# FKJ Promise Of Happiness - 1AC

At the 2015 Tournament of Champion, only about 20% of LD debaters identify as women, less than 10% women of color. The 1AC began with a discussion of the institutional and psychological structures in debate that created this skew.

#### Women in this debate space have been constantly dominated by masculine norms but we will not tolerate its patriarchal ideology anymore. Like civil society, the debate space functions within dominant power structures to suppress the voice of the feminine.

**Griffin and Raider** (Women in High School Debate. J. Cinder Griffin and Holly Jane Raider 1989 – “Punishment Paradigms : Pros and Cons” <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Griffin&Raider1989PunishmentPar.htm>)

Debate, unlike athletics, does not require physical skills which might restrict the participation of women. Additionally, debate is academically oriented and women tend to select extracurricular activities , that are more academic in nature than men.3 Based on these assumptions, one would expect proportional representation of the genders in the activity. Why then, are there four times more men in debate than women? Several explanations exist that begin to account for the low rate of female participation in debate. Fewer females enter the activity at the outset. Although organizational and procedural tactics used in high school debate may account for low initial rates of participation, a variety of social and structural phenomena, not necessarily caused by the debate community also account for these rates. Ultimately, the disproportionate attrition rate of female debaters results in the male dominated composition of the activity. There are more disincentives for women to participate in debate than for men. While entry rates for women and man may in some cases be roughly equal, the total number of women who participate for four years is significantly lower than the corresponding number of men. This rate of attrition is due to factors that can be explained largely by an examination of the debate community itself. Socially inculcated values contribute to low rates of female entry in high school debate. Gender bias and its relation to debate has been studied by Manchester and Freidly. They conclude, "[m]ales are adhering to sex-role stereotypes and sex-role expectations when they participate in debate because it is perceived as a masculine' activity. Female debate participants experience more gender-related barriers because they are not adhering to sex-role stereotypes and sex-role expectations.5 In short, 'nice girls' do not compete against or with men, are not assertive, and are not expected to engage in policy discourse, particularly relating to military issues. Rather, "nice girls" should be cheerleaders, join foreign language clubs, or perhaps participate in student government. It should be noted that many of these attitudes are indoctrinated at birth and cannot be directly attributed to the debate community. However, there are many activity specific elements that discourage female participation in high school debate. Structural barriers endemic to the forensics community dissuade female ninth graders from entering the activity.6 Recruitment procedures and initial exposure may unintentionally create a first impression of the activity as dominated by men. By and large, it is a male debater or a male debate coach that will discuss the activity with new students for the first time. Additionally, most debate coaches are men. This reinforces a socially proven norm to prospective debaters, that debate is an activity controlled by men. This male exposure contributes to a second barrier to participation. Parents are more likely to let a son go on an overnight than they are a daughter, particularly when the coach is male and the squad is mostly male. This may be a concern even when the coach is a trusted member of the community. While entry barriers are formidable, female attrition rates effect the number of women in the activity most significantly.7 Rates of attrition are largely related to the level of success. Given the time and money commitment involved in debate, if one is not winning one quits debating. The problem is isolating the factors that contribute to the early failure of women debaters. Even if equal numbers of males and females enter at the novice level, the female perception of debate as a whole is not based on the gender proportions of her immediate peer group. Rather, she looks to the composition of debaters across divisions. This may be easily understood if one considers the traditional structures of novice debate. Often it is the varsity debate team, composed mostly of males, who coach and judge novice. Novices also learn how to debate by watching debates. Thus, the role models will be those individuals already involved in the activity and entrenched in its values. The importance of female role models and mentors should not be underestimated. There is a proven correlation between the number of female participants and the number of female coaches and judges.8 The presence of female mentors and role models may not only help attract women to the activity, but will significantly temper the attrition rate of female debaters. Novice, female debaters have few role models and, consequently, are more likely to drop out than their male counterparts; resulting in an unending cycle of female attrition in high school debate. Pragmatically, there are certain cost benefit criteria that coaches on the high school level, given the constraints of a budget, must consider. Coaches with teams dominated by males may be reluctant to recruit females due to traveling and housing considerations. Thus, even if a female decides to join the team, her travel opportunities may be more limited than those of the males on the team. Once a female has "proven" herself, the willingness to expend team resources on her increases, assuming she overcomes the initial obstacles. 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 judgement, 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. 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. High school debate coaches, tournaments, and even trophies herald policy debate as "two man" debate. Often, two women debating together are referred to as "the girls." Many female debaters observe that male debaters when referring to a female competitor's argument, frequently say, "on his argument. . .." Also observed, are references to female debaters as honey or chicks. Other lingo of the community supports this conclusion. Arguing military issues is "manly." Debating straight up is "going balls up." Aggressive females are either bitchy or manly. The effect of this type of behavior on female attrition is difficult to measure. At its core, this kind of overt sexism makes young debaters uncomfortable. It is offensive and intolerable. Contrary to popular opinion, women do not find it funny. By the time many females have ended their debating careers offensive language has become such a part of their daily existence that they may laugh about it. One will never know how many women are intimidated and offended to such a degree that they leave the activity before they develop the self-confidence and level of success necessary to overcome the inherent gender bias against them, a bias contributed to by the "old boy" tactics of the members of the community. If the assumption that there should be an equal number of male and female debaters is granted, reformation must begin within the existing community in order to attain this goal or the "old boy" traditions will remain.

#### Civility acts as a tool for masculinity and oppressive structures to continually police politics and discourse, leaving the disempowered in a state of silence.

Lonzano-Reich and Cloud 09 (Nina M. Lonzano-Reich & Dana L. Cloud. “The uncivil tongue: invitational rhetoric and the problem of inequality” Western Journal of Communication 73.2. April-June 2009.)

