# 1AC—Poetic Intervention

#### Content warning: The AC is going to be discussing sexual assault as well how it relates to the indigenous body. Let me know if there are any issues☺

*could the barbarity capture her body, strip her of her personhood, drag her violently to a place of isolation? Can they do whatever they want to justify the cruelty she faces manifested in mutilation?*

### Framing

#### Indigenous Womxn’s bodies has always been the foundation of the world and opened the door for the fungibility of native flesh. The raping of Native Womxn dates back to the colonizer to savage relationship where our bodies were always open to sexual exploitation.

**Pochedley 16** (Lakota Shea Pochedley, Master of Arts at the University of Texas at Austin, “Neshnabe Treaty Making: (Re)visionings for Indigenous Futurities in Education,” May 2016, https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/39210/POCHEDLEY-THESIS-2016.pdf)

Native Nations and peoples have never stopped fighting to assert their “true” sovereignty, autonomy, and responsibilities to rule and speak for themselves, in spite of the settler colonial institutionalized policies such as blood quantum, state-led violence, (male) settler impunity (particularly in regard to sexual violence), [imposed democratization, nation-state notions of sovereignty, allotment, boarding schools, wardship, and U.S. citizenship. These tools of the United States settler colonial government were first employed to eliminate us and continue to be used to colonize us from within—continuously oppressing and dispossessing us of our inherent responsibility of Indigenous Nationhood (Grande, 2015). As seen in the ways in which federal laws (and their legal loopholes) essentially allow for corporations to consume and exploit Indigenous territories and for non-Native men to rape Native women with impunity, settler colonialism is evolvingly constant. “Indeed, the crisis of rape in tribal communities is inextricably linked to the way in which the United States developed and sustained a legal system that has usurped the sovereign authority of tribal nations” (Deer, 2015: xiv). The U.S. settler colonial state works to continually structure, attack, and disregard our lives, relationships, and sovereignty (Million, 2013). I believe that calling upon an individual’s sense of responsibility, rather than asserting claims or rights, is most effective in helping us to remember and use our traditional knowledge. We do not have claims and rights to each other, but we do have responsibilities to each other, our traditions (cultural, political, language, and historical), and the land (L. Pochedley, 2013). State sanctioned notions of sovereignty are foreign to our philosophies and epistemologies, yet it is a practice that has become completely internalized by our communities (Alfred, 1999; Grande, 2015). The U.S. settler and nation-state colonial projects prevent Indigenous Nationhood and impose tribal sovereignty by regulating our Native values and objectives. Tribal sovereignty implements and requires a constant surveillance of our “self-determination, -governance, and –regulation” by the settler government. We have accepted these impositions because it allows us to help and support our people, but it prevents our absolute emancipation from settler control (Alfred, 1999; Barker, 2005; Grande, 2015). The United States claims to “recognize” Native Nations, as evidenced by Obama’s confident proclamation of his wishes to “build on our true government-to- government relationship” (Obama, 2013, paragraph six). Recent history proved that this is not the case; we remain domestic “nations within” (Deloria & Lytle, 1998) and “citizens-but-wards” (Lomawaima, 2013). “True sovereignty,” or what some refer to as Indigenous Nationhood (Alfred, 1999), is the reality to employ our values, objectives, and responsibilities to all living, relational beings without surveillance and regulations imposed by the settler colonial government. It is a form of “self-termination” (Deloria & Lytle, 1998) in which a real “nation-to-nation” relationship is formed, respected, and practiced. “Since it [American government] will never understand the intangible, spiritual, and emotional goals of American Indians, it [tribal sovereignty] cannot be understood as the final solution to Indian problems” (Deloria & Lytle, 1998: 15). In the same way the U.S. government will never truly attempt understand the goals, values, and objectives of tribal nations, I argue that Native students, Native dual citizenship, and Indigenous sovereignty will also never be understood in non-Native public schools and institutions. Since the institutions of schools and education within the U.S. have always been driven and employed as centers to reproduce and rearticulate U.S. settler colonialism with regards to the positionalities of Natives, settlers, and arrivants, we must consider carefully what Western-modeled schools can realize and undertake as anti- or de- colonial spaces (Simpson in Grande, 2015). REARTICULATIONS OF SETTLER COLONIALISM THROUGH NEOLIBERAL INSTITUTIONS: SCHOOL REFORM, MUL TICUL TURALISM, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE David Harvey (2005) defines neoliberalism as “the first instance a theory of political economy practices that proposes human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within and institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (2), or more simply put, “free market fundamentalism” (7). Many trace the beginnings of neoliberalism to the elections of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan in the late 1970s, in addition to the effects of the post-World War II Keynesian economic practices that had been labeled as failing (i.e., stagflation) (Brown, 2015; Harvey, 2005). The reasoning and theorizing of neoliberalism appeared new and inventive, particularly with the rise of the “the Chicago boys,” a group of economists who trained or engaged with Milton Friedman’s neoliberal theories (Harvey, 2005: 8). Yet, when we investigate and deconstruct the underpinnings of neoliberalism, we discover that neoliberalism is nothing new in the Americas, but rather a contemporary, rearticulation of settler colonialism within the borders of the U.S. and more largely the European-turned U.S. imperial project. Neoliberalism allowed and allows for an unbridled [global] capitalism that seeks to destroy all public spheres of life for the continual, maximal accumulation of capital for the few at the expense of the majority because it will allow for further “liberties” for the majority within the realms such as individualism, private property, and personal responsibility (or choice). As an economic theory enacted through political, governmental means, neoliberalism in practice has largely been most successful at restoring the power of the economic elite, although these new elites may not be the elites of the past (Harvey, 2005). To further understand how neoliberalism is a contemporary rearticulation of settler colonialism, we must return to the fulcrum of settler colonialism--the insatiable need for “empty” land to “work” in the name of profit and wealth regardless of the claims of Indigenous peoples who were there (and were always there). **One must understand the original sin of the United States--the dispossession and subsequent genocide of Indigenous peoples, governing systems, and ways of life** (Grande, 2015)--to understand the current dispossessions of public spaces within U.S. borders and the dismantling of “savage,” or rather “undemocratic,” nations abroad under the guise of neoliberalism, progress, and democracy. As Byrd (2011) argues this “reproduction of Indianness” or “to make ‘Indian’” (p. xx) allows for the U.S. to employ these logics rooted in settler colonialism to further their imperial claims to and over the world. It serves the U.S. imperial project by “facilitat[ing], justify[ing], and maintain[ing] Anglo-American hegemonic mastery over the significations of justice, democracy, law, and terror” and allows for them to savagize (“make Indian”) any “peoples or nations who stand in the way of U.S. military and economic desires” (Byrd, 2011: xx). The exploration of U.S. colonization of the Americas, particularly North America, has largely been ignored due to its unique status as a settler colony--thus, operating as metropole and colony within the same spatial confines (Tuck & Yang, 2012). When communities, peoples, and nations are “made Indian,” settler colonial logics of dispossession and subsequently erasure allow for legitimation of current neoliberal projects, such as, privatizing schools, unlocking access to natural resources (i.e., timber), deconstructing labor unions in the name of “common good.”

