### 1AC Aztlan

**<MUSIC>**

The resolution asks us to interrogate war powers but never questions the continuous war that occurs against those on the borderlands.

U.S. law and policies always operate to exclude and enact violence upon millions of those on the borderlands

The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation writes:

(The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation is an internationally operating, progressive non-profit institution for civic education, April 2013, http://www.rosalux-nyc.org/wp-content/files\_mf/muñoz\_the\_chicano\_movement.pdf)

When the Chicano Movement emerged in the 1960s, there were only three visible Latino populations. The largest was the Mexican American, followed by the Puerto Rican, and the Cuban American populations, which collectively represented 6% of the U.S. population. By the start of the 21st century, the Latino populations represented 16% of the total U.S. population, or just over fifty million people. It is more complex and diverse due to changing immigration patterns from all of the Latin American nations. The Mexican American population remains the largest, with over 65% of the total Latino population. In numbers, that represents 33 million people. The Puerto Ricans remain the next largest Latino population at four and a half million people. The Cuban American remains the third largest at a million and a half. There are now several million more Latinos who have emigrated from other Latin American nations. The undocumented immigrant population has likewise undergone enormous growth. There were an estimated 540,000 undocumented immigrants in the 1960s; by 2011, there were 11,500,000, the vast majority of whom are Mexicans. The response to the growth of the Latino population, and especially the Mexican American population, has been characterized by vulgar, racist anti-immigrant politics. As has been the case historically, Mexicans are once again perceived as a threat to dominant U.S. culture. Right-wing politicians and armed vigilantes along the U.S.-Mexico border promote a racist hysteria against Mexicans. Academics are also adding fuel to the fire, as they did back in the 1920s and 1930s during immigration hearings in the U.S. Congress. For example, the late Samuel Huntington, a distinguished political scientist at Harvard Uni- versity, argued in his 2004 book “Who Are We: The Challenges to America’s National Identity,” that Mexicans were the most serious threat to Eurocentric identity and culture. He expressed fears that the United States would lose its single national language and its core WASP culture. In his words: I*n this new era, the single most immediate and most serious challenge to America’s traditional identity and border security comes from the immense and continuing immigration from Latin America, especially from Mexico.* In California, the state with the largest Mexican population in the nation, right-wing Republicans contributed to the passage of anti-immigrant electoral propositions. The first was Prop- osition 187, in the 1994 elections, which called for the termination of government health and social services for undocumented immigrants and made undocumented children ineligible for public schooling. The proposition was lat- er struck down by a federal court judge on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. In the 1998 elections, the state’s majority of white registered voters supported the anti-immigrant Proposition 227, which terminated bilingual classes for students with limited English profi- ciency, namely Latino and Latino immigrant stu- dents. It remains in effect. In 2005, the battleground shifted to the U.S. Congress, where right-wing House Republi- cans introduced anti-immigrant legislation, numbered HR 4437, with the title “Border Pro- tection, Anti-terrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act.” HR 4437 came to be known as the Sensenbrenner Bill after Wisconsin Republican Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner. It passed but was defeated in the U.S. Senate after over five million Latinos protested in the streets of Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and other cities across the nation with visible populations of Latino immigrants. The first and largest protest, numbering over a million Latinos, took place in the streets of Los Angeles on March 4, 2006. In 2010, the battleground shifted to Arizona’s state legislature, where right-wing Republicans succeeded in passing two bills, SB 1070 and HB 2281. The first bill made it a misdemeanor crime for an “alien” to be in the state without documents and allowed police to stop and question suspicious individuals who look like undocumented immigrants. In effect, it made it legal for police to racially profile Latinos. Two years later, in 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on SB 1070 in the case “Arizona v. United States.” It concluded that three provisions of the law were unconstitutional, but it upheld that the police had the right to stop and question the immigra- tion status of individuals they determine to look like undocumented immigrants. It was a victory for those advocating the racial profiling of Latinos and Latinas. The second Arizona bill HB 2281 outlawed Ethnic Studies in public schools, arguing that its curriculum promoted “the overthrow of the U.S. Government,” anti-white resentment, and “ethnic solidarity” instead of individualism. The real target of this bill was Mexican American Studies, because its curriculum included courses offering a critical reinterpretation of American history and underscoring the positive values of Mexican culture and traditions. Following the passage of this bill, books on the Mexican American experience were banned by the city of Tucson’s Unified School District. Anti-immigrant racial politics have also result- ed in an ongoing war against immigrants in the streets, their workplaces, and their homes. Mexicans are once again the main targets, be- cause they represent the vast majority of the undocumented. On a daily basis, immigrants are terrorized, arrested, imprisoned, and de- ported without trial by the Department of Homeland Security’s Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency. The U.S.-Mexico border has been a militarized zone since a wall was built during the presidency of liberal Democrat Bill Clinton. President Obama increased the militarization of the border by approving the allocation of the largest budget to the U.S. Border Patrol in history. There are now more border patrol police than there are FBI agents. He has also deported more immigrants than any other president in the history of the United States. Over 400,000 Latino immigrants were deported in 2012 alone. In addition, his administration supports the use of profit-making private prisons in the deportation process. Every day, upwards of 30,000 undocumented men, women, and children are imprisoned in them. Right-wing racist politics, U.S. government policies and anti-immigrant laws at the state level have given birth to an Immigrant Rights Movement with Mexicans and Mexican Americans as its core constituency. While its leadership and constituency is largely Latino, it is a multiracial and multiethnic movement that includes other people of color. It has put pressure on Presi- dent Obama to make comprehensive immigra- tion reform policy a priority on the agenda for the 2013 U.S. Congress. The movement, however, is not a cohesive one. It is basically a coalition comprised of a multi- tude of organizations, including unions, at the community, state, and national levels. Although all activists in the movement identify as “pro- gressives,” there are divisions between those advocating for human rights-based compre- hensive immigration reform versus those will-ing to settle for whatever compromise is agreed upon by Republicans and Democrats. Activists advocating human rights-based reform call for the demilitarization of the U.S.-Mexico border, the immediate termination of deporta- tions and ICE terrorism, no more guest worker programs, and legal protections for undocu- mented workers. Their organizations generally have transnational, anti-imperialist, anti-racist, or democratic socialist perspectives. They in- clude: the Hotel, Restaurant, & Janitor Work- ers Union, the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA), Ed- ucators for Fair Consideration, the Immigra- tion Legal Resource Center (ILRC), the Nation- al Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR), Blacks for a Just Immigration (BAJI), Filipinos for Justice, the National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALACC), MORENA (a bi-national democratic socialist Mexican grassroots organization), the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, the DREAM Activist Network, and the social network *presente.org*. In his second inaugural speech in January 2013, President Obama made clear that he does not support comprehensive human rights- based immigration reform. He instead advocated reform based on maintaining the militarized border and ICE enforcement focused on deportations, as well as the continuation of guest worker programs needed by corpo- rate interests, in return for a policy that maps out a long-term path to U.S. citizenship for the undocumented. Latino organizations support- ing the president and whatever compromises emerge from the Republicans and Democrats include the National Council of La Raza, the Center for Community Change, the National Immigration Forum, the Service Employees In- ternational Union (SEIU), the League of Unit- ed Latin American Citizens (LULAC), and the Mexican American Legal Defense & Education Fund (MALDEF). The members of the Hispanic Congressional Caucus, with one or two exceptions, will also support whatever compromise reform is agreed upon by the president and congress.

