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#### Interpretation: “Federal Government” means the United States government

Black’s Law 99 (Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p.703)

The U.S. government—also termed national government

#### “Should” is mandatory

Nieto 9 – Judge Henry Nieto, Colorado Court of Appeals, 8-20-2009 People v. Munoz, 240 P.3d 311 (Colo. Ct. App. 2009)

"Should" is "used . . . to express duty, obligation, propriety, or expediency." Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2104 (2002). Courts [\*\*15] interpreting the word in various contexts have drawn conflicting conclusions, although the weight of authority appears to favor interpreting "should" in an imperative, obligatory sense. HN7A number of courts, confronted with the question of whether using the word "should" in jury instructions conforms with the Fifth and Sixth Amendment protections governing the reasonable doubt standard, have upheld instructions using the word. In the courts of other states in which a defendant has argued that the word "should" in the reasonable doubt instruction does not sufficiently inform the jury that it is bound to find the defendant not guilty if insufficient proof is submitted at trial, the courts have squarely rejected the argument. They reasoned that the word "conveys a sense of duty and obligation and could not be misunderstood by a jury." See State v. McCloud, 257 Kan. 1, 891 P.2d 324, 335 (Kan. 1995); see also Tyson v. State, 217 Ga. App. 428, 457 S.E.2d 690, 691-92 (Ga. Ct. App. 1995) (finding argument that "should" is directional but not instructional to be without merit); Commonwealth v. Hammond, 350 Pa. Super. 477, 504 A.2d 940, 941-42 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1986). Notably, courts interpreting the word "should" in other types of jury instructions [\*\*16] have also found that the word conveys to the jury a sense of duty or obligation and not discretion. In Little v. State, 261 Ark. 859, 554 S.W.2d 312, 324 (Ark. 1977), the Arkansas Supreme Court interpreted the word "should" in an instruction on circumstantial evidence as synonymous with the word "must" and rejected the defendant's argument that the jury may have been misled by the court's use of the word in the instruction. Similarly, the Missouri Supreme Court rejected a defendant's argument that the court erred by not using the word "should" in an instruction on witness credibility which used the word "must" because the two words have the same meaning. State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958). [\*318] In applying a child support statute, the Arizona Court of Appeals concluded that a legislature's or commission's use of the word "should" is meant to convey duty or obligation. McNutt v. McNutt, 203 Ariz. 28, 49 P.3d 300, 306 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2002) (finding a statute stating that child support expenditures "should" be allocated for the purpose of parents' federal tax exemption to be mandatory).
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#### Increase means to become bigger or larger in quantity

Encarta 7 – Encarta World English Dictionary, 7 (“Increase”, 2007, <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861620741>)

Increase

transitive and intransitive verb  (past and past participle in·creased, present participle in·creas·ing, 3rd person present singular in·creas·es)

Definition:

make or become larger or greater: to become, or make something become, larger in number, quantity, or degree

#### Violation- the 1AC does not MANDATE a plan by the US federal government where Economic Engagement is increased.

#### Prefer our interpretation:

#### Ground: allowing un-topical affs kills ground, resolutional neg ground is based off of a policy happening. Absent a stable locus for links and competition, debate is shallow, killing education

#### Predictable limits: government action is key to create a limit on the topic, allowing different methods or framings to be the 1ac explodes neg research burden and kills core generics. Prefer our limits because they are predictably based off of the resolution

#### Topic education: the topic is about the effects of US policies toward regions of Latin America. A discussion of policies accesses a knowledge of politics, which is the largest portable impact to debate

#### Aff conditionality: without the plan text as a stable source of the offense the aff can shift their advocacy to get out of offense which discourages research and clash. Voting issue

#### e. Undermining switch side debate destroys critical activism – debating both sides of democracy assistance empirically creates powerful liberal coalitions

Guilhot ‘5

[Nicolas. Prof Sociology and Fellow at the Social Science Research Council. The Democracy Makers, 2005, Pg 13-4]

Finally, there can be double agents only where there is conflict and con­tending agendas. This is crucial dimension to the analyses. The genesis of global prescriptions for democratization or human rights and the production " of international norms in a variety of regulatory areas are conflictual processes. Goals, means, strategies, models, interlocutors, experts, grantees are constantly being contested. The meaning of concepts themselves is at stake in these struggles: for instance, the debate about human rights in the 1980s was entirely about deciding whether human rights were a universal norm that could be opposed to any form of government (as liberals would argue), in whether they did not exist outside of national political traditions and legal systems (as neoconservatives would say)—which then meant, in the latter case, that the defense of U.S. interests could not be contrary to human rights, and that exporting and imposing the rule of law and democracy was the only possible human rights policy. The opposition between different political and social agendas is the perfect ground for the emergence of a tiiick layer of intermediaries, mediators, arbiters, and go-betweens shuttling back and forth between contending groups, between dominant institutions and NGOs, between the national and the international, between the de­tached position of the academic and the involvement of the practitioner. These double agents tend to occupy the middle ground and to be in the best position to make hegemonic institutions more sensitive to emancipatory claims, while at the same time disciplining or moderating NGOs and activ­ists. By doing so, they seem to further all agendas at once. In the 1980s, for instance, the most successful advocates of democratization programs in­cluded committed U.S. and Latin American political scientists who had been promoting both democratization and the limitation of democracy to the political sphere.¶ All this entails no judgment about the psychological motivations of actors. Talking of double agents does not imply that individuals follow cynical self-serving calculations. Cynicism is a model of individual rationality which is anthropologically dubious and epistemologically untenable. On the con­trary, the individuals who appear in this book are often idealists, motivated by a real commitment to the causes they champion. What has changed is the place and the role of this idealism in the global context. What makes them "double" agents is the structural context in which they participate. It is not an issue of character. While the demands for a more ethical foreign policy and other forms of international democratic activism were once clearly critical elements, they have become today the building blocks of new world orders. The construction of "market democracies" across the world has been adopted as a crucial element of the U.S. security doctrine and also an instrument of economic liberalization, while the exportation of democ­racy has given birth to new forms of political, legal, and scientific imperi­alism. In this new context, democratic activism has obviously changed its signification, if not its sides.

