# NC

I negate.

## Foucault K

### First is Framing

#### Since the ballot confers the truth of the resolution, the judge is the assumed intellectual of the round. As an intellectual, your primary obligation is to deconstruct the regime of truth

**Foucault[[1]](#footnote-1)**

It seems to me that what must now be taken into account in **the intellectual is not the ‘bearer of universal values.’ Rather, it’s the person occupying a specific position – but whose specificity is linked, in a society like ours, to the general functioning of an apparatus of truth.** In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or ‘organic’ intellectual of the proletariat); that of his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, and political and economy demands to which he submits of against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truths in our societies. And it’s with this last factor that his position can take on a general significance and that his local, specific struggle can have effects and implications which are not simply professional or sectorial. The intellectual can operate and struggle at the general level of that regime of truth which is so essential to the structure and functioning of our society. **There is a battle ‘for truth,’ or at least ‘around truth’** – it being understood once again that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true’, it being understood also that it’s not a matter of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays. It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of ‘science’ and ‘ideology’, but in terms of ‘truth’ and ‘power’. And thus the question of the professionalization of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. All this must seem very confused and uncertain. Uncertain indeed, and what I am saying here is above all to be taken as a hypothesis. In order for it to be a little less confused, however, I would like to put forward a few ‘propositions’ – not firm assertions, but simply suggestions to be further tested and explained. ‘Truth’ is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. **‘Truth’ is linked in a circular relation with system of powers which produces and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A regime of truth.** This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism. And it’s this same regime which, subject to certain modifications, operates in the socialists countries (I leave open here the question of China, about which I know little). **The essential political problem for the intellectual is** not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but **that of ascertaining the possibility of constitution a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people’s consciousness’s –** or what’s in their heads – **but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. It’s not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power** (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power) **but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time.**

#### This is the most important role of the judge because normative truth that is not critiqued becomes a meaningless list of rules entrenched within us by the regime

**Schlag[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Normative legal thought cannot wait to enlist epistemology, semiotics, social theory or any other enterprise in its own ethical-moral argument structures about the right, the good, the useful, the efficient** (or any of their doctrinally crystallized derivatives). **It cannot wait to reduce world views, attitudes, demonstrations, provocations, and thought itself, to norms.** In short, it cannot wait to tell you (or somebody else) what to do. In fact, normative legal thought is so much in a hurry that it will tell you what to do even though there is not the slightest chance that you might actually be in a position to do it. For instance, **when was the last time you were in a position to put the difference principle into effect, or to restructure [anything?] the doctrinal corpus of the first amendment?** “In the future, we should ….” When was the last time you were in a position to rule whether judges should become pragmatists, efficiency purveyors, civic republicans, or Hercules surrogates? Normative legal thought doesn’t seem overly concerned with such worldly questions about the character and the effectiveness of its own discourse. It just goes along and proposes, recommends, prescribes, solves, and resolves. Yet despite its obvious desire to have worldly effects, worldly consequences, normative legal thought remains seemingly unconcerned that for all practical purposes, its only consumers are legal academics and perhaps a few law students – persons who are virtually never in a position to put any of its wonderful normative advice into effect. If there’s no one in charge at the other end of the line, why then is normative legal thought in such a hurry to get its message across? And why, particularly, is it always in such a hurry to repeat the same old boring moves? There is an edge to these questions. And the edge comes in part from our implicit assumption that normative legal thought is a kind of that and that, as thought, it is in control of its own situation, its form, its own rhetoric. But it isn’t so. If normative legal thought keeps repeating itself, and if it is incapable of understanding challenges to its own intellectual authority, **that is because it is not simply or even fundamentally a kind of thought[, but]. Normative legal thought is in part a routine** – our routine. **It is the highly repetitive, cognitively entrenched, institutionally sanctioned, and politically enforced routine of the legal academy – a routine that silently produces our thoughts and keeps our work channeled within the same old cognitive and rhetorical matrices. Like most routines, it has been so well internalized that we repeat it automatically, without thinking.**