Historical and continuous exclusion inherent in United States policy and law shapes and impacts the identity of those on the borderlands. Not only are these peoples excluded based on being labeled foreign within United States society, they are also often rejected as American within Mexican society – it is this binaristic notion of always part of, or always outside of, a particular position that is so dangerous. When it is impossible to completely fit in either category, as is true for the Chicana woman, an inner war manifests itself that can only be resolved by overcoming such dualistic thinking.

Anzaldua writes:

87(Gloria, “Borderlands: The new Frontera,” P78)

The ambivalence from the clash of voices results in mental and emotional states of perplexity. Internal strife results in insecurity and indecisiveness. The mestiza's dual or multiple personality is plagued by psychic restlessness.¶ In a constant state of mental nepantilism, an Aztec word meaning torn between ways, la mestiza is a product of the transfer of the cultural and spiritual values of one group to another. Being tri-cultural, monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual, speaking patois, and in a state of perpetual transition, the mestiza faces the dilemma of the mixed breed: which collectivity does the daughter of a dark skinned mother listen to?¶ Ef choque de un alma atrapado entre el mundo del espiritu y el mundo de la tecnica a veces la deja entullada. Cradled in one culture, sandwiched between two cultures, straddling all three cultures and their value systems, la mestiza undergoes a struggle of flesh, a struggle of borders, an inner war. Like all people, we perceive the version of reality that our culture communicates. Like others having or living in more than one culture, we get multiple, often opposing messages. The coming together of two self-consistent but habitually incompatible frames of reference causes un choque, a cultural collision. Within us and within la cultura chicana, commonly held beliefs of the white culture attack commonly held beliefs of the Mexican culture, and both attack commonly held beliefs of the indigenous culture. Subconsciously, we see an attack: on ourselves and our beliefs as a threat and we attempt to block with a counterstance.¶ But it is not enough to stand on the opposite riverbank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. A counterstance locks one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed; locked in mortal combat, like the cop and the criminal, both are reduced to a common denominator of violence. The counterstance refutes the dominant culture's views and beliefs and, for this, it is proudly defiant. All reaction is limited by, and dependent on, what it is reacting against. Because the counterstance stems from a problem with authority – outer as well as inner - it's a step towards liberation from cultural domination. But it is not a way of life. At some point, on our way to a new consciousness, we will have to leave the opposite bank, the split between the two mortal combatants somehow healed so that we are on both shores at once and, at once, see through serpent and eagle eyes. Or perhaps we will decide to disengage from the dominant culture, write it off altogether as a lost cause, and cross the border into a wholly new and separate territory. Or we might go another route. The possibilities are numerous once we decide to act and not react.¶ A Tolerance For Ambiguity¶ These numerous possibilities leave La mestiza floundering in uncharted seas. In perceiving conflicting information and points of view, she is subjected to a swamping of her psychological borders. She has discovered that she can't hold concepts or ideas in rigid boundaries. The borders and walls that are supposed to keep the undesirable ideas out are entrenched habits and patterns of behavior; these habits and patterns are the enemy within. Rigidity means death. Only by remaining flexible is she able to stretch the psyche horizontally and vertically. La mestiza constantly has to shift out of habitual formations; from convergent thinking, analytical reasoning that tends to use rationality to move toward a single goal (a Western mode), to divergent thinking, characterized by movement away from set patterns and goals and toward a more whole perspective, one that includes rather than excludes. The new mestiza copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity. She learns to be an Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, she operates in a pluralistic mode – nothing is thrust out, the good the bad and the ugly, nothing rejected, nothing abandoned. Not only does she sustain contradictions, she turns the ambivalence into something else.¶ She can be jarred out of ambivalence by an intense, and often painful, emotional event which inverts or resolves the ambivalence. I'm not sure exactly how. The work takes place underground – subconsciously. It is work that the soul performs. That focal point or fulcrum, that juncture where the mestiza stands, is where phenomena tend to collide. It is where the possibility of uniting all that is separate occurs. This assembly is not one where severed or separated pieces merely come together. Nor is it a balancing of opposing powers. In attempting to work out a synthesis, the self has added a third element which is greater than the sum of its severed parts. That third element is a new consciousness – a mestiza consciousness – and though it is a source of intense pain, its energy comes from continual creative motion that keeps breaking down the unitary aspect of each new paradigm.¶ En unas pocas centurias, the future will belong to the mestiza. Because the future depends on the breaking down of paradigms, it depends on the straddling of two or more cultures. By creating a new mythos - that is, a change in the way we perceive reality, the way we see ourselves, and the ways we behave – la mestizo creates a new consciousness.¶ The work of mestiza consciousness is to break down the subject-object duality that keeps her a prisoner and to show in the flesh and through the images in her work how duality is transcended. The answer to the problem between the white race and the colored, between males and females, lies in healing the split that originates in the very foundation of our Eves our culture, our languages, our thoughts. A massive uprooting of dualistic thinking in the individual and collective consciousness is the beginning of a long struggle, but one that could, in our best hopes, bring us to the end of rape, of violence, of war.