#### Framework is a voting issue for the reasons above

#### Double Bind—Either A) the aff is a K of the resolution by saying engagement is bad, in which case you vote neg because they have dejustified the resolution OR B) some forms of engagement are okay and the topical version of the aff resolves these questions

#### That turns the aff – focusing on the details and inner-workings of government policy-making is productive – critical approaches can’t resolve real world problems like poverty, racism and war

McClean, Mollow College Philosophy Professor, 01

[David E., Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Molloy College, New York, 2001 “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Available Online at www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm, JMP, Accessed on July 5, 2013)][SP]

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

#### 5. Following the resolution is the best way to engage politics – key to discussion, community, and problem solving.

Chandler 9

[David, Professor of International Relations at the University

of Westminster, “Questioning Global Political

Activism” in “What is Radical Politics Today”, , p 76 – 84, accessed 8/30, CC]

Conclusion¶ I have attempted to argue that there is a lot at stake in the radical understanding¶ of engagement in global politics. Politics has become a religious¶ activity, an activity which is no longer socially mediated; it is less and¶ less an activity based on social engagement and the testing of ideas in¶ public debate or in the academy. Doing politics today, whether in radical¶ activism, government policy-making or in academia, seems to bring¶ people into a one-to-one relationship with global issues in the same way¶ religious people have a one-to-one relationship with their God.¶ Politics is increasingly like religion because when we look for meaning¶ we find it inside ourselves rather than in the external consequences¶ of our ‘political’ acts. What matters is the conviction or the act in¶ itself: its connection to the global sphere is one that we increasingly¶ tend to provide idealistically. Another way of expressing this limited¶ sense of our subjectivity is in the popularity of globalisation theory –¶ the idea that instrumentality is no longer possible today because the¶ world is such a complex and interconnected place and therefore there¶ is no way of knowing the consequences of our actions. The more we¶ engage in the new politics where there is an unmediated relationship¶ between us as individuals and global issues, the less we engage instrumentally¶ with the outside world, and the less we engage with our¶ peers and colleagues at the level of political or intellectual debate and¶ organisation.¶ You may be thinking that I have gone some way to describing or identifying¶ what the problems might be but I have not mentioned anything¶ about a solution. I won’t dodge the issue. One thing that is clear is that¶ the solution is not purely an intellectual or academic one; the demand¶ for global ethics is generated by our social reality and social experiences.¶ Marx spent some time considering a similar crisis of political subjectivity¶ in 1840s Germany and in his writings – The German Ideology, Introduction¶ to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, Theses on Feuerbach, and¶ elsewhere – he raged against the idealism of contemporary thought and¶ argued that the criticism of religion needed to be replaced by the criticism¶ of politics – by political activism and social change based on the¶ emerging proletariat (see Marx, 1975, for example). Nearly two centuries¶ later it is more difficult to see an emerging political subject which can¶ fulfil the task of ‘changing the world’ rather than merely ‘reinterpreting¶ it’ through philosophy.¶ I have two suggestions. Firstly, that there is a pressing need for an¶ intellectual struggle against the idealism of global ethics. The point needs¶ to be emphasised that our freedom to engage in politics, to choose our¶ identities and political campaigns, as well as governments’ freedom to¶ choose their ethical campaigns and wars of choice, reflects a lack of social¶ ties and social engagement. There is no global political struggle between¶ ‘Empire’ and its ‘Radical Discontents’; the Foucauldian temptation to see¶ power and resistance everywhere is a product of wishful or lazy thinking¶ dominated by the social categories of the past. The stakes are not in the¶ global stratosphere but much closer to home. Politics appears to have¶ gone global because there is a breakdown of genuine community and the¶ construction of fantasy communities and fantasy connections in global¶ space. Unless we bring politics back down to earth from heaven, our¶ critical, social and intellectual lives will continue to be diminished ones.¶ Secondly, on the basis that the political freedom of our social atomisation¶ leads us into increasingly idealised approaches to the world we¶ live in, we should take more seriously Hedley Bull’s (1995) injunction¶ to pursue the question, or in Alain Badiou’s (2004: 237–8) words subordinate¶ ourselves to the ‘discipline of the real’. Subordination to the¶ world outside us is a powerful factor that can bind those interested in¶ critical research, whereas the turn away from the world and the focus on¶ our personal values can ultimately only be divisive. To facilitate external¶ engagement and external judgement, I suggest we experiment with¶ ways to build up social bonds with our peers that can limit our freedoms¶ and develop our sense of responsibility and accountability to others.¶ We may have to construct these social connections artificially but their¶ value and instrumentality will have to be proven through our ability to¶ engage with, understand, critique and ultimately overcome the practices¶ and subjectivities of our time.

#### 6. Roleplaying gives an accurate education about indigenous cultures – following resolution is key – allows time to research before and has multiple education benefits.

NORMAN 4

[Heidi, Lecturer at the Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning at the University of Technology Sydney, awarded the UTS Vice-Chancellors Teaching¶ Award and is currently enrolled in her doctorate. She is a¶ descendant of the Gamilaroi nation in northwest New¶ South Wales., the AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL of INDIGENOUS EDUCATION, “EXPLORING EFFECTIVE TEACHING¶ STRATEGIES: SIMULATION CASE¶ STUDIES and INDIGENOUS STUDIES ¶ at the UNIVERSITY LEVEL”, <http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/research/bitstream/handle/10453/5921/2004002371.pdf?sequence=1>, accessed 9/3, CC]

