# **Fem K Aff**

### **Inherency**

#### **National LD circuit is currently sexist and causes many womxn to quit debate.**

**Tartakovsky 16**

[Daniel Tartakovsky, “Gender Disparities in Competitive High School Debate New Evidence from Comprehensive Tournament Results Data”,Econ 980b: Education in the Economy May 9, 2016] AA

First, large differences in performance-related characteristics of men and women at tournaments would, other things equal, lead to larger win-loss gaps by gender in rounds 1 and 2 than in later debates. For example, since power-paired rounds match debaters according to skill as determined by their previous performance at the tournament, if women on average have less debate experience than men, they would perform worse in preset rounds and better in power-paired rounds. These performance-related characteristics could encompass male debaters having more experience due to their age, receiving more attention from their school’s coaches, feeling more welcome or comfortable at debate competitions, having access to better research due to larger social networks, etc. These factors could lead men to perform better than women even if judges are unbiased.

A second explanation for the pattern observed in the data is judge discrimination. Suppose a female debater loses a preset round due to a judge’s unconscious bias against her. All else equal, in a later power-paired round the female debater’s skill level should exceed that of a male opponent whose record would reflect his skill alone as opposed to some weighted average of skill and harm from past judge discrimination. In other words, past judge discrimination forces women into a lower bracket, which makes it easier for women to win future rounds because their opponents will tend to be worse. Power-pairing may partially reduce the effect of judge biases by pairing female debaters against less skilled opponents in subsequent rounds.

To resolve this issue, I restrict the sample to the cohort of debaters graduating from high school in 2016. I then calculate a “participation gap,” defined as the difference between fraction of male and female debaters who, conditional on having debated as sophomores, also debate as juniors and as seniors. Table 2 shows that women who debated in at least one tournament as sophomores are about 2.5 percentage points less likely than men to debate as juniors. However, the participation gap does not seem to grow from junior to senior year. There is thus some evidence that women are more likely to quit National Circuit Lincoln-Douglas debate than men. Still, the lack of an increase participation gap between junior and senior year cautions against too strong of an interpretation of these results. Moreover, it is impossible to see whether women switch to a different kind of debate or stop debating entirely, so the information is imperfect.

#### **Current education is harmful because teachers use a banking concept where students can only listen to the institution run by the dominant powers, we must allow students to have their own voices be heard in the debate context. Talking about the rules in debate isn’t changing that education.**

**Friere 93**

[Paulo Freire, Director of Education at SESI, “CHAPTER 2 OF PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED”, New York: Continuum Books, 1993.]AA

Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the "banking" concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits. They do, it is true, have the opportunity to become collectors or cataloguers of the things they store. But in the last analysis, it is the people themselves who are filed away through the lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system. For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, individuals cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other. In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology) of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he- justifies his own existence. The students, alienated like the slave in the Hegelian dialectic, accept their ignorance as justifying the teachers existence—but, unlike the slave, they never discover that they educate the teacher.

### Offense

#### **The discussion of workers right to strike are male- oriented. Before we have the discussion of an unconditional right to strike, we need to fix the discourse in debate so that womxn get an equal voice.**

## Baker and Robeson 81’ (“Trade Union Reactions to Women Workers and Their Concerns”. The Canadian Journal of Sociology /Maureen Baker and Mary-Anne Robeson. Maureen Baker's research while affiliated with University of Auckland. )