Bone et al. acknowledge that historically, societal standards of decorum have often been used to silence groups and keep them in their place. Nowhere is this truer than in the case of women, told to play nice with their oppressors (Ehrenreich & English, 2005). But the authors contradict this position when they argue, ‘‘When we adopt an invitational approach and are civil [emphasis added], the potential for grief and violence is minimized’’ (p. 457). Likewise, they write, ‘‘Civility . . . can be understood as an . . . integral component of democracy’’ (p. 457). Based upon historical and contemporary examples, we reject these claims; when theorizing as to how individuals should deal with ‘‘difficult situations,’’ our authors’ call for adopting an invitational paradigm grounded in civility is not only antithetical to the goals of invitational rhetoric, but also in combating systems of oppression. Historically, dominant groups have repeatedly enacted civilizing strategies to effectively silence and punish marginalized groups (e.g., labor; women and people of color; the poor; and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender [LGBT] people). Indeed, 19th-century notions of propriety and civility is used as cultural ideals to place legal, political, and physical restrictions on women—whereby relegating women to the private sphere (Oravec, 2003). Antifeminists frequently appealed to masculine norms of ‘‘civilization’’ to ‘‘depict women as less civilized than men, less able to contribute to the advancement of the race’’ (Bederman, 1995, p. 121). Extending this history, women of color have been silenced through civilizing strategies that deem legitimately angry speech to be ‘‘uppity’’ ‘‘or ‘‘illiterate’’ (Anzaldu´ a, 1999; hooks, 1989). It has taken decades of critical feminist scholarship to resist politics of civility and overcome oppressive stereotypes so that women of color can be viewed as speaking subjects, and not as uncivilized subjects needing a firm hand. Similarly, LGBTQ sexual practices have also been vulnerable to oppressive charges of indecorum. Culturally, dominant sexual ethics and decorous community standards function to shame queer individuals, and stigmatize nonnormative acts of sexuality (Morris & Sloop, 2006; Warner, 1999). One need only look to hate crimes enacted upon gays or immigrants, or acts of femicide inflicted upon women who dare to speak out. Clearly, a move towards civility in relation to oppressed groups may potentially increase grief and violence. Bone et al. claim that civility fosters democracy. While voting is indeed civil, radical social change has not occurred in voting booths, but results, instead, from democratic grassroots tactics. Protestors inherently do not operate within the realm of decorum. Indeed, political confrontations up to and including violence have been perennial resources in struggles for justice (Kirkpatrick, 2008). The civility standard is detrimental to this project. When measured by standards of civility, protesters are framed as wild and riotous by dominant media, rendering their struggles illegitimate (Gitlin, 2003). In a post-9=11 climate, moreover, ‘‘uncivil’’ protestors are equated with terrorists (and terrorists cannot be ascribed any rationality whatsoever). Bederman (1995) asks whether conforming to mainstream standards of civility replaces one kind of exclusion with another. This paradox holds except in cases of discourses among equals. Discourses of civilization ‘‘have proven [to be] a slippery slope for those who dream of a more just society’’ (Bederman, 1995, p. 239). Likewise, Mayo (2002) argues that ‘‘civility is a form of social discrimination, for it is predicated on making distinctions that support accepted practices and values, and entails enacting those distinctions to the detriment of the purportedly uncivil’’ (p. 82). In other words, we view Bone et al.’s argument for invitational civility in situations of conflict as potentially perpetuating discrimination in the name of peace. Theorizing resistance to oppression requires attention to both invitation and confrontation, along with criteria enabling critics to evaluate both modes. Consequently, we believe it is irresponsible to displace more confrontational models for social change in favor of a politics of civility that has been proven to leave those already disempowered in a continued state of conformity, punishment, and/or silence.

#### This means before we can discuss policies or post-fiat impacts, we must liberate the voice of the feminine that is currently suppressed in the debate sphere.

#### And, masculine civility irrevocably distorts human thought. When human epistemology defaults to the male point of view, our presumably gender free knowledge will always be distorted by masculine thought since we won’t be able to consider womn’s unique experiences. Disrupting masculinity and inclusion of the feminine perspective is a pre-requisite to accessing undistorted knowledge.

#### I stand in affirmation of the enactment of the feminist kill joy, creating a starting point for inclusion that allows womn and all marginalized groups to insert their voices into the current conversation. My method of engagement counters preconceived roles of women through self-empowerment and calls to anger the collective wrong doings of the systems. We must rage against sustained signs of patriarchy even if it means laying our bodies on the line.

Ahmed 10 (Sara Ahmed. “Feminist Killjoys (And Other Willful Subjects). The Barnard Center for Research on Women – the Scholar and Feminist Online. Issue 8.3. Summer 2010)