Indigenous studies has a difﬁcult place in Western¶ academies – as we struggle (or juggle) the multidisciplinary¶ nature of Indigenous studies, meet the very different¶ educational and vocational needs of students in our classes¶ and critically reﬂect on appropriate pedagogical issues – the¶ place and authority of Indigenous studies is questioned.¶ Aboriginal studies in higher education has largely come¶ about through the development of Indigenous student¶ support services and in some cases a successful wrestling¶ match with the anthropologists. Mostly, Aboriginal studies is¶ aligned with particular disciplines as a major within areas¶ like Faculties of Education. The teaching is mostly¶ multidisciplinary and often with little theoretical¶ underpinning. It is a little bit history, a little bit social¶ enquiry, anthropology, politics, law, resource management,¶ cultural studies,community development,literature studies,¶ media studies and social policy. It is hard to do justice to¶ these diverse areas of study, and the complex debates that¶ exist within each of these ﬁelds, and apply them to a ﬁeld¶ that is outside of the organisation of Western knowledge¶ systems.Different teaching strategies that allow ﬂexibility in¶ student identiﬁed learning outcomes, and that address the¶ professional practices of Australian graduates go some way¶ towards anchoring Indigenous studies within the academy.¶ In 2003 students participated in a simulated role-play¶ based on the events relating to the development of the¶ Hindmarsh Island Bridge on Hindmarsh Island in South¶ Australia. The construction of the bridge from mainland¶ South Australia to Hindmarsh Island has been a¶ multilayered and complex dispute. The development of¶ the bridge was opposed by traditional Ngarrindjeri¶ women.They argued that it was a site of signiﬁcance for¶ women. The Federal Government opposed the¶ development, the state Government held an inquiry into¶ the validity of the women’s “beliefs” – and found that¶ they had “fabricated” evidence while the Federal Liberal¶ opposition made public documents intended for women¶ only. The media, various expert witnesses, including¶ anthropologists and lawyers, along with the High Court¶ of Australia all played a role in this controversial dispute.¶ In the end the bridge was developed and the newly elected conservative Federal Government enacted¶ special legislation to allow for the bridge against the¶ trend of rights to cultural heritage protection and¶ interpretations of racial discrimination laws. This dispute¶ also took place in the context of the legislated¶ reconciliation movement and yet no mention,¶ throughout the 10-year dispute, was made of the¶ reconciliation themes. The simulated role-play was an¶ assessed component of the new elective subject,¶ Reconciliation Studies, offered at the University of¶ Technology Sydney. The student cohort was made up of¶ overseas study abroad students, mainly from Europe and¶ North America, and Indigenous and non-Indigenous¶ students. Students were organised into “stakeholder”¶ groups to research and then role-play, through their¶ assigned characters, the multilayered and complex¶ dimensions of this recent dispute. Students were¶ required to reﬂect critically on the cultural, economic,¶ legal and political issues that were pertinent to their¶ stakeholder and explore the underlying racial, ethical and¶ moral grounds for their particular standpoint.¶ Simulation case studies¶ Innovative teaching strategies, such as simulations and¶ games have been around for a long time. Harvard Law¶ School is attributed with having pioneered the “case¶ study model” in the 1800s, where it was considered a¶ very radical and controversial shift in curriculum and¶ teaching strategy. It is now widely used by other¶ disciplines, including business and medicine, and there¶ are various associated networks, including the¶ International Simulations and Gaming Association (ISGA).¶ From the 1970s adult educators have explored, theorised¶ and documented effective and innovative teaching and¶ learning practices (e.g., Leigh & Kinder, 1999; Lewis,¶ 1986; Mille & Crookall, 1989). Lovelock (in Lewis, 1986)¶ explains that the case study model of teaching¶ emphasises inductive learning and is in contrast to the¶ deductive teaching approach used in the lecture format¶ where students are directly presented with concepts and¶ theories. Simulations are generally deﬁned as openended, real-life oriented, often behaviourally-based and¶ process focused. A case study, according to Leigh and¶ Kinder (1999), is characterised by in-depth analysis,¶ detail,and a review of results and actions.Simulation case¶ studies are an opportunity to bring real-life learning¶ experiences to students through which they can¶ consider appropriate ways to solve problems.¶ Organising the Hindmarsh Island Bridge¶ simulation case study¶ The Hindmarsh Island Bridge simulation case study was¶ run over three classes that were each three hours in¶ length.A total of nine hours of class time was thus spent¶ on the case study. Students were required to work¶ collaboratively to develop an understanding of their¶ stakeholder, and individually to produce a paper¶ analysing and/or critically reﬂecting on the role of their¶ stakeholders and how the dispute could be understood¶ within a reconciliation framework.¶ There were three distinct stages to the organisation of¶ the Hindmarsh Island Bridge simulation case study:¶ Stage one¶ • Developing an appropriate topic and learning¶ objectives.¶ • Setting up the activity.¶ • Sorting students into groups.¶ • Locating appropriate resources.¶ • Explaining or negotiating participant/stakeholder¶ roles.¶ • Organising suitable space/room.¶ Stage two¶ • Session one: Preparing the class (three hours).¶ • Session two: Conducting the role-play (three hours).¶ • Session three: Debriefing and critical reflection¶ (three hours).¶ Stage three¶ • Student completion of written analysis of how the¶ Hindmarsh Island Bridge dispute can be understood¶ within a reconciliation framework.¶ In setting up the activity a number of issues need to¶ be taken into account.These are discussed sequentially in¶ relation to the three stages.¶ Stage one issues¶ Developing an appropriate topic and learning objectives¶ The simulated case study was based on the events of the¶ Hindmarsh Island Bridge,so it was a “real-life”case study.It¶ was chosen as a topic because it was a dispute that¶ covered a range of complex issues and it took place over¶ the time of the reconciliation movement, yet there was no¶ reference to reconciliation throughout the dispute. In¶ seemed that on the one hand bridge walks were taking¶ place in support of Indigenous rights and in other cases¶ they were being built in deﬁance of rights. The Hindmarsh¶ Island Bridge case study provided an opportunity for¶ students to critically engage with some complex issues¶ and concepts and to critically consider the place and¶ signiﬁcance of the different reconciliation frameworks.