Yo represento a las personas que vienen de los Nongo, gente de la tierra,

No chico malcriado, la gente que suda y scratch con los dientes y las uñas,

personas que FIST un machete. Los suyos y hims juntos

serán todos celebrar la prosperidad, la salud y el amor siempre abundará,

no sufren, no estar abajo, todo se va a poner mejor

y vamos a disfrutar de lo que tenemos ...

Coro 1: Nos quedaremos aquí Krudas con nuestra misión, el trabajo

en representación de las mujeres con la voluntad sin límites.

Los que prefieren la papaya, que al igual que la cobra

todo denunciando juntos de esta agitada vida.

Coro 2: Me rebelo, me rebelo, me rebelo contra el que se rebelan yo.

Contra el poder de los rebeldes del sistema de I, contra la supremacía me rebelo.

Contra la falta de amor que se rebelan contra toda injusticia, me rebelo. (3)

#### ‘Me Rebelo’

By Las Krudas Cubensi (http://www.krudascubensi.com/lyrics/i-rebel/, 54 Seconds)

\*\*\*We play the portion of the song covered by the lyrics below and then I read the highlighted

I represent the people that come from the ñongo, people of the earth,

not brat boy, people that sweat and scratch with their teeth and nails,

people that fist a machete. The hers and hims together

will all celebrate prosperity, health, and love will always abound,

don’t suffer, don’t be down, everything is gonna get better

and we will enjoy what we have…

Chorus 1: We shall remain here Krudas with our mission, the work

representing women with boundless will.

The ones that prefer papaya, that like the cobra

all denouncing together of this anxious life.

Chorus 2: I rebel, I rebel, I rebel against that I rebel.

Against the power of the system I rebel, against supremacy I rebel.

Against a lack of love I rebel, against all injustice, I rebel.(3)

#### In Cuba blackness marks women as hyper masculine and an outcast.

#### In Cuba women are commodified for their physical appearance and femininity.

#### In Cuba gay pride is illegal.

#### In Cuba Las Krudas face each part of this compounding oppression daily.

#### Post revolutionary laws in Cuba have been crafted in ways that exacerbate these horrid stereotypes and oppression. The intersectionality of Las Krudas’ critique is what gives it power to challenge these discourses.

Saunders, Ohio State University Assistant Professor, 9

(Dr. Tanya L. Saunders is an Assistant Professor of African American and African Studies at the Ohio State University, Caribbean Review of Gender Studies, “La Lucha Mujerista: Krudas CUBENSI and Black Feminist Sexual Politics in Cuba”, 2009, http://sta.uwi.edu/crgs/november2009/journals/CRGS%20Las%20Krudas.pdf, RH)