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who better performs a genealogy that brings subjugated knowledges to light. Genealogy is key—it mobilizes marginalized groups by tapping into their experiences

**Medina 1[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Subjugated knowledges remain invisible to mainstream perspectives**; they have a precarious subterranean existence that renders them unnoticed by most people and **impossible to detect by those whose perspective has already internalized certain epistemic exclusions.** And with the invisibility of subjugated knowledges, certain possibilities for resistance and subversion go unnoticed. **The critical and emancipatory potential of Foucaultian genealogy resides in challenging established practices of remembering and forgetting by excavating subjugated bodies of experiences** and memories, bringing to the fore the perspectives that culturally hegemonic practices have foreclosed. **The critical task of the scholar and the activist is to** resurrect subjugated knowledges—that is, to revive hidden or forgotten bodies of experiences and memories—and to **help produce insurrections of subjugated knowledges.**4 In order to be critical and to have transformative effects, **genealogical investigations should aim at these insurrections, which are critical interventions that disrupt and interrogate epistemic hegemonies and mainstream perspectives** (e.g. official histories, standard interpretations, ossified exclusionary meanings, etc). **Such insurrections involve the difficult labor of mobilizing scattered, marginalized publics and of tapping into the critical potential of their dejected experiences and memories. An epistemic insurrection requires a collaborative relation between genealogical scholars/activists and the subjects whose experiences and memories have been subjugated: those subjects by themselves may not be able to destabilize the epistemic status quo until they are given a voice at the epistemic table** (i.e. in the production of knowledge), **that is, until room is made for their marginalized perspective to exert resistance**, until past epistemic battles are reopened and established frameworks become open to con- testation. On the other hand, the scholars and activists aiming to produce insurrectionary interventions could not get their critical activity off the ground if they did not draw on past and ongoing contestations, and the lived experiences and memories of those whose marginalized lives have become the silent scars of forgotten struggles.

#### And marginalized groups aren’t powerless, just subjugated—genealogies are key to deconstructing dominant discourse by mobilizing other forms of knowledge

**Medina 2[[4]](#footnote-4)**

And it is of course crucial that we regard power and knowledge not only as intimately related but as inseparable, which is why Foucault and Foucaultians have used the cumbersome expression ‚power/knowledge.‛ **One may naively think that the opposite of power/knowledge would be powerlessness/ignorance, so that those excluded or marginalized in the discursive practices that produce certain epistemic and power effects would be simply subjects without any knowledge and any power**, quasi-non-agents. **But the pluralistic genealogical approach that Foucault sketches goes completely against those views** that portray the oppressed as merely powerless and ignorant. In fact, this approach unmasks as an important misconception the view that the oppressed simply lack power and knowledge because of the forms of exclusions and marginalization they suffer. **That distorted characterization plays in the hands of the dominant ideologies and grants too much to them: namely, it grants the very definition of what counts as legitimate power and legitima[cy]te knowledge [to dominant ideologies].** Instead, **a more accurate characterization would be the one that describes oppressed groups as those whose powers and knowledges have been demeaned and obstructed.** This is why, after drawing the contrast between genealogy and history of knowledge, Foucault goes on to say that **the critical task that genealogy confronts us with is ‚an immense and multiple battle, but not one between knowledge and ignorance, but an immense and multiple battle between knowledges in the plural**—knowledges that are in conflict because of their very morphology, because they are in the possession of enemies, and because they have intrinsic power-effects.‛ 7 **How do we fight against power on this view?** Not by trying to escape it (as if liberation consisted in standing outside power altogether), but rather, **by turning power(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of power against others. Similarly, how do we fight against established and official[, oppressive] forms of knowledge when they are oppressive? Not by trying to escape knowledge altogether, but rather, by turning knowledge(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of knowledge against others.**

Additionally prefer

#### Pre-requisite. Bringing subjugated knowledges to light is key to weighing other frameworks since these knowledges can’t be considered as methodological options before they have a seat at the table. For example you can’t read colonialism as a role of the ballot without first understanding the colonialist roots of national service through genealogy. Thus even if there exists a better role of the ballot, the only way we can assess all our options is to do a genealogy first.