¶ Setting up the activity¶ Ten stakeholder groups were identiﬁed for the Hindmarsh¶ Island Bridge simulation case study. These were:¶ • Ngarrindjeri traditional owners (women and men);¶ • Ngarrindjeri community of Hindmarsh (men and¶ women);¶ • Federal Labor Party in Opposition and Government;¶ • Federal Coalition in Opposition and Government;¶ • State Government;¶ • media;¶ • expert witnesses (Anthropologists);¶ • developers;¶ • legal experts; and¶ • Australian “public”.¶ Sorting students into groups¶ Students were encouraged to assign themselves to a¶ stakeholder group. This allowed for students to undertake¶ research in areas they were comfortable with and that¶ interested them. There were 30 students in the class with¶ three students assigned to each group. In some cases¶ students took opposing views within their group (for¶ example, the media and expert witnesses). Assigning or¶ nominating to a group requires sensitivity and discretion.¶ It is important that students are not assigned to groups¶ that could be embarrassing or that bear closely on¶ personal issues. In this case study some roles were very¶ emotionally confronting, especially for students who¶ were not familiar with feelings of being marginalised or¶ silenced. There were also issues of sensitivity around¶ Aboriginal identity and religion.¶ Locating appropriate resources¶ Several key texts on the Hindmarsh Island Bridge dispute¶ were listed in the subject outline for students to research¶ their stakeholder’s position. In addition, over 100 journal¶ articles were sourced and forwarded to students¶ according to their stakeholder’s role. We kept in regular¶ email contact with students and set up online forums for¶ each group to work collaboratively. This was also useful¶ for posting electronic copies of journal articles.¶ Explaining or negotiating participant/stakeholder roles¶ Students kept in regular email contact with us to clarify¶ particular events and their stakeholder’s perspective. The¶ Hindmarsh Island Bridge dispute extended over a period¶ of more than 10 years. There is continuing academic¶ work on the dispute as well as ongoing considerations in¶ the legal and heritage protection area, not to mention¶ among the Ngarrindjeri women and community. The¶ simulation followed the events as they occurred in a¶ time-line format, although some events were not dealt¶ with in the same detail as others. For the purposes of the¶ case study the life of the dispute was condensed to a¶ three hour session with particular events, as narrated by¶ the instructor, dealt with in detail.¶ Organising suitable space/room¶ Classrooms at UTS are generally of a standard model¶ where desks are aligned facing the front of the¶ classroom. For the purposes of this activity, and¶ throughout the whole semester, the classroom was¶ rearranged so that all participants could interact in a¶ collaborative learning environment.¶ Stage two issues¶ Session one: Preparing the class¶ For the ﬁrst class students discussed the events of the¶ Hindmarsh Island Bridge dispute and collectively¶ compiled a time-line. Based on their research, students¶ spoke outside of their chosen character. This meant¶ that all students became familiar with the overall¶ dispute rather than simply from their own¶ stakeholder’s experience of the dispute. Some students¶ were nervous about what to expect (I was too!). The¶ ﬁrst session was important to calm nerves and ensure¶ that all students were familiar with the “bigger picture”¶ of the dispute. This was also an important time for¶ clarifying role-play protocols. These included a signal¶ for “time-out” that participants could use at any time in¶ the role-play; they could move out of character and¶ speak in more analytical terms where it was¶ appropriate and where there were issues of cultural¶ sensitivity; and that the cultural rights of the¶ Ngarrindjeri women would be respected in the roleplay, despite what occurred in real-life. It was also¶ noted that students were discouraged from¶ caricaturing or overly exaggerating their stakeholder.¶ Session two: Conducting the role-play¶ At this stage students were reminded that they were “roleplaying” and then moved into character by introducing¶ themselves to the group. The instructor’s “role”in the roleplay was to:¶ • manage the discussion and keep the dialogue¶ progressing, even though it was contrived, as a natural¶ process;¶ • ensure all of the stakeholders had a chance to¶ participate;¶ • call time-out if necessary;¶ • support students who were more timid or nervous;¶ and,¶ • keep an eye on time and determine when to call a halt¶ to the role-play¶ Students were well prepared, although some students,¶ given their apparent state of nerves were given the option¶ of observing. They were well equipped with the relevant¶ readings for their stakeholder based research and had¶ participated in a three-hour lead-in discussion to prepare¶ them for the role-play. Many students came along to class “in¶ character”– some even dressed up for the occasion, and had¶ all taken their research seriously and were well prepared in¶ terms of the position of their stakeholder. The lead-in¶ discussion ensured that all students were familiar with the¶ broader dispute not just the perspective of their character.¶ The success of the simulation depends on student¶ preparation and successful intervention by the instructor.¶ Given that the simulation was loosely based on a time-line of¶ events,the main role of the instructor was to keep students¶ on task and ensure that all of the stakeholders were¶ contributing in a manner consistent with the actual events.¶ Session three: Debrieﬁng and critical reﬂection ¶ At the debrieﬁng time it is important that students come¶ out of their character. Pfeiffer and Jones (in Jones 1980)¶ suggest a process whereby participants say, for example,¶ “I am no longer Mrs Chapman the Developer, I am …” as¶ a way of formally debrieﬁng from their character. Some¶ students became very emotional at the sense of injustice,¶ and for some students it was apparent through their¶ body language that they felt very alienated and¶ dispossessed from the other students. It was necessary¶ to be sensitive to their needs and allow them to talk in¶ detail about how they felt and for other students to¶ understand this emotional response.