## https://www.jstor.org/stable/3339868)

These figures emphasize that although women are under-represented as union members, their involvement in decision-making positions is even less rep- resentative. In 1976, Canadian women union members were in the minority in 80 per- cent of labor organizations(CALURA, 1976:54).Those unions which are dominated in numbers by women, contain 42.6 percent of women union members. This reflects the segregated nature of the labor force. The fact that most unions have a majority of male members has led to the comment that the collective bargaining process "is not an ideal instrument through which to redress the wrongs suffered by women" (Finn, 1976:47). Nor can we assume that all women workers possess the same needs, de- mands or outlooks, and that "women's issues" are of equal interest and import to all working women. Class differences, differences in marital status and child- bearing create barriers to homogeneity and collective action. The conflict of interest groups within a union does not preclude women. But the fact that women's bargaining power is already low because of the nature of their jobs and their minority membership means that any division among women affects them to a greater extent than it would affect men. Marchak (1973) concluded that trade unions are of greatest benefit to those whose bargaining power is already the strongest, and of least benefit to those who are easily replaceable. Many women writing about trade unions have emphasized the male "worldview" that predominates in the union movement policies and priorities (Safilios-Rothschild, 1974:154;Hartman, 1976; Howe, 1977). Women's apparent lack of interest in unions may be largely related to their competing family responsibilities, but could also be a way of expressing their dissatisfaction with the priorities of union men. Unions tend to bargain for those issues considered important by the majority of members,and the majority are largely blue-collar men.  Of the four explanations analyzing the negative reactions of trade unions to women workers, we feel that the nature of the collective bargaining process, with its reliance on majority rule, explains much of the reaction. Women are under-represented in the labor force compared to men, less likely to be union- ized when gainfully employed, and far less likely to occupy decision-making positions within the union organization. Consequently, **women as a group have low bargaining power**. Moreover, those in the majority (blue-collar men) have lobbied for other issues. To understand why blue-collar men have not been con- cerned about child care or equality for women workers, we must return to the sexism argument. Blue-collar men have tended to accept the traditional ideology that women with children should not be in the labor force. Although middle class men have supported women's rights with greater enthusiasm than working class men (Tolson, 1977), the impetus for change women themselves. Historically, women have been more likely than men to push for equal pay, equal work, child care, and maternity leave (Auchmuty, 1975; O'Neill, 1969). Considering that unions are dominated in membership by blue-collar men, we cannot expect them to be leaders in women's rights. In fact, women as well as men have generally accepted the idea that women's place is in the home. Women's double burden ing the day and doing housework for no pay at home women from spending more time than necessary on the job. Union participation requires extra time at work rather than at home. Canadian studies by Meissner et al. (1975) and Clark and Harvey (1976) indicate that working most of their housewife tasks. In addition to the home responsibilities that many women carry, women's socialization has not encouraged them to see themselves assertive, politically efficacious, confronting, or even career-oriented. The more nurturant characteristics socialized into many girls do not naturally direct them into leadership positions and lack of encouragement from husbands and fellow workers reinforces their socialization. Thus, women are unlikely to ag- gressively voice their concerns within unions. However, traditional attitudes about women's roles explain only a part of their lesser tendency to unionize. The nature of women's work is such that the labor movement has been both less interested and less successful in organizing them. Women are clustered in low status white-collar jobs, are more likely than men to be part-time workers, and are in positions with low job control. A search for reasons for these job characteristics of women workers, highlights the idea that women are more "exploitable" through their "feminine" socialization, their family responsibilities, and discrimination against them. working for pay dur- – has discouraged

### Framework

#### Before we can talk about the unconditional right to strike in a post-fiat world, we need to make debate a safe space. The role of the judge is to make debate a home to everyone by being inclusive.

**Desai 15**

[Shrey Desai, “Three Ways to Defuse Skepticism”, VBriefly, 2015] AA

It is easy to deduce that if morality doesn’t exist or people cannot achieve moral truth, then it would be impossible to condemn acts that seem intuitively wrong. For example, a moral skeptic would argue that the Holocaust would be an indifferent event or punching babies would not be morally correct nor would it be morally incorrect. Other instances such as slavery would also fall subject to this skeptic dilemma. As people that have either experienced or read about these tragedies, we can come to the conclusion that these events are morally repugnant and ought to have the label that they are bad. It would be taboo in our society to say that said events are morally just or even indifferent. Upholding the severity of these instances is especially important in debate because as debaters we must ensure that we respectfully engage in discussions about the topic. Recently, there has been a lot of discussion about how debate is not a safe place at times and the judge’s primary obligation is the make sure that debate is a home to everyone and is as inclusive as possible. Vincent (2013) puts it well when he writes, “If a judge is comfortable enough to vote for discourse that is racist, sexist, or homophobic, they must also be prepared to defend their actions.” The same logic applies to arguments about skepticism. If a debater, whose family has experienced years of oppression by the government, walks into a debate round and hears the negative argue for a position that denies the moral injustice of that oppression, the debater would certainly feel uncomfortable. It would send the message that we are indifferent to their suffering and refuse to accept the conclusion that events such as the Holocaust are morally repugnant. This would make the debater excluded from the discussion at hand and would have a detrimental impact to their feelings as well as their perception of the debate atmosphere. Debate should be a safe place for all participants where everyone should feel included. The negative reading skepticism would thus have to achieve an extremely high threshold to beat these arguments back if the affirmative were to make these arguments. Therefore, it is a very intuitive argument that the judge ought to reject skeptical positions prima facie because it draws repugnant conclusions make the debate an unsafe space for its participants.

