## 1AC

### Part 1 is the Problem

**He hit me, held a** knife to my throat, a **gun to my head, and choked me with a golf club**. **My arms, legs, and body were often covered with bruises**. He would kiss them, cry and say, "Baby, I didn't mean to hit you. I don't know why... I lost my temper."

#### The 1AC is an interrogation of the brutality of IPV faced by Asian American women – these women are left out of the discussion time and time again. It is time to shift the discussion to an issue that rarely comes up. It is time to break through the web of oppression and recognize the white spider which has kept us trapped for centuries.

**Wang**, [Wang, Karin. "Battered Asian American Women: Community Responses from the Battered Women's Movement and the Asian American Community." Asian LJ 3 (1996): 151. SK]

These **brutal experiences are familiar to many battered women**, **but** these two **stories** belong to battered **[of] Asian American3 women**. Their stories **are unique**, **not** **because Asian American women necessarily experience domestic violence differently from non-Asian American women**, **but because the stories of battered Asian American women are still relatively unheard and unknown**.4 While the movement against domestic violence has made tremendous gains in the past twenty years,' not all battered women have benefited equally. **Women of color have gained less from the progress of the anti-domestic violence movement, which has been primarily "white-centered."** 6 And **within** communities of color, including **Asian American communities**,7 **domestic violence has yet to become a priority issue**., Although battered women experience universally similar abuse, the needs and concerns of Asian American domestic violence victims require special attention. **Battered Asian American women are situated differently than other battered women in the United States, especially white women.**9 **Domestic violence is a complex psychological and sociological phenomenon which is further complicated in Asian American communities by other factor such as language, immigrant status, culture, and racial stereotypes**. **Battered Asian American women stand at the intersection of multiple identities, not only as women and domestic violence victims, but also as Asians and often as immigrants."°** However, **American society and laws**, which are constructed largely along binary lines (e.g., the "black-white" paradigm of ASIAN LAW JOURNAL race)"t, **have great difficulty recognizing intersectionalities and effectively ignore those-such as battered Asian American women**-who exist at intersections of identity." SK

#### And, this issue is not isolated to Asian Americans - Domestic violence victimizes our entire society and threatens the lives of the oppressed.

**Wang** Wang, Karin. “Battered Asian American Women: Community Responses from the Battered Women 's Movement and the Asian American Community” Asian American Law Journal, 1996. http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/aalj/vol3/iss1/7

Although hidden for years behind closed doors and matrimonial sanctity, domestic violence is finally being recognized as a "true epidemic" which affects society as a whole, but victimizes women in particular.2 7 The pervasiveness of domestic violence in American society is frightening. Every year, more than four million women are severely assaulted by their spouses or ex-spouses. 8 On third of the women who seek emergency medical care have been battered.29 Husbands and boyfriends commit more than half of the murders of women.3 " Not surprisingly, battering injures more women ages fifteen to forty-four than any other form of violence.31

#### For too long the “Model Minority” mindset has trivialized Asian cultures, exacerbating racial oppression, leading to a hegemonic system of totalization by the “superiors” – this specifically harms victims of domestic violence as they cannot speak out. Also – means that solutions that attempt to offer “help” or “therapy” will never work – we need to cut off the problem before it begins.

Wang, [Wang, Karin. "Battered Asian American Women: Community Responses from the Battered Women's Movement and the Asian American Community." Asian LJ 3 (1996): 151. SK]