To be unseated by the table of happiness might be to threaten not simply that table, but what gathers around it, what gathers on it. When you are unseated, you can even get in the way of those who are seated, those who want more than anything to keep their seats. To threaten the loss of the seat can be to kill the joy of the seated. How well we recognise the figure of the feminist killjoy! How she makes sense! Let's take the figure of the feminist killjoy seriously. One feminist project could be to give the killjoy back her voice. Whilst hearing feminists as killjoys might be a form of dismissal, there is an agency that this dismissal rather ironically reveals. We can respond to the accusation with a "yes." The figure of the feminist killjoy makes sense if we place her in the context of feminist critiques of happiness, of how happiness is used to justify social norms as social goods (a social good is what causes happiness, given happiness is understood as what is good). As Simone de Beauvoir described so astutely "it is always easy to describe happy as a situation in which one wishes to place [others]."[[4](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm#end4)] Not to agree to stay in the place of this wish might be to refuse the happiness that is wished for. To be involved in political activism is thus to be involved in a struggle against happiness. Even if we are struggling for different things, even if we have different worlds we want to create, we might share what we come up against. Our activist archives are thus unhappy archives. Just think of the labor of critique that is behind us: feminist critiques of the figure of "the happy housewife;" Black critiques of the myth of "the happy slave"; queer critiques of the sentimentalisation of heterosexuality as "domestic bliss." The struggle over happiness provides the horizon in which political claims are made. We inherit this horizon. To be willing to go against a social order, which is protected as a moral order, a happiness order is to be willing to cause unhappiness, even if unhappiness is not your cause. To be willing to cause unhappiness might be about how we live an individual life (not to choose "the right path" is readable as giving up the happiness that is presumed to follow that path). Parental responses to coming out, for example, can take the explicit form not of being unhappy about the child being queer but of being unhappy about the child being unhappy.[[5](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm#end5)] Even if you do not want to cause the unhappiness of those you love, a queer life can mean living with that unhappiness. To be willing to cause unhappiness can also be how we immerse ourselves in collective struggle, as we work with and through others who share our points of alienation. Those who are unseated by the tables of happiness can find each other. So, yes, let's take the figure of the feminist killjoy seriously. Does the feminist kill other people's joy by pointing out moments of sexism? Or does she exposes the bad feelings that get hidden, displaced, or negated under public signs of joy? Does bad feeling enter the room when somebody expresses anger about things, or could anger be the moment when the bad feelings that circulate through objects get brought to the surface in a certain way? The feminist subject "in the room" hence "brings others down" not only by talking about unhappy topics such as sexism but by exposing how happiness is sustained by erasing the signs of not getting along. Feminists do kill joy in a certain sense: they disturb the very fantasy that happiness can be found in certain places. To kill a fantasy can still kill a feeling. It is not just that feminists might not be happily affected by what is supposed to cause happiness, but our failure to be happy is read as sabotaging the happiness of others. We can consider the relationship between the negativity of the figure of the feminist killjoy and how certain bodies are "encountered" as being negative. Marilyn Frye argues that oppression involves the requirement that you show signs of being happy with the situation in which you find yourself. As she puts it, "it is often a requirement upon oppressed people that we smile and be cheerful. If we comply, we signify our docility and our acquiescence in our situation." To be oppressed requires that you show signs of happiness, as signs of being or having been adjusted. For Frye "anything but the sunniest countenance exposes us to being perceived as mean, bitter, angry or dangerous".[[6](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm#end6)] To be recognized as a feminist is to be assigned to a difficult category and a category of difficulty. You are "already read" as "not easy to get along with" when you name yourself as a feminist. You have to show that you are not difficult through displaying signs of good will and happiness. Frye alludes to such experiences when she describes how: "this means, at the very least, that we may be found to be "difficult" or unpleasant to work with, which is enough to cost one's livelihood."[[7](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm#end7)] We can also witness an investment in feminist unhappiness (the myth that feminists kill joy because they are joy-less). There is a desire to believe that women become feminists because they are unhappy. This desire functions as a defense of happiness against feminist critique. This is not to say that feminists might not be unhappy; becoming a feminist might mean becoming aware of just how much there is to be unhappy about. Feminist consciousness could be understood as consciousness of unhappiness, a consciousness made possible by the refusal to turn away. My point here would be that feminists are read as being unhappy, such that situations of conflict, violence, and power are read as about the unhappiness of feminists, rather than being what feminists are unhappy about. Political struggles can takes place over the causes of unhappiness. We need to give a history to unhappiness. We need to hear in unhappiness more than the negation of the "un." The history of the word "unhappy" might teach us about the unhappiness of the history of happiness. In its earliest uses, unhappy meant to cause misfortunate or trouble. Only later, did it come to mean to feel misfortunate, in the sense of wretched or sad. We can learn from the swiftness of translation from causing unhappiness to being described as unhappy. We must learn. The word "wretched" has its own genealogy, coming from wretch, meaning a stranger, exile, banished person. Wretched in the sense of "vile, despicable person" was developed in Old English and is said to reflect "the sorry state of the outcast." Can we rewrite the history of happiness from the point of view of the wretch? If we listen to those who are cast as wretched, perhaps their wretchedness would no longer belong to them. The sorrow of the stranger might give us a different angle on happiness not because it teaches us what it is like or must be like to be a stranger, but because it might estrange us from the very happiness of the familiar. Phenomenology helps us explore how the familiar is that which is not revealed. A queer phenomenology shows how the familiar is not revealed to those who can inhabit it. For queers and other others the familiar is revealed to you, because you do not inhabit it. To be "estranged from" can be what enables a "consciousness of." This is why being a killjoy can be a knowledge project, a world-making project. A feminist call might be a call to anger, to develop a sense of rage about collective wrongs. And yet, it is important that we do not make feminist emotion into a site of truth: as if it is always clear or self-evident that our anger is right. When anger becomes righteous it can be oppressive; to assume anger makes us right can be a wrong. We know how easily a politics of happiness can be displaced into a politics of anger: the assumption of a right to happiness can convert very swiftly into anger toward others (immigrants, aliens, strangers) who have taken the happiness assumed to be "by right" to be ours. It is precisely that we cannot defend ourselves against such defensive use of emotion that would be my point. Emotions are not always just, even those that seem to acquire their force in or from an experience of injustice. Feminist emotions are mediated and opaque; they are sites of struggle, and we must persist in struggling with them.[[8](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end8)]After all, feminist spaces are emotional spaces, in which the experience of solidarity is hardly exhaustive. As feminists we have our own tables. If we are unseated by the family table, it does not necessarily follow that we are seated together. We can place the figure of the feminist killjoy alongside the figure of the angry Black woman, explored so well by Black feminist writers such as Audre Lorde[[9](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end9)] and bell hooks[[10](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end10)]. The angry black woman can be described as a killjoy; she may even kill feminist joy, for example, by pointing out forms of racism within feminist politics. She might not even have to make any such point to kill joy. Listen to the following description from bell hooks: "a group of white feminist activists who do not know one another may be present at a meeting to discuss feminist theory. They may feel bonded on the basis of shared womanhood, but the atmosphere will noticeably change when a woman of color enters the room. The white woman will become tense, no longer relaxed, no longer celebratory."[[11](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end11)]It is not just that feelings are "in tension," but that the tension is located somewhere: in being felt by some bodies, it is attributed as caused by another body, who comes to be felt as apart from the group, as getting in the way of its enjoyment and solidarity. The body of color is attributed as the cause of becoming tense, which is also the loss of a shared atmosphere. As a feminist of color you do not even have to say anything to cause tension! The mere proximity of some bodies involves an affective conversion. We learn from this example how histories are condensed in the very intangibility of an atmosphere, or in the tangibility of the bodies that seem to get in the way. Atmospheres might become shared if there is agreement in where we locate the points of tension.A history can be preserved in the very stickiness of a situation. To speak out of anger as a woman of color is then to confirm your position as the cause of tension; your anger is what threatens the social bond. As Audre Lorde describes: "When women of Color speak out of the anger that laces so many of our contacts with white women, we are often told that we are 'creating a mood of helplessness,' 'preventing white women from getting past guilt,' or 'standing in the way of trusting communication and action.'"[[12](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end12)] The exposure of violence becomes the origin of violence. The woman of color must let go of her anger for the white woman to move on.The figure of the angry black woman is a fantasy figure that produces its own effects. Reasonable, thoughtful arguments are dismissed as anger (which of course empties anger of its own reason), which makes you angry, such that your response becomes read as the confirmation of evidence that you are not only angry but also unreasonable! To make this point in another way, the anger of feminists of color is attributed. You might be angry about how racism and sexism diminish life choices for women of color. Your anger is a judgment that something is wrong. But then in being heard as angry, your speech is read as motivated by anger. Your anger is read as unattributed, as if you are against x because you are angry rather than being angry because you are against x. You become angry at the injustice of being heard as motivated by anger, which makes it harder to separate yourself from the object of your anger. You become entangled with what you are angry about because you are angry about how they have entangled you in your anger. In becoming angry about that entanglement, you confirm their commitment to your anger as the truth "behind" your speech, which is what blocks your anger, stops it from getting through. You are blocked by not getting through. Some bodies become blockage points, points where smooth communication stops. Consider Ama Ata Aidoo's wonderful prose poem, *Our Sister Killjoy*, where the narrator Sissie, as a black woman, has to work to sustain the comfort of others. On a plane, a white hostess invites her to sit at the back with "her friends," two black people she does not know. She is about to say that she does not know them, and hesitates. "But to have refused to join them would have created an awkward situation, wouldn't it? Considering too that apart from the air hostess's obviously civilized upbringing, she had been trained to see the comfort of all her passengers."[[13](http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/ahmed_08.htm" \l "end13)]Power speaks here in this moment of hesitation. Do you go along with it? What does it mean not to go along with it? To create awkwardness is to be read as being awkward. Maintaining public comfort requires that certain bodies "go along with it." To refuse to go along with it, to refuse the place in which you are placed, is to be seen as causing trouble, as making others uncomfortable. There is a political struggle about how we attribute good and bad feelings, which hesitates around the apparently simple question of who introduces what feelings to whom. Feelings can get stuck to certain bodies in the very way we describe spaces, situations, dramas. And bodies can get stuck depending on the feelings with which they get associated.