**From the late 1960s through the late 1970s, homosexuality was deemed a decadent, bourgeois social ill by the Revolutionary Cuban state** (Arguelles and Rich 1984, Lumsden 1996). Between 1965 and 1980, **the Revolutionary government considered homosexuality to be a form of immorality that could corrupt Revolutionary youth and it enforced preexisting social decency laws, which criminalized homosexual acts** (Arguelles and Rich 1984, Lumsden 1996). In 1971, **the state mandated that known homosexuals not be allowed in educational, cultural and other institutions that were in direct contact with Revolutionary youth. In the case of women‘s rights organizations, by 1970, known lesbians were not allowed to join the country's only women‘s rights association**: the state- run Federation of Cuban Women. This exclusion lasted until the late 1980s (Smith and Padula 1996). Existing research on sexuality in Cuba largely focuses on heterosexual women and gay male sexuality; analyses of homosexuality have tended to focus on a universalized ―gay experience‖ in Cuba (Almendros and Jiménez-Leal 1984, Arguelles and Rich 1984). Additionally, **print accounts of homosexuality in Cuba in the 1980s and 1990s have been written by men who acknowledge that their work does not focus on the experiences of lesbians, as lesbian spaces are hard to access** (Lumsden 1996, La Fountain-Stokes 2002). There has been some representation of lesbian‘s experiences in independent film (Not Because Fidel Says So (1988), Looking for Space (1994), Gay Cuba (2000)). These films capture the changes in state policy concerning homosexuality between 1980 and 1996, when the state began to focus on targeting homophobia within Cuban society in order to address the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1980s and early 1990s. The state sought to address the crisis through reducing the social stigma concerning homosexuality, and undertaking a massive sexual education program that targeted men who had sex with men (Acosta et al 2003, OREMI 2005). The result of state policies has been more public space that is inclusive for gay male Cubans. T Con T: Lesbian Lives in Contemporary Cuba (a forthcoming film in which members of Las Krudas are interviewed) is the first film to focus exclusively on lesbians in Cuba. T Con T offers more insight into the issues facing lesbians, as it focuses on the underground lesbian scene in Cuba and efforts at creating a lesbian community while navigating their decreased economic independence as women (which is a result of Cuba‘s 1990s economic crisis). The women in the film note the increase in gay male public space over the last 20 years, while lesbian space remains invisible. Gay male domination of non- heteronormative space is linked to the ways in which heteronormativity intersects with machismo6 to create a particularly vitriolic and isolating experience for Cuban lesbians (Arguelles and Rich 1984). **There seem to be several factors that make it difficult for women, particularly Black lesbians and self-identified feminists, to challenge the social ills that they face. One is** Fleites-Lear (2003) defines machismo as ―the idea that men are superior to women and should dominate them socially, economically, physically, and sexually. that throughout the Caribbean, and much of the world, feminism is associated with imperialism. This belief has some basis in some of the historical actions of European and North American feminists. For example, during the hemispheric struggle for universal suffrage during the 1920s and 1930s, feminists from the United States argued that Latin American women were not ready for universal suffrage; that they did not understand the responsibilities of participating in an electoral public (Stoner 1991, 113). Feminists from the United States fought against suffrage being expanded to the racialized, and by extension inferior, populations of women of Latin America and the Caribbean (Stoner 1991). As a result, this history has prevented feminism from being accepted as a legitimate discourse for social equality in post-colonial and neo-colonial societies. Another factor is that post-colonial and neo-colonial Caribbean states tend to conflate morality, sexuality and gender. M. Jacqui Alexander (1991) argues that the managing of sexuality through legislating morality has affected the ability of subsequent organizing against heteronormativity. In the case of Trinidad and Tobago, Alexander links this move to legislate morality to colonial rule and to the post-colonial state‘s attempt at legitimizing itself: the postcolonial state uses Victorian notions of civilization as a tool to discipline and regulate the social. By conflating gender and sexuality with a notion of morality, feminists and other women-centered activists cannot only focus on ―gender‖ or ―women‖ as a means of challenging social inequality; they must also focus on morality. Like Trinidad and Tobago, Cuba also implemented morality laws that sought to implement social order through the conflation of gender, sexuality, and morality. When the Cuban Revolution occurred in 1959, the Revolutionary government ushered in the ―New Man,‖ or the ―Revolutionary,‖ as the ideal citizen. At the core of the notion of the ―**Revolutionary,‖ was a notion of morality: the Revolutionary was a white, heterosexual male and moral subject who cared for and defended his nation** (Bejel 2001). These factors, combined with **Cuba‘s highly racialized society, has created a situation where women can only critique their social experiences as feminine, heterosexual subjects**. While the majority of the women within the CUHHM critique the treatment of women within their music, **only Las Krudas have connected the ways in which heteronomativity—as a racialized system through which culturally based notions of gender conformity and heterosexuality are policed—is constitutive of and reinforces Black women‘s oppression.**

#### The Western domination of Cuba is part of a larger system of paternalist colonial relations toward Latin America. For every positive action we take towards the Good-Left we take a negative one toward the Bad-Left. Thus a net increase of engagement is impossible.

Young, NYT Staff Writer, 4/20

(Kevin, NYT, 4/20/13, “The Good, the Bad, and the Benevolent Interventionist: U.S. Press and Intellectual Distortions of the Latin American Left” http://www.nytexaminer.com/2013/04/the-good-the-bad-and-the-benevolent-interventionist-u-s-press-and-intellectual-distortions-of-the-latin-american-left/, date accessed 7/5/13 IGM)