**The** widespread "**model minority myth,"'' with its dangerous assumptions that all Asian Americans have**

**achieved economic, academic, and social success, helps to conceal the very real problems of battered Asian American women.** 42 The myth suggests that all Asian Americans are "economically sucessful and socially accepted into American society".'43 This "model minority" image incorrectly fosters assumptions that Asian Americans do not suffer from poverty, discrimination, or other social problems. 44 Furthermore, the Asian American success story has been attributed at least in part to the existence of strong nuclear families in most Asian American communities. 145 It is true that the family is the most important social unit in most Asian communities and that family concerns often take priority over individual issues. 146 However, despite this traditional Asian emphasis on the family, the model minority myth's glorification of the perfect nuclear Asian American family in fact hides intrafamily problems.147 Inevitably, **the myth renders it more difficult for the rest of American society, and for Asian Americans themselves, to be able to acknowledge and address problems such as domestic violence**. The inaccurate images projected by the myth create difficulties for non-model minority immigrants. For example, **by perpetuating an image of successful and stable Asian American families, the myth masks high poverty rates among recently-immigrated Asian Americans.** 14 8 In turn, **the model minority image may make it more difficult for Asian Americans to gain public assistance. This may have ramifications for battered Asian American women who depend on their batterers for support**. In order to leave their batterers, domestic violence victims must be able to support and provide for themselves independently.' 49 Also, **the concept of the "model minority" Asian American family may create false impressions that all Asian American families are happy and stable, thereby making stories of battered Asian American women seem unrealistic or exaggerated.** Regardless, the myth, which has impeded many other Asian American civil rights struggles, delegitimizes the existence of domestic violence against Asian American women and makes it more difficult for battered Asian American women to leave their batterers and survive on their own. SK

#### Speaking out is key - The amount of times we have been told we are not oppressed or that we deserve to be silenced is ridiculous. This is a problem that has made its way in our community, not just a hypothetical, detached scenario we are to discuss. And, by starting a discussion about impacts that affect us as debaters, I move the community closer to liberation for those who are oppressed so affirming is key to real world change and pre-fiat reason to affirm. It’s the start of a rebellion.

Wang, [Wang, Karin. "Battered Asian American Women: Community Responses from the Battered Women's Movement and the Asian American Community." Asian LJ 3 (1996): 151. SK]

**Although a handful of shelters and other programs exist which serve battered Asian American women**, **the Asian American community as a whole has ignored its domestic violence victims**. In the context of domestic violence against Asian American women, the only voices raised on behalf of battered Asian American women have been those of the few Asian American women who are already active in fighting domestic violence. 176 The Asian American community's civil rights struggles have been singularly race-focused and gender-blind. The major Asian American civil rights players, such as the NAPALC, the JACL, and the OCA, have yet to incorporate domestic violence or any other women's issues into their agenda. 177 These **organizations and** the **leaders** of these groups **must** take the lead **in bringing domestic violence to the forefront because it is these organizations and leaders whose voices drive the conscience of the community**. In the meantime, **the failure to address domestic violence committed against Asian American women keeps the Asian American community's civil rights struggles locked in a gender-blind paradigm and traps battered Asian American women in their abusive relationships**.SK

#### They are oppressed not only by the myth of the model minority but also by white femininity which rejects their humanity

**Pyke and Johnson** “ASIAN AMERICAN WOMEN AND RACIALIZED FEMININITIES ‘Doing’ Gender across Cultural Worlds” University of California, Riverside. University of Washington, Seattle. 2000, file:///C:/Users/Jennifer/Downloads/Pyke\_Johnson\_AsianAmericanWomen.pdf

Gendered behavior engaged in Asian ethnic settings was largely described as performative, fake, and unnatural, while that in white-dominated settings was cast as a reflection of one’s true self. The [white mainstream] femininity of the white mainstream is glorified as authentic, natural, and normal, and Asian ethnic femininity is denigrated as coerced, contrived, and artificial. The “white is right” mantra is reiterated in this view of white femininity as the right way of doing gender. The glorification of white femininity and controlling images of Asian women can lead[s] Asian American women to believe that freedom and equity can be acquired only in the white-dominated world. For not only is white behavior glorified as superior and more authentic, but gender relations among whites are constructed as more egalitarian. Controlling images of Asian men as hypermasculine further feed presumptions that whites are more egalitarian. Asian males were often cast as uniformly domineering in these accounts. Racialized images and the construction of hegemonic (white) and subordinated (Asian) forms of gender set up a situation where [make] Asian American women feel they must choose between white worlds of gender equity and Asian worlds of gender oppression. Such images encourage [us] them to reject their ethnic [our] culture and Asian men and embrace the white world and white men so as to enhance their power. In these accounts, we can see the construction of ethnic and mainstream cultural worlds—and Asians and whites—as [is] diametrically opposed. The perception that whites are more egalitarian than Asian-origin individuals and thus preferred partners in social interaction further reinforces anti-Asian racism and white superiority. The cultural dominance of whiteness is reaffirmed through the co-construction of race and gender in these narratives. The perception that the production of gender in the mainstream is more authentic and superior tothat in Asian ethnic arenas further reinforces the racialized categories of gender that define white forms of femininity as ascendant. In the next section, we describe variations in gender performances within ethnic and mainstream settings that respondents typically overlooked or discounted as atypical.