#### The 1ac is an embodiment of the feminist killjoy and exemplification of female rage, my rage that is critical to challenge all forms of oppression. My experiences as a cis able bodied Indian woman differs from other bodies, but rage translates into accessibility - we engage in a new world where women of all races and ethnicities can use anger that tears at the walls of male supremacy. Woman’s rage is beautiful and energizing. It demands change.

**Lorde 81** (Audre. The Uses of Anger. Source: Women's Studies Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 1/2, Looking Back, Moving Forward: 25 Years of Women's Studies History (Spring - Summer, 1997), pp. 278-285. Published by: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York,. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40005441)

Racism. The belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance, manifest and implied. Women respond to racism. My response to racism is anger. I have lived with that anger, on that anger, beneath that anger, on top of that anger, ignoring that anger, feeding upon that anger, learning to use that anger before it laid my visions to waste, for most of my life. Once I did it in silence, afraid of the weight of that anger. My fear of that anger taught me nothing. Your fear of that anger will teach you nothing, also. Women responding to racism means women responding to anger, the anger of exclusion, of unquestioned privilege, of racial distortions, of silence, ill-use, stereotyping, defensiveness, misnaming, betrayal, and coopting. My anger is a response to racist attitudes, to the actions and presumptions that arise out of those attitudes. If in your dealings with other women your actions have reflected those attitudes, then my anger and your attendant fears, perhaps, are spotlights that can be used for your growth in the same way I have had to use learning to express anger for my growth. But for corrective surgery, not guilt. Guilt and defensiveness are bricks in a wall against which we will all perish, for they serve none of our futures. Every woman has a well-stocked arsenal of anger potentially useful against those oppressions, personal and institutional, which brought that anger into being. Focused with precision it can become a powerful source of energy serving progress and change. And when I speak of change, I do not mean a simple switch of positions or a temporary lessening of ten- sions, nor the ability to smile or feel good. I am speaking of a basic and radical alteration in all those assumptions underlining our lives. I have seen situations where white women hear a racist remark, resent what has been said, become filled with fury, and remain silent, because they are afraid. That unexpressed anger lies within them like an undetonated device, usually to be hurled at the first woman of Color who talks about racism. But anger expressed and translated into action in the service of our vision and our future is a liberating and strengthening act of clarification, for it is in the painful process of this translation that we identify who are our allies with whom we have grave differences, and who are our genuine enemies. Anger is loaded with information and energy. When I speak of women of Color, I do not only mean Black women. We are also Asian American, Caribbean, Chicana, Latina, Hispanic, Native American, and we have a right to each of our names. The woman of Color who charges me with rendering her invisible by assuming that her struggles with racism are identical with my own has something to tell me that I had better learn from, lest we both waste ourselves fighting the truths between us. If I participate, knowingly or otherwise, in my sister's oppression and she calls me on it, to answer her anger with my own only blankets the substance of our exchange with reaction. It wastes energy I need to join with her. And yes, it is very difficult to stand still and to listen to another woman's voice delineate an agony I do not share, or even one in which I myself may have participated. We speak in this place removed from the more blatant reminders of our embattlement as women. This need not blind us to the size and complexities of the forces mounting against us and all that is most human within our environment. We are not here as women examining racism in a political and social vacuum. We operate in the teeth of a system for whom racism and sexism are primary, established, and necessary props of profit. Women responding to racism is a topic so dangerous that when the local media attempt to discredit this Convention they choose to focus upon the provision of Lesbian housing as a diversionary device - as if the Hartford Courant dare not mention the topic chosen for discussion here, racism, lest it become apparent that women are in fact attempting to examine and to alter all the repressive conditions of our lives. Mainstream communication does not want women, particularly white women, responding to racism. It wants racism to be accepted as an immutable given in the fabric of existence, like evening time or the common cold. So we are working in a context of opposition and threat, the cause of which is certainly not the angers which lie between us, but rather that virulent hatred leveled against all women, people of Color, Lesbians and gay men, poor people - against all of us who are seeking to examine the particulars of our lives as we resist our oppressions, moving toward coalition and effective action. Any discussion among women about racism must include the recognition and the use of anger. It must be direct and creative, because it is crucial. We cannot allow our fear of anger to deflect us nor to seduce us into settling for anything less than the hard work of excavating honesty; we must be quite serious about the choice of this topic and the angers entwined within it, because, rest assured, our opponents are quite serious about their hatred of us and of what we are trying to do here. And while we scrutinize the often painful face of each other's anger, please remember that it is not our anger which makes me caution you to lock your doors at night, and not to wander the streets of Hartford alone. It is the hatred which lurks in those streets, that urge to destroy us all if we truly work for change rather than merely indulge in our academic rhetoric. This hatred and our anger are very different. Hatred is the fury of those who do not share our goals, and its object is death and destruction. Anger is the grief of distortions between peers, and its object is change. But our time is getting shorter. We have been raised to view any difference other than sex as a reason for destruction, and for Black women and white women to face each other's angers without denial or immobilization or silence or guilt is in itself a heretical and generative idea. It implies peers meeting upon a common basis to examine difference, and to alter those distortions which history has created around difference. For it is those distortions which separate us. And we must ask ourselves: Who profits from all this? Women of Color in America have grown up within a symphony of anguish at being silenced, at being unchosen, at knowing that when we survive, it is in spite of a whole world out there that takes for granted our lack of humanness, that hates our very