In order to truly transcend such dualistic thinking and access a new consciousness we must begin by adopting an Aztlan aesthetic that creates a method in which the identity and culture of those on the borders can be rearticulated positively while breaking down the logic of colonialism and imperialism by challenging the legitimacy of the national border and natural claims to the land. Such challenges reveal how those on the borderlands have always been unaccounted for within US policy and law and challenges the very legitimacy of the United States as an actor.

Brady 2k2 (Mary Pat, “Extinct Lands, Temporal Geographies: Chicana Literature and the Urgency of Space, 2002, P143-145)

As a number of contemporary literary critics have observed, Aztlan collates a zeries of critiques, utopian longings, and postures that enable a multisited Chicano nationalist resistance to dominant labor and symbolic relations. Heart of Aztlan suggests that complex political resistance requires an organizing mythology solidly grounded in a mythic understanding of the “dark womb-heart of the earth.” In just such a manner, the 1969 turn to Aztlan was a useful move, many theorists have argued, because it filled an imaginary lack that impeded organizing for political change. Genaro Padilla, for example, notes interestingly that myths such as Aztlan “do kill time…In the process of transporting the individual and the community onto an ahistoric plane of consciousness, however, myth and legend must also succeed in reinvigorating the material surgace of history.” For Padilla, the myth of Aztlan functions in contradistinction to time and thus establishes a transhistorical framework from which to imagine political and economic change. For Emma Perez, on the other hand, Aztlan is better understood not as a myth beyond time but rather as one intertwined with it: “Aztlan, the mythic homeland shifts and moves beneath and around us. The mythic homeland is longed for, constructed, and rewritten through collective memories. Time is traversed, and a mythic past entwines with a future where a decolonized imaginary has possibilities.”18 The question of temporality haunts characterizations of Aztlan because of temporality’s centrality to nationalist imaginaries and because it underpins what could be called the moral assumptions of nationalist claims to land. It is precisely around the claims that Chicana/os made to land that the early phases of Chicano nationalism resonated with other land-based, anti-colonial movements. Noting the centrality of land claims in anticolonial movements, Edward Said argues, “Now if there is anything that radically distinguishes the imagination of anti-imperialism, it is the primacy of the geographical in it. Imperialism after all is an act of geographical violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, charted, and finally brought under control…For the native, the history of his/her colonial servitude is inaugurated by the loss to an outsider of the local place, whose concrete geographical identity must thereafter be searched for and somehow restored.”19

Aztlan exemplifies the “primacy of the geographical” in the Chicano anti-imperialist imaginary. By focusing on Aztlan, Chicanos could rearticulate their own experience, not as unwelcome migrants to the United States, not as exiles from the Mexican Revolution, not as dispossessed and landless peoples, but as a community with an ancient, even autochthonous relationship to a significant geographical portion of the United States – a relationship that preceded the arrival of Columbus and that thereby granted Chicanos a status similar to that of American Indians. Additionally, the turn to Aztlan enabled Chicana/os to analyze the United States in terms of its imperial practices and thus to connect with other land-based struggles across the globe. Aztlan fueled the redefinition of the past, modifying the past in order to change the present. The call to claim Aztlan also provided a stunning critique of the formation of U.S. boundaries and borders. By questioning the legitimacy of the national border on moral and legal terms, the invocation of Aztlan cast doubt on reigning economic and social relations. In some sense, the turn to Aztlan inaugurated a contest over “the natural” because it challenged the naturalized boundaries of the United States by positing an even more “natural” claim to the land through references to ancestors and cultural antecedents. The desire for primacy further provided a land-based legitimacy to the newly formulated term Chicano, the hope being that it would strengthen political resistance and allow for the formation of a new consciousness among Chicanos, just as the Heart of Aztlan envisions.

Given the notion that the law and government has never accounted for those on the borderlands, we must question the very notion of reform and engagement with the topic. Any potential US policy naturalizes the legitimacy of the US as an actor to govern the territory and peoples it claims to protect but continuously enacts violence against. Given the inherent contradictions that continuously manifest themselves in the law and perpetuate exclusion of those on the borders, in order to operate outside of an understanding of history and identity that is grounded in colonialism, we must begin from a starting point outside of the United States Government.

An aztlan aesthetic allows for this form of questioning while simultaneously deconstructing the dualistic thinking of identity through a new understanding of community that thinks difference positively.

Additionally, the forgetting of those on the borderlands is reflected in debate itself. The fact that the community has never had a resolution centered on an actor other than the United States Federal Government and quickly dismissed alternative resolutions in the face of maintaining the status quo reveals the privilege in which debate is grounded. Given the very topic selection, debate never chooses to account for those that have always been forgotten in United States Policy or those that can never ethically advocate an illegitimate actor. The procedures and the topic are not formulated for those that don’t view debate as only a game and are engaging in struggles external to the round. We must reconceptualize debate as a place that also thinks difference positively.

Warner 2k2 (Ede, University of Louisville, “Go Homers, Makeovers or Takeovers? A Privilege Analysis of Debate as a Gaming Simulation)