#### Emancipating the debate space. Not only do structures of power manipulate our understanding of the truth surrounding the resolution, but they structure the topical engagement we have in the debate space in the first place. For example not only does the regime of truth make security an objective good, but it makes all debates about international relations focus on security. Therefore deconstructing the truth is key to unleashing the true potential of the discussions we have in the debate space, leading to more unique and valuable education.

### On to Offense

#### The regime of truth implores us to believe that national service is an honor, but national service finds its roots in colonialist oppression—it’s not just that colonial powers used national service to recruit soldiers for their army, it’s that these armies were instrumental in turning colonized peoples against each other, rendering decolonization impossible. Whiteness was seen as a consequence of their lack of development, allowing it to hide its monopolization of knowledge. Here’s a narrative—[SLOW DOWN]

**Whittle 15[[5]](#footnote-5)**

Early in At Fever Pitch ([1959] 1965), David Caute’s novel of decolonization in an African colony, the prospect of post-colonial unity is depicted as being derailed by the lasting influence of western development and colonialist racial hierarchies. **Coming from the country’s Northern interior**, described as “a land of small clustered villages where they spoke the lingo of the North”, **Sully Azambugu moves to the modernized South, “where it was said there were many towns and Africans of a different race who used the ways of the white man”** (Caute [1959] 1965, 20). **The decision to move comes after a British soldier visits Sulley’s village and implores the men to join the army, offering good pay and education.** Yet, **Sulley is recruited as a servant of the British junior officer Michael Glyn and finds himself the figure of racial abuse by his fellow Africans.** **In a bar he is taunted by an African man who “spoke to him sarcastically in a tongue of the South which he could not understand”, and whose proud claim “I have been to England!”** (23) implies an English University education. **Other men surround him, shouting insults** such as “How do you like cars, bush baby?” and “Where’s your loin-cloth, muscle man?” **before the first man goes on to blame “the bushmen and savages of the North who have no education, no towns, no cars, no cinemas”** (23) **for the history of imperial oppression they have endured.** With independence on the horizon, the man announces that, “Soon we shall be free and these dogs will do as we say. They will dig the sewers for us!” (24).

[FAST]

#### Colonialism relies upon turning its subjects against one another; in national service some subjects serve the white elite while others strive for independence, breeding internal conflict. Vote neg to protest this unending subjugation and unite us all in anti-colonial thought. The 1954 protests in Singapore prove—