existence, outside of its service. And I say "symphony" rather than "cacophony" because we have had to learn to orchestrate those furies so that they do not tear us apart. We have had to learn to move through them and use them for strength and force and insight within our daily lives. Those of us who did not learn this difficult lesson did not survive. And part of my anger is always libation for my fallen sisters. Anger is an appropriate reaction to racist attitudes, as is fury when the actions arising from those attitudes do not change. To those women here who fear the anger of women of Color more than their own unscrutinized racist attitudes, I ask: Is our anger more threatening than the woman-hatred that tinges all the aspects of our lives? It is not the anger of other women that will destroy us, but our refusals to stand still, to listen to its rhythms, *to learn within it*, to move beyond the manner of presentation to the substance, to tap that anger as an important source of empowerment. I cannot hide my anger to spare you guilt, nor hurt feelings, nor answering anger; for to do so insults and trivializes all our efforts. Guilt is not a response to anger; it is a response to one's own actions or lack of action. If it leads to change then it can be useful, since it becomes no longer guilt but the beginning of knowledge. Yet all too often, guilt is just another name for impotence, for defensiveness destructive of communication; it becomes a device to protect ignorance and the continuation of things the way they are, the ultimate protection for changelessness. Most women have not developed tools for facing anger constructively. CR [consciousness-raising] groups in the past, largely white, dealt with how to express anger, usually at the world of men. And these groups were made up of white women who shared the terms of their oppressions. There was usually little attempt to articulate the genuine differences between women, such as those of race, color, class, and sexual identity. There was no apparent need at that time to examine the contradictions of self, woman, as oppressor. There was work on expressing anger, but very little on anger directed against each other. No tools were developed to deal with other women's anger except to avoid it, deflect it, or flee from it under a blanket of guilt. I have no creative use for guilt, yours or my own. Guilt is only another way of avoiding informed action, of buying time out of the pressing need to make clear choices, out of the approaching storm that can feed the earth as well as bend the trees. If I speak to you in anger, at least I have spoken to you; I have not put a gun to your head and shot you down in the street; I have not looked at your bleeding sister's body and asked. "What did she do to deserve it?" This was the reaction of two white women to Mary Church Terrell's telling of the lynching of a pregnant Black woman whose baby was then torn from her body. That was in 1921 , and Alice Paul had just refused to publicly endorse the enforcement of the Nineteenth Amendment for all women - excluding the women of Color who had worked to help bring about that amendment. The angers between women will not kill us if we can articulate them with precision, if we listen to the content of what is said with at least as much intensity as we defend ourselves from the manner of saying. Anger is a source of empowerment we must not fear to tap for energy rather than guilt. When we turn from anger we turn from insight, saying we will accept only the designs already known, those deadly and safely familiar. I have tried to learn my anger's usefulness to me, as well as its limitations. For women raised to fear, too often anger threatens annihilation. In the male construct of brute force, we were taught that our lives depended upon the good will of patriarchal power. The anger of others was to be avoided at all costs, because there was nothing to be learned from it but pain, a judgment that we had been bad girls, come up lacking, not done what we were supposed to do. And if we accept our powerlessness, then of course any anger can destroy us. But the strength of women lies in recognizing differences between us as creative, and in standing to those distortions which we inherited without blame but which are now ours to alter. The angers of women can transform differences through insight into power. For anger between peers births change, not destruction, and the discomfort and sense of loss it often causes is not fatal, but a sign of growth. My response to racism is anger. That anger has eaten clefts into my living only when it remained unspoken, useless to anyone. It has also served me in classrooms without light or learning, where the work and history of Black women was less than a vapor. It has served me as fire in the ice zone of uncomprehending eyes of white women who see in my experience and the experience of my people only new reasons for fear or guilt. And my anger is no excuse for not dealing with your blindness, no reason to withdraw from the results of your own actions. When women of Color speak out of the anger that laces so many of our contacts with white women, we are often told that we are "creating a mood of hopelessness," "preventing white women from getting past guilt," or "standing in the way of trusting communication and action." All these quotes come directly from letters to me from members of this organization within the last two years. One woman wrote, "Because you are Black and Lesbian, you seem to speak with the moral authority of suffering." Yes, I am Black and Lesbian, and what you hear in my voice is fury, not suffering. Anger, not moral authority. There is a difference. To turn aside from the anger of Black women with excuses or the pretexts of intimidation, is to award no one power - it is merely another way of preserving racial blindness, the power of unaddressed privilege, unbreached, intact. For guilt is only yet another form of objectification. Oppressed peoples are always being asked to stretch a little more, to bridge the gap between blindness and humanity. Black women are expected to use our anger only in the service of other people 's salvation, other people's learning. But that time is over. My anger has meant pain to me but it has also meant survival, and before I give it up I'm going to be sure that there is something at least as powerful to replace it on the road to clarity. What woman here is so enamoured of her own oppression, her own oppressed status, that she cannot her feel print upon another woman's face? It is not my anger that launches rockets, spends over sixty thousand dollars a second on missiles and other agents of war and death, pushes opera singers off rooftops, slaughters children in cities, stockpiles nerve gas and chemical bombs, sodomizes our daughters and our earth. It is not the anger of Black women which corrodes into blind, dehumanizing power, bent upon the annihilation of us all unless we meet it with what we have, our power to examine and to redefine the terms upon which we will live and work; our power to envision and to reconstruct, anger by painful anger, stone upon heavy stone, a future of pollinating difference and the earth to support our choices. We welcome all women who can meet us, face to face, beyond objectification and beyond guilt.

