# Equity Updates

## Discourse Key

#### As an individual confronted with the issues presented in our 1AC, your only ethical choice is to critically interrogate dominant narratives of racial oppression. This obligation comes first in debate.**Reid-Brinkley 08** (Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, Assistant Professor of African American Studies and Communications as well as the Director of Debate at the University of Pittsburgh, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE,” 2008.<http://www.comm.pitt.edu/faculty/documents/reid-brinkley_shanara_r_200805_phd.pdf>)

To begin an investigation of these questions of race, representation and performance, I utilize ideological criticism as a rhetorical method. This project is interested in the ideological discourses and representations of race, class, gender, and sexuality within the public conversation about race and education. The dominant narratives, bred within institutional structures, must be interrogated for processes of normalization implicated in the success and achievement of black students in American society. In other words, an ideological analysis provides us with an opportunity to critically analyze the networks of power through which ideologies flow and gain discursive and representative dominance. The Marxist conception of ideology, reformulated and popularized by Louis Althusser, revolves around the assumption that social bodies are trapped within a “false consciousness” that blinds them to the truth. Althusser argues that “ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.” 66 Such a conception of ideology was necessary to explain why the working class did not rise up against the ruling class. Such ideologies were theorized as part of the superstructure resulting in the limited ability of subjects to exercise agency. For Althusser, dominant ideologies allowed the social structure to reproduce itself without ensuing conflict. Ideology functioned to naturalize the dominant structure encouraging individuals to participate by engaging in practices and behaviors designed to maintain that system. More importantly, ideologies were thought to construct an imaginary reality by which social beings became dependent on the structure as it functions, in order to make sense of their very lives. In essence, ideology was considered to be deterministic, binding individuals to the imaginary reality. However, current scholarship has been expressly critical of such a conceptualization of ideology, particularly, within the field of cultural studies, as it made the critical turn away from the study of dominant ideology and toward the cultural and everyday practices by which subjects engage ideological domination. Noted theorists, including Michel Foucault, Raymond Williams, and Stuart Hall have offered significant critiques of such a view of the relations of power in social system. One criticism of this version of ideology is that it assumes there is a truth, somewhere out there, that we are unable to ascertain because of the false consciousness produced through ideological discourses. 67 Second, as Foucault argues, “ideology stands in a secondary position relative to something which functions as its infrastructure, as its material, economic determinant, etc.” 68 In other words, ideology is defined as a result of economic structures. Thus, the economic structures are pre-existent and thus, uninfluenced by ideology, but simply productive of it. And, third, if the individual or the subject is not critical to the development of such ideological structures, but are instead determined by them, then social subjects become agent-less. They become simply social beings produced by the superstructure. Despite significant criticism of the concept of ideology, it remains significantly useful in the study of social domination. We can agree that there is not some true expression of reality out there that we are somehow blinded from seeing. We can agree that ideology is both produced by and produces economic and social structures. And, we can agree that social actors and their actions are not determined by ideology as much as social actors are strongly influenced toward accepting those ideologies as within their best interest, an internalization of ideological discourse as inscribed through various apparatuses of power. Yet, as media and communications scholar Nicolas Garnham cautions, the focus on resistance in cultural studies can prevent us from studying the manner in which dominance is maintained, both through structure and discourse. 69 He notes that it is the responsibility of intellectuals to map out structural and social dominance. Social actors participate in the production and maintenance of culture, both dominant and subordinate. In any given situation, both dominance and resistance are likely to be active in varying degrees. Thus, this project is not simply interested in the study of the production and maintenance of dominant ideologies; simultaneously, we must look to the manner in which social actors engage in resistance efforts within and through such dominant ideologies. Contemporary racism is reproduced and maintained through discursive constructions that are circulated through ideologies. Ideologies help to make stereotypical representations intelligible to an audience. As long as racism remains a social phenomenon in our society, racial ideologies will likely remain a critical tool by which racial difference is signified. All racial ideologies do not function the same way; they are often complicated by intersections of class, gender, sexuality and context. And, as ideologies often function to dominate, they also create circumstances for resistance. This project seeks to engage both dominance and resistance; how racial ideologies reproduce social dominance, and how those affected by that dominance attempt to resist it. The rhetoric surrounding race and education offers one space from which to analyze the social reproduction of racial dominance**.