McIntosh (1988) speaks to the notion of both male and white privilege as an invisible knapsack carrying benefits and advantages that those without the extra luggage fail to receive. In particular, privilege has historically been part of the game of debate and still haunts any and all efforts at diversity, especially in intercollegiate policy debate. Do I exaggerate? Have you counted the number of Latino/Latina participants in non-Urban Debate League settings lately? How many women are judging late elimination rounds in national policy college tournaments? How many African Americans hold coaching positions, especially with terminal degrees? Historically, what is the gender and racial composition of high school and college debate topic committees? Why on a topic of race *and* gender civil rights, less than 10% of the affirmative cases were about race? What is the diversity of interscholastic high school policy debate outside of the Urban Debate Leagues? Are the new populations of urban students represented equally in elimination rounds compared to preliminary rounds of non-urban debate league tournaments? The statistics are commonplace enough that I will not recite them here, although there is always someone willing to use the a-typical example to disprove or mitigate the broader claims. The reality is that policy debate, especially at nationally competitive levels in high school and college, still disproportionately represent the domain of the white, economically privileged suburban male. That lack of diversity includes the coaching and judging ranks—generally the two groups that control procedure development—since winning ballots on procedural arguments is what dictates community procedural acceptance. If the judging community overwhelmingly votes against an affirmative case on topicality, few teams would continue to run that affirmative. Teams will adapt to the topicality argument in some way, look for creative solutions to procedural problems--like arguing that there is something more important than topicality (they create new areas of procedure contestation)—or sacrifice competitive success in lieu of keeping their voice on an issue of importance to them. More often than not, talk about privilege in debate is relegated mostly to economic and occasionally gender- or race-based discussions. Refocused recruiting efforts and accomplishments like Urban Debate Leagues and Women’s Caucuses at tournaments are addressing more overt concerns in an effort to create more equal playing fields, yet tremendous inequities remain that require explanation. Over twenty years of various diversity efforts, especially in CEDA, have failed to substantially change the racial, gender, social and economic composition of interscholastic policy debate at its highest levels. The reason is simple: privilege extends much further than just acknowledging overt and obvious disparities. Privilege creeps into more subtle, covert spaces, like the essence of why and how people “play the game,” recognizing that the rules and procedures are created by those carrying that privilege. Snider argues that the greatness of debate as a game is in his belief that it is short on inflexible rules and long on debatable procedures. However, if procedures are functionally not debatable and begin to look more like participation requirements than starting points of discussion, the quality of the game, is “not as successful and well-designed” (Snider, 1987, p. 123). Privilege envelopes both substantive and stylistic procedures, increasing the likelihood that supposedly debatable conventions become rigid norms, preventing achievement of a “more thoughtful” game and creating entrance barriers to successful participation. Here’s how. Snider (1987) says that evaluation of a “winning” procedural argument occurs through the lenses of determining which procedures best facilitate achieving the goals of the debate activity. Snider offers three such goals: 1) education of the participants; 2) discussion of important issues in the resolution; and 3) creation of a fair contest. He concedes that some may be missing. Of course, interested participants with lesser privilege might select different goals as more important, such as having a voice to discuss the topic through the perspective of their social concerns, even if this perspective doesn’t fit nicely with some of the other goals. More often than not, the creation of a “fair contest” is given an absolute priority relative to other goals and justifies ignoring attempts to achieve other game objectives. At least one implicit goal deserves mention: incorporation of the cultural and social values of the participants. It makes sense that the like-minded values of the largest participating class will dominant procedural and rule development of a game simulation. Cultural and social values may appear to have little or no relationship to the first three goals of debate. But in fact, the cultural and social values will in many ways dictate the meaning of Snider’s goals. What types of education do the participants’ value? Who decides what the important issues are—the participants? The communities most directly related to the topic? Do cultural and social values privilege any notions of “fairness”? Cultural and social background surely impacts each of these areas tremendously. If there are cultural or social disagreements over what constitutes “education,” what “issues” are important, or what is “fair,” then privilege plays a much larger role in game development than has been acknowledged to date. For example, the specialized jargon necessary to compete is a stylistic entry barrier that gets driven in no small part by privilege. My position is *not* that it is inappropriate to have jargon as a tool to facilitate understanding of particular argument concepts, but rather, that the argumentation theory should be driven by the argument made, not the other way around. Which of Snider’s goals does jargon fit into and why? I would argue that jargon is not necessary to achieve any of the three goals. A product of the social and cultural values of the participants, one can ask the rhetorical question, “Can a participant understand permutation theory without using the language choice, `permutation’?” If the answer is yes, then allowing debaters to use jargon to substitute for the actual argument creates an entrance barrier that may not be necessary and privileges a culture more likely to utilize this language style. If the answer is no, the question becomes why isn’t this a rule? The truth is that the acceptance of jargon-laded speech in delivery exists for one primary reason: to increase efficiency in argument presentation in order to make more arguments in the allotted time to increase the likelihood of winning. This is another condition that it would seem should be debatable and not generally assumed to function as a rule. If participants, especially educators, consistently substitute jargon for the actual argument, what initially appeared to be a procedure has now become functionally a rule and consequently an entrance barrier. Had the argument simply been made, non-participants could follow, even debate, the argument even if they could not recognize its theoretical significance, and the likelihood that practical learning by application of the theory is enhanced. Other stylistic procedures are directly tied to privilege. For example, the method of presentation is another area operating closer to a rule than procedure. CEDA/NDT debates do not begin with a discussion of how information and arguments are going to be presented. In fact, again there exists a series of accepted and even mandatory practices. Contrary to popular belief within the community, none of these practices, from speaking fast to relying on a very specific form of introducing evidence to flowing, have been proven to better meet Snider’s goals more than other stylistic practices. A slower debate that relies on non-traditional forms of argument and focuses on rhetorical savvy as opposed to flow-centered constructions of argument can equally meet those goals. Many of the debates I have judged since I stopped flowing are a living testament to this idea, as are many debates in which University of Louisville debaters have engaged. Delivery style has been another relatively rigid convention prior to the Louisville sustained collective commitment to challenge delivery procedures. Procedures for topic selection as well as arguments made in debates are certainly grounded in privilege. The types of topics that are more likely to interest a student are relative to one’s experiences and lot in life. Participants actively involved in a particular social-justice struggle that directly affect them are probably less likely to find interest in a game simulation of lesser direct relevance to their lives. The issues most directly relevant to the wealthy participant who has nepotistic connections in Washington and who has Congressional aspirations after leaving law school are often going to be fundamentally different from those whose direct government relationship is staying out of harms way where the local police are concerned or the student whose father is on death row and whose mother is struggling to make ends meet. What is perceived as relevant is relative, and often the population selecting topics has a homogenous privilege that prefers areas of interest less important to those without similar privilege. None of this proves that less privileged populations are incapable of debating these topics, just that they are likely less interested. Urban Debate League populations may challenge this belief, but evidence of substantial retention must be demonstrated, not just introductory participation. And even if there are high levels of Urban Debate League retention in intercollegiate debate, this would not provide evidence concerning whether more relevant topics and the ability to make one’s identity relevant to the topic being debated could increase participation and competitive success of non-privileged groups even more. The anecdotal evidence from the University of Louisville project suggests it might.[[1]](#endnote-1) Even when more relevant topic areas for those with less privilege are selected, they are usually written in ways that lose the most timely relevance and importance for those from those communities in an effort to preserve substantive procedure competitiveness. Past discussions on the development of the Africa and Native American topics offer examples where concerns for debatable “ground” and avoiding the wrong plan-inclusive counterplans create a topic that steers far from the literature base and issues most relevant to those directly impacted by the topic, or the goal of debating the “important issues.” The few Native Americans living on reservations who discussed this topic with members of the debate community almost uniformly said that an “increase in federal control” was not an issue that had relevance to them, and many found most of the cases on the topic offensive, as well as ignoring the timely issues they faced. Another hindrance to Snider’s vision of gaming simulation is that the policy debate community’s substantive procedures differ drastically from Snider’s more realistic perspective as outlined in earlier work (e.g., Snider, 1987). If the gaming model does not rely on fantastical conceptions like fiat but, rather, starts with the recognition that we are a student-driven game competing on the merits of a particular topic, this model simply is not an accurate description of how the game currently operates. Rhetorical claims like “we will stop nuclear war” or “we will end famine in Africa” are examples of fiat-based advocacy, or the assumption that the state is actually acting for the purpose of creating a fair division of ground for both teams. One test of comparison might be the public audience debate. Conventional notions of fiat do not exist, yet “fair” debates with sufficient “ground” happen all the time. Although many teams are beginning to reject this notion of fiat and arguing for the importance of the discourse being utilized, one might think these competitive frameworks are closer to the spirit of the gaming simulation. But they too often fall into the trap of making claims like, “our rhetoric is a demand on the state,” usually without a willingness to address the obvious question: how effective can a demand on the state be if the state fails to hear it? In either case, the continued desire to call for the ballot for actions that will not occur as a result of the actual signing of the ballot only fuels the fantastical speculation Snider argues against in earlier work. Again privilege seems to play a role in these manifestations as those without privilege are probably less inclined to role play, especially if involved in social justice struggles and interested in speaking to those issues.