#### We adopt a form of strategic essentialism as a starting point to break down these boundaries between individuals

Wang, [Wang, Karin. "Battered Asian American Women: Community Responses from the Battered Women's Movement and the Asian American Community." Asian LJ 3 (1996): 151. SK]

**Discussing how Asian American women are differently situated from white women implies that all Asian American women are similarly situated with respect to each other**. **I do not intend to assert an essential Asian American identity,5" as there is no singular Asian culture or nation**.59 "**Asian American" as an identity is socially constructed and created out of political and social necessity, in recognition of the need to embrace commonalities among diverse Asian Americans**.6" **It is in this vein that I discuss battered A sian American women**. **To effectively address barriers faced by battered Asian American women** but not by battered white women, **a recognition of commonalities among Asian American communities is critical**. The common factors which distinguish battered Asian American women from white women are: (1) the overwhelmingly immigrant character of Asian American communities, (2) the existence of similar cultural patterns across most Asian American communities, and (3) the existence of harmful stereotypes about Asian Americans collectively and Asian American women specifically. SK

### Part 2 is the Advocacy

I advocate that the United States ought to ban handguns with the intent of breaking down male violence. I reserve the right to clarify.

#### First, the gun inherently is a symbol of male domination – rejection is key

Bassin, [Bassin, Alana. "Why packing a pistol perpetuates patriarchy." Hastings Women's LJ 8 (1997): 351. SK]

This essay argues the contrary. It argues that **for women, the handgun is not a source of empowerment**. Instead, **the handgun is a serious detriment to women and our communal interest in safety**. Specifically, this essay demonstrates that: (1) **Guns are a source of male domination**; (2) **Guns foster violence in society and against women**; (3) **Women who endorse the theory that the gun is an equalizer are victims of the NRA 6 and gun industry marketing campaigns** exploiting our nation's violence; and (4) **Women advocating gun use have misdiagnosed societal violence and ignored the communal interest in gun control** as a result. In conclusion, this essay examines gun control laws today and what women can do for the future to unpack the pistol and curb the perpetuation of patriarchy. SK

#### Second, guns perpetuate violence in the home regardless of whether they are used – means aff is best way to combat IPV

Bassin 2, [Bassin, Alana. "Why packing a pistol perpetuates patriarchy." Hastings Women's LJ 8 (1997): 351. SK]

**Gun control laws** also **advance safety in the home**. **When women purchase guns for self-protection and keep them loaded in their purses or bedside tables, women allow accessibility to children and others**--one trigger pull away from deadly accidents. Consequently, **gun-related accidents plague homes**.45 Statistics show that the presence of a gun in the home nearly triples the chance of a homicide occurring there.46 Furthermore, **guns kept in the home for self-protection are 43 times more likely to kill a family member or a friend than an intruder**. 47 Other statistics show that **suicidal adolescents are twice as likely to kill themselves if they have access to a gun at home**.48

#### Third, opposition to gun bans for various reasons are just facades under which white masculinity hides its never ending desire to increase its power – it is a manifestation and perpetuation of colonial ideology that wants to push the minorities below the “white man”.