** Looking to specific contexts through which we analyze the significance of racial ideologies allows us as scholars to map out the forces of power active through racial difference. Specifically, a rhetorical focus can map the public discursive maneuvers that (re)produce and resist these social ideologies. The rhetoric surrounding race, culture, and performance within educational discourse is of critical importance to the future course of educational opportunity in American society. We must understand the strategies of signification that are most persuasive and powerful to the general public audience. What representations of racial others are most intelligible to the public and how might racial others respond to that intelligibility? As our previous discussion of the “acting white” thesis and the rise of cultural explanations of racial difference indicate, contemporary ideological representations of race have changed and in some ways remained the same. We must interrogate the use of ideological representations of race, gender, class, and sexuality as rhetorical strategy in public deliberations. And, it is important to read the social actors involved and watching as embodied. It is quite clear, that the public discourse surrounding race and education is extensive and far beyond the space allotted for this project. Thus, I have chosen a localized context from which to interrogate the ideological representations of race that may operate in any given American educational context. Academic policy debate is a competitive activity available to high school and college students. The activity dates back to the early 1900’s in American history. 70 It is an extracurricular activity that pits students against one another in a rigorous mental and verbal challenge. To engage in the ideological analysis of race and education discourse, I analyze three case studies within American policy debate and its representation. Chapter Two is an analysis of a non-profit organization for minority, inner city youths, the Urban Debate League, that has received wide media representation. I analyze the representation of UDL participants in local and national newspapers, as well as, an extended primetime story by 60 minutes on the Baltimore Urban Debate League. In this chapter, I argue that successful black students are scapegoated in news media representation and then redeemed by their debate participation. More specifically, I argue that the news media relies on racial stereotypes of black youths to make the UDL participants intelligible to the viewing and reading audience. It is necessary for the audience to view the students as “at risk” in order to later demonstrate their exemplary status. It is the students’ ability to mimic the performative dynamics of success that allows their race, class, and gender status to be redeemed in news media representation. I conclude that such a practice demonstrates the social significance of the stereotype even in positive portrayals of inner city black youths. Chapter Three is an analysis of race and performance in national college policy debate. The rising interest in diversifying policy debate at the high school level through non-profit organizations has fueled attempts to diversify at the college level. This chapter analyzes the University of Louisville Malcolm X debate program as it pushes the debate community to confront its race and class privilege. In this chapter, I ask how do black students respond to the racial ideologies surrounding their debate participation? What are the rhetorical strategies by which they engage a majority white audience in public discussion about race, privilege, and performance? I argue that these students use black sub-cultural styles, including signifyin’, and black popular culture such as gospel and hip hop, to engage in a critical re-negotiation of intellectual knowledge making practices within the debate community. I argue further that the Louisville students engage in rhetorical practices that violate the genre of policy debate speechmaking. To engage in this investigation I review three elimination round debates at the Cross-Examination Debate Association’s National Championship Tournament. I specifically focus on the most successful of the Louisville teams made up of the partnership between Elizabeth Jones and Tonia Green. I argue that the use of subcultural style offers a means for the Louisville students to resist the norms of white privilege that permeates the traditional debate landscape. Chapter Four is an analysis of the debate community’s response to the Louisville Project. In this chapter we are interested in how a majority white community responds to confrontational protest rhetoric in resistance narratives centered around racial representation and performance. I argue that the debate community engages in anti-movement resistance strategies. Instead of an outright rejection of the Louisville Project, the debate community attacks the Project’s violation of the community’s notion of order and decorum. Through these three case studies, I seek to demonstrate the connection between the public representation of blackness and the performative strategies engaged in by Blacks in the attempt to resist the stereotypes associated with such representations. This project takes seriously the use of performative and cultural style as a strategic and rhetorical engagement with contemporary racism in America.