### ROB

#### The ROB is to vote for the debater that best deconstructs white hegemony.

#### Reject Eurocentric definitions and interpretations of the topic – these debates do not have to be just util whole res affs vs some random pic – you should value interpretations about the topic and definitions of the topic that don’t value fairness but critical pedagogy – especially in the context of indigenous lives.

Sara **Lennox 10** [GLOBALIZATION, POST-EUROCENTRISM, AND THE FUTURE OF FEMINIST LITERARY STUDIES Professor Emeritus, Department of German & Scandinavian StudiesProfessor Lennox's research interests include: Post-1945 German and Austrian literature; women’s writing; literary, cultural, and social theory; comparative literature, women’s studies, gender in Germany and Europe, race in Germany and Europe, people of color in Germany and Europe, colonialism, transnational approaches, globalization, http://www.sciy.org/?p=6500 July 19, 2010]

So what specifically should feminists *do*, should they undertake to **pursue post-Eurocentric approaches** to their subjects? As Sebastian Conrad, editor of *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus* and a young historian critical of Eurocentrism within German historiography, has noted: “Das ist eine Problematik, deren Thematisierung noch weitgehend den Status programmatischen Tastens und Fragens besitzt” (151). That is to say, that question cannot really be answered yet, though it is possible to begin tentatively to grope in the direction of answers. **It is obviously necessary to understand all literature and culture to derive finally from the complex global circumstances** that enabled their production, though global contributions may be present only in very, very coded traces or will be evident only in gaps and absences of the cultural product, that about which it can’t or won’t speak. We need also fully and deeply to interrogate the categories we utilize for literary and cultural analysis, including those commonly used to understand gender relations, to make sure that we are not taking the very Eurocentric, social-scientistic terms for granted that we need to draw into question. Particularly, **we need to investigate how cultural practices, including those undertaken by women, have contributed to the production of modernity**, an issue Benjamin and Benedict Anderson has broached with respect to the novel and the newspaper, what kind or kinds of modernity they have helped to bring into being., and to what degree conceptions of “alternative modernities” help us to understand women’s place within modernity differently. Deconstruction and queer theory have already helped us to think about the tenability of the binary oppositions so often foundational in cultural texts—say, presence/absence, self/other, masculinity/femininity, but now we can further and more critically probe such dualisms with an understanding of additional hegemonic structures they also serve to underwrite. We can raise objections to a teleological conception of history as progress by drawing attention to heterogeneous voices of dissent and protest that have been occluded in dominant cultural narratives, and we can also draw attention to the heteroglossia of canonical texts and submit dissenting readings of them. It may be possible for scholars of European culture to begin to understand that, to produce the modern nation-state, the varied populations of European regions were subjected to colonializing practices sometimes as violent as those Europeans imposed on the rest of the world, and we can read cultural texts both as evidence for that violence and as a place where suppressed elements have nonetheless be preserved. While acknowledging that culture is always intertextual and necessarily presents itself in forms shared collectively (like language itself), we can also insist that literature is also the purview of the particular and singular, perhaps even beginning to explore how the aesthetic moment itself can operate as a form of resistance to homogenizing forces, an argument that was broached by the Frankfurt School among other German thinkers. Finally, we can recognize, even make a virtue of, the situatedness of our own readings of cultural product, acknowledging that our interpretations are always culturally and historically-specific, thus, **unless they willfully distort the evidence of the text, neither right nor wrong but simply *different* than others’ readings.** Of course we should not delude ourselves that, as feminist scholars of language, literature, and culture, we can turn the tide of a destructive globalization. But because we believe in the power of education and in the power of culture, we can begin to elaborate other possibilites for our students, our colleagues, and ourselves **that model other frameworks for thought and action, and they might help to produce a different kind of future.** As Chakrabarty puts it: “We write, ultimately, as part of a collective effort to teach the oppressed of today how to be the democratic subject of tomorrow” (Habitations 33). Also turning to Benjamin, Lowe and Lloyd conclude: “Our moment is not one of fatalistic despair; faces turned toward the past, we do not seek to make whole what has been smashed, but to move athwart the storm into a future in which the debris is more than just a residue: it holds the alternative” (27).

### Links

#### Link 1: Rape is used as a dominating weapon from it being institutionalized to reinforce our less-than-person positionality. It reinforces our hesitance in the world.

Smith 10 (Andrea, PhD, academic, feminist, and activist against violence, Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism. Glq-a Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies - GLQ-J LESBIAN GAY STUD. 16. 41-68. 10.1215/10642684-2009-012.)//

Heteropatriarchy is the logic that makes social hierarchy seem natural. Just as the patriarchs rule the family, the elites of the nation-state rule their citizens. Consequently, when colonists first came to the Americas, they saw the necessity of instilling patriarchy in Native communities because they realized that indigenous peoples would not accept colonial domination if their own indigenous societies were not structured on the basis of social hierarchy. Patriarchy, in turn, rests on a gender-binary system; hence it is not a coincidence that colonizers also targeted indigenous peoples who did not fit within this binary model. In addition, gender violence is a primary tool of colonialism and white supremacy. Colonizers did not just kill off indigenous peoples in this land, but Native massacres were always accompanied by sexual mutilation and rape. As I have argued elsewhere, the goal of colonialism is not just to kill colonized peoples but to destroy their sense of being people.76 It is through sexual violence that a colonizing group attempts to render a colonized peoples inherently rapable, their lands inherently invadable, and their resources inherently extractable. As Denetdale notes, however, because we have internalized these logics, our liberation struggles often reify the structures of social domination they claim to displace. As I have shown above, an uncritical politics of futurity and tradition can contribute to reifying neocolonialism within our struggles for sovereignty. At the 2009 World Social Forum (WSF) I attended, a consensus that seemed to emerge from the indigenous peoples’ organizations of Latin America was that indigenous liberation depends on global liberation from the nation-state form of governance. These groups explicitly linked the colonial nation-state system with patriarchy and Western epistemology, calling on indigenous and nonindigenous peoples to break with their internalization of social domination logics to imagine a world based on radical participatory democracy.

#### Link 2: Sexual assault victims are also victims of victim blaming, this normalizes the way that society responds to sexual assault. We need to hold reporters accountable and explain Native womxns stories with the implementation of the poetic use.