The good-left/bad-left thesis may seem more enlightened and progressive than classic racist or imperialist rhetoric in that it does not lump all Latin Americans together, but in fact the clever colonizer has always distinguished between “good” and “bad” members of the subordinate group. When Columbus sailed through the Caribbean in the 1490s, he contrasted the peaceful Arawaks of Cuba to the aggressive, allegedly cannibalistic Caribs to the southeast (Hulme, 1994: 169–171, 190). European and U.S. imperialists, as well as Latin American elites, employed similar discursive strategies over the following centuries.2 In the early twentieth century, both the jingoists led by Theodore Roosevelt and the Wilsonian “idealists” contrasted the unruly children of Central America and the Caribbean with the more responsible leaders in the bigger Latin American countries. Woodrow Wilson and his appointees pledged to replace the “naughty children” of Latin America with “good men,” whom they would “teach the South American republics to elect” (Schoultz, 1998: 244, 272, 192–197; Kenworthy, 1995: 30; cf. Johnson, 1980: 209, 217; Black, 1988). Later, following the 1959 Cuban Revolution, U.S. policy came to focus on assisting the good Latins while isolating, and often exterminating, the bad; many of the tropes used to characterize Hugo Chávez in the past decade have clear precedents in government and press depictions of Fidel Castro starting four decades earlier (Platt et al., 1987; Johnson, 1980: 113, 241; Landau, 2006; Chomsky, 2008). Similar binary depictions have long characterized Orientalist discourse toward Asian and African peoples, particularly Muslims (Mamdani, 2004).

Historically these distinctions have helped to justify outside intervention in the name of “protecting” the good from the bad, and today the “benevolent interventionist” frame often accompanies the good-left/bad-left frame. Just as Columbus was protecting the peaceful Arawaks from the savage Caribs, the U.S. government promotes democracy through its relations with the good left, protecting those countries from the bad left. By definition, all such interventions are undertaken with noble and humanitarian intent. This paternalistic discourse has remained remarkably consistent throughout the history of imperialism and internal colonialism, albeit with new rhetorical demons and pretexts in each successive epoch: corruption, endemic revolts, and European intervention in Wilson’s day, Communism during the Cold War, and autocrats, populists, terrorists, and drug cartels since the Soviet Union’s collapse. The main demons are typically external to Latin America—often associated with the “Old World,” the Soviet Union, or, more recently, various Asian and Middle Eastern countries—but there are usually internal demons, too (Kenworthy, 1995: 18–37).

Press coverage of right-wing coups against Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez in 2002 and Honduras’s Manuel Zelaya in 2009, and of the U.S. government’s role in and after those coups, offers stark examples of media support (open or tacit) for recent U.S. interventionism. In both cases the U.S. response was accompanied by reports and opinion pieces about legitimate U.S. security concerns and honest regard for democracy. In addition to praising U.S. motives, news reports, opinion pieces, and intellectual commentary often implied that Latin Americans both needed and wanted U.S. intervention.

#### Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the team that best performatively and methodologically challenges oppressive normative structures within debate.

#### I am

#### Privileged

#### I am

#### White

#### I am

#### Male

#### I am

#### Straight

#### My conscious however is not these things

#### I know

#### One too many people who didn’t join

#### I know

#### One too many people who quit

#### I know

#### People who don’t feel welcomed here

#### Now comes time for the why?

#### Why is the debate community biased toward me?

#### Why do I benefit from my ancestors who came here in 1639?

#### Why do the bodies in this community that don’t fit have to change themselves?

#### Traditional knowledge production in debate leads to epistemological myopia, The Aff offers an alternative method of the three-tier process, which does not exclude, but augments traditional knowledge production.

Dr. Reid-Brinkley, University of Pittsburgh Department Of Communications, 8

("THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE" pages 81-83) (\*\*\*Edited for ablist language)

The process of **signifyin**’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters **is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence; their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”** In other words, **those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These** legitimating **practices** usually **function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledge-making practices,** while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making practices**.** The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.” Jones and Green offer **an alternative framework for drawing claims**in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. Andwe talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three ~~blind folded~~ [masked] people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then **you can achieve a greater truth.”** Jones argues that **without the three tier process debate claims are based on singular perspectives that privilege those with institutional and economic power.** The Louisville debaters do not reject traditional evidence per se, instead they seek to augment or supplement what counts as evidence with other forms of knowledge produced outside of academia. As Green notes in the double-octo-finals at CEDA Nationals, “Knowledge surrounds me in the streets**,** **through my peers, through personal experiences, and everyday wars that I fight with my mind.**” The thee-tier process: personal experience, organic intellectuals, and traditional evidence, provides a method of argumentation that taps into diverse forms of knowledge-making practices. With the Louisville method, **personal experience and organic intellectuals are placed on par with traditional forms of evidence.** While the Louisville debaters see the benefit of academic research, they are also critically aware of the normative practices that exclude racial and ethnic minorities from policy-oriented discussions because of their lack of training and expertise. Such exclusions prevent radical solutions to racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia from being more permanently addressed. According to Green: bell hooks talks about how **when we rely solely on one perspective to make our claims, radical liberatory theory becomes rootless.** That’s the reason why we use a three-tiered process. **That’s why we use alternative forms of discourse such as hip hop.** That’s also how we use traditional evidence and our personal narratives so you **don’t get just one perspective** **claiming to be the right way.** **Because it becomes a more meaningful and educational view as far as how we achieve our education.**The use of **hip hop and personal experience function as a check against the homogenizing function of academic and expert discourse.** Note the reference to bell hooks, Green argues that without alternative perspectives, “radical libratory theory becomes rootless.” The term **rootless** seems to **refer to a lack of grounded-ness in the material circumstances** that academics or experts study. In other words, academics and experts by definition represent an intellectual population with a level of objective distance from that **which they study.** For the Louisville debaters, **this distance is problematic as it prevents the development of a social politic that is rooted in the community of those most greatly affected by the status of oppression.**¶