#### Thus, the role of the ballot is to disrupt masculine civility by engaging in discourses that kill joy.

#### Rupturing the debate sphere with a method that combats civil in-round standards is a prerequisite to productive discourse about ethics or policymaking since the status-quo currently delegitimizes non-normative voices. A topical version of this aff would allow the negative to sidestep and hijack the discussion and divorce me from my subject position. It’s necessary to work outside the bounds of traditional debate to challenge its exclusive civil ethics.

#### Debate matters. This is the training ground for people who end up in positions of power in business, academia, and politics – we need to hold people accountable in debate or else we’ll reproduce the status quo structures of domination.

**Griffin and Raider** (Women in High School Debate. J. Cinder Griffin and Holly Jane Raider 1989 – “Punishment Paradigms : Pros and Cons” <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Griffin&Raider1989PunishmentPar.htm>)

In recent years there has been some effort to isolate the factors that limit the participation of women in collegiate debate.2 These studies are superfluous if the factors regarding participation of females at the high school level are not understood. Unfortunately, no such formal research attempt has been made to explain the reasons underlying the thoughts that contribute to the opening quote. The issue of participation of other minority groups in debate is a topic beyond the scope of our discussion. The virtual non-existence of minorities is a deeply disturbing issue and deserves further investigation. Understanding gender and minority selection of debate as an activity in high school level is useful in explaining those selection factors at the collegiate level. One finds few college debaters who were not exposed to the activity in high school. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a female who has not experienced some competition and success in the activity while in high school will remain, very much less begin, debating in college. Additionally, given its competitive nature, quest for excellence, and skewed gender composition, debate offers a micro-model of the business and academic worlds. There are implications for female representation and treatment in these societal roles as debaters tend to become leaders in both the business and academic worlds. As the perceptions of women ingrained through debate experience are translated into society at large through leadership positions, the implications for under-representation of women in debate takes on greater significance. This article addresses several of the reasons behind female participation rates at the high school level and offers a few solutions to the problem. All things being equal, one would assume roughly equal numbers of male and female participants in high school debate.

#### The result is normalized violence against womn that universal but not monolithic. We never consider the sexual terrorism, femicide and messages of masculine dominance that translated through objectification and ownership of women.