NAESV 17 (<https://www.endsexualviolence.org/where_we_stand/naming-victims-in-the-media/>)

Some people argue that journalists should identify victims of rape or sexual assault in news stories because they should be treated like any other crime victims. This position ignores important and unique aspects of the crimes of rape and sexual assault. Although rape and sexual assault occur at an alarming rate in our society, the vast majority of these crimes remain unreported. Victims remain silent because they fear being subjected to theintense public scrutiny and blame that often follow being named in the media. Our culture continues to condemn the victim for rape and, as a result, an extraordinary amount of shame and silence follow the crime. Publicizing the name of a rape complainant under these conditions only deters more victims from coming forward.As a result, the NAESV urges members of the news media to adopt the following policy on publishing the names of persons who come forward with a change of rape or sexual assault. It is the policy of this news organization not to publish the names of minors who come forward with allegations of sexual abuse or rape and to avoid reporting stories in such a way that these minors are identifiable. Barring extraordinary circumstances, it is also the policy of this news organization not to publish the names of adults who come forward with allegations of sexual abuse or rape unless those individuals are willing to be named in the media. Members of this news organization will report these stories with sensitivity toward the stigma associated with being publicly named. Others argue that, until more people are named as sexual assault victims, the stigma attached to being a victim will not fade away. They contend that the news media should therefore publish the names of victims who come forward with allegations as a way to decrease the stigma of rape. The NAESV believes, however, that we should not advance social change on the backs of unwilling and traumatized victims, who have so recently been used for others’ ends.

#### Link 3: Native Womxn are continuously preyed on because there are already narratives in the sqo that paint us as illegitimate savages showing how the community uses the resolution as a way to mitigate these narratives. The US is the white savior for native savages and link to damage narratives about Natives.

**Tuck and Ree 2013** [Eve, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations and Coordinator of the Native American Studies Program at the State University of New York at New Paltz. C. Ree holds an MFA from the University of California, Irvine; she works in multiple genres, overlapping public performance, architecture, photography, video, and sculpture. “A Glossary of Haunting.” Handbook of Autoethnography, 2013. Pgs. 640-641. Accessed 3/2/16 here at: <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/557744ffe4b013bae3b7af63/t/557f2d6ce4b029eb4288a2f8/1434398060958/Tuck+%26+Ree%2C+A+Glossary+of+Haunting.pdf>]

As much as the discourse of decolonization has been embraced by the social sciences over the last decade, the decolonial project rarely gets beyond the conceptual or metaphorical level. I want to slip a note into some people’s pockets, “Decolonization is not metaphor,” because at some point, we’re going to have to talk about returning stolen land. My guess is that people are going to be really reluctant to give up that ghost. Fanon (1963) told us that decolonizing the mind is the first step, not the only step. Decolonization necessarily involves an interruption of the settler colonial nation-state, and of settler relations to land. Decolonization must mean attending to ghosts, and arresting widespread denial of the violence done to them. Decolonization is a recognition that a “ghost is alive, so to speak. We are in relation to it and it has designs on us such that we must reckon with it graciously, attempting to offer it a hospitable memory out of a concern for justice” (Gordon, 1997, p. 64, emphasis original). Decolonization is a (dearly) departure from social justice. Honestly, I just sometimes have trouble getting past that phrasing, “social justice.” Listing terrors is not a form of social justice, as if outing (a) provides relief for a presumed victim or (b) repairs a wholeness or (c) ushers in an improved social awareness that leads to (a) and (b). That is not what I am doing here, saying it all so that things will get better. Social justice is a term that gets thrown around like some destination, a resolution, a fixing. “No justice, no peace,” and all of that. But justice and peace don’t exactly cohabitate. The promise of social justice sometimes rings false, smells consumptive, like another manifest destiny. Like you can get there, but only if you climb over me. Damage narratives are the only stories that get told about me, unless I’m the one that’s telling them. People have made their careers on telling stories of damage about me, about communities like mine. Damage is the only way that monsters and future ghosts are conjured. I am invited to speak, but only when I speak my pain (hooks, 1990). Instead, I speak of desire. Desire is a refusal to trade in damage; desire is an antidote, a medicine to damage narratives. Desire, however, is not just living in the looking glass; it isn’t a trip to opposite world. Desire is not a light switch, not a nescient turn to focus on the positive. It is a recognition of suffering, the costs of settler colonialism and capitalism, and how we still thrive in the face of loss anyway; the parts of us that won’t be destroyed. When I write or speak about desire, I am trying to get out from underneath the ways that my communities and I are always depicted. I insist on telling stories of desire, of complexity, of variegation, of promising myself one thing at night, and doing another in the morning. Desire is what we know about ourselves, and damage is what is attributed to us by those who wish to contain us. Desire is complex and complicated. It is constantly reformulating, and does so by extinguishing itself, breaking apart, reconfiguring, recasting. Desire licks its own fingers, bites its own nails, swallows its own fist. Desire makes itself its own ghost, creates itself from its own remnants. Desire, in its making and remaking, bounds into the past as it stretches into the future. It is productive, it makes itself, and in making itself, it makes reality.