**Wikipedia[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**In December 1953, the British colonial government in Singapore passed the National Service Ordinance, requiring all male British subjects and Federal citizens between the ages of 18-20 to register for part-time National Service (Thum, 2012).[1]** The dateline for registration was on the 12th May 1954 and those who fail to register would either be jailed or fined. On the 12th May 1954, students from the Chinese Middle Schools still did not register themselves for National Service. In light of the impending deadline for registration and with requests from the Chinese students, Chief Secretary William Goode would later meet representatives from the affected student body in the government house on 13 May 1954 (Thum, 2012).[1] **On 13 May 1954, students gathered to present their petition to Chief Secretary William Goode. However, the peaceful demonstration turned into a clash between the police and students.** More than 2 dozen people were injured and 48 students were arrested (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011).[2] **The demonstration of 13 May 1954 was followed by further demonstrations and proved a key moment in galvanizing popular opposition to colonial rule.** Following the end of the Japanese Occupation in 1945, the British sought to regain political control over Singapore, what was a vital strategic centre to them. The British Military Administration was set up, focusing on the reorientation of the state in order to meet post-war crisis. The British set sights to bolster social and economic life, and to secure their footing in Singapore (Harper, 2001).[3] Of the social programmes that the government laid out, the most far-reaching and critical was education. The British envisioned setting up "national schools", prioritizing English-medium education and undermining vernacular education. With that, Chinese schools were starved of funding, resulting in anger and resentments among the Chinese students and teachers. This led to the rise in anti-colonial sentiments (Thum, 2013).[4] This growing anti-colonial sentiment was further fueled by the larger anti-colonial sentiment that was also happening outside Singapore - how winning freedom for colonies in Africa and Asia played a part in instilling hope in the progressive left in Singapore – that independence may come one day (Thum, 2013).[4] One good example was also the defeat of the French at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu in Vietnam (1954). Moving into 1948, the outbreak of communist insurrection in the Malayan jungles, saw the declaration of emergency in Singapore. The declaration of emergency which was to last for almost a decade, saw heightened security control. Singapore was turned into a police state, progressives and anti-colonial activists were rounded up, and political repression suspended all forms of left-wing politics in Singapore (Turnbull, 2009).[5] While organized opposition to colonial rule was difficult, nevertheless, the period was plagued with social discontent and stirrings of anti-colonial and nationalistic sentiments in view of the British’s plan to consolidate and maintain rule, following the Japanese occupation (Quee,Tan,& Hong, 2011).[2] 13 May 1954[edit] In December 1953, the National Service Ordinance was passed, requiring the registration of all male British subjects and Federal citizens between the ages of 18-20 for part-time military training. After the announcement was made regarding the National Service draft, personnel involved were to register for the call-up from 8 April – 12 May 1954. By 12 May 1954, students from the Chinese Middle Schools still did not register themselves for National Service (NS) (Thum, 2012).[1] In light of the impending deadline for registration and with requests from the Chinese students, Chief Secretary William Goode would later meet representatives from the affected student body in the government house on 13 May 1954. This day however, resulted in a clash between Chinese Middle School students and riot squads. More than 2 dozen were reportedly injured and nearly 50 students were arrested. Of those arrested, 7 were convicted of obstructing the police (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011).[2] Following the riot, students re-assembled in Chung Cheng High School and only dispersed in the afternoon on 14 May 1954 (Lee, 1996).[6] On 18 May 1954, a delegation of students (the 55-member Chinese Middle Schools Student Delegation) met the Chinese Chamber of Commerce (CCC), requesting their (CCC) help to speak to the British government on their (the students) behalf. However, the only concrete result from this meeting was having their school holidays being pushed forward by 2 weeks (Lee, 1996)[6] to deny students the opportunity to rally together. Having their school holidays pushed forward, this action prompted a second massive sit in by the students which took place on 23 May 1954 in Chung Cheng High School. However, due to the prevention of food supplies from reaching these students, the group dispersed. The third massive sit in took place in the Chinese High School on 2 June 1954. This time, students requested for the postponement of call-up for National Service. Though, the lack of response from the government saw the students went on hunger strike on the 15 June. The students only dispersed on the 24 June (Singh, 2008).[7] Constant negotiations were made back and forth between the students and the government in the following days (Thum, 2012).[1] **However, due to the resistance put up by the students, the attempt to recruit male youths for National Service took a back seat.** The aftermath of 13 May 1954 resulted in the conviction of 7 students for obstructing the police during the demonstration, as well as further tightening of control over the students by the British. Interpretations of 13 May 1954[edit] 13 May 1954 connotes different interpretations, and be characterized as: (i) 13 May 1954 as communist subversion, (ii) 13 May 1954 as Anti-Colonial Movement, and (iii) 13 May 1954 as a bottom up,spontaneous response to particular events. (i) 13 May 1954 as Communist subversion[edit] In the 1950s, the Chinese students were one of the largest groups involved in demonstrations and their motivations have been consistently credited to communist manipulation – through the united front strategy. The united front strategy was a political tool employed by the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) with aims of regathering and rebuilding their strength which was greatly depleted in jungle fighting during the earlier years of the State of Emergency between 1948 and 1960. The strategy focuses on building relations and contacts with workers, peasants and students, emphasizing on how plans and arrangements should be made in order to gain mass (Lee, 1996).