¶ The debrieﬁng session, according to Cryer (1982) and¶ Pfeiffer and Jones (in Jones 1980), is the most critical¶ point of the case study – it is after all the deductive¶ analytical stage where the learning experiences come¶ together. They outline ﬁve key stages to assist in¶ facilitating the debrieﬁng:¶ 1. Publishing: Describing what happened in the¶ exercise, sharing reactions and observations.¶ 2. Integrating: Putting together the separate viewpoints¶ to reveal underlying patterns and dynamics and¶ making interpretations.¶ 3. Generalising: Drawing out general principles and¶ concepts and relating them to other contexts.¶ 4. Applying: Considering what has been learnt both¶ individually and collectively and the implications of¶ that for future action and scope for problem solving.¶ 5. Evaluating: Discussing how valuable the activity was¶ for everyone and how it might be improved.¶ Stage three issues¶ Students were required to research and prepare a written¶ proﬁle from the perspective of their stakeholder on the¶ dispute.Through this they were required to outline and¶ critically analyse the range of issues at the centre of¶ political and cultural conﬂicts between non-Indigenous¶ and Indigenous Australians. They were also required to¶ understand and discuss what is meant by adopting a¶ reconciliation framework for resolving this dispute.¶ Students’ learning outcomes of the simulation case study¶ These can be summarised as follows:¶ • Understanding of different viewpoints and how the¶ views we hold can be seen to be located within¶ particular cultural frameworks.¶ • Understanding of how knowledge is produced in¶ particular contexts.¶ • Place of Indigenous issues within the federal system of¶ governance.¶ • Different ideological positions of the Labor and Liberal¶ Parties on heritage protection and Indigenous rights¶ protection.¶ • Limitations of the Australian constitution and the “race¶ power” provision.¶ • The signiﬁcance of ATSIC’s “rights agenda”.¶ • The limitations and/or differences of the Council for¶ Aboriginal Reconciliation.¶ • Divisions and differences within Aboriginal¶ communities and how these are interpreted¶ differently and in some cases manipulated.¶ • Impact of colonisation on individuals, families and¶ communities.¶ • Cultural revival.¶ • The role of the media in the reporting of Indigenous¶ news stories,in creating particular public perceptions,¶ and agenda setting.¶ • Use of language: how language constructs knowledge,¶ logic and prominence of voice.¶ • The role of anthropologists as experts on Aboriginal¶ people’s history and culture.¶ • Broader questions about Australian nationhood and¶ identity, truth, justice, racism and legal recognition.¶ It can be seen that the learning outcomes for students¶ were comprehensive.All of the issues listed above were¶ explored prior to and after the role-play so many of these¶ concepts were reinforced by “experiencing” them. It¶ meant that key concepts were presented to students¶ through different teaching strategies. But it also provided¶ a quick means for students to acquire necessary¶ information.For example,the issue of “race power”that is¶ embedded in the Australian constitution requires¶ discussion of the 1967 referendum, the politics of the¶ conservative Howard government, rights protection and¶ probably the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander¶ Commission’s (ATSIC) “rights agenda”. Each of these¶ requires careful presentation of what are complex¶ political and legal issues.The simulation role-play as well¶ as the traditional lecture format and small group¶ discussions allowed for students to develop an¶ understanding of the inter-relationship of these events¶ and issues – and that the “race power” in the Australian¶ constitution is not an abstract legal technicality. Its¶ impact is real and has been devastating. It also provides a¶ useful and appropriate forum for students, as future¶ professionals, to consider solutions to problems. For¶ example, students reﬂected critically on solutions, such¶ as constitutional or legislative change.¶ Often, at least in my experience, Australian students¶ approach Aboriginal studies subjects with a great deal of¶ trepidation – they are nervous and anxious that they are¶ going to be attacked or confronted. We can understand¶ these fears as stemming from issues of power and¶ dominance, deeply entrenched ideas about race and¶ possibly simple naivety.I have encountered students who¶ approach Australian history and Aboriginal studies armed¶ with a litany of ill-informed anecdotes and unsourced¶ references to “special” beneﬁts Aboriginal people receive¶ and,often,ﬁxations on bloodline percentages.Commonly¶ in teaching Aboriginal studies the ﬁrst and critical task is¶ to bring students around to a more considered and less¶ defensive position.¶ Simulation role-plays that are appropriately timed,¶ resourced and setup are useful ways to achieve this.This¶ is largely because students get to “experience”, in a safe¶ environment, a range of competing, conﬂicting and¶ different perspectives; to step outside of themselves and¶ develop an understanding of complex issues; but also,¶ and most importantly, to understand what it feels like to¶ be marginalised, and how dominant ideas are served and¶ afﬁrmed by existing social institutions.To understand and¶ feel one’s self constructed as irrational through legal and¶ political forums and the media was a very powerful¶ learning experience for students.¶ In The meeting of the waters (2003) Simons says that:¶ The story of the Hindmarsh Island bridge is one of¶ the most important that can be told about Australia¶ at the end of the last century and the beginning of¶ this. It can be seen as a tale of small town gossip¶ and enmity. But as well … it is one of those big,¶ even archetypal, stories that tell us something¶ about who we are (Simons, 2003, p. xvi).¶ Through the study of Ngarrindjeri people’s experience¶ and the building of the bridge, students could see the¶ unquestioned dominance of their own cultural identity¶ and logic played out.This resulted in a shifted framework¶ in thinking about solutions. They understood how their¶ own cultural privilege and aspirations were,in the case of¶ Hindmarsh, a part of the problem. As they worked¶ towards thinking about solutions it was not within a¶ framework of coming up with solutions for Aboriginal¶ people, but rather a more nuanced understanding of the¶ complexity of race relations and their own implication. As¶ future professionals it gave them a sense that they did not¶ necessarily have the answers, but could understand how¶ to begin to understand the complexity of Indigenous¶ rights and reconciliation. As future professionals –¶ lawyers, journalists, scientists, developers, activists and¶ advocates – they could see critical issues for their¶ professional practice.