### Impacts

*No words she screams could change their thoughts*

*No begging or pleading would leave them believing*

*That she wasn’t an object to invade.*

*Will anyone notice or will she continue*

*to have no place; continue not to matter?*

#### Impact 1: Claims of rape are constantly silenced allowing for this to continuously be the norm.

Spieler 17, Geri, et al. “Native American Rape Survivors Tell How Deck Is Stacked Against Them.” *Truthdig: Expert Reporting, Current News, Provocative Columnists*, 27 Sept. 2017, www.truthdig.com/articles/native-american-rape-survivors-tell-deck-stacked/.

WHITE EARTH RESERVATION, Minn.—Candice (not her real name) awoke with a start. Someone was pulling down her sweatpants. It was a male friend. “Stop!” she shouted. He kept groping her. She kicked him and he fell off the bed. She dashed out of the bedroom, tripping and tumbling down the stairs. Gripped with fear, she heard his footsteps behind her in the dark and forced herself to stand upright as she staggered out to the porch. Candice was still intoxicated. She got into her car and drove into a ditch. A white police officer pulled up. She struggled to hold back tears as she told him about the attempted rape. All the officer saw was a drunk and disorderly Native American woman. He dismissed Candice’s report of sexual assault as a lie she had made up to avoid getting a DUI. He did not take her to the hospital for a forensic exam. The sexual assault was not recorded in his police report. “The cops didn’t do anything,” Candice said as she recalled the 2008 sexual assault. “What’s the use of even saying anything?” Candice, 43, had been sexually assaulted on four separate occasions. Her first perpetrator was a family member who molested her behind some trees by a lake when she was 5 years old. She doesn’t remember whether he was arrested. The next three perpetrators were not arrested. Two of Candice’s three daughters have also been raped. Their perpetrators were never arrested. The Department of Justice estimates that one in three Native American women reports having been sexually assaulted during her lifetime. They are 2.5 times more likely to experience sexual violence than women of [any other ethnicity](https://www.justice.gov/ovw/tribal-affairs) in the U.S.

#### Impact 2: We cling to humxnity. We labor to explain away the Native. We live within the parameters of white society. Fuck that. Our world is the constant reality that strips us of land, culture, and life.

Alfred 2010 [Taiaiake is from Kahnawá:ke in the Mohawk Nation and is a professor of Indigenous Governance at the University of Victoria. “What is Radical Imagination? Indigenous Struggles in Canada.” *The University of Victoria*, 11/23/2010, accessed 6/25/18, <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/affinities/article/view/6130>, SKS]