#### Mounting resistance to the disciplinary structure of education is the only way to save it. The racist power of the debate community is sustained by debaters and will eventually destroy our activity.**Reid-Brinkley 08** (Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, Assistant Professor of African American Studies and Communications as well as the Director of Debate at the University of Pittsburgh, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE,” 2008. http://www.comm.pitt.edu/faculty/documents/reid-brinkley\_shanara\_r\_200805\_phd.pdf)

The attempts at educational reform are not limited to institutional actors such as the local, state, and federal governments. Non-profit organizations dedicated to alleviating the black/white achievement gap have also proliferated. One such organization, the Urban Debate League, claims that “Urban Debate Leagues have proven to increase literacy scores by 25%, to improve grade-point averages by 8 to 10%, to achieve high school graduation rates of nearly 100%, and to produce college matriculation rates of 71 to 91%.” The UDL program is housed in over fourteen American cities and targets inner city youths of color to increase their access to debate training. Such training of students defined as “at risk” is designed to offset the negative statistics associated with black educational achievement. The program has been fairly successful and has received wide scale media attention. The success of the program has also generated renewed interest amongst college debate programs in increasing direct efforts at recruitment of racial and ethnic minorities. The UDL program creates a substantial pool of racial minorities with debate training coming out of high school, that college debate directors may tap to diversify their own teams. The debate community serves as a microcosm of the broader educational space within which racial ideologies are operating. It is a space in which academic achievement is performed according to the intelligibility of one’s race, gender, class, and sexuality. As policy debate is intellectually rigorous and has historically been closed to those marked by social difference, it offers a unique opportunity to engage the impact of desegregation and diversification of American education. How are black students integrated into a competitive educational community from which they have traditionally been excluded? How are they represented in public and media discourse about their participation, and how do they rhetorically respond to such representations? If racial ideology is perpetuated within discourse through the stereotype, then mapping the intelligibility of the stereotype within public discourse and the attempts to resist such intelligibility is a critical tool in the battle to end racial domination. Education theorist Ludwig Pongratz argues that the testing focus in the standards and accountability movement is “probably the most effective means of realizing disciplinary procedures.” 11 He argues further that the contemporary “reformist drive” sweeping western nations is a tool designed to replicate normative practices, values, beliefs and behaviors consistent with the broader society. In other words, building on the work of Michel Foucault, Pongratz argues that the educational system, including reform efforts, function as a disciplinary “apparatus” that shapes and molds social bodies into normalized social systems. 12 The disciplinary character of modern education systems do not operate through institutional control, but instead through the positioning of social bodies to engage in self-control, an internalization of the discourse of institutional power**.** Pongratz notes that “in this way, it becomes possible to integrate school pupils into the school’s institutional framework more effectively than ever before.” 13 Acclaimed French Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’ theory of habitus is useful here. For Bourdieu, habitas represents the incorporation of the “social into the corporeal.” 14 Gender theorist Terry Lovell argues “Through habitus, social norms are incorporated in the body of the individual subject.” 15 An institution, like those attached to public education in the U.S. “can only be efficacious if it is objectified in bodies in the form of durable dispositions that recognize and comply with the specific demands of a given institutional area of activity.” 16 In other words, the disciplinary character of the school system only functions in so much as disciplinary parameters can be internalized by the members of a social body. What is missing from the study of education reform and the black/white “achievement gap” is an analysis of the discursive construction of racial “images and stereotypes with which” the public is “confronted.” 17 Public discourse about education reform, particularly that which revolves around the black/ white achievement gap, requires the use of race, class, and gender imagery that is intelligible to the general public. In essence, from experts to politicians to the news media, public representations of black underachievement and reform efforts depend on the versatility of social and cultural stereotypes consistent with the argumentative structures and social ideologies that make rhetorical efforts at reform intelligible. Education reform engages in a discourse of “paradigm shift.” 18 In essence there is a discursive consistency amongst education reform proponents for characterizing reform efforts as a change in perspective from previous values and beliefs about how best to educate America’s youth. Philosophy of education scholar Jeff Stickney argues that scholars interested in the production of education reform discourse should be concerned with “how a change of perception is to be brought about or secured.” 19 In other words, Stickney argues that the discourse supporting educational reform functions to discipline educators into a compliance that belies any attempt to critique and engage the viability of the reform effort to the specific contexts educators find themselves working within. 20 While Stickney is interested in engaging such discourse for the purpose of furthering theoretical scholarship on curriculum development, his study raises the question of how the public discourse surrounding education reform may function to discipline its differently situated stakeholders.