#### 7. Our framework is socially productive – forcing students to assert policy solutions has tremendous research and education benefits and encourages them to become advocates for change rather than mere spectators

Joyner, Georgetown University International Law in the Government Department Professor, 99

[Professor of International Law in the Government Department at Georgetown University, 1999 (Christopher C., Spring, 199, 5 ILSA J Int'l & Comp L 377, Accessed on July 5, 2013)][SP]

Use of the debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences. Debates, like other role-playing simulations, help students understand different perspectives on a policy issue by adopting a perspective as their own. But, unlike other simulation games, debates do not require that a student participate directly in order to realize the benefit of the game. Instead of developing policy alternatives and experiencing the consequences of different choices in a traditional role-playing game, debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience. Having the class audience serve as jury helps each student develop a well-thought-out opinion on the issue by providing contrasting facts and views and enabling audience members to pose challenges to each debating team. These debates ask undergraduate students to examine the international legal implications of various United States foreign policy actions. Their chief tasks are to assess the aims of the policy in question, determine their relevance to United States national interests, ascertain what legal principles are involved, and conclude how the United States policy in question squares with relevant principles of international law. Debate questions are formulated as resolutions, along the lines of: "Resolved: The United States should deny most-favored-nation status to China on human rights grounds;" or "Resolved: The United States should resort to military force to ensure inspection of Iraq's possible nuclear, chemical and biological weapons facilities;" or "Resolved: The United States' invasion of Grenada in 1983 was a lawful use of force;" or "Resolved: The United States should kill Saddam Hussein." In addressing both sides of these legal propositions, the student debaters must consult the vast literature of international law, especially the nearly 100 professional law-school-sponsored international law journals now being published in the United States. This literature furnishes an incredibly rich body of legal analysis that often treats topics affecting United States foreign policy, as well as other more esoteric international legal subjects. Although most of these journals are accessible in good law schools, they are largely unknown to the political science community specializing in international relations, much less to the average undergraduate. By assessing the role of international law in United States foreign policy- making, students realize that United States actions do not always measure up to international legal expectations; that at times, international legal strictures get compromised for the sake of perceived national interests, and that concepts and principles of international law, like domestic law, can be interpreted and twisted in order to justify United States policy in various international circumstances. In this way, the debate format gives students the benefits ascribed to simulations and other action learning techniques, in that it makes them become actively engaged with their subjects, and not be mere passive consumers. Rather than spectators, students become legal advocates, observing, reacting to, and structuring political and legal perceptions to fit the merits of their case. The debate exercises carry several specific educational objectives. First, students on each team must work together to refine a cogent argument that compellingly asserts their legal position on a foreign policy issue confronting the United States. In this way, they gain greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas faced by policy makers. Second, as they work with other members of their team, they realize the complexities of applying and implementing international law, and the difficulty of bridging the gaps between United States policy and international legal principles, either by reworking the former or creatively reinterpreting the latter. Finally, research for the debates forces students to become familiarized with contemporary issues on the United States foreign policy agenda and the role that international law plays in formulating and executing these policies. 8 The debate thus becomes an excellent vehicle for pushing students beyond stale arguments over principles into the real world of policy analysis, political critique, and legal defense.

# CP

#### Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should enact S. 744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

#### cross apply from fw

#### CP solves best – focusing on the details and inner-workings of government policy-making is productive – critical approaches can’t resolve real world problems like poverty, racism and war

McClean, Mollow College Philosophy Professor, 01

[David E., Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Molloy College, New York, 2001 “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Available Online at www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm, JMP, Accessed on July 5, 2013)][SP]

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

#### CIR is crucial to maintaining value to life

Editors at AZ Central, 9/23

[“If immigration reform fails, more people die”, <http://www.azcentral.com/opinions/articles/20130923immigration-reform-border-deaths-editorial.html>, accessed 9/26, CC]

If you value human life, demand a change in our border policies.¶ Nearly 150 people have died along Arizona’s border already this year. We’ll surpass last year’s numbers.¶ The annual border death count is as much a part of Arizona’s summer as the achingly dry song of the cicadas.¶ This should cause moral outrage. But it doesn’t. It’s barely noticed beyond humanitarian groups.¶ This lack of general and sustained anger about the death toll is an outrage in itself. We are, after all, a nation that claims to care about human rights.¶ But this country’s border-enforcement policies — coupled with the continuing lure of jobs and the drive to reunite with family members — are undeniably lethal.¶ Efforts to reform those policies in Congress are being declared dead or on life support, depending on who is assessing the odds. There are so many reasons to pass a comprehensive solution s

imilar to what emerged in the Senate. Among those is the consequence of inaction.¶ “The evidence suggests an immigrant attempting to cross illegally into the United States today is eight times more likely to die in the attempt than approximately a decade ago,” according to a report by the National Foundation for American Policy, which analyzed Border Patrol data.¶ Fewer people are crossing, and proportionally, more people are dying.¶ That’s a result of U.S. border policies that did not address the demand for migrant labor while systematically beefing up security in easy-to-cross places. Would-be laborers now travel rugged territory with criminal smugglers who routinely leave behind the sick or injured.¶ Dr. Gregory Hess, chief of the Pima County Office of the Medical Examiner, says the death count this calendar year is 148 people as of Monday. That’s 23 more dead people than this time last year.¶ Since the beginning of 2001, Hess’ office has received more than 2,200 bodies of people who tried and failed to cross Arizona’s southern deserts. His office gets bodies from all border counties except Yuma County¶ The Border Patrol, which keeps track by fiscal year, reports 171 deaths statewide from Oct. 1, 2012, to Aug. 31. That’s down 10 from the same time last fiscal year.¶ Hess says his office gets bodies the Border Patrol might know know about, such as those found by hikers and reported directly to local sheriffs. Last year, his office received 157 bodies of border crossers.¶ “We will surpass that this year,” he says.¶ Texas border counties are reporting increasing numbers of deaths of border crossers there as migration patterns shift in response to enforcement efforts in Arizona.¶ Enforcement alone doesn’t work. It kills.¶ The National Foundation for American Policy report says: “If another five years goes by without Congress approving new legal temporary visas for workers, it is predictable that an additional 2,000 people will die simply because they wanted to work in America.”¶ Immigration reform is not about politics. It is about people.¶ It is about men, women and children who share our humanity. Their fragile hopes are like anybody else’s. So is their tender love for families left behind or waiting somewhere on this side of the line.¶ Their deaths are bitter testimony to the failure of our current border policies.

# 1NC

#### The Eurocentric worldview of the Aff compromises their epistemology because it is a hegemonic and dominating lens. It precludes the possibility of rational analysis.