What is Radical Imagination? Indigenous Struggles in Canada Taiaiake Alfred Abstract Radical imagination is reenvisioning your existence on this land without the inherited privileges of conquest and empire. It is accepting the fact of a meaningful prior Indigenous presence, and taking action to support struggles not only of social and economic justice, but political justice for Indigenous nations as well. In order to answer the question of what is a radical imagination, I am going to have to back up a bit. About 500 years. This longer-term, bigger picture view of the Indigenous struggle is quite consistent among Indigenous people across the continent. I am going to boil it down theoretically, and put the explanation right in front of you: we have never really resolved the problem of colonization’s theft of our lands, its imposition of foreign sovereignties and laws on our nations, and its forced acculturation of our people to European ways of life. We have not resolved the problem of the European imagination of this continent as terra nullius, a land empty of civilization, culture, law, governance, and empty of people worthy of respect. And today, this imperative of conquest has been transformed semantically into the assumption of “development” and a variety of state programs to that effect. The principles of international and inter-species respect and co-existence that governed this land for millennia have, since the arrival of Europeans, been obliterated in the newcomers’ drive to remake this place and its inhabitants in the image of their bible and the other founding texts of imperialism. It is this image, and the unending commitment of Euroamericans to the vision of their ancestors which is at the root of the problem we face. Radical imagination…? In today’s North America this would mean rejecting the image of this land and everything on and in it as mere resources for capitalist enterprise. Would it be possible for people cultured in the North American mainstream to reimagine themselves in relation to the land and others and start to see this place as a real, sacred homeland, instead of an encountered commodity destined to be used and abused to satisfy impulses and desires implanted in their heads by European imperial texts? I am not the one to answer this question. All I know is what I see happening around me; and the actions of the newcomers today do not look much different from what I imagine. So the problem of colonization, which true Indigenous struggles are confronting and not cooperating with, is not one of an historical era. Colonization is not just Redcoats, muskets and felt hats. It is not even just priests in residential schools. It is you. It is this continual living process of the renewal in the minds of Canadians and Americans of the ancestral fantasies of dispossession, domination and assimilation that were at the foundation of their forebears’ colonial enterprises. North American society has never collectively confronted the root of its existence in this land; it is a poisoned root of racism and brutality and fraud and abuse. The successful colonization of North America has allowed Euroamericans to transform the foundational elements of the old colonial imagination into a dynamic cultural, political and legal framework which serves to rationalize the illegal and immoral displacement, dispossession and deculturation of the human societies and human beings whose homeland this continent truly is. It has allowed for the creation of the Canadian and American states and for the creation of national cultures in which every citizen of Canada and the United States forms his or her identity. In this intellectual, cultural and political environment, imagining a relationship with Indigenous peoples outside of the colonial context is virtually impossible. Beliefs about the natural supremacy of the white race, the inherent superiority of European culture, the uncritical acceptance of the validity of science and technological advancement, continual expansion, capitalism… these are the legacies of the colonial imagination, and they have stained Euroamericans’ sense of their place in the world and their relation to others. Canada and America were created out of a mission of divine conquest and colonialism, and any adherence or affinity to Canadian or American identities implies the restatement and revitalization of this bizarre racist arrogance and its institutional and structural forms: colonialism. I believe that most North Americans’ imaginative capacity to regenerate and re-form relationships with the land and with Indigenous peoples is limited by the inherent and embedded colonial character of the state and of culture in Canada and the United States. In order to decolonize, Canadians and Americans have to sever their emotional attachment to their countries and reimagine themselves, not as citizens with the privileges conferred by being a descendents of colonizers or newcomers from other parts of the world benefitting from white imperialism, but as human beings in equal and respectful relation to other human beings and the natural environment. This is what radical imagination could look