, co-author of Why Loiter? “It’s the same blame game every time: why was she out that time of night? Why was she alone? Or who was she with? It’s all so hostile, and made out to be the victim’s fault,” said Khan in Mumbai. SPONSORED “But why is it okay for wom[x]n to only be out at certain times or for certain reasons? **Why should anyone question a woman’s right to be in a public space at any time?”** The number of rapes in India rose by 9 percent to 33,707 in 2014, according to official data. The country’s conservative and patriarchal attitudes mean victims of sexual assault are often shunned by their families and communities and blamed for the violence perpetrated against them, say activists and lawyers. While the numbers of working wom[x]n and female students are on the rise in India, it is unusual to see wom[x]n out by themselves at night. In a Thomson Reuters Foundation poll of 15 of the world’s major cities, Delhi ranked as having the fourth most dangerous transport systems for wom[x]n. Mumbai, India’s financial hub, is regarded as being safer, but attitudes toward wom[x]n in public spaces are just as conservative, said Neha Singh. Singh leads wom[x]n on walks and bicycle rides in various parts of the city with other wom[x]n, and curates a blog called Why Loiter? The wom[x]n have encountered men who follow them and heckle them, and policemen telling them to go home. **“The concept that women, like men, can just be loitering in a public space, without doing anything else, is so alien to them,” she said. “They immediately think she must be a prostitute or somehow inviting trouble and must be told off or sent home,” said Singh, after a rehearsal of a play called Loitering, to be staged on March 8 to mark International Women’s Day.** The campaign has prompted a demand to relax curfews in Indian colleges, where wom[x]n have stricter curfews than men, and a movement in Pakistan called Girls@Dhabas, referring to the no-frills restaurants typically frequented by young men. In India, recent campaigns including #SelfiewithDaughter and Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s ‘Beti padhao, beti bachao’ (educate your daughter, save your daughter) have helped increase awareness of wom[x]n’s rights. New Delhi is now one of 25 cities which are part of the United Nations’ safe cities project, with measures to improve street lighting, install toilets, set up helplines and strengthen laws on sexual harassment. Municipal officials however, admit that ending sexual violence will also need sustained public campaigns that dispel sexism and challenge gender stereotypes. “We cannot, as a nation, claim progress until wom[x]n can feel safe anywhere at anytime,” said Singh.

## Part 3: You’re Gonna Miss Me When I’m Gone

#### [Hodges] THIS PERFORMANCE IS KEY TO OCCUPYING THE DEBATE SPACE: THIS IS MY FORM OF REDUCING IPP. I’m not debating the topic as written – that would prop up the existing weapons.

**Hodges:** Hodges, Simon. [Director of Storyourself, which activates storytelling for campaigns and organizations] “What’s So Special About Storytelling for Social Change?” January 2014. AZ