### 2AC

#### The shift away from ancestral indigenous wisdom and continual denial of indigenous knowledge is the foundation of all forms of violence – only beginning with an Aztlan aesthetic can we return to a biocentric way of life, in which all life is respected, that would make abolishing the complex systems of oppression possible

McFarland 2k12 (Pancho, Chicano Rap: Gender and Violence in the Postindustrial Barrio, Sep 21, 2012, p144-146)

They contend that contemporary European-derived society is the source of oppression. In “Heavy,” members of El Vuh argue that many of the ills in our communities result from European colonialism: We have been kept from our ancient wisdom, torn away from our roots, that’s why we have drug dealers, gang bangers and prostitutes, identity lost, spiritual death is the cost, modern day holocaust, since 1942, but no one is making a big deal about it like they did for the Jew, you see, Hitler’s roots go back to Columbus, the first chance they got they started killing us, to this very day the killings are continuous. Mexican indigenous wisdom derived from centuries of examining celestial phenomena, nature, and human spirit allowed our ancestors to place themselves within a natural and spiritual order in which all life is respected. They observed a biocentric (life-centered) way of life. After five centuries of colonialism, the children of native Mexicans – Chicanas/os – have seen their “natural” ways replaced by anthropocentric (human-centered) value system whereby with each advancement in technology we find a concomitant increase in our distance from the natural world and each other. We have become ruled by a consumer ethic in which we define our quality of life by our relationship to things as opposed to our relationships with people and other living beings. Examining the often destructive interplay between technology, “progress,” and the nature of humanity, in “m.i.n.d” on *Jaguar Prophecies* El Vuh rhymes, technology has kept me under captivity, not allowing me to be who I’m supposed to be, a natural human, surrounded by the technological demon in search of my original origin, but where do I begin? E-Rise adds to this analysis in the first verse of “Spiritual Souldier,” rapping that “our souls are controlled by the billfold.” Money and the “mental penitentiary” control us and cause us to support corrupt politicians. We are blinded by material goods, causing us to back a beast who has us fighting wars to make his pockets obese…hidden societies won’t be pleased, till we’re all deceased, or on our knees, man-made disease and killer police run loose on my peeps [people]. For El Vuh and other indigenist-Mexica rappers and musicians, everything from police violence to greed, misogyny, prostitution, and drugs result from the loss of ancient wisdom caused by European colonization of Anahuac or Turtle Island, names that indigenous peoples gave the Americas. Like Krazy Race and others, El Vuh suggests that unity among oppressed people in resistance to racist, capitalist, misonynist domination is the solution for our survival and the survival of all beings. El Vuh as Mexica focuses on the unity of indigenous peoples throughout the Americas as in this line from “Heavy”: “Mexica, the day will come when all of Anahuac will be unified as one.” Again echoing Krazy Race’s stance that it is up to us to change our situation, El Vuh shouts that we need to return to an older way of life and worldview: “broken is the cycle once you decide to change your mind/ unleashing the ancestry that was left behind.” Like their elder Luis J. Rodriguez, members of El Vuh hail from the dangerous urban environs of Los Angeles where violence, poverty, and disillusionment are concentrated. Much like Rodriguez, El Vuh sees part of the problem as a loss of identity and an uncertain future for many youth. They rap and put music to the efforts of urban activists who are promoting new rituals and ceremonies as a way to provide a sense of identity, a pathway, and a future for youth. Lines in “Heavy” exemplify the way in which El Vuh sees a pathway out of the dire circumstances for many of our youth: “enter the circle and find your true identity/ not a fantasy/ brought over by a foreign mentality.” Throughout the album El Vuh evokes images of ritual and ceremony such as entering a prayer circle, thanking “the four directions, Mother Earth and Father Sky,” and praying to gods and goddesses such as “Tezcatlipoca, Quetzalcoatl, and Ometeoh.” They rap that through ritual we can find healing and find ourselves.

#### Dualistic thinking led to class divisions – means that breaking down such thinking solves the K

Morrigan, No date (Clementine, writer, poet, essayist and multidisciplinary artist, “Multiplicity: Three feminist texts,” <http://clementinemorrigan.com/essays/multiplicity-three-feminist-texts/>)

Feinberg’s socialist analysis positions the enforcement of the male/female and masculine/feminine binaries as a tool to aid the imposition of a classed society and then to assist with the process of colonization. For Feiberg, as for Anzaldúa, all systems of oppression are inextricably linked. The division of the people into hierarchically arranged binaries such as male/female and gender-conforming/gender-nonconforming stripped them of their power. This then made the transition to a society based on the binary of ruling class/working poor easier. The witch hunts in Europe not only terrorized a people into abandoning a way of life which valued and respected women and trans people, it also procured through “the seizures of lands and assets of the ‘accused’ the capital to expand their domination over Asia, Africa and the Americas” (139). Colonization then violently forced binarist systems which denied multiple forms of gender expression on the rest of the world.