like. But the process of colonization is on-going because the objectives of white society, as they relate to Indigenous people, have not really changed. First Nations people as a whole do not feel that things have changed all that much on a fundamental level from the very first days of first contact when Europeans came looking for land, intent on taking down our societies, our authorities, our laws and our governments. Non-natives came looking to transform our culture and our way of being in the world, to change us so that we reflected, or at least didn’t contradict, the values and the ways of being of the new Euroamerican society that was emerging on this continent. Colonialism is a living process because land is still being lost, our authorities, laws and governments are still not respected, and Euroamericans are still consuming to excess everything in their path. When questions of culture come up, it is still the question of Indigenous peoples accommodating or adapting to new cultural ideals from within Canadian society, as opposed to having our cultural values, norms and way of life fundamentally respected. If you think about the history of this country, you most likely recall a version of the dominant narrative or story that is interwoven through the public discourse, in the media, in movies, in television and in the school systems. It is one of conquest, or one which shows the First Nations as a problem. The “Indian problem,” a phrase used historically and today to dehumanize and deligitimate, was at first that the Indians were in the way. When the non-native people came from Europe, they were looking for land to build their societies. Some were escaping persecution. They were escaping whatever situation it was in Europe that drove them away from their ancestral home to come here and take what we had. There were a lot of different reasons that people came from Europe. But they came here uninvited to our home nonetheless, and the problem is that this is our homeland and all the land is owned, by us. That situation had to change, because otherwise there could not be the establishment of the vision and the dream that the people from Europe had for themselves in this territory. All kinds of legal principles were imagined, developed and implemented in order to achieve this in a legal sense. It was also done in a physical sense. It was done through financial incentives. But if you think about it, the first relationship, in spite of some of the conciliatory rhetoric that we see on both sides, romanticizes it a bit. The reality is that First Nations and non-native relations were characterized by conflict and violence from the beginning. Think about it in relation to issues like the Oka Conflict 20 years ago or the Six Nations-Caledonia conflict today. Whether you want to focus on these, or whether you want to focus on conflicts that have gone on in the last generation or two, they are always rooted in Indigenous people being in the way of something that non-native society wants to do with the land. People can say, “Well, you know, things were different back then, 200 hundred years ago, and things are different now.” But, in reality, how different are they? There is always the continual development, the so-called “progress” of North American society, and there is always the impediment posed by Indigenous people wanting to retain their homes and to continue their ancestral connection to the land. It is still the reality today, even though the land base of the First Nations people has been shrunk. Whatever is left is still open for development and Indigenous people are still targets for conversion, except that now, instead of imagining us as Christians, Canadian society is taken up with imagining us as consumer-citizens. But the intent and the effects of this understanding of who we are together on this land are the same as they have always been. From an Indigenous point of view radical imagination is not an exercise in pie-inthe-sky dreaming, nor does it even require much creativity. Radical imagination is simply Euroamericans deciding to leave the old visions of conquest and privileges of empire behind and focusing on their responsibilities as human beings today. Learn the history of this land. Find your own place and that of your family in the story of North American colonization. This will tell you what you need to do to make amends for that history and point the way to grounding yourself as a true person of this place. Ask Indigenous people about the promises that were made by your ancestors, the commitment that allowed for your existence here, and then decide to honor those promises right here and right now in the best way that you can. Live up to the basic tenets of universal concepts of justice: do not tell lies. Give back what you have stolen. If you could imagine a renewal of our relationship built on these premises, on your responsibility and your action to undo colonization, and if you have the integrity to dedicate yourself to working with us Indigenous people towards its realization, towards a renewed regime governing this land, then and only then could you truthfully call yourself a radical.