Quijano, Peruvian Sociologist, 2k

(Anibal, Peruvian sociologist and humanist thinker, known for having developed the concept of "coloniality of power". His body of work has been influential in the fields of post-colonial studies and critical theory, 2000, Duke University Press, “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America”, http://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf, Accessed 7/5/13, JB)

The intellectual conceptualization of the process of modernity produced a perspective of knowledge and a mode of producing knowledge that gives a very tight account of the character of the global model of power: colonial/modern, capitalist, and Eurocentered. This perspective and concrete mode of producing knowledge is Eurocentrism.19 Eurocentrism is, as used here, the name of a perspective of knowledge whose systematic formation began in Western Europe before the middle of the seventeenth century, although some of its roots are, without doubt, much older. In the following centuries this perspective was made globally hegemonic, traveling the same course as the dominion of the European bourgeois class. Its constitution was associated with the speciﬁc bourgeois secularization of European thought and with the experiences and necessities of the global model of capitalist (colonial/modern) and Eurocentered power established since the colonization of America. This category of Eurocentrism does not involve all of the knowledge of history of all of Europe or Western Europe in particular. It does not refer to all the modes of knowledge of all Europeans and all epochs. It is instead a speciﬁc rationality or perspective of knowledge that was made globally hegemonic, colonizing and overcoming other previous or different conceptual formations and their respective concrete knowledges, as much in Europe as in the rest of the world. In the framework of this essay I propose to discuss some of these issues more directly related to the experience of Latin America, but, obviously, they do not refer only to Latin America.

#### Eurocentrism frames social norms – the normative function of race, gender, sex and other types identity are reinforced by Eurocentrism, causes inevitable inequality

Baker, University of Rochester, Graduate Student School of Education and Human Development, 8

(Michael, “Teaching and Learning About and Beyond Eurocentrism: A Proposal for the Creation of an Other School”, March 16, 2008, <http://academia.edu/1516858/Teaching_and_Learning_About_and_Beyond_Eurocentrism_A_Proposal_for_the_Creation_of_an_Other_School>, accessed 7/12/13)

The Other School would be oriented around an alternative framework for knowledge and understanding that we might call the decolonial paradigm, since its central aim is to decolonize thinking and being, in part, through dialogue (not just the study of cultures as objects of knowledge) with the diversity of ways of knowing and being that have been devalued and eclipsed in Eurocentric education. The decolonial paradigm of education would focus on concepts of culture and power. Culture is not separate from politics and economics, contrary to the taken-for-granted disciplinary divisions. “….political and economic structures are not entities in themselves, but are imagined, framed and enacted by individuals formed in a certain type of subjectivity; a subjectivity that is also framed in the dominant structure of knowledge” (Mignolo, 2005, p. 112). The cultural group (in the U.S. -- Anglo-American) with the most money and the most political power is also the dominant culture reproduced in the school curriculum. Most of us (particularly if we not white) recognize that a racial hierarchy exists and is maintained by the dominant cultural group (for example, see Huntington, 2004). Cultural diversity in “multicultural education” is often more a way to manage or contain difference while maintaining the racial hierarchy. Multiculturalism only became an issue and concept in education during the unsettling 60s, when ethnic groups labeled “racial minorities” raised their voices demanding that the promises of modernity be made available to them as well as to whites. Racism is not simply the result of individual prejudice and hateful expressions, but the consequence of the relations of power that are historical and structural. The power side of culture can be conveniently neutralized in the classroom as teachers and students learn about “diversity” without examining how these differences have been constructed, how they are reproduced in the curriculum, and how these constructions continue to serve the white power elite. In English classes for example, “students read works that movingly depict personal struggles against discrimination, without gaining any sense of how English literature was used to teach people their distance from the center of civilization” (Willinsky, 1989, p. ).

Multicultural education needs to include the study of “how five centuries of studying, classifying, and ordering humanity within an imperial context gave rise to peculiar and powerful ideas of race, culture, and nation that were, in effect, conceptual instruments that the West used both to divide up and to educate the world” (Willinsky, 1989, pp. 2-3). Race, in other words, is a “mental category of modernity” (Quijano, 2000, p. 536), created along with European colonization of the Americas and the emergence of capitalism in the Atlantic commercial circuit in the sixteenth century. Modernity/coloniality came together in the sixteenth century during the emergence of the Atlantic commercial circuit that propelled an incipient European capitalism and charted the racial geopolitical map of the world. Racial classification and the divisions and control of labor are historically intertwined – the two parts of colonial matrix of power (Quijano, 1999; Quijano & Wallerstein, 1992). Types of work, incomes earned, and geographical location among the world’s population today profoundly reflect this racial capitalist hierarchy and domination – the coloniality of power. Coloniality of power has been since the sixteenth century and is still today an epistemic principle for classifying the non-European world in relation to Europe on the principle of skin color and brain capacity (i.e., race and rationality). Ethnicities (local community identities based on shared knowledge, faith, language, memories, tastes etc.) have been racialized within this modern matrix of power (Sardar, Nandy & Wyn Davies1993).

Multicultural education therefore should be understood and consequently taught within the colonial horizon of modernity, since the sixteenth century. Racism is a symptom of the persistence of coloniality of power and the colonial difference.

One of the achievements of imperial reason was to affirm European or white, Christian, male, heterosexual, American, as a superior identity by constructing inferior identities and expelling them to the outside of the normative sphere of the real (Mignolo, 2006). Cultural differences then would be recognized as part of the colonial difference in the 500-year history of control and domination by the white, European, heterosexual, Christian, male through the intersection of race, religion, gender, class, nationality and sexuality. The coloniality of power is a European imposed racial classification system that emerged 500 years ago and expanded along with (is constitutive of) the modern/colonial world capitalist-system. Race, class, gender, and sexuality and religion intersect as hierarchical elements within the modern/colonial capitalist system of classification and power relations.

#### When we focus on solely Western modes of thought we inevitably see indigenous peoples as the Other. How we read, write, and speak are important – it shapes the way we view ourselves and the world.

Smith, University of Waikato indigenous education professor, 7

(Linda Tuhiwai, 2007, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, pg. 35-36, JZ)

As I am arguing, every aspect of the act of producing knowledge has influenced the ways in which indigenous ways of knowing have been represented. Reading, writing, talking, these are as fundamental to academic discourse as science, theories, methods, paradigms. To begin with reading, one might cite the talk in which Maori writer Patricia Grace undertook to show that 'Books Are Dangerous'.21 She argues that there are four things that make many books dangerous to indigenous readers: (1) they do not reinforce our values, actions, customs, culture and identity; (2) when they tell us only about others they are saying that we do not exist; (3) they may be writing about us but are writing things which are untrue; and ( 4) they are writing about us but saying negative and insensitive things which tell us that we are not good. Although Grace is talking about school texts and journals, her comments apply also to academic writing. Much of what I have read has said that we do not exist, that if we do exist it is in terms which I cannot recognize, that we are no good and that what we think is not valid.