Multiplicity breaks down binarist frameworks and questions the inevitability of divides that pit oppressed groups against one another – preventing coalescing which is the only way to solve the K

Morrigan, No date (Clementine, writer, poet, essayist and multidisciplinary artist, “Multiplicity: Three feminist texts,” http://clementinemorrigan.com/essays/multiplicity-three-feminist-texts/)

Irigaray, Anzaldúa and Feinberg each envision multiplicity as a space of possibility and reinvention. Irigaray describes “a sort of universe in expansion for which no limits could be fixed and which, for all that, would not be incoherency” (388). Anzaldúa writes “I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only has produced a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings” (257). Feinberg states “It is apparent that there are many ways for women and men to be; everything in nature is a continuum” (133). These multiplistic visions of a universe in expansion, a creature which occupies both halves of a binary and questions the meanings of those categories, and of a natural continuum, offer different ways of thinking about the world. Irigaray, Anzaldúa and Feinberg not only call out the dangers and damages of hierarchical binarist systems they also invite us to open our minds to the creative potentiality of a world not based on binaries. They ask us to use our imaginations and suggest that this imaginative, generative way of thinking is in fact more natural than the reductive, limiting framework we have been trained to think with.

Hierarchical binarist systems deny humanity and limit possibility. They are oppressive and exploitative. They divide people and pit oppressed groups against each other. Binaries are produced through the denial, suppression and punishment of multiplicity. Multiplicity, the occupation of more than one space simultaneously, when not erased or destroyed, disrupts these binarist frameworks. Irigaray, Anzaldúa and Feinberg explore the tension between multiplicity and binary in their texts in different yet overlapping ways. Taken together, the three writers provide complex and imaginative approaches to thinking outside of binaries. We are asked to question the discreteness, naturalness and inevitability of such binaries as male/female, white/nonwhite, heterosexual/queer, cis/trans, ruling class/working poor, oppressor/oppressed and even singularity/multiplicity. We are also asked to consider what ends the production and maintenance of these binaries is in service of and whether we would like to imagine something more. Feminism is enriched and strengthened by an exploration of multiplicity and binary, promoting an opening of possibilities rather than a closing of them.  Irigaray, Anzaldúa and Feinberg complicate our thinking for the better.

**acts of English in the 1700s when the system was born**. **In the global economy, people are displaced because the economies of their countries of origin are transformed. That transformation enables corporations and elites to transfer value, or wealth, out of those countries**. **After World War Two, the former colonies**

#### Their interpretation relies on an impoverished understanding of action: the belief that action must be solely governed by rationality, judged based on its effectiveness and usefulness in deliberative judgment and confined to pragmatic goals foregrounds a masculine Cartesian subject at the expense of difference. The AFF’s defense of communicative thinking allows for a more open vision of dialogue which can engage difference without overwriting oppressed people under the guise of expediency.

**Pajnik 2006**

/Mojca, THE PEACE INSTITUTE, INSTITUTE FOR CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES, LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA, “Feminist Reﬂections on Habermas’s

Communicative Action: The Need for an Inclusive Political Theory,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 2006 9: 385, DOI: 10.1177/1368431006065719/

Jane Braaten (1995) notes that Habermas, with his theory of communicative action, distances himself, on the one hand, from the Cartesian philosophy of the subject, but, on the other, reproduces it with the concept of communicative rationality. In explaining communicative rationality, Habermas becomes overly trapped in the patriarchy of traditional epistemology, which tries to defend the possibility of action in the period of the new historicism of late modernity. Braaten tries to understand Habermas’s theory through the perspective of feminist reasoning and feminist epistemology, on which she bases her alternative to communicative rationality. She calls it communicative thinking, which is based on two principles: the principle of solidarity and the principle of intersubjectivity. As an alternative to the technical image of rationality, grounded in Western, Anglo-American theoretical traditions, according to which rational action, to use Plato’s terminology, is reserved for the ‘enlightened’, Braaten advocates a rational feminist discourse which is based on the principle of solidarity and linked to the issues of discrimination against women. By defending different forms of rational action, she attempts to transcend the bounds of a technical explanation of the success and effectiveness of action, which Habermas also problematized, particularly with the critique of strategic, instrumental action (see Habermas, [1963] 1972, 1968). The difference between communicative rationality and communicative thinking is also explained by the author by drawing on the principle of intersubjectivity: in Habermas’s communicative rationality, this is too narrowly tied to the linguistic process of accepting and rejecting arguments, or is at least, as pointed out by Dallmayr (1984: 236), not clearly formulated. Communicative thinking is a concept which reﬂects the complexity of everyday life, and the multiple means of action and which takes into account the diversity of contexts of action. Braaten understands it as wider than communicative rationality – this she understands in a somewhat narrow sense as (merely) spoken agreement, achieved by the domination of the superior argument. Consensus, which in Habermas arises from a commonly deﬁned objectivity, assumes ideal, abstract individuals, while communicative thinking considers life contexts and memories. Communicative thinking includes ‘imagination and ﬂexibility’ (Braaten, 1995: 156) and relies on forms of action which try to aerate the stability of social structures. From the standpoint of the organization of society, communicative thinking does not mean a rejection or abandonment of communicative rationality, but rather an extension of rationality in the direction of conceptualization, which Darij Zadnikar recognizes in Habermas and calls ‘a multi-dimensional (“soft”) theory of rationality’ (Zadnikar, 1995: 9). Braaten, whose explanation of communicative thinking explicitly draws on a personal, even physical, feminist perspective, identiﬁes several meanings for this concept. Communicative thinking foremost means respecting differences in everyday life with the inclusion of possibilities for the transformation of conventional politics, with the aim of meeting speciﬁc needs, for instance, those of women. It advocates the rethinking of the position of different groups of citizens to respect the speciﬁcities of life contexts and opportunities. By providing an alternative to one-dimensionality and the systematic, uniﬁed arrangement of structures, it stimulates the multi-dimensionality of expression (Braaten, 1995: 156, 157). Communicative thinking is a response to a technically deﬁned rationality which, in the view of some critics, is still present in Habermas’s theory; it assumes the Kantian action of autonomous, rational subjects: we can speak of the success of speech acts, according to Habermas, when rational subjects act in order to achieve a rational consensus. In this, they are acting according to communicative norms, the rules of universal pragmatics, which assume a communicative competence for grammatical expression. This rigidly deﬁned communicative rationality implies, as expressed in Benjamin Barber’s categories, too thin an understanding of communicative action and in this framework communicative thinking as an alternative is of interest.