### Solvency

*The dominating weapon reinforces her place*

*Her place as less than a person;*

*A place of no escape.*

#### Thus, the advocacy: Reporters in all instances ought to protect the identity of confidential sources through our poetic intervention.

Mary Kate **Hurlbutt** June 6, 20**11** (To Name or Not to Name? That is Not the Question: An Examination of Journalistic Standards in Media Rape Coverage;https://d1wsaxfu7b8rcr.cloudfront.net/6ec97964-8eeb-40bb-aaf3-559324202ce9/mary-kate-hurlbutt-2011%20%281%29.pdf)

**Journalists need to grow comfortable with the reality that sexual assault is a crime that cannot be separated from its gendered nature and the patriarchal institutions** under which it’s definition has evolved over this nation’s history. Until they do, and they are able to report on the subject with informed insight, not just bland factuality, **they should withhold on identifying survivors on the grounds of journalistic integrity**. Unfortunately, “no amount of clarity or accuracy in the news reporting will end the trauma of someone who has been raped, but care in reporting may avoid the infliction of fresh wounds through stories that ignore or misrepresent behavior” (Simpson & Cote 208). So, ethically, it still seems right to omit names until they can be accompanied by consistently responsible reporting. In today’s society, it still falls under a journalist’s ethical duty to withhold the private information of victims in cases of rape and sexual assault. Arguments can be made that this practice is deceptive and potentially dangerous to certain fundamental principles of journalism. But, **until journalists accept** that **their dedication to clinical objectivity does not always result in fair and accurate coverage, the precedence not to go public with names and personal information should remain. If journalists were able to cover the already unbalanced nature of rape**. Hurlbutt 26 investigations and trials in an impartial manner, then it is possible that releasing the names of victims could help enlighten the public and eliminate ignorant stigma. But the journalism community needs to reexamine certain ethical standards regarding objective coverage and fair and balanced reporting before members can promote the role of the press as an instigator of social change. **It does not seem fair to expect the public’s perceptions regarding rape to change if journalists are not expected to tell them that their perceptions are misplaced to begin with.** In the case of rape, reporting the facts truthfully only serves to further disguise the truth about the facts. **And until journalists are able to turn a critical eye to their coverage of rape as a societal issue, they have a responsibility to protect victims from the press’s own shortcomings**.

#### The poetic intervention is key to building new communities of change that act as the groundworks for further innovation

Czernuanin 13 Department of Psychology, University of Wrocław Catharsis in Poetry Therapy (25-26)//SP