#### Only the intervention into hegemonic discourses of colonization through the hip-hop of Las Krudas Cubensi can ever be liberatory. Status quo institutional approaches are always already gendered, homophobic and from the positionality of antiblackness.

Saunders, Ohio State University Assistant Professor, 9

(Dr. Tanya L. Saunders is an Assistant Professor of African American and African Studies at the Ohio State University, Carribean Review of Gender Studies,“La Lucha Mujerista: Krudas CUBENSI and Black Feminist Sexual Politics in Cuba”, 2009, http://sta.uwi.edu/crgs/november2009/journals/CRGS%20Las%20Krudas.pdf, Accessed 11/14/13, NC)

One of the most influential groups of the Cuban Underground Hip-Hop Movement (CUHHM) is the Black feminist lesbian trio called Las Krudas CUBENSI (Rivera-Velázquez 2008, Armstead 2007, Fernandes 2006, Joffe 2005, West-Durán 2004, Perry 2004). Las Krudas use art to challenge the oppressive hegemonic discourses within Cuban society that concern race, gender, and sexuality. They have been working to do so for over a decade. Las Krudas describe their goal as contributing to ―the third revolution within the Revolution,‖2 that of Black women and lesbian equality. Their work is a timely intervention into public discourse surrounding gender and sexuality, as several recent independent surveys (released in 2002, 2003) have concluded that lesbians remain one of the most socially marginalized and invisible groups in Cuba (Acosta et al 2003, Más 2003, OREMI 2005, Saunders 2009). The studies note that cultural norms persist in which women are evaluated by their physical appearance, specifically by how ―feminine‖ they are. Black women face a particularly harsh social environment because they are deemed unfeminine or even mannish because Blackness is perceived as a marker of aggressiveness and hyper masculinity (Candelario 2007 Saunders 2009)

In their music and hip-hop performances, Las Krudas attempt to interrupt hegemonic systems of representation, as a means to expand Revolutionary discourse to include the citizenship demands of socially marginal groups such as Black women and Black lesbians. By combining Revolutionary discourses of inclusive citizenship with an Afro-Cuban, hip-hop and Black feminist consciousness that centers on embracing difference as a means to promote social equality, Las Krudas‘ strategy as cultural workers has been to challenge dominant discourses concerning ―women and heteronormativity3 within Cuba‘s expansive cultural sphere4.

Krudas‘ politics of a linguistic and ideological intervention into hegemonic discourses surrounding race, gender, and sexuality, problematizes oppression through the critique of individual experiences that they link to systemic forms of social oppression. Their work centers on changing the minds of fellow citizens as a means of spurring grassroots social change. It is through their usage of tools such as poetry (hip-hop lyrics) and street theater performance that Las Krudas has been able to work within Cuba’s cultural sphere, a key component of Cuba‘s public sphere. In this sphere, they have been able to challenge the hegemony of the sexist, racist, and homophobic discourses that continue to circulate within Cuban society. They do so by educating their peers and communities about social inequality, particularly racial, gender, and sexual inequalities.

#### Supporting the resolution is never an option. Participation in debate as future policymakers teaches the wrong portable skills. We distance ourselves from our colonial legacy. We celebrate each new nuclear war.

Dr. Reid-Brinkley, University of Pittsburgh Department Of Communications, 8

(Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley, University of Pittsburgh Department Of Communications, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE” 2008, NC)

Mitchell observes that the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture.”115 In other words, its participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like torture, terrorism, genocide and nuclear war without blinking. Debate simulations can only serve to distance the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about. As William Shanahan remarks: …the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. When we blithely call for United States Federal Government policymaking, we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent. We cannot wish away the horrific atrocities perpetrated everyday in our name simply by refusing to acknowledge these implications” (emphasis in original).116 118 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona. The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts. As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is integrally linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression. In other words, the discursive practices of policy-oriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege. Thus, these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony. So, rather than seeing themselves as government or state actors, Jones and Green choose to perform themselves in debate, violating the more “objective” stance of the “policymaker” and require their opponents to do the same.