Karlin, [MARK KARLIN, EDITOR OF BUZZFLASH AT TRUTHOUT, “Many American White Men Worship Guns Because of Sexual Insecurity, Entitlement, and Profit”, Monday, 01 April 2013 10:29. SK]

**You won't find anyone willing to dare say it** much in the media, **but a good percentage of the white men who oppose gun control of any sort** – and who back measures that would even allow alleged terrorists and straw purchases for drug dealers to buy guns – **are just afraid that without their guns, their phallic power will be reduced to size.** You can feel at least temporarily reassured when a long-barreled assault weapon compensates for just another average manhood; it's an irresistable testosterone high to the beleaguered white male. Call this Freudian psychobabble analysis, but **when you add it into the mix of just angry white males who want their guns to show that they are still top dog on the political, social and marital hierarchy, you got a good percentage of the psychologically need gun owners**. **A gun**, **particularly** assault weapons and lethal **militarized handguns**, **are** at least two things: a prosthetic dick and **a sign that even unemployed white guys still rule the Western World and sit at the head of the kitchen table. We're talking about a dying patriarchy making a last stand** with the ownership and brandishing of weapons that provide the semblance of ultimate power over life and death. Sure, there is the rapidly decreasing tradition and understandable ritual of hunting in rural areas, particularly for those who actually need the meat because of near poverty. And there are handgun target shooters who truly regard handguns as a sport -- which they are in some cases. But these white men are a minority in a culture war that causes even elected Democrats to tremble in fear at voting on a gun control measure, even a law that might aid police in apprehending criminals, but the gun lobby opposes it for some obscure reason to rally their supporters around. Let's face it, **the more white guys feel besieged by a multi-cultural society in which women and minorities have chewed away at their perch until it is about to crash to the ground and leave them equals among other humans, the more fierce and maniacal the opposition to regulating guns as dangerous instruments of death becomes.** That is to say that a gun, or multiple numbers of them (which is the trend per gun owner over the past few years), provides a sense of potency, a shot of dominance that allows one – in some states -- to walk around "open carry" with a handgun. **"You see who I am," the handgun symbolizes, "I am of the white guy lineage that conquered the world from the heathens, that wears a 'white hat,' that has anchored civilization since the launch of European empires.** This gun tells you one thing; don't mess with me." Add this to the militia conspiratorialists, the gun profiteers (manufacturers and the whole chain of distribution including gun stores and gun shows), and the guys like NRA honcho Wayne LaPierre who are pulling in hefty salaries running high-octane incendiary and fanciful Alamo campaigns to incite virulent fear – and you got the beginnings of understanding why gun control never gets much past "go." In fact, except with the brief early Bill Clinton passage of the Assault Weapons Ban (flawed as it was and which sunset after 10 years), the nation has been moving incrementally backwards on gun policy. Memories of gun massacres last a few months and fade away, but **the psychological need of the white man for feeling sexually and politically powerful continues like a raging tsunami as progressives forget about the last mass shooting**, the issue receding as a priority among the majority of the nation who support gun control. On March 29 in the Washington Post, Charlotte Childress and Harriet Childress discussed the culpability of white male gun worshippers in regards to mass shootings (and that is only the most visible edge of the some 10,000 gun homicides each year in the US, in addition to countless gun injuries): **Imagine if African American men and boys were committing mass shootings month after month**, year after year. Articles and interviews would flood the media, and **we’d have political debates demanding that African Americans be “held accountable.”** Then, if an atrocity such as the Newtown, Conn., shootings took place and African American male leaders held a news conference to offer solutions, their credibility would be questionable. The public would tell these leaders that they need to focus on problems in their own culture and communities. **But when the criminals and leaders are white men, race and gender become the elephant in the room.** **Nearly all of the mass shootings in this country in recent years** — not just Newtown, Aurora, Fort Hood, Tucson and Columbine — **have been committed by white men and boys**. Yet when the National Rifle Association (NRA), led by white men, held a news conference after the Newtown massacre to advise Americans on how to reduce gun violence, its leaders’ opinions were widely discussed. As just one of many logical fallacies in the public gun lobby stance in support of guns as religious objects that must be free of all constraints, the Childresses's point out: When white men try to divert attention from gun control by talking about mental health issues, many people buy into the idea that the United States has a national mental health problem, or flawed systems with which to address those problems, and they think that is what produces mass shootings. But **women and girls with mental health issues are not picking up semiautomatic weapons and shooting schoolchildren**. **Immigrants with mental health issues are not committing mass shootings in malls and movie theaters.** Latinos with mental health issues are not continually killing groups of strangers. Of course, **black and Latino youth are being shot down in urban areas like ducks on a pond, but the white guy gun lobby could care less about that**. Given their reaction to the "post-racial" Obama presidency, many of them probably figure the fewer blacks and Latinos the better. The reality is that for many of the gun "culture warriors" (and remember that they have the gun industry with a profiteering motive egging them on through the NRA and other gun groups), they are standing at the edge of a cliff with the multi-cultural hordes surrounding them, even governing them. And women are now supervising them in the workplace or in the same jobs as they do, if they are employed. And many women are now sexually independent and don't put up with a male sense of sexual prerogative. Oh yes, and the American empire is facing threats on several fronts. Globalization is eating away at its post World War II dominance, with nations like "the yellow peril" of China becoming economic power houses. Jobs are hard to come by and terrorists abound behind every paranoid turn of the head. It's not a good time to be a white man wistfully lamenting the age when white men ruled without dissent. But like a nervous eater who turns to food to resolve anxiety, there's nothing like guns to restore a sense of glories past. This is not an issue about self-defense; this is about psychological need -- born of sexual and curtural displacement -- assuaged by the possession of a killing machine. SK