Ray 97 (A. E. Ray “The Shame of it: gender-based terrorism in the former Yugoslavia and the failureof international human rights law to comprehend the injuries.” The American University Law Review. Vol 46)

In order to reach all of the violence perpetrated against the women of the former Yugoslavia that is not committed by soldiers or other officials of the state, human rights law must move beyond its artificially constructed barriers between "public" and "private" actions: A feminist perspective on human rights would require a rethinking of the notions of imputability and state responsibility and in this sense would challenge the most basic assumptions of international law. If violence against women were considered by the international legal system to be as shocking as violence against people for their political ideas, women would have considerable support in their struggle.... The assumption that underlies all law, including international human rights law, is that the public/private distinction is real: human society, human lives can be separated into two distinct spheres. This division, however, is an ideological construct rationalizing the exclusion of women from the sources of power. The international community must recognize that violence against women is always political, regardless of where it occurs, because it affects the way women view themselves and their role in the world, as well as the lives they lead in the so-called public sphere. When women are silenced within the family, their silence is not restricted to the private realm, but rather affects their voice in the public realm as well, often assuring their silence in any environment. For women in the former Yugoslavia, as well as for all women, extension beyond the various public/private barriers is imperative if human rights law "is to have meaning for women brutalized in less-known theaters of war or in the by-ways of daily life." Because, as currently constructed, human rights laws can reach only individual perpetrators during times of war, one alternative is to reconsider our understanding of what constitutes "war" and what constitutes "peace." " When it is universally true that no matter where in the world a woman lives or with what culture she identifies, she is at grave risk of being beaten, imprisoned, enslaved, raped, prostituted, physically tortured, and murdered simply because she is a woman, the term "peace" does not describe her existence. In addition to being persecuted for being a woman, many women also are persecuted on ethnic, racial, religious, sexual orientation, or other grounds. Therefore, it is crucial that our re-conceptualization of human rights is not limited to violations based on gender." Rather, our definitions of "war" and "peace" in the context of all of the world's persecuted groups should be questioned. Nevertheless, in every culture a common risk factor is being a woman, and to describe the conditions of our lives as "peace" is to deny the effect of sexual terrorism on all women. Because we are socialized to think of times of "war" as limited to groups of men fighting over physical territory or land, we do not immediately consider the possibility of "war" outside this narrow definition except in a metaphorical sense, such as in the expression "the war against poverty." However, the physical violence and sex discrimination perpetrated against women because we are women is hardly metaphorical. Despite the fact that its prevalence makes the violence seem natural or inevitable, it is profoundly political in both its purpose and its effect. Further, its exclusion from international human rights law is no accident, but rather part of a system politically constructed to exclude and silence women. The appropriation of women's sexuality and women's bodies as representative of men's ownership over women has been central to this "politically constructed reality. Women's bodies have become the objects through which dominance and even ownership are communicated, as well as the objects through which men's honor is attained or taken away in many cultures. Thus, when a man wants to communicate that he is more powerful than a woman, he may beat her. When a man wants to communicate that a woman is his to use as he pleases, he may rape her or prostitute her. The objectification of women is so universal that when one country ruled by men (Serbia) wants to communicate to another country ruled by men (Bosnia-Herzegovina or Croatia) that it is superior and more powerful, it rapes, tortures, and prostitutes the "inferior" country's women. The use of the possessive is intentional, for communication among men through the abuse of women is effective only to the extent that the group of men to whom the message is sent believes they have some right of possession over the bodies of the women used. Unless they have some claim of right to what is taken, no injury is experienced. Of course, regardless of whether a group of men sexually terrorizing a group of women is trying to communicate a message to another group of men, the universal sexual victimization of women clearly communicates to all women a message of dominance and ownership over women. As Charlotte Bunch explains, "The physical territory of [the] political struggle [over female subordination] is women's bodies.”

#### And, our identity always determines the way in which we’re perceived in this debate, as a womn of color, I am a marked body that is held to a different set of standards. Detaching from my identity is not a luxury I have so I cannot adhere to abstract ethical theories that assume a neutral identity.

#### Detached ethical theories create a false consciousness that only serve to abstract oppression to get out of the discussion.

Matsuda 89 (Mari J Matsuda, Associate Professor of Law, University of Hawaii, “When the First Quail Calls: Multiple Consciousness as Jurisprudential Method”, 1989 *Gender and Law Manual.* (1989) 11 Women’s Rts L Rep 7 at 8-9. Reproduced by permission of the author and publisher.)