#### Their understanding of communication includes difference as an afterthought to the necessity of a liberal rational deliberative community premised on a rigid and exclusionary set of conditions for participation. The focus on goal and action oriented communication excludes and erases difference, thereby cementing dominant structures of violence. The AFF’s inclusive vision of communication is able to rupture normative understandings of action, speech and value; thus creating an emotive community where narration can counter dominant understandings of subjectivity which result in subjection.

**Pajnik 2006**

/Mojca, THE PEACE INSTITUTE, INSTITUTE FOR CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES, LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA, “Feminist Reﬂections on Habermas’s

Communicative Action: The Need for an Inclusive Political Theory,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 2006 9: 385, DOI: 10.1177/1368431006065719/

Inclusion is a criterion of political legitimacy that implies the ability to transcend individual interests not by negating those interests but through interacting with, listening to, and responding to others. Inclusive political communication is developed by Iris Marion Young (2000) as an attempt to extend the Habermasian concept of communicative action to a theorization of responsibility of the individual towards others and an openness in the sense of publicity. The theorization of inclusion requires an expansion of communicative action from rational argumentation towards other forms of expression and articulation. The component of the inclusive in communicative action relates to the inclusion of embodied forms of expression: emotion, metaphor, expressiveness etc., i.e. expression that contains, using Arendt’s terminology, the ability to discover truth (Arendt, [1961] 1985: 54). The viewpoints expressed, the opinions and demands of individuals and groups, and especially of minority/marginalized groups, are often unheard or considered unimportant. At the same time, formal rules according to which minority groups have public relevance, and according to which their opinions should be actively heard, do not produce the necessary actual (empirical) publicly and politically acknowledged relevance of these groups. Inclusiveness thus is not based so much on a liberal ideal of an all-inclusive democratic potential, but connotes a more inclusive communicative action. Gender, racial, or cultural differences, or differences that arise from the different needs of various groups of individuals are often marginalized. The result of Habermas’s normative assumption of the equal value of the use of the speech act for all remains at the level of the ideal and can have exclusionary consequences in practice. Habermas’s discourse, which assumes the freedom and equality of individuals in public debate and includes the principle of reciprocity of perspectives in the public sphere, is, as Carol Gould (1996: 172) notes, attractive but problematic. The difﬁculties appear especially in the treatment of difference: generalized interest as the result of Habermas’s discourse deliberations does not sufﬁciently take into account differences between individuals and groups that are publicly active. In Habermas’s theory, difference is recognized merely as ‘the presence of the different and no more than this’ (Gould, 1996: 177; see also 1990: 18). At this level there is a discrepancy between the normative discourse model of the public sphere, which is based on universalistic principles (openness and equality of access, participation, etc.), and attempts to theorize differences related to the recognition of difference, the protection of particularity, and so on. Gould argues for a redeﬁnition of Habermas’s communicative action that would validate differences. She places differences as a point of departure from which she wishes to go beyond Habermas’s theorization of differences as a commodity of discussion or as expressions on which the status of the private is necessarily imposed. According to this interpretation, Habermas’s theory treats differences only as material that can be manipulated, or as a marginal privacy that does not appear in the public sphere as potentially redeﬁning public action (Gould, 1996: 172, 173). The stability of what appears to be unquestionable norms of rational, argumentative articulation on which communicative action, according to Habermas, is based, tends towards the exclusion of emotive expression. This being the case, Young proposes an expansion of communicative action to include three modes of action: (1) greeting and public acknowledgement; (2) afﬁrmative rhetoric; and (3) narrative and situated knowledge. The aim of discussing three modes of communication is in the addition of dimensions that extend political communication, or rather, do not limit it to the achievement of consensus on the basis of spoken, rational argumentation. Moreover, the three modes of communication are not realized in the public sphere through the negation of argument as a form of communication, but contribute to ‘enriching both a descriptive and normative account of public discussion and deliberation’ (Young, 2000: 57). They also imply a critical response to a mistrustful attitude towards the expressive, which, at least since the time of Descartes, has meant equating the expressive and the subjective generally with a lack of clarity and an absence of reality: Among communicative expressions, greeting implies a recognition of individuals in their particularity. Greeting is a communicative moment, a public acknowledgement, which is not based on Levinas’s ontological ethics or on Taylor’s politics of recognition. These belong, in Zolo’s terminology, in the sphere of ‘Christian ethics and humanistic culture’. This produces a standardized rationality that is actualized through the privileging of certain forms of action and the exclusion of other forms (Zolo, 1992: 31, 37). Acknowledgement is a political moment, which in Habermas’s speech practice adds the expression of speech, its manifestation. Greeting is an expression of acknowledgement of discourse or communicative equality, which implies the possibility of establishing interactions on the basis of trust and listening. ‘Communicative political gestures’ (Young, 2000: 61) represent the recognition of others via discursive inclusion that is neither merely pro forma nor an end goal of communicative action, but rather the initial moment of political interaction. This moment indicates that communicative action comprises more than merely that which is expressed with arguments and which relies on articulation and coherent linguistic formulation, but also other discursive signs. (2) Afﬁrmative rhetoric is another form in the typology that implies a widening of the concept of communicative action. Young argues for changing the understanding of rhetoric, or rather for transcending Platonic interpretations that arise from the difference between rational speech and action. According to these interpretations, rational speech is based on universalistic, unemotional/non-expressive and neutral argumentation, while rhetoric is based on strategically directed communication, meaning the achievement of a goal by using strategies of manipulation. Leon Mayhew (1997: 37) states that Habermas’s rhetoric is an ‘indirect force’, and that Habermas ‘assimilates’ rhetoric with force. The separation of the rational from the irrational in Habermas pushes aside emotion, imagination, and playful forms of action, which are regarded as not worthy of attention. Rhetoric in communicative action, in contrast, includes three aspects of communication: (1) the emotional tone of the discourse (its content is uttered with fear, joy, anger or other expressions of passion); (2) the use in the discourse of ﬁgures of speech (such as metaphor, puns, along with humorous, ironic, etc. styles); and (3) forms of making a point that do not only mean speech, such as visual media, signs, banners, street demonstrations, and guerrilla theatre (Young, 2000: 65). The reformulation of rhetoric in communicative action implies a recognition and rethinking of conﬂict, in which certain groups of citizens can be excluded, owing to ‘non-standard’ modes of expression. Rhetoric relates to reﬂexiveness in the sense of active listening to various speakers. It brings inclusiveness into communicative action since it is based on the active recognition of the speciﬁcity of context and the positioning of political actors. An understanding of rhetoric by means of inclusion in communicative action means that rhetoric ‘becomes a feature of political expression to which we ought to attend in our engagement with one another, rather than an aspect of expression we try to bracket in order to be truly rational’ (Young, 2000: 64). (3) Narrative and situated forms of knowledge represent the third way to expand the conceptualization in the direction of inclusiveness. This form implies an active response to conditions when the experience and the values of the majority inﬂuence minority discourse by means of domination, repression, devaluation or demanding change in the sense of a necessary compatibility with the dominant paradigm. Narration and storytelling mean illuminating veiled perspectives and empowering the excluded to speak. They also represent a challenge to the supposedly neutral, unbiased, and standardized principles of valid legal norms. These forms of narrative show, explain and describe experience that has been silenced; they bring expression of exclusion, discrimination and injustice, in which, as Hannah Arendt would say, there is a public action as a performative action, for appearance and discovery, for Selbstdarstellung as active presence, and not for action which has some ﬁnal product (Arendt, [1961] 1985: 153; 1978: 29). Story-telling is an important strategy for the uncovering of injustice and systemic mistakes whose victims are marginalized groups, for example, migrants – in situations where exclusion cannot be explained through universal argumentation.