**Fourth,** banning handguns is the beginning of the discussion and functions as a symbolic sign to the public that patriarchy and subjugation are *not ok*. Also means that any attempt to exclude our analysis from this standpoint further entrenches the problem.

Farr et al, [Edited by Vanessa Farr, Henri Myrttinen and Albrecht Schnabel, “Sexed pistols: The gendered impacts of small arms and light weapons”, UN University Press. SK]

Resistance to including discussions **of national firearms regulation in campaigns against small arms has been driven in large part by American opposition,** which in turn has been driven by the NRA.89 As discussed above, **resistance to gun control is steeped in traditional notions of masculinity**, individualism and patriotism. Opponents of gun control try to frame it as ‘‘emotional, irrational’’, even emasculated, and to marginalize the supporters of gun control. For example, one study by a prominent gun collector argued that **students who were pro-gun control were also pro-homosexual**, pro-censorship of pornography and not experienced with guns. He implied that **men who favour gun control are emasculated** GENDER, ATTITUDES AND REGULATION OF SMALL ARMS 35 **and tend to have ‘‘politically correct’’ attitudes**. Women who support gun control do so in the context of controlling male violence and sexuality. **Gun control is thus** a symbolic attack **on masculinity**.90 **Studies of gun-control movements** in industrialized countries **have demonstrated the critical role the media can play in promoting or undermining efforts**,91 **as well as the subtle ways in which women** involved in the discussion **are often marginalized.** **Those supporting gun control are seldom ‘‘experts’’ but often ‘‘anti-gun advocates’’.** Women speaking on the issue are ‘‘a small but strident group of misguided people who lack a basic comprehension of how guns work’’.92 Expertise is often defined in terms of knowledge of and experience with guns rather than knowledge and experience with crime or violence prevention. Summing up this section’s discussion, the following points can be made. First, **firearms ownership and use are primarily male practices closely linked to notions of masculinity**. Second, **powerful and often taken-for-granted cultural practices reinforce the link between guns and masculinity**. Third, while cultural determinants are important, they are not deterministic. Many countries have made conscious decisions to reject cultures of violence by strengthening gun laws. And fourth, the media play an important role in shaping attitudes to guns and to the regulation of small arms. SK

### Part 3 is the Attempt

#### Handgun bans decrease IPV – its at the very worst a step in the right direction – empirical analysis proves – also proves that substitution effect doesn’t occur

Rivto, [Crime is not the Problem: Lethal Violence in America, 1997. SK]