While working in the belly of corporate communications some years ago, I stumbled across a storytelling night at Amsterdam’s Mezrab cultural centre. Nude model drawing classes and the Mahabharata in Dutch were also on the menu, but it was the storytelling that caught my eye, hosted on an open stage by an Iranian storyteller by the name of Sahand Sahbedivani. Even through the candlelight and the smoke, the rapt attention on the faces of the audience made it clear that they loved the stories of human drama they were hearing, which was the opposite of my experience in my work. Despite the fact that I was working extremely hard to get the company’s stories more attention, they rarely ignited anything like this response in the public’s imagination. The difference between a profit-making organisation and an alternative arts event was obvious but intriguing. Why did storytelling at Mezrab succeed while corporate communications generally fell flat? The answers are relevant to anyone who has a story to tell, and nowhere is that more important than in the field of social change. Today, storytelling is wildly popular. It’s seen as the key to succeeding in business, strengthening organizational culture, and drumming up support for advocacy and campaigns. But why is that? The first reason is obvious: climate change, inequality, **violence and other challenges can’t be solved by doing more of the same. We need** new **narratives that connect with peoples’ deepest motivations and promote more radical action.** Stories engage people at every level **- not just in their minds but in their emotions, values and imaginations, which are** the drivers of real change**. So if we want to transform society, we must learn to tell - and listen to - a new set of stories about the world we want to create.** So far so good, but what actually makes for a good story in this sense? That’s where my visits to Mezrab were so instructive. For one thing, the storytellers that got the most attention were not necessarily the funniest or wittiest. Instead, they were the ones that were most prepared to put their skin in the game, to state something that was uncomfortably close to how they saw the world. **This radical subjectivity – perhaps the basis of all great art – is a crucial lesson for anyone who wants to communicate a complex topic.** When we allow our own insights to organise the telling of a story, we give a more compelling account of events. Why? Because our deepest values are closest to what we share with others. Business is only now learning that telling a good story requires authenticity, as if bewildered by the discovery of truth. Storytelling in social movements is more advanced. In fact for those who work for social justice, the problem has not been making up good stories, but getting people to listen to the ones they have already. This can be especially hard when movements are very broad, and when the issues they deal with are so large in scope. **But my storytelling sessions taught me another lesson that’s useful in this context: even when the issues are large and complex, we feel compelled to listen when we ourselves are included in the storyline. The danger of much current rhetoric is that justified frustration at injustice comes across in torrents of abuse. The parlous state of the economy, for example, is not just the fault of the bankers and politicians who have overspent, it’s also something that involves all of us on a daily basis in our roles as consumers and producers, employers and employees, shareholders and borrowers. When anyone is marginalized or demonized in this context, they are less likely to be part of the solution, even if they have the power to make change. The Mezrab storytellers were successful because they and their audience felt united with each other at some level, even if they might disagree on the surface.** In myth, drastic opposites are often reconciled through elaborate plots and casts of characters. We can do the same in our own stories by not alienating the people we need to talk to or persuade. Michael Margolis, a San Francisco-based ‘story architect,’ makes this point elegantly by asking that our stories of social change become love stories. His argument is that undermining belief systems – a necessary step in social change – requires an emphasis on shared values and commonality. These shared values can then be used to show when, why and how some people aren’t living up to them in practice. **Stressing unity between divergent interests has often been the basis of effective change - look no further than the genesis of the European Union after World War Two.** A more local example came in the wake of the killing of British soldier Lee Rigby by two self-proclaimed Muslims in Woolwich, southeast London, in 2013. This event outraged the far-right English Defence League (EDL) who organised a protest outside a mosque in York. Knowing of this plan and anticipating violence, members of the mosque invited the protestors in for tea and biscuits. In the discussion that followed, both parties realised that they had a common interest in ending extremist violence.

#### [CBTJ] AND THIS IS NOT A FUTURITY CLAIM – MY PERFORMANCE RIGHT HERE, RIGHT NOW FIGHTS THE SQUO. Debate becomes an echo chamber of cismale oppression unless we interject non-cismale thought into it.

**CBTJ:** Cultural Bridges to Justice. [cbtj has grown into a consortium of competent, highly effective, passionate trainers and activists from across the United States who believe that challenging oppression, while forging justice, is both a practical necessity and a moral imperative of contemporary life] "When I Doubt Myself and other Females– challenging internalized sexism / internalized misogyny" *Cultural Bridges to Justice*, no date (most recent mentioned date is 2011). AZ

