

First is an independent voter — my opponent contradicts their ROB by making the debate space a site of colonization when they say:

Performativity: They presuppose that their epistemology will be valued which means contestation proves our role of the ballot is a prerequisite to all evaluation

Like a colonizer, my opponent comes into the space and makes assumptions about me, my positionality, my background, and my intentions. She declares that my epistemology is “such and such” and then asks you to make judgments about me and my advocacy based on her assertions. *This is the colonialist mindset* — they encounter new things and then, without stopping to learn anything about them, they make and act on assumptions to promote their own success. My opponent doesn’t know me; their willingness to make unfounded assertions about how I will perform models the very colonialism they’re asking you to deconstruct.

This negates under their Role of the Ballot because they are literally asking you to endorse the debater who best deconstructs the colonialist mindset, and yet their performance in round embodies that mindset. This is the highest layer and they can’t try to shift to some other layer without betraying the core of their advocacy.

Disad: by advocating state action, they re-empower the colonialist mindset as the modern system of states is the result of ongoing colonialist projects.

They try to get out of this by saying that they do not “role play the state,” but their advocacy admits “I’ll defend that the member nations of the WTO ought to reduce intellectual property protections on medicines” - the agent of action is the members states of the WTO; the advocacy embraces the state system; there is no deconstruction of colonialism in the advocacy. Rather the performative advocacy literally emboldens the colonialist state to exercise its control and then claims that that exercise of control will somehow deconstruct the colonialist project.

COUNTERADVOCACY: The indigenous peoples of the world have the right to lay claim to their own experience of health and its connection to their environments and resources. I’m not even going to talk about states and states’ authority because doing so only reconstructs in the debate space the practice of colonialism. I don’t assume the validity of the state system. I don’t assume the validity of the WTO or the borders that define it - borders that result from the destruction of indigenous cultures the world over. All of that is a dream; a fiction created by people who imagine they are powerful. But we know that the power of the so-called state is just a construction.

I do not role play in the round. I am just me, and I am not an indigenous resident of the US or the state of Iowa. But I recognize the connections of indigenous persons and cultures and I advocate that we listen to the voices of indigenous persons, prioritizing *their* approaches to medicine, health, and the sharing of resources. I'm not trying to tell anyone what to do except to say that I for one refuse to be governed by a state system that destroys so many and I will preference the voices of the cultures that pre-exist the violence of colonialism.