Amicis’ **analysis of the available data~ indicates that the number of homicides involving family members and intimate partners declined steadily after the enactment of the handgun ban**. See Appendix at App. 1, Figure 1. The drop is even more pronounced when homicides involving semiautomatic and automatic handguns, which are associated with gang and drug activity,5 are excluded from the data. See Appendix at App. 2, Figure 2. **Chicago’s decrease in the number of intimate partner handgun homicides with a female victim was also much larger than the nationwide average.** While domestic violence rates have been steadily decreasing nationwide, **Chicago’s intimate partner homicides with female victims have gone down by a much larger percentage.** Because of the relatively small data set and its volatility from year to year, amici averaged the number of intimate partner/female victim homicides in the six years before the ban (1976~1981) and the twelve years after the ban (1982-1993).~ **The United States experienced a 4.3% drop in intimate partner homicides with female victims from the preban period to the post-ban period**. **Chicago’s drop over the same period was 27.2%.** The analysis by amici also showed that **the reduction in handgun homicides contributed to overall reduction in family/intimate partner homicides in Chicago.** This suggests that **when handguns are not present, a less lethal weapon is used or the dispute does not escalate.** Thus, the evidence demonstrates that **Chicago’s handgun ban saves lives by reducing the number of handgun homicides involving intimate partners** and family memb. SK

### Part 4 is Framing

#### The judge has the unique obligation to endorse the 1AC which was a dramatic reveal of power and an affirmation of many voices, including the voice of Asian American women who are excluded.

Koh and Niemi, [Koh, Ben and Niemi, Rebar, “How Do I Reach these Kids?: An Affirmation of Polyvocal Debate.” September 15, 2015. <http://nsdupdate.com/2015/09/15/how-do-i-reach-these-kids-an-affirmation-of-polyvocal-debate-by-ben-koh-rebar-niemi/>. SK]