**Internalized sexism is defined as the involuntary belief by girls and women that the lies,** stereotypes and **myths about girls and women that are delivered to everyone in a sexist society ARE TRUE. Girls and women, boys and men hear the sexist messages (lies and stereotypes) about females over their entire lifetimes.** They hear that women are stupid, weak, passive, manipulative, with no capacity for intellectual pursuits or leadership. There are two logical, predictable consequences of a lifetime of such messages. First, boys / men will grow to believe many of the messages, and treat women accordingly. They will be thoroughly indoctrinated into their role in sexism, protecting their male privilege by colluding with the perpetuation of sexism. But there is a second logical consequence - **the same messages also stick to girls and women, resulting in internalized sexism / internalized misogyny. girls and women are taught to act out the lies and stereotypes, doubting themselves and other non-males (sometimes called “horizontal hostility.”) This is the way women collude with the perpetuation of sexism. For the sexist system to be maintained and passed on to the next generation, we all must** believe **the messages (lies and stereotypes) to some degree, and collude with sexism by performing our assigned roles.** Most progressive, non-profit organizations, whether in human services or social change, recognize that their mission cannot be completely fulfilled until all forms of oppression (racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, ableism, anti-Semitism, et al) are addressed. Many of these same organizations, however, do not recognize the forms of internalized oppression that interfere with accomplishing their missions. **Women’s organizations, in particular, must take conscious action to recognize, acknowledge and interrupt internalized sexism / internalized misogyny as it affects individual women and the organization as a whole.** This workshop encourages females to recognize and examine the harmful impact of a lifetime of sexist messages on their own self image, as well as their attitudes toward other females. Exercises and skills are offered to affirm females, females’s skills and to challenge internalized sexism, in our own lives, for females in our lives, and in our females’s organizations. Sample Objectives To provide a framework and common language for genuine dialogue about sexism and internalized sexism, and to create an environment which encourages such dialogue.

#### [Sachs et al] DO NOT tell me that a TVA solves – been there, done that, bought the T-shirt and it didn’t fit. I should not have to CHECK IN WITH CISMEN to make sure my positions are okay. And telling me to “just debate the topic” reifies static notions of the space. THIS IS TRUE EVEN WHEN THE DEBATER READING T IS NON-CISMALE – the issue is with the argument, not the identity of the person reading it.

**Sachs et al:** Sarah Sachs, Annie Zhu, Mollie Cowger, Sammi Cannold, Paige Mackenzie, Juliet Nelson, and Stephanie Franklin. “Gender Disparity in Debate” *NSD Update*, comment section, December 2011. AZ