Leonie Pihama makes a similar point about film. In a review of The Piano she says: 'Maori people struggle to gain a voice, struggle to be heard from the margins, to have our stories heard, to have our descriptions of ourselves validated, to have access to the domain within which we can control and define those images which are held up as reflections of our realities.' 22 Representation is important as a concept because it gives the impression of 'the truth'. When I read texts, for example, I frequently have to orientate myself to a text world in which the centre of academic knowledge is either in Britain, the United States orWestero Europe; in which words such as 'we' 'us' 'our' 'I' actuall􀄆 exclude me. It is a text world in which (if what I am interested in rates 6l AiMAlii'BA) I Aoua leosgsd d.lat 1 he'ons Par#?' jp the Third \XlgrJd Pa!#J' in the 'Women of Colour' world, part!J in the black or African world. I read myself into these labels part!J because I have also learned that, although there may be commonalities, they still do not entirely account for the experiences of indigenous peoples.

So, reading and interpretation present problems when we do not see ourselves in the text. There are problems, too, when we do see ourselves but can barely recognize ourselves through the representation. One problem of being trained to read this way, or, more correctly, of learning to read this way over many years of academic study, is that we can adopt uncritically similar patterns of writing. We begin to write about ourselves as indigenous peoples as if we really were 'out there', the 'Other', with all the baggage that this entails. Another problem is that academic writing is a form of selecting, arranging and presenting knowledge. It privileges sets of texts, views about the history of an idea, what issues count as significant; and, by engaging in the same process uncritically, we too can render indigenous writers invisible or unimportant while reinforcing the validity of other writers. If we write without thinking critically about our writing, it can be dangerous. Writing can also be dangerous because we reinforce and maintain a style of discourse which is never innocent. Writing can be dangerous because sometimes we reveal ourselves in ways which get misappropriated and used against us. Writing can be dangerous because, by building on previous texts written about indigenous peoples, we continue to legitimate views about ourselves which are hostile to us. This is particularly true of academic writing, although journalistic and imaginative writing reinforce these 'myths'.

#### The alternative is to reject the aff - key to ‘decolonize’ education

Baker, Professor of Education and Human Development at the University of Rochester, 12

(Michael, October 31 - November 4, , American Educational Studies Association, Annual Conference Seattle, Washington, “Decolonial Education: Meanings, Contexts, and Possibilities,” <http://academia.edu/3266939/Decolonial_Education_Meanings_Contexts_and_Possiblities>, Accessed: 7/7/13, LPS.)

¶ What do decoloniality and decolonial education mean? Where does this movement come from? What are the key ideas that underlie and comprise decolonial education? What does decolonial education look like in practice? My presentation will introduce a decolonial perspective on modernity and sketch the implications of this perspective for rethinking modern education beyond the epistemological boundaries of modernity. The overall argument can be seen as an attempt to reveal, critique, and change the modern geopolitics of knowledge, within which modern western education first emerged and remains largely concealed. ¶ Decoloniality involves the geopolitical reconceptualization of knowledge. In order to build a universal conception of knowledge, western epistemology (from Christian theology to secular philosophy and science) has pretended that knowledge is independent of the geohistorical (Christian Europe) and biographical conditions (Christian white men living in Christian Europe) in which it is produced. As a result, Europe became the locus of epistemic enunciation, and the rest of the world became the object to be described and studied from the European perspective. The modern geopolitics of knowledge was grounded in the suppression of sensing and the body, and of its geo-historical location. The foundations of knowledge were and remain territorial and imperial. The claims to universality both legitimate and conceal the colonial/imperial relations of modernity (Mignolo, 2011). ¶ ¶ Decolonial education is an expression of the changing geopolitics of knowledge whereby the modern epistemological framework for knowing and understanding the world is no longer interpreted as universal and unbound by geohistorical and bio-graphical contexts. “I think therefore I am” becomes “I am where I think” in the body- and geo-politics of the modern world system (Mignolo, 2011). The idea that knowledge and the rules of knowledge production exist within socio-historical relationships between political power and geographical space (geopolitics) shifts attention from knowledge itself to who, when, why, and where knowledge is produced (Mignolo, 2011). The universal assumptions about knowledge production are being displaced, as knowledge is no longer coming from one regional center, but is distributed globally. From this recognition of the geo and body politics of knowledge, education, including the various knowledge disciplines that comprise education and knowledge of education, can be analyzed and critiqued with questions such as: who is the subject of knowledge, and what is his/her material apparatus of enunciation?; what kind of knowledge/understanding is he/she engaged in generating, and why?; who is benefiting or taking advantage of particular knowledge or understanding?; what institutions (universities, media, foundations, corporations) are supporting and encouraging particular knowledge and understanding? (Mignolo, 2011, p. 189). ¶ Decolonial thinking and writing first emerged in the initial formations of modernity from the experiences of and responses to European colonization in the Andean regions during the sixteenth century. The colonial context created a betweeness of cosmologies for the colonized. This consciousness of being between cultures within a dominant culture is the central feature of decolonial thought -- thinking from the borders created by a totalizing cosmology associated with European modernity. For example, the sixteenth century writings of Waman Puma de Ayala focused on ways to preserve Aymara and Kechua knowledge cultures and co-exist within the new world order (Mignolo, 2005). Today, decolonization is used among indigenous intellectuals around the world, where a variety of models of decolonial education have emerged. Decolonial thinking about education is rooted in the violent occlusion of ways of knowing and being among indigenous civilizations in the Americas within the imposition of a new world order. The conquest of the Americas meant the demolition of indigenous education and economic systems. European Renaissance universities, for example, were soon transplanted across the Atlantic that had no relation to the languages and histories of the native peoples.

# Case

#### No solvency or advocacy statement means the aff does not have a way to solve. There is no reason to vote for them. Even if you buy the ideology behind the aff, you can still

#### Role of the ballot - decenter