**For as long as there has been debate, there has been the debate about what debate is**. We are not against **a discussion of what constitutes debate**. In fact we are absolutely for it. We argue that this **is a crucial debate within debates**. The question should not be “what is debate?” **The proper question is “what can debate do?”** The constitutive feature of debate that we are most abstractly interested in is the precise one that is so often banished by debate pundits – the possibilities of what it can do. We do not yet know what debate can do. **All are welcome to accept the challenge of forcing debate into a linear and instrumental framework, but be warned it will certainly fail**. **Debate is a process and a field, not a mechanism**. This is the case for polyvocal debate. Our current definition (which is open to redefinition) is that **debate should be thought of as a complex assemblage of voices** (the debaters, the judge, audiences, coaches, the authors quoted, and so on), **and** **that it is wrong to limit the possible voices or the possible enunciations of those voices**. **Debate is always about multiple voices** – multiple ways of sensing/expressing. Even non-sense and non-expression have their own voices. This is not a paradigm. It is a hypothesis about the system of relations that co-creates debate. **The power and potential of polyvocal debate is** not located in some far-off future. It is **right here right now,** and it is also capable of contact with the outsides of one perspective on time and space. To paraphrase June Tyson – Don’t you know? It’s after the end of the world. Within the system of relations composed by polyvocal debate, we always have the ability to ask “should we believe in something in the first place?” as well as “if we believe it, what are its normative implications?” These questions, in whatever form they take, are some of the most primal elements of debate. **Restricting the scope of debate** to only some of these questions **is a serious loss**. **More absurd is the justification for restriction based on the value of being able to ask and engage with these questions in the first place.** **It is wrong to assume that chaos and doubt are bad. It is even worse to argue for a progressive fallacy that chaos and doubt can be removed from debate without debate ceasing to be debate at all.** Debate is not soccer, or chess, or playing the trumpet. Perhaps it can do similar things to those activities, but if so it is because it does not feature the limits that define soccer or chess or playing the trumpet. It is apparently very easy to make assumptions about what education is. Most often this is accomplished without citing a single theorist on the subject of education OR a robust understanding of what education could be outside of “commonsensical” assumptions (which are less common and relatable that they initially seem). As we often like to tell our students – read the literature. **We call the kind of education that is often assumed “banking-style education”** after Paulo Friere. This is the notion that education is about accumulating knowledge. 100 facts are better than 99 facts. **People devalue education because they think of it only in** these **calculated terms**. To the banking conception, the end game of education would not be an increase in self-respect, a commitment to social justice, or a development of communication and empathetic powers. It would be the resume statement of “things I’ve learned.” **We must not buy into this conception of education. In debate, the collaborative way voices intertwine builds a world of speech and frames it**. **No debate performance can be perfectly reproduced**. The judge’s interpretation and voice are then added. The desire for absolutely objective or procedurally exact judging is a desire for an impossibility. We should not be afraid of **the judge’s voice**. We recognize it as **[is] one among many**. Some judges speak loudly and have particular desires. We do not begrudge them this. What is important is that they acknowledge that theirs is only one voice among the many and one way of sensing among all sense and nonsense. **It is not a question of excluding the chaos or even controlling it, but understanding the value in hearing the clash of multiple voices.** For **nowhere else in school are we given the vibrant opportunity to be as real in the academic space as is in debate; where we are able to read multiple arguments from multiple views from multiple bases**. We must encourage debate to be an outlet for the chaotic and doubtful elements of our beliefs for it’s an opportunity to bridge debate’s separation from the real world into our own world. **Our lives** aren’t always smooth unwavering stories. They **are often a chaos that is hard to grasp outside the lens of community**. **Polyvocal debate is inclusive and encouraging of this chaos, of the hard questions and life changing moments of realization.** **A form of debate that acts as if it can omit doubt is not a true form of debate at all.** This isn’t just an argument for “unique educational value” in the banking-sense. Debate should not be thought of as an esoteric extracurricular designed to spice up the resume. Paradigms of debate that stop at the moment of rational justification treat the issue of what world we create for ourselves as an unnecessary step, but this conversation is what must happen in our lives and further what must happen in debate. Polyvocal debate allows for this discussion. **We should not just ask “is deontology true” but further “is it good for me to believe in deontology” or util or contractarianism, etc.** **Rationality cannot be trusted to judge itself**, but abandoning logic altogether isn’t necessary just yet. It is too easy to take up one side or the other (only truth matters or only the good matters). Debate is harder. The tenets of logic and justification can create questionable conclusions, and **a truly valuable form of debate must allow us to criticize and reevaluate these conclusions to live our lives to the fullest**. We must be able to ask if beliefs empower or disempower our lives. **We always have the power to ask should we believe it or is it correct, and exercising this capacity is the practice of debate**. There are two ways in which we can understand and consider what we ought to believe – what is rationally justifiable, and what is good for us to believe for ourselves. **In our lives we cannot just ask “what do I think is true.” We must always end up asking “is it good for me to believe in what I believe?”** This is how we must act in our own lives outside of just the debate space. When we are faced with a difficult situation be it in our personal lives, work, etc., we are inevitably going to be confronted with moments of seemingly undeniable hopelessness; where despite our best efforts and our thinking, we cannot justify or rationally see a way to be happy or push ourselves through to the other side. Is it good for me to believe that no matter what I will do, that I will get a bad grade in this class? Is it good for me to believe that I will fail in my work? Is it good for me to believe in hopelessness? Our answer is no. Our answer is that **debate helps you learn new questions as well as new answers**. Again and again we’ve heard the articles and arguments that collapse everything to the old questions: education versus fairness, the rules versus innovation and expansion, correct ways of being versus incorrect ones. Bizarrely there are some who like to play with the same questions forever, perpetually flipping bits between one and zero, never writing new code. We are tired of these questions. Perhaps they would be enlivened by new voices. **Polyvocality is the necessary and explosive generation of new questions**. The practice of **debate is an educational activity because it is generative and interrogative of voices**. Use it for what it’s used for. **Education can be praxis** – where the abstraction of theory becomes lived abstractness inside the fabric of everyday experience. Where a radical new way of thinking-feeling the world become possible. Where you don’t just learn about quantum physics, but cry at how beautiful the expression of quantum interactions can be and feel blessed to be a part of them, and then teach them to your friends and family. But this is only part of what education is. **Education is a becoming that is necessarily political**. Often times it is anti-reactionary or anti-conservative, not because it includes some biased political position, but because it is impossible to actually experience learning without it changing you – what you think is right and wrong, what you want to do, and who you think of yourself as. On our view, this makes education necessarily anti-fascist (where fascism is defined as the tendency to over-represent and prefer certain ways of being to others based on normative, intuitive, or ontological claims). No matter your petty political affiliations, too many people in our world must attempt escape everyday, live as targets, suffer, and experience domination. If education is not a force to help us address this, it is not a properly empathetic education. **Even if the educational space of debate allows for slightly more opportunities to escape the everyday and find new connections and places to dwell, this is a greater benefit to everyone than any obedience to respectability politics, norms of conduct, or “correct ways of being” could ever achieve.** This is how the world works. **We should not abandon the cause of empathy just because we can have that elsewhere**. It’s not as if we should not care about others at certain times because we do so in others Debate is foundationally about empathy. Arguments are only persuasive in the ability for their to be foster a shared experience of understanding. Judges vote for arguments that have a particular effect on them – the effect of “being convincing.” Arguments that win send the judge on a path of becoming-convinced. In order for this to happen, the debater must actually get through to the judge on some level, whether intuitively, emotively, via rhetoric, the flow, or explanation. **The best debating promotes empathy. Not empathy defined by biased terms** – **empathy defined by actual contact with actual others, perspectives, and ways of expressing oneself.** It is not that young people are in need of moral training or must be told what is right and wrong or that debate should erase and conquer disagreement. Rather, it is that **we should strive to learn to live with disagreement**. For it is too simple and brute to believe in a monovocal system of thought – that your language is the only Rosetta Stone to translate the world through. Debate must be a place to see how to live with ourselves and live among others. **If being the better debater means being the worse person, we should NOT endorse this conception of better debating**. **There is no value to improving a debate related skillset that is not bracketed by being caring and affirming of the world**. **The argument against education, methodology, and performance debates is that these will somehow sacrifice an essential part of what makes debate debate.** This perspective is entirely wrongheaded. **What a polyvocal understanding of debate underscores is that what makes debate is multiple voices.** Our belief is that it is possible to promote incredible skill, learning, and growth in students and be better debaters while at the same time being better people. Debate is a field where participants of all kinds create real experiences and real change. Students have the ability to speak their individual truths and have real academic and personal conversation about what creates, sustains, and restricts their worlds – and **if the current “rules of debate” do not allow for that, we advocate breaking those rules.**SK