To the debate community, As a disclaimer: we understand that this post is long, but it also the opinion of seven non-male debaters in the activity; we sincerely hope that people read it through. We have made a diligent effort to keep this brief, so please bear with us. We are current girl debaters who have decided to post together because we believe that we all come from a similar point of view and can share our experiences together. In the past, the **issue of females in debate has been discussed seriously for two weeks, and then mocked for the rest of the year.** Although discussion has once again died down, we hope that, by writing this post together, people see how serious these issues are to us. **We** have **hear**d the **opinions of those who have graduated or quit.** We think it is time to hear the thoughts of those who are still in the activity. First, we want to discuss our experiences at camp. **Being outnumbered 4:1 in a lab** is not especially hard - in top lab of VBI this year**, four females sat together almost exclusively the first week.** When it was time to break up into drill groups, we would almost always end up partnering with each other. This didn’t really seem to bother us until **a lab leader would say something like, “try to work with the females, guys,” and the boys would** start **laugh**ing**. We felt like we were being treated like charity, and we didn’t see why everyone else found that funny.** Being a competitive non-male in a male dominated debate camp can sometimes be very difficult. **When we ask boys to be our partners in lab, we have to deal with the “girl likes boy” jokes for the rest of camp. Just like you, we want to work.** Simple things like being teased for a nonexistent crush make it impossible to feel respected and focused. For the crushes that are real, people in debate adopt a disgusting paradox. If a girl likes a boy and he doesn’t like her back, she becomes the center of all jokes and punch lines. This can be upsetting and embarrassing. If a girl doesn’t like a boy back, she becomes a slut who is harassed from then on out. We are always the people they joke about, never him. These instances have not been experienced by all seven of us – some of us have had more positive experiences in the activity than others. However, we all believe that it is important to change the sexism that has affected non-male debaters generally. There are many stories and anecdotes we can tell, but we believe that it is more important to be proactive in making sure these situations don’t happen again. Sarah, Paige, Mollie, Annie, and Stephanie have all had the luxury of being on an all females/non-male-dominated team with a non-male coach. They have had the privilege of non-male role models and teammates to go to when faced with problems regarding sexist behavior or otherwise. Unfortunately, there are only about seven non-male coaches and two schools in the community who can provide similar experiences. So, we, as active non-males on the circuit, want to express our commitment to current and future generations of females in debate. **We are all girl female debaters who want nothing more than to talk to and share our experiences with other females.** Rather than just being role models, we want to be friends - the important thing isn't having people to look up to as competitive figure heads (e.g. oh, Catherine Tarsney won TOC so I know a girl can do it) but instead to just have people to talk to about the issues we have to deal with. Beyond just being available to talk to other females, though, we also promise to A) defend other females who are being attacked in conversation B) not talk about other females behind their back C) call out people who are behaving offensively. Regardless of whether the debate over hiring more or less females at debate camps is settled, we believe that it is important that females have people they can talk to even outside of that setting. We want to be those females and are 100% dedicated to forming that kind of network. We also realize that there are a lot of guys who have made a conscious effort to stop this kind of behavior and work hard to make the community a safe and enjoyable place for females, and we want to say thank you - it has really helped us love debate and grow as debaters. However, we feel as though there are enough guys who engage in this type of detrimental behavior for us to speak up about it. There has also been a lot of discussion on this thread about numbers, and whether or not it makes sense for there to be less competitive success for females. We don’t think that that is the point of this discussion –the problem is much larger than that. Guys just need to stop being sexist jerks. One might say that this isn’t a “systematic issue,” but we have witnessed it with our own eyes. We have witnessed females quitting debate, leaving immediately after they graduate because they hated the community; we have witnessed females recounting all of the horrible encounters they had both in and out of round with sexist behavior. Ultimately, we, like Catherine, believe that it is the small things that make females less excluded from the activity. **Male debaters have told us to our face that they know they** a**re douchebags, but that they think that it’s funny to see females overreact.