Let us imagine a student with women-of-color consciousness sitting in class in the first year of law school. The dialogue in class is designed to force students to pare away the extraneous, to adopt the lawyer’s skill of narrowing issues and delineating the scope of relevant evidence. The professor sees his job—and I use the male pronoun deliberately—as training the students out of the muddleheaded world where everything is relevant and into the lawyer’s world where the few critical facts prevail. The discussion in class today is of a Miranda-type case. Our student wonders whether the defendant was a person of color and whether the police officer was white. The student knows the city in which the case arose, and knows that the level of police violence is so high in that place that church groups hold candlelight vigils outside the main police station every Sunday. The crime charged is rape. The student wonders about the race of the victim, and wonders whether the zealous questioning by the police in the case was tied to the victim’s race. The student thinks about rape—the rape of her roommate last year, and her own fears. She knows, given the prevalence of violence against women, that some of her classmates in this class of 100 students have been raped. She wonders how they are reacting to the case, what pain it resurrects for them. In the consciousness of this student, many facts and emotions are relevant to the case that are extraneous to standard legal discourse. The student has decided to adopt standard legal discourse for the classroom, and to keep her women-of-color consciousness for herself and for her support group. This bifurcated thinking is not unusual to her. She’s been doing it throughout her schooling—shifting back and forth between her consciousness as a Third World person and the white consciousness required for survival in elite educational institutions. This student, as she has become older, has learned to peel away layers of consciousness like layers of an onion. In the one class where she has a woman professor—a white woman—she feels free to raise issues of violence against women, but she decides to keep to herself another level of consciousness: her nationalist anger at white privilege and her perception that the dominant white conception of violence excludes the daily violence of ghetto poverty. This constant shifting of consciousness produces sometimes madness, sometimes genius, sometimes both. You can hear it in the music of Billie Holiday. You can read it in the writing of Professor Pat Williams—that shifting in and out, that tapping of a consciousness from beyond and bringing it back to the place where most people stand. Let’s give an ending to the student I described: she goes on to excel in law school, she becomes an international human rights activist, and she writes poems in her kitchen in her spare time while she waits for the pies to cool. She doesn’t go mad because she continues to meet with her support group and they continue to tell her “No, you are not crazy, the world looks that way to us, too.”What does a consciousness of the experience of life under patriarchy and racial hierarchy bring to jurisprudence? The ideas emanating from feminist legal theorists and legal scholars of color have important points of intersection that assist in the fundamental inquiries of jurisprudence: What is justice, and what does law have to do with it? Outsider scholars have recognized that their speciﬁc experiences and histories are relevant to jurisprudential inquiry. They reject narrow evidentiary concepts of relevance and credibility. They reject artiﬁcial bifurcation of thought and feeling. Their anger, their pain, their daily lives, and the histories of their people are relevant to the deﬁnition of justice. “The personal is the political," we hear from feminists, and “Everything is political,” we hear from communities of color. Not much time is wasted in those communities arguing over deﬁnitions of justice. Justice means children with full bellies sleeping in warm beds under clean sheets. Justice means no lynching and no rapes. Justice means access to a livelihood. It means control over one’s body. These kinds of concrete and substantive visions of justice ﬂow naturally from the experience of oppression. And what of procedure, of law? Here outsiders respond with characteristic duality. On the one hand, they respond as legal realists, aware of the historical abuse of law to sustain existing conditions of domination. Unlike the postmodern critics of the left, however, outsiders, including feminists and people of color, have embraced legalism as a tool of necessity, making legal consciousness their own in order to attack injustice. Thus, to the feminist lawyer faced with pregnant teenagers seeking abortions, it would be absurd to reject the use of an elitist legal system or the use of the concept of rights when such use is necessary to meet the immediate needs of her client. There are times to stand outside the courtroom door and say, “This procedure is a farce, the legal system is corrupt. justice will never prevail in this land as long as privilege rules in the courtroom." There are times to stand inside the courtroom and say, “This is a nation of laws, laws recognizing fundamental values of rights, equality and personhood.” Sometimes, as Angela Davis did, there is a need to make both speeches in one day. Is that crazy? Inconsistent? Not to Professor Davis, a Black woman on trial for her life in racist America. It made perfect sense to her and to the twelve jurors good and true who heard her when she said, “Your government lies, but your law is above such lies.” Professor Davis's decision to use a dualist approach to a repressive legal system may very well have saved her life. Not only did she tap her history and consciousness as a Black, a woman, and a communist, she did so with intent and awareness. Her multiple consciousness was not a mystery to her but a well-defined and acknowledged tool of analysis, one that she was able to share with the jury. A professor once remarked that the mediocre law students are the ones who are still trying to make it all make sense, that is, the students who are trying to understand law as necessary, logical, and coextensive with reality. The students who excel in law schools—and the best lawyers-are the ones who are able to detach law and to see it as a system that makes sense only from a particular viewpoint. Those lawyers can operate within that view and then shift out of it for purposes of critique, analysis, and strategy. The shifting of consciousness I have thus far ascribed to women of color is a tool used in a more limited way by skilled lawyers of many ideological bents. A good corporate lawyer can argue within the language and policy of antitrust law, modify that argument to suit a Reagan-era judge, and then advise a client that the outcome may well tum on some event in Geneva wholly irrelevant to the legal doctrine. Multiple consciousness as jurisprudential method, however, encompasses more than consciousness shifting as skilled advocacy. It encompasses as well the search for the pathway to a just world. The multiple consciousness I urge lawyers to attain is not a random ability to see all points of view, but a deliberate choice to see the world from the standpoint of the oppressed. That world is accessible to all of us. We should know it in its concrete particulars. We should know of our sister carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel, our sister trembling at 3 a.m. in a shelter for battered women, our sisters holding bloodied children in their arms in Cape Town, on the West Bank, and in Nicaragua. The jurisprudence of outsiders teaches that these details and the emotions they evoke are relevant and important as we set out on the road to justice. These details are accessible to all of us, of all genders and colors. We can choose to know the lives of others by reading, studying, listening, and venturing into different places. For lawyers, our pro bono work may be the most effective means of acquiring a broader consciousness of oppression. ¶ Abstraction and detachment are ways out of the discomfort of direct confrontation with the ugliness of oppression. Abstraction, criticized by both feminists and scholars of color, is the, method that allows theorists to discuss liberty, property, and rights in the aspirational mode of liberalism with no connection to what those concepts mean in real people's lives. Much in our mainstream intellectual training values abstraction and denigrates nitty-gritty detail. Holding on to a multiple consciousness will allow us to operate both within the abstractions of standard jurisprudential discourse, and within the details of our own special knowledge.¶ Whisperings at Yale and elsewhere about how deconstructionist heroes were closet fascists remind me of how important it is to stay close to oppressed communities. High talk about language, meaning, sign, process, and law can mask racist and sexist ugliness if we never stop to ask: "Exactly what are you talking about and what is the implication of what you are saying for my sister who is carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel? What do you propose to do for her today, not in some abstract future you are creating in your mind?" If you have been made to feel, as I have, that such inquiry is theoretically unsophisticated, and quaintly naive, resist! Read what Professor Williams, Professor Scales-Trent, and other feminists and people of color are writing.' The reality and detail of oppression are a starting point for these writers as they enter into mainstream debates about law and theory.