#### The 1AC is a starting pointbut one of many ways in which we can analyze other forms of oppression.

#### The role of the judge is thus to endorse the debater who provides the in round discourse that aims to break down oppressive norms.

#### And, speaking out and engaging in the context of educational spaces is uniquely key for Asian American students.

Osajima, [Osajima, Keith. "Internalized Oppression and the Culture of Silence: Rethinking the Stereotype of the Quiet Asian American Student" *Race and Racism in the United States* (n.d.): 152-55. Web. SK]

**A good student is quiet, obedient, [and] unquestioning,** prompt, and attentive.They do well on tests designed by the teacher. They can give the right answer. In return for this behavior, “good” students are rewardedwith good grades, praise from teachers, honor rolls,and col- lege entrance. A “bad student”, who is loud, rebellious, defies and questions authority, skips class or comes in late, and doesn’t do the home- work, is stigmatized and isolated from the rest. For many of us, **these messages are so strong that they become a** natural, **internalized indicator of our** self-**worth.** **We** come to **believe** that **our abilities and** our **intelligence are** best **measured by** our grades, or by the **opinions** and praise we receive from our teachers. This creates a tremendous pull to adhere to the image of a “good” student. At the same time those rewards **[which]** become a means to **control students,** for in the process **we lose sight** of the fact that we are smart enough to think and figure many things out ourselves, and we also lose sight **of** our **critical,** reflective **abilities that allow us to question the ways that schooling may be oppressive.** I think **for Asian students, the pull** to be “good” students **becomes even stronger** when we place that studentoppression **in** the context of the way Asians have responded to racial oppression in **this country**. **For** many **Asian-Americans, silence** and education **lies at the heart of how we have dealt with racial oppression**. As Colin Watanabe and Ben Tong argued in the early 1970’s, Asian-Americans often adopted a passive, quiet, con- forming behavior as a means to survive racial hostilities. It was deemed safer not to rock the boat than to call attention to oneself and risk oppression. Many of us learned these lessons from our parents as we were growing up, internalized them, and came to believe that we too might be in danger if we speak out, or call attention to ourselves. Thus, even when the situation may not be threatening, **the internalized oppression often makes us feel that we need to be quiet in order to be safe.**SK

## Frontlines