** This is NOT okay; guys should not get pleasure out of seeing females upset and miserable. To every guy who has ever called a girl a slut, whore, or bitch; to every guy who has characterized females as crazy and emotional; to every guy who has made a sexist joke or targeted a specific girl and laughed it off - what you do has real effects on us as current debaters. **It has made some of us doubt continuing to stay in the activity and others have to witness females, who are usually strong and aggressive, break down because of this very real sexism. We don’t ask for anything other than for you to realize that this is not okay.** The next time you make a joke or a side

#### [Little] And INNOVATION NET BENEFIT: accepting this aff as a form of resistance lets the activity keep evolving – Ks and performance were radical when they were first introduced, but we need them to keep progressing.

**Little:** Little, William [adjunct assistant professor in Sociology at the University of Victoria] “Introduction to Sociology.” *opentextbc*, chapter 21, no date. SN

**Social movements are purposeful, organized groups striving to work toward a common goal.** These **groups might be attempting to create change (Occupy Wall Street, Arab Spring), to resist change (anti-globalization movement), or to provide a political voice to those otherwise disenfranchised (civil rights movements). Social movements create social change.** Consider the effect of the 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. This disaster exemplifies how a change in the environment, coupled with the use of technology to fix that change, combined with anti-oil sentiment in social movements and social institutions, led to changes in offshore oil drilling policies. Subsequently, in an effort to support the Gulf Coast’s rebuilding efforts, changes occurred. From grassroots marketing campaigns that promote consumption of local seafood to municipal governments needing to coordinate with federal cleanups, organizations develop and shift to meet the changing needs of the society. **Just as we saw with the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, social movements have, throughout history, influenced societal shifts.** Sociology looks at these moments through the lenses of three major perspectives. The functionalist perspective looks at the big picture, focusing on the way that all aspects of society are integral to the continued health and viability of the whole. A functionalist might focus on why social movements develop, why they continue to exist, and what social purposes they serve. On one hand, social movements emerge when there is a dysfunction in the relationship between systems. The union movement developed in the 19th century when the economy no longer functioned to distribute wealth and resources in a manner that provided adequate sustenance for workers and their families. **On the other hand, when studying social movements themselves, functionalists observe that movements must change their goals as initial aims are met or they risk dissolution.** Several organizations associated with the anti-polio industry folded after the creation of an effective vaccine that made the disease virtually disappear. Can you think of another social movement whose goals were met? What about one whose goals have changed over time? **The critical perspective focuses on the creation and reproduction of inequality. Someone applying the conflict perspective would likely be interested in how social movements are generated through systematic inequality**, and how social change is constant, speedy, and unavoidable. In fact, the conflict that this perspective sees as inherent in social relations drives social change. For example, **the** National Association for the Advancement of Colored People **(NAACP) was founded in the United States in 1908. Partly created in response to the horrific lynchings occurring in the southern United States, the organization fought to secure the constitutional rights guaranteed in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, which established an end to slavery, equal protection under the law, and universal male suffrage (NAACP 2011).** While those goals have been achieved, **the organization remains active today, continuing to fight against inequalities in civil rights and to remedy discriminatory practices.**