Psychologically a poem arises from the unconscious, which, according to Freud, was discovered by a poet (Longo, 2002). According to Jung, the soul (psyche) which is in communion with the unconscious, precedes a poem (Jung, 1997). Subsequently, a poem is finally created by the mind, since poetry is its language: it is content in the form of words, which often express the mind and psychic tribulation, thus influencing the emotions. The form safely imagines the content (image, sound) and a specified organization of words (rythm, methaphor, style). The content can be presented by deep experiences reflected in the above-mentioned specifi ed and safe form as an expressive act, after which emotions are usually de-escalated and relief and happiness appear. Additionally, this act can bring into being a sense of community as creative experience (Longo, 2002).This is the way in which poetry arises. The term ‘Poetry Therapy’ consists of two words: ‘poetry’, which is represented by a poem with its specifi cally organized utterance(Głowiński, Kostkiewiczowa, Okopień-Sławińska, Sławiński, 1976), and ‘therapy’ derived from the Greek ‘therapeia’, which means healing through the expressive arts like poetry, singing or the dance. In ancient Greek mythology Asclepius, the god of medicine and healing, was the son of Apollo, god of poetry, healing and the arts;these two areas refl ect that connection (Longo, 2002). Firstly, in both history and literature, poetry as well as all artistic works originated in Ancient Greece. Actually, they can be divided into two main types: expressive and constructive, in which many subparts could be distinguished. The first type, expressive artistry, consists of poetry, music and dance; these interfuse with each other and make a whole. On the other hand, the second type of artistry consists of architecture, sculpture and painting (Tatarkiewicz, 1962). Therefore, an inseparable part of expressive art is dance,accompanied with its words and sound, thus making one art. This art focuses on expressing human feelings and drives by means of sound, movements, words, melody and rhythm (Tatarkiewicz, 1962). In this early art people expected that emotional release would provide them relief. This art, therefore, was commonly used for ‘soul cleansing’, in Greece called ‘catharsis’. The term ‘catharsis’ appeared initially in relation to their art, and has remained unchanged (Tatarkiewicz, 1962). In this way poetry started to heal and ‘therapeia’ arose, which was perceived by the Greeks not as a skill but as a poet’s divine afflatus. Therefore, thanks to divine intervention, poetry provides access to the highest knowledge: it leads souls, moralizes about people, and even tries to make them better than they currently are (Tatarkiewicz, 1962).

#### Using poetry to advocate for change from the squo is a form of embodied ptx that necessitates taking responsibility for argumentation

McEwen 12 (Lauren McEwen, October 24 2012, A Q&A with poet laureate Sonia Sanchez, https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/therootdc/post/a-qanda-with-poet-laureate-sonia-sanchez/2012/10/24/eb76c68c-1e02-11e2-ba31-3083ca97c314\_blog.html?utm\_term=.115b1a710812)

So, I can’t tell young people what to write when I taught creative writing and playwriting, all of these courses, women’s studies. But what I say to my students is that, “What you have to keep foremost in front of you is the idea of peace, the idea of freedom and the idea of justice.” At some point, you have to know that when you write, you are either maintaining the status quo or you’re talking about change. You can do that in many ways. Many of the young people can do very innovative things with the language. But I’m not here to tell you what you should do. I’ve heard generation after generation talk about the same thing. I say do your work. Follow what you think is important. Not only to your people, but to the country and other people. Understand that this thing, this language, is very important. Also, remember what [Frantz] Fanon [said](http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/37728.Frantz_Fanon): “To speak is to assume a culture. And to bear responsibility for civilization.” When I began to speak out loud and I began to write, I knew that I bore responsibility for a civilization, and that is so important and so earthshaking on so many levels. It’s such a joy to be a part of that.

### Underview:

#### 1] That performance of the 1AC was poetry.

#### 2] Discussions of how we are not topical always privilege elitism in debate

Shanara rose **Reid-Brinkley 2008** [“the harsh realities of “acting black”: how african-american policy debaters negotiate representation through racial performance and style”]

**The stylistic norms of the** policy **debate community are inextricably attached to the social performance of identity**. In other words,if **the stylistic norms privilege the stylistic choices of white, straight, economically privileged males,** as is clearly indicated by their statistical representation at the heights of competitive success, then difference marks one as other unless the individual performs according to those stylistic and identity-based norms. Racially and/or ethnically different bodies must perform themselves according to the cultural norms of the debate community. **For UDL students it can often mean changing one’s appearance, standardizing language practices, and eschewing cultural practices at least while participating in debate. In essence, students of color are performatively “whitened” in order to have an opportunity for achieving in debate competitions.** “Acting black” or brown is problematicbecause those performative identities are not privileged in terms of successful participation. In fact, **they signify a difference, an opposite, a negative differential**. It is not that the debate community actively operates to exclude based on race, instead it is an exclusion based on racial performance, in other words, how the differentially colored body chooses to style itself.

#### 3] Theory forces people to jump through hoops – they’re artificial requirements

**Smith 13:** Elijah Smith, A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate, Vbriefly, 2013.

It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but [has] a learning environment with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.