## Impact (Racism)

#### Every instance of racism must be rejected

**Memmi, 2000** (Albert, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ Unv. Of Paris, RACISM, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.163-165, JG)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved, yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism. One cannot even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism because racism signifies the exclusion of the other and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is “the truly capital sin.”fn22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall,” says the bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice. A just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

## FW Answers

#### The neg’s appeals to objective rules are based in the same flawed system of laws that whiteness wraps itself in an attempt to sustain privilege. Voting on framework only enforces the system that is only fair in the eyes of the oppressor.

Vargas 05 (Geiza, Juris Doctor, Boston College Law School, “White Investment in Black Bondage”, 27 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 41, 2005, JG)

 In Black Skin, White Masks, Frantz Fanon writes that "the feeling of inferiority [of the colonized] is the correlative to the European's feeling of superiority ... . It is the racist who creates his inferior." n77 The right fantasy of black gives whites ownership and possession of not just blackness but of whiteness. n78 Whites' feelings of superiority are rooted in a fantasy that equates their skin complexion with industry, (and therefore) wealth, intelligence, and with law-abiding qualities. n79 Whites also fantasize the law as rational, objective, and race-less. n80 But alas, whiteness is a veil over blue eyes. n81 In the words of Professor Farley: "The veil creates a world [\*56] in which reality is doubled - black, white, separate, and unequal - and the conditions of communication's possibility have been destroyed, not by the fact of doubling but by the violence out of which the veil is woven." n82 Whites `fail to recognize that a legal system that consistently offers and protects white privilege will always seem objective and rational from their perspective. n83 The criminal justice system, and therefore, society, does not perceive whites as drug addicts or traffickers because drug laws are not enforced against them. n84 To be marked white is to "qualify" as legally and socially superior. n85 Whites are not first perceived as suspect, n86 and their historically superior position means the police are not stalking their neighborhoods or entering their homes and businesses looking for drugs. n87 And more important, the police are not making arrests that would reflect the actual occurrence of white crime. n88 Black is a loaded word that operates the black body. n89 Black is manipulated reality. n90 Black is a legal fiction that marks dark skin with white fear, desire, hatred, anger, and perversions. n91 White fantasies of black connect past to present supremacy. n92 For whites, [\*57] blackness represents a shade of inferiority. n93 Black is criminal. n94 Black is ugly and scary. n95 And most important, black is not white and never can be n96 What is white? What is the pleasure of whiteness? Whiteness is meaningless n97 unless there is a system that recognizes white privilege. n98 Enter American law, created by, and for, white privilege. n99 A deeply rooted fantasy that marks and equates blacks with criminality has driven the law's present and historical relationship with **[\*58]** blacks. n100 American slavery was the most sadistic expression of that fantasy. Slavery allowed whites to delight in white supremacy, n101 and history has well-preserved the dynamic. The right imagery of black allows whites to maintain control of who they think they are. n102 Speaking from the position of the fantasized object, James Baldwin wrote that if the black man is not who/what the white man thinks he is, it is traumatic, because it means that the white man is not who he thinks he is: The danger, in the minds of most white Americans is the loss of their identity. Try to imagine how you would feel if you woke up one morning to find the sun shining and all the stars aflame. You would be frightened because it is out of the order of nature. Any upheaval in the universe is terrifying because it so profoundly attacks one's sense of one's own reality. n103 Private prisons are almost entirely white enterprises. n104 Prisons full of black bodies provide the assurance that blacks are who/what whites think. The joint venture between private prison magnates **[\*59**] and federal and state governments not only generates investment dollars; it also generates the Other. n105 Private prisons testify to the fact that in the United States, whites have no intention of relinquishing the social, economic, legal, and political power that they presently possess. n106

Vargas 05 (Geiza Vargas, Juris Doctor, Boston College Law School, “White Investment in Black Bondage”, 27 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 41, 2005, JG)