#### [Polson] AND NO, THIS DISCUSSION IS NOT GOING TO BE TABLED. WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THIS RIGHT NOW, BECAUSE IN-ROUND IS THE BEST PLACE TO HAVE THIS DISCUSSION.

**Polson:** Polson, Dana Roe. [Ph.D. in Language, Literacy and Culture, University of Maryland] “‘Longing for Theory:’ Performance Debate in Action.” Baltimore City Schools, 2012. BS

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? Aaron, a high school student at the time of the interview, believed that students, in general, “stay silent” about the social issues they are experiencing. He attributed this issue to the conventional vision of poverty as evidence of deviance. I think when you’re dealing with the population like urban city kids, a lot of times we stay silent about a lot of it, really heavy issues....I think probably why a lot of people don’t like talking about social issues in this school is because they probably live in those certain issues....poverty is also seen as this notion of lacking something. You’re lacking money, in this case, your you’re lacking some type of moral or ethical backgrounds... [many people]... look down upon poverty seeing that as being bum, poor, you know, like, you know, being deviant, trying to always get over on somebody.... (Aaron, interview, p. 10-12) Poverty is therefore a marker of lack, and poverty is taken to be evidence of, at best, laziness or lack of ambition, and at worst, deviance and moral or ethical deficiency. This implicit moral judgment of “bum, poor...deviant,” made by people who have resources, silences people who lack them. Thus silenced, they are unable to explore a structural position that might look at their poverty in a different, more empowering way. As Freire tells us regarding oppression: we ‘must first critically recognize its causes.’ Aaron also saw the debate community at large as ignoring the socio-economic conditions of debaters (ibid). This ignoring could be seen, for example, in the kinds of debate resolutions that are chosen yearly,23 which often relate to foreign affairs or, in the case of the 2012 resolution, space exploration. Aaron saw the debaters’ silence compounded by the debate world’s complicity. I’d like to look at how debate gives participants a chance to have their voices heard in a very literal sense. As Scott Smith points out, adolescents perpetually feel that they are not being listened to by adults. To have an activity based on the listening-to of students feeds a need, perhaps especially for the working class or poor Black students seen in this study, because they are racially/economically coded as other and thus not seen or heard as much as white privileged youth are. I’m reminded again of Charles Bernschein’s belief that the most traditional forms of policy *debate are better pedagogically than most classroom pedagogy in urban areas, in which student silence is often welcomed.* In policy debate tournaments of all kinds, student voices are almost all that is heard for 90 minutes at a time. They talk for long stretches of time in a structured way; other students have to listen intently to them in order to respond intelligently, and at the end an adult or older peer may give a thoughtful critique of what was said, designed to help the student improve for the next time their voice is heard. The adult and the peers have had to listen in a sustained and focused way to each particular voice, and not only to listen, but to engage and respond. *Elaine Smith, a coach, celebrated the very basic aspect of being heard as she coached members of the Paul Robeson School’s team. She thought of debate as an activity in which students could be themselves around others being themselves: debate as self-actualization.*

**And that’s a unique advantage of the aff –** we only hear from debaters after they’ve graduated, but this aff lets us have the discussion about PRESENT-DAY issues.