[6] According to Singh (2008),[7] the first step of this strategy [was] is to engage students through the exploitation of communal issues. Singh quotes an MCP directive as saying: "The work of winning over the school children is very important and must not be overlooked. Especially in circumstances where the enemy is stronger than we are, the work of winning support from school children and organising them is more important than military activities."(Sing, 2008)[7] According to Lee (1996),[6] the reason as to why the MCP chose to start the mass movement from the students can be attributed to the following reasons: (i) the MCP recognised these Chinese students as a valuable political force and worked towards systematically absorbing them into the communist movement and (ii) during this period of time, members of the Town Committee (a secret organisation operating underground as the executive arm of the Malayan Communist Party with its mobile headquarters on the borders of Malaya and Thailand) were arrested, leaving only the cells in charge of propaganda and cells in the Chinese Middle School, intact. The propaganda sector consisted of few people, but the student sector had many members. Thus, it was the student sector which had the manpower to launch the open united front struggle when the time came. However, in order to mobilise and arouse the students, an issue had to be capitalised upon. The National Service Ordinance was chosen to serve this purpose (Lee, 1996).[6] In Lee’s book, he also mentioned that in the eyes of the communists themselves, the agitation over the national service was a great success. Lee made this statement based on a following comment by Ng Meng Chang (a student cadre) : "…. said that the tremendous success of the May 13 incident was beyond expectation… this was the most successful student struggle ever since the emergency regulations…" Lee (1996)[6] also concluded by saying that "13 May 1954" had seen the creation of many student leaders which should be given support to, as they become future pillars of the student movement. This statement was drawn from unpublished statements of ex-detainees. In conclusion, authors like Singh (2008)[7] and Lee(1996)[6] hold that the Malayan Communist Party was looking for manpower and the result of "13 May 1954" was a fulfillment of this aspiration. All in all, 13 May 1954 as Communist subversion was seen in the context of the cold war and in supporting this position, sources from scholars such as Lee (1996)[6] and Singh (2008)[7] are largely from colonial media. 13 May 1954 as Anti-Colonial Movement[edit] Following the declaration of emergency in 1948, the political-left in Singapore grew vastly, both in size and power in 1954. This was attributed to the large levels of economic exploitation and social injustice felt by the people which then saw subsequent calls for self-governance and democracy. This was especially so for the Chinese when the decision was made by the British to prioritise English-medium education over vernacular education. With that, friction between the Chinese community and the British authorities resulted. Anger and anti-colonial resentments were felt within the Chinese community for English language represented colonial domination (Thum, 2013).[4] This was not all. In 1954, both the Chinese leadership and student activists face further pressures when the British made even more demands by making English the only language to be used in the legislative assembly (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011).[2] **The Chinese middle school students had however, also moved out of the parameters of strictly Chinese-focused issues by linking themselves to a larger historical context of anti-colonial movement.** The Chinese students, together with the Socialist Club members of the University of Malaya, identified themselves with the students of China, India, and Indonesia who also played a role in their country’s liberation (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011).[2] Both the English and Chinese-educated students were seen to be working together to resist colonial rule, and that the socialist club had a hand in organising "13 May 1954". This was in view that copies of the Fajar Publication (Issue 7) were found in the Chinese High Schools. With that, amidst the Chinese student’s demonstration, the hostels of students from the socialist club were also raided by the police on 28 May 1954, and **8 members of the University socialist club were charged with sedition for articles printed in [a student] the Fajar Publication [an] (Quee,Tan, & Hong, 2011).[2] According to Loh (2013),[8] this particular issue, dated 10 May 1954, and titled as "Aggression in Asia", was one that involved critical views on the ongoing Anglo-American Military initiative to form the Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO). In addition, the issue also contained comments on the National Service Bill which was passed in Singapore earlier on. It argued that by pressing students into military service, [it] is in no way "national" for it entailed "a colonial people to be trained to fight wars in the making of which they have no part – no choice of their foes or allies. Though we are not fit to rule ourselves, we are not unfit to die for other people’s interests." (Loh, 2013).**[8] Loh bases his opinion largely from the Fajar Publication itself. Anti-colonial sentiment was overwhelming, but the colonial authorities simply look upon them as the result of communist agitation. Common hatred (both Chinese and English students) of exploitation, British rule and the declaration of Emergency in paved the way for "13 May 1954", a resistance seen to be driven by overwhelming "leftist resentments against the British", with the rank and file on the ground taking initiative and moving without proper direction and control (Barr, & Trocki, 2008).[9] **In the view of scholars like (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011)[2] and (Barr, & Trocki, 2008),[9] "13 May 1954" represented the convergence of notions of nationalism (with help from the English-educated). The student resistance was very focused and uncompromising. It was evident that they were pushing the boundaries as far as the emergency regulations would allow, and anti-colonialism was the main engine driving their cause (Quee, Tan, & Hong, 2011).**