#### Violence against womxn is normative in debate, this means that the reading of this k to promote feminist epistemologies is offense under the role of the ballot.

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

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

**I define a womxn as anyone identify as a womxn, additionally, the role of the judge is open to all forms of oppression, meaning neg can talk about solving for any oppressed group, the aff does not limit the ground and is intersectional.**

#### We can’t just look to fairness, education, and other rules – those further push voices out and don’t allow for their rational thinking.

**Gilligan 82**

[Gilligan, Carol. American Feminist Scholar In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Womxn's Development. Harvard University Press, 1982] AA

Thus, while taking the law into account and recognizing its function in maintaining social order (the judge, Jake says, "should give Heinz the lightest possible sentence"), he also sees the law as man-made and therefore subject to error and change. Yet his judgment that Heinz should steal the drug, like his view of the law as having mistakes, rests on the assumption of agreement, a societal consensus around moral values that allows one to know and expect others to recognize what is "the right thing to do. " Fascinated by the power of logic, this eleven-year-old boy locates truth in math, which, he says, is "the only thing that is totally logical." Considering the moral dilemma to be "sort of like a math problem with humans," he sets it up as an equation and proceeds to work out the solution. Since his solution is rationally derived, he assumes that anyone following reason would arrive a t the same conclusion and thus that a judge would also consider stealing to be the right thing for Heinz to do. Yet he is also aware of the limits of logic. Asked whether there is a right answer to moral problems, Jake replies that "there can only be right and wrong in judgment," since the parameters of action are variable and complex. Illustrating how actions undertaken with the best of intentions can eventuate in the most disastrous of consequences, he says, "like if you give an old lady your seat on the trolley, if you are in a trolley crash and that seat goes through the window, it might be that reason that the old lady dies. " Theories of developmental psychology illuminate well the position of this child, standing at the juncture' of childhood and adolescence,' at what Piaget describes as the pinnacle of childhood intelligence, and beginning through thought to discover a wider universe of possibility. The moment of preadolescence is caught by the conjunction of formal operational thought with a description of self still anchored in the factual parameters of his childhood world -- his age, his town, his father's occupation, the substance of his likes, dislikes, and beliefs. Yet as his self- description radiates the self-confidence of a child who has arrived, in Erikson's terms, at a favorable balance of industry over inferiority -- competent, sure of himself; and knowing well the rules of the game -- so his emergent capacity for formal thought, his ability to think about thinking and to reason things out in a logical way, frees him from dependence on authority and allows him to find solutions to problems by himself. This emergent autonomy follows the trajectory that Kohlberg's six stages of moral development trace, a three-level progression from an egocentric understanding of fairness based on individual need (stages one and two), to a conception of fairness anchored in the share d conventions of societal agreement (stages three and four), and finally to a principled understanding of fairness that rests on the free-standing logic of equality and reciprocity (stages five and six) . While this boy's judgments at eleven are scored as conventional on Kohlberg's scale, a mixture of stages three and four, his ability to bring deductive logic to bear on the solution of moral dilemmas, to differentiate morality from law, and to see how laws can be considered to have mistakes points toward the principled conception of justice that Kohlberg equates with moral maturity. In contrast, Amy's response to the dilemma conveys a very different impression, an image of development stunted by a failure of logic, an inability to think for herself. Asked if Heinz should steal the drug, she replies in a way that seems evasive and unsure

### Underview

#### [1] 1ar theory since the neg can do infinite bad things and I can’t check. It’s drop the debater since the 1ar is too short to win both layers. No RVI since they’d dump on it for 6 minutes. CI since reasonability is arbitrary and bites intervention.

#### [2] Permissibility and presumption substantively affirm: a) Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me b) Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason. c) If anything is permissible, then definitionally so is the aff since there is nothing that prevents us from doing it

#### [3] No omissions: All neg theory violations and kritik links must come from the text of the AC, not the absence of specification a) I have a limited time to speak so it’s an infinite aff burden b) Race to bottom – incentivizes people to not engage the aff and make a bunch spec argument to preclude

#### [4] RVI on NC theory – you can read arguments such as T that are exclusively neg so I need them to compensate

#### [5] Reject Determinism – a) proves that we should never do anything because there’s no purpose to attempts which justifies never solving violence b) it affirms because the aff can be uninherent which means it was already determined