 **[\*47]** This Article is about the criminal justice system's joint venture with Wall Street. It is about white fantasy, desire and pleasure. n25 It is, in short, about the how the law sanctions white supremacy. n26 In this Article, I argue that as the law processes more and more black bodies, and as prisons further entrench themselves as investment vehicles, the dynamics that distinguished slavery reappear. n27 In Part I, I argue that white supremacy is fueled by social constructions, or fantasies, of black identity that legitimize the exploitation of blacks for social and economic advantage. Professor Anthony Paul Farley's theories about race and fetishism bolster my argument that white fantasies of blacks are deeply rooted in American history and reflect American values of pleasure consumption. In the ante-bellum era, whites dominated a culture that marked blackness with savagery and inferiority. n28 Clearly, the end of slavery did not eradicate such conceptions. Rather, it marked an opportunity to adopt new ways to objectify blacks - ways which continued to serve whites. **[\*48]** In Part II, I examine the private prison real estate ownership and management industry. Private prisons mirror our social hierarchy - whites derive economic and political power from these corporations, power systematically denied to blacks. The American economy is about consumption, n30 and from that a market has materialized in the consumption of black crime. The emergence of private prisons, I argue, exhibits a desire to preserve a social, economic, and legal structure through which whites can extract pleasure, profit, and power. Slave narratives are important accounts of a violent time in U.S. history n31 that many white Americans wish to forget. n32 In this Article, I study a form of narrative written by those who profit from the incarceration of black bodies - private prison owners and operators, whose duty is to increase shareholder profit. n33 The narratives consist of certain annual and quarterly financial reports n34 and registration statements filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). n35 In reading these reports, I am interested in **[\*49]** how corporations represent the opportunity to invest in the confinement of (black) human bodies. I also consider narratives produced by the U.S. government. I examine reports about the prison population produced by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), a division of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). In reading these statistical reports, I am interested in how our government represents black crime to the public

USFG = Racism
Reid-Brinkley 08 (Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, Assistant Professor of African American Studies and Communications as well as the Director of Debate at the University of Pittsburgh, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE,” 2008.<http://www.comm.pitt.edu/faculty/documents/reid-brinkley_shanara_r_200805_phd.pdf>)

Racism is one of the leading exports of the United States Federal Government and it exploits it on to other countries. It doesn’t acknowledge its problems at home and the debate community replicates those values by playing in this fantasy world that we cannot change. By sitting silent, by not acknowledging, or addressing the problems within this community. It is easy for us to say that there are problems racism and sexism but the problem comes when we recognize those systemic issues and do nothing to change our methods of how we challenge those problems. 109 Green is holding the debate community accountable for its failure in significantly increasing diversity and inclusion. They hold teams accountable for their methodological choices in debate participation forcing other teams and judges to consider whether or not the traditional or normative ways of engaging in competition result in an activity and environment hostile to those debate bodies marked by difference.

Fairness and predictability are not neutral or objective but rather shot through with biases produced by dominant power relations
Delgado 92 (Richard, Law Prof at U. of Colorado, 1992 [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May])

We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. 41 Thus, the stronger party is able to have his way and see himself as principled at the same time. 42 Imagine, for example, a man's likely reaction to the suggestion that subjective considerations -- a woman's mood, her sense of pressure or intimidation, how she felt about the man, her unexpressed fear of reprisals if she did not go ahead 43 -- ought to play a part in determining whether the man is guilty of rape. Most men find this suggestion offensive; it requires them to do something they are not accustomed to doing. "Why," they say, "I'd have to be a mind reader before I could have sex with anybody?" 44 "Who knows, anyway, what internal inhibitions the woman might have been harboring?" And "what if the woman simply changed her mind later and charged me with rape?" 45 What we never notice is that women can "read" men's minds perfectly well. The male perspective is right out there in the world, plain as day, inscribed in culture, song, and myth -- in all the prevailing narratives. 46 These narratives tell us that men want and are entitled [\*820] to sex, that it is a prime function of women to give it to them, 47 and that unless something unusual happens, the act of sex is ordinary and blameless. 48 We believe these things because that is the way we have constructed women, men, and "normal" sexual intercourse. 49 Notice what the objective standard renders irrelevant: a downcast look; 50 ambivalence; 51 the question, "Do you really think we should?"; slowness in following the man's lead; 52 a reputation for sexual selectivity; 53 virginity; youth; and innocence. 54 Indeed, only a loud firm "no" counts, and probably only if it is repeated several times, overheard by others, and accompanied by forceful body language such as pushing the man and walking away briskly. 55 Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. 56 Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about administrability, fairness, stability, and ease of determination points us away from what [\*821] really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. 57 First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; 58 then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts. 59 A nice trick if you can get away with it.