# Updates

## 2NR Extensions

### Framing

**Go to the K framing…**

**EXTEND Foucault—you as the judge are DIRECTLY LINKED to the truth of the resolution and therefore are an intellectual. Because norms are linked to the system of powers which sustain it, your obligation is to deconstruct them to discover the truth.**

**EXTEND Schlag, who tells you that absent deconstruction the normative truths surrounding the resolution become routines devoid of any meaning. In other words your role as an intellectual COMES FIRST since the discourse we have in this round is meaningless if we just repeat the same thought instilled within us rather than looking inward to critique it.**

**[If critical thinking]**

**Also means neg controls the internal link to all critical thinking impacts within the round since your thought isn’t critical if you’re just repeating something rather than thinking inward at what you’ve been told.**

**EXTEND that the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who better performs a genealogy that brings subjugated knowledges to light. More specifically,**

**EXTEND Medina 1: genealogy is UNIQUELY KEY to deconstructing the truth. Without deconstruction some knowledges are subjugated by systems of power, and to bring these subjugated knowledges to light we need to perform a genealogy to a) understand how and why these knowledges became subjugated and b) mobilize marginalized groups by tapping into their experiences**

**[if necessary] EXTEND Medina 2, which clarifies that the choice isn’t between accepting or rejecting one dominant ideology, but choosing between multiple forms of knowledge. This is a reason to prefer the role of the ballot because genealogy actually mobilizes other forms of knowledge instead of just saying that bad things are bad.**

**[If critical pedagogy]**

**Also this is THE BIGGEST DISAD to your resisting oppression role of the ballot; your framing just says let’s reject X because it’s bad, but in doing so, makes X seem MORE LEGITIMATE by only discussing this ideology. Genealogy solves this since it says X is bad but also mobilizes a better ideology Y against it.**

**EXTEND the two analytics as reasons to prefer the framing. EXTEND a) that my role of the ballot is fundamentally a pre-requisite because it brings more methodological options, such as colonialism, to the table in order for us to consider all our options and b) that my framing actually emancipates the debate space since otherwise we just debate the same constructed arguments around the same, routine, engrained normative truths.**

### Offense

**Referring back to the framing, right now the “normative truth” is that national service is an honor for your country, when in reality, it traces its roots to a colonialist era. It’s not just that all things originating in the colonial era were bad, it’s that national service had a UNIQUE ROLE—EXTEND Whittle 15 and consider the example provided from this narrative—the African man Sully is taunted by his fellow African men for being the cause of the imperialist oppression they have endured. This example is indicative that national service had a unique role in expanding whiteness through a colonialist lens, since a) by forcing men to defend the same country that oppressed them subjugated populations are turned against each other, inhibiting decoloniality and b) this inherent antagonism between the two groups breaks down nationalism and in turn fosters a sense of superiority that hides the true oppressive nature of colonialism and hides how whiteness has subjugated other populations, as seen when the other African man blames Sully and the other men for colonialism.**

**Next, your voting neg in the round is crucial to a) deconstructing the narrative that national service has always been an honor for one’s country and b) unite us all in anti-colonial thought. EXTEND Wikipedia—this isn’t just something I’m making up, it’s EMPIRICALLY PROVEN—when Chinese students protested the 13 May 1954 British National Service Ordinance, they were a) able to criticize this as an oppressive tenet of colonialism b) able to hinder the progress of the ordinance and c) most importantly actually galvanize support against British colonialism as a whole.**
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