#### Debate privileges certain forms of knowledge production as legitimate or illegitimate – this is dangerous, denying the reimagining of possibilities that promote rather than negate multiplicities. Debaters experience rejection when they do not conform to traditional argument choice, communication, and practices that the dominant community has deemed legitimate.

Eisenberg in 2012  
Particular types of argument choices may affect the way participants experience a debate round. For example, debaters may experience some pushback to some of the arguments they wish to speak about in debate, especially if they are trying to integrating personal experiences into their argument. For example, Akila explains that debaters tend to treat each other as if it is a race to the bottom, where the ballot is the only thing that matters. Judy notes that this norm of the community to place emphasis on competitive success allows people to justify arguments that are reprehensible or “not okay.” Akila highlights several examples of teams who will justify racism, sexism and imperialism as appropriate side effects of advocacies that claim to save the lives of many people from potential nuclear war scenarios constructed through a lens of political realism. Ivana notes that externalized logic, large body counts and phallic weapons are privileged over personal experience or “your own body.” Akila feels that debaters don’t place an emphasis on trying to relate to one another, and feels that debate isn’t an alternative space where students are encouraged to relate more ethically towards one another. Like Judy, Akila agrees that the atmosphere promotes an emphasis on competitive success that makes debate feel like “warfare,” a common masculine metaphor. Akila shares: On a personal level, I spent time writing this poem to try to convey to you what being a woman of color and an immigrant is like under this year’s topic which is immigration, but because of the way that we are taught to socialize in a sort of militarized space that is debate, that gets lost until it becomes some sort of arsenal or some sort of weapon. My narrative is just a reason we should win because it foregrounds experiences of immigrants…that’s not a good way of understanding why people put themselves in debates. People put themselves in debates because debate needs to be less insular; it needs to be less detached from the reality of what we talk about. While some women experienced this as a barrier, others did not perceive specific arguments as inherently gendered or as a roadblock to their participation or success in debate. Even though Catherine adopts this particular perspective, she has become more aware of language choices in argumentation, and explains that she frequently hears rhetoric that equates certain argument choices with weakness, such as comparing arguments with rape or making comments such as “that’s gay” or other. These comparisons serve to reaffirm hegemonic masculinity, and Catherine feels that this type of rhetoric is a distinct barrier to inclusion in debate. In order to combat some of these barriers, women utilize argument choice itself as a tactic. Ivana, for example, frequently deploys feminist arguments in debate rounds. She notes that even though some men in the community find it acceptable to speak more candidly about women’s bodies and sexual experiences, it is perpetually taboo to speak about women’s bodies in debate rounds. Ivana deployed arguments related to women’s menstruation as one way to engage this dichotomy she is confronted with. Thomas (2007) explains how the menstruation taboo in modern Western society is “restricting Western women from full citizenship” (p. 76). Ivana’s decision to speak out in this public forum about women’s menstruation might be thought of as a tactic to confront this taboo while reclaiming a sense of citizenship in the debate community or even in the round itself. By requiring both the judge to listen and the other team to engage her discussion of menstruation, she can call for a questioning of this simultaneous objectification and silencing of women while establishing a space for her to feel engaged and empowered by her argument. Other women chose to approach these tensions by using personal experience as evidence, sharing their own stories in debate rounds. Davis (2007) argues that “women’s subjective accounts of their experiences and how they affect their everyday practices need to be linked to a critical interrogation of the cultural discourses, institutional arrangements, and geopolitical contexts in which these accounts are invariably embedded” (p. 133) This is precisely what these women are doing, weaving their own narratives in with theoretical texts and political events situated while acknowledging the particular institutional space the activity is located in. Lucille doesn’t feel that she uses tactics in debate rounds very often to overcome these barriers, however she notes that there are instances where enough was enough and she spoke about her subjectivity as a woman. Several women noted that being able to speak about being a female or femininity in general while also remaining strategic and successful was an empowering tactic. Akila calls these types of tactics “little disruptions,” or subversive instances in debate that challenge their competitors and judges to a moment of reflexivity.

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)