#### [Amer] DROP-OUT NET BENEFIT: this keeps me here. Non-cismale debaters leave the activity after being continuously told to hold their tongues – EXTINCTION IS ALREADY HAPPENING.

**Amer:** Amer, Areeba. [Greenhill student] “Sexism is a problem in debate, female debaters say” *The Evergreen*, April 2016. AZ

Despite the success of Greenhill Debate, **female debaters often leave the program.** According to class rosters, there are currently only five females in the Advanced Debate class out of a total of 13 students. Of these five, there is only one active non-male senior debater. Many say this is due to the apparent sexist behavior in debate, not exclusively at Greenhill, but at tournaments as well. Before senior Brooke Bulmash’s first debate tournament her freshman year, Cindy Timmons, Director of Debate Aaron Timmons’ wife, who often helps at tournaments, sat her and the other females **females down to discuss the way they should handle themselves during a tournament. They were told to hold their tongue and mind the volume of their voice, because trying to match boys’ behavior would paint them in a bad light.** Whereas boys might be perceived as assertive, females are often perceived as ‘bossy,’ even if they are simply rising to the same level of aggression as their male opponents. Brooke said she soon realized why this conversation was important so early on in her debate career. Although the treatment of females in debate at Greenhill was fair and equal, the tournaments were a different story. “I was about to give the first constructive speech, and as I gave [my opponents] the flash-drive with my speech on it, and I was walking back to my computer I heard, ‘Debate Barbie,’ [from the opposing boys] which was very unsettling. That threw me off for the rest of the round and even the rest of the tournament,” Brooke said. According to Brooke, the incident made her realize the amount of criticism that females receive in debate. She said it’s not just the way females speak that is scrutinized, but also the way they dress. “There is a lot of scrutiny on the way you dress as a debater. females who wear high heels and a lot of makeup and not necessarily business attire are seen as less competitive,” Brooke said. Middle and Upper School Debate Coach Eric Forslund said that sexism isn’t exclusive to debate, but is an issue throughout competitive academic fields. “I think there are some pressures females face nationally. When they are involved in high-level academic events, there is pressure to not be associated with that. I’ve seen that quite a bit, there is more pressure to do things that are considered feminine,” Mr. Forslund said. Senior debater Grace Kuang said that there is pressure on the females to not make mistakes in class, as they risk losing credibility when they do. “It’s weird because a lot of the people there, especially guys, aren’t intentionally trying to be sexist. It’s like when you get a group of guys together who are really intelligent and who think they are really intelligent, there’s this group mentality that always happens where it feels like you’re consistently undermined, or if you speak up in class and give the wrong answer, there’s more loss of credibility when you do it than when they do it,” Grace said. Senior Shivani Daftary, who is still enrolled in the class but no longer debates competitively, said that this creates an exclusive atmosphere where females do not always feel comfortable. “I think **females may be deterred from the activity because they might not want to be in a class that’s full of just guys. It’s kind of intimidating. The way that guys go about learning is different than females, and when you don’t have any other females on the team or only have one other girl, it can seem a little alienating. In a sense, it seems like, ‘Why am I doing this activity if I’m not treated in the same way, even if it may be unintentional or subconscious?’” Shivani said. Shivani said part of the reason she left competitive debate was because of the lack of female role models in the activity.** “Partially it had to do with the fact that I had other commitments and I didn’t want to give up everything for debate, so I switched to public forum because it was less time intensive. But another portion of it was also the way that male coaches, not intentionally, but especially in the debate world, teach in general is very different than how a non-male might coach. They expect that you know something, and if you don’t, it’s guy mentality that they joke around about it,” Shivani said. Freshman Sophia Hurst, who is in the Introductory to Debate class, said that boys in her class form a camaraderie that excludes females. “The team dynamic is very masculine and very based on a male dynamic. It may not be sexist, but there is definitely exclusion throughout the debate community,” Sophia said. According to Director of Debate Aaron Timmons, Greenhill’s debate staff recognizes these issues and has had conversations about possible solutions. “Start with young females and allow them to have a voice. One of the things we have done in the last four to five years is develop a Lower School speech and debate club, and when they’re younger, we have the females debating mainly with females and the boys debating with boys. It’s to develop a sense of confidence and a sense of a voice that they may not have had,” Mr. Timmons said. Freshmen debater Esha Julka noted that it is up to the females in debate to serve as role models to other females who may be hesitating to join the team. “As females, it’s our responsibility to do so because the only way we are going to get females to stick with an activity that they love is to make sure they have someone there guiding the way,” Esha said. Mr. Timmons believes it’s also important to have non-male coaches. Shivani agrees, and believes that having non-male role models on the team would result in a higher retention rate for females. “There’s a difference between having two males coaches on the debate team and having non-male representation. **Starting off freshman and sophomore year the class is pretty equal in terms of females and boys, but in terms of people you look up to, they’re all guys,” Shivani said.** Currently, Greenhill Debate has two assistant non-male coaches. However, they do not spend much time with the team. Sophia and Esha think they should play a bigger role on the team. “They’re not really very involved, so it’s hard to tell what they’re like. They come to tournaments when the coaches can’t, and it’s hard to form a relationship with someone you don’t see very often,” Sophia said. Despite the issues that many females face in debate, there are females who thrive in the program and debate all four years of high school. “We’ve had over the last few years a robust number of females participate. Not only participate, but excel. They’re the ones who can not only put into words, but also have the motivation, the drive to navigate through some tough situations. Some of the best debaters we have had here have been females,” Mr. Timmons said. Last week, junior Shruthi Krishnan was named the top speaker and champion of the National Debate Coaches Associations National Championship event. She was thrilled to gain this status not only for herself, but for her team, saying that her role models were the strong Greenhill non-male debaters that came before her. “I was really excited to win top speaker and win the event because it’s a goal I’ve had ever since I joined Greenhill debate as a freshman. I would look up to all the people that had done Lincoln-Douglass debate before me like Rebecca Kuang a couple years ago and think, ‘That’s so cool, they won all these awards, I want to be successful like them,’” said Shruthi. “Some of my biggest role models and some of our most successful debaters have been non-male debaters, like Rebecca Kuang and Mitali Mathur.” Despite the program’s flaws, Grace said that it’s important for females to continue debate because of the value of the skills learned in the activity. “It is such **a shame when a girl female quits debate because of a guy because it’s such a valuable activity,” said Grace. “It teaches females how to combat sexism in the real world and gives them those advocacy skills that will help them later on in life.”**

**YOU NEED DEBATERS TO HAVE DEBATE. WHEN WE LEAVE, WE DON’T COME BACK, AND YOU’RE GONNA MISS ME WHEN I’M GONE. KEEP ME HERE AND AFFIRM.**

## Underview:

#### [Moore] Reject T and theory – that means non-cismales have to self-police to avoid alienating cismales to remain in the public space.

**Moore:** Moore, Tracy. “Google Exec: Wom[x]n, Stop Saying 'Just' So Much, You Sound Like Children” *Jezebel*, July 2015. AZ

Just when you finally got a handle on saying “sorry” so much, turns out there’s another detrimental phrase in your lexicon keeping you from being taken seriously as a wom[o]n: “Just.” As in, “Just checking in,” and “Just following up,” and “Just wondering if you’d decided.” A former Google exec says this “permission” word is undermining your authority, and you need to cut down on your “J Count” pronto. Writing at Business Insider, a former exec at Google and Apple named Ellen Petry Leanse says that, a few years ago, she started noticing that the many females she worked with were using “just” a lot in emails, conversations, and presentations. Leanse writes: It hit me that there was something about the word I didn’t like. It was a “permission” word, in a way — a warm-up to a request, an apology for interrupting, a shy knock on a door before asking “Can I get something I need from you?” The more I thought about it, the more I realized that it was a “child” word, to riff Transactional Analysis. As such it put the conversation partner into the “parent” position, granting them more authority and control. And that “just” didn’t make sense. Outstream Video 00:00 00:00 Well, it does make sense if you think about how **females are culturally conditioned to be so sympathetic and empathic to the needs of others well before their own that they essentially walk on** permanent eggshells**, as if invisibly bumping into humanity at all times. It makes plenty of sense when you think about how females live with the ever-present background fear of being perceived as a b[-word**] bitch **or a nag, so the only way to prove we are, in fact, correctly socialized to understand that we** a**re nothing special**, innately kind-hearted, and also chill as fuck **is by apologizing for every possible thing we might ever do, want, think, ask, need, feel. Sorry you bumped into me! Sorry I had a feeling and expressed it! Sorry I need you to treat me like a person! Sorry for existing at all! The “sorry” epidemic is well-documented—females do apologize more, and perceive themselves as having committed more personal offenses than men**, and the whole shebang even landed in a Pantene commercial that aimed to move some units by empowering females to dial back the deference while maintaining impossibly glossy manes. Maybe it worked, in that our gender’s favorite form of hedging a request has turned from “sorry” to “just”? Leanse writes: I am all about respectful communication. Yet I began to notice that “just” wasn’t about being polite: it was a subtle message of subordination, of deference. Sometimes it was self-effacing. Sometimes even duplicitous. As I started really listening, I realized that striking it from a phrase almost always clarified and strengthened the message. So she suggested a moratorium on the word with her team, who agreed that it undermined their image as “trusted advisors.” The more they caught themselves using it, the more they were able to eliminate it from communication, and the perception of their preparedness improved. Then, Leanse decided to test out the “just” gender frequency in a mixed room of entrepreneurs who took turns speaking to the group about their startups: I asked them to leave the room to prepare, and while they were gone I asked the audience to secretly tally the number of times they each said the word “just.” Sarah went first. Pens moved pretty briskly in the audience’s hands. Some tallied five, some six. When Paul spoke, the pen moved … once. Even the speakers were blown away when we revealed that count. Now, that’s not research: It’s a mere MVP of a test that likely merits more inquiry, but we all have other work to do. Plus, maybe now that you’ve read this, you’ll heighten your awareness of that word and find clearer, more confident ways of making your ideas known. Once you start paying attention to your own use of hedge words like “just” and “sorry,” it is indeed strange to acknowledge how often you work them into sentences and how habitual it can be. I reflexively apologize still when someone bumps into me, not because I assume I was in the wrong, but because I’m not omniscient and maybe I was being oblivious and sorry covers that regardless. I don’t even think of it as deferential, I think of it is being nice. Because in a perfect world, the other person would say sorry also as a mutual covering of the same potentially egregious ground. If a wom[o]n, she usually says sorry back. But if it’s a dude, I get a sorry as often as I am given a free monthly supply of tampons (once). It’s not a huge deal, is it? But language shapes consciousness, and if females are the only ones softening their language or self sabotaging their own credibility—even inadvertently, only to be “nice”—it’s still reinforcing that it’s a wom[o]n trait to be nice. In a interview at GOOP with Tara Mohr, a career coach who wrote a book about such habits called Playing Big, we learn her take on “just”: “I just want to check in and see…” “I just think…” Just tends to make us sound a little apologetic and defensive about what we’re saying. Think about the difference between the sound of “I just want to check in and see…” and “I want to check in and see…” or the difference between “I just think” and “I think…” And others: Inserting actually: “I actually disagree…” “I actually have a question.” It actually makes us sound surprised that we disagree or have a question—not good! Using qualifiers: “I’m no expert in this, but…” or “I know you all have been researching this for a long time, but…” undermines your position before you’ve even stated your opinion.