#### When you role-play as the prison guard that is what you become. The system will always create a monster; fiat draws you into the fantasy of control.

Facing History and Ourselves, 8

(FACING HISTORY AND OURSELVES is a nonprofit organization, Facing History has challenged students to connect the complexities of the past to the moral and ethical issues of today, 2008, “From Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior, Chapter 5,” http://www.facinghistory.org/matter-obedience, Accessed 2/2/14, NC)

Zimbardo observed similar behavior in an experiment he supervised in 1971. He chose twenty-four young men – “mature, emotionally stable, normal, intelligent college students” – from seventy applicants. These men were arbitrarily designated as “guards” or “prisoners” in a simulated prison. The “guards” met to organize the prison and set up rules. Zimbardo reported what happened next.

At the end of only six days we had to close down our mock prison because what we saw was frightening. It was no longer apparent to most of the subjects (or to us) where reality ended and their roles began. The majority had indeed become prisoners or guards, no longer able to clearly differentiate between role playing and self. There were dramatic changes in virtually every aspect of their behavior, thinking and feeling. In less than a week the experience of imprisonment undid (temporarily) a lifetime of learning; human values were suspended, self-concepts were challenged and the ugliest, most base, pathological The question to ask of side of human nature surfaced. We were horrified because we saw some boys (guards) treat others as if they were despicable animals, taking pleasure in cruelty, while other boys (prisoners) became servile, dehumanized robots who thought only of escape, of their own individual survival and of their mounting hatred for the guards.3

#### The debate community is not inclusive- the price of admission is often a forced assimilation where we force debaters to become what they are not and ignore their own lived experience.

That is Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley in 2008

("THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE")

This tone characterizes the contemporary rhetoric of diversity and inclusion within policy debate discourse**. The policy debate community is committed to its diversification. Yet, it is important to define** *what kind of diversity* **the community seeks to achieve.** As demonstrated by its outreach efforts, **the debate community seems clearly committed to the integration of minority groups into the** *current structure of the activity***.** **In other words, diversity and inclusion are dependent upon the willingness of the “other” to “share” the** *values, practices, and traditions of the community as a “prerequisite****” for membership***. They should “aspire” to the goals and signifiers of success already in place within the community they are being invited to join. **That benevolence comes with a price. The community wants to bring those people** into the fold **who** *do not resist the assimilation process* **into the social and competitive structure. The price of *admission is* often *assimilation***. Stated more directly, only those “others” that are willing to participate in the current power structures of the activity are generally accepted by it. Their participation is encouraged in so much as they stand as exemplars of “other-ed” bodies who have garnered success in the community. The exemplars provide justification for the benevolent standpoint, for they demonstrate to the community that opportunity and access alone can solve their diversity problem**. Yet teams**, like Louisville **have begun to question and *critique this process of assimilation*, questioning whether or not they can *dismantle the exclusionary practices of debate from within*. Many have chosen to do so by violating the** “civility and decorum” of **traditional practices of debate competition**. In the analysis section of this chapter, I identify three significant rhetorical themes in the critique of the Louisville Project. These three thematic arguments include critiques of Louisville’s confrontational rhetorical strategy, use of victimization rhetoric, and the personalizing of debate participation.

#### **We control uniqueness. The idea of “cards” and “researched evidence” is exclusionary. It has the mentality that only the most “qualified” authors with PhDs are the only “acceptable” forms of knowledge/education. The Louisville debaters criticize this normative knowledge production. The idea of “experts” has left real voices/other types of evidence ignored, “expertism” is what justifies the exclusion of certain forms of knowledge production.**

Dr. Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, 2008

(Dr. Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, BA at Emory University and University of Alabama, “The Harsh Realities of ‘Acting Black,’: How African-American Policy Debaters Neogiate Representation Through Racial Performance and Style, RH)

Signifyin’ on Traditional Policy Debate: The Use of African-American Rhetorical Practices to Confront Social Normativity¶ The Louisville debaters signify on a number of practices and procedures of the policy debate community. Henry Louis Gates defines signifyin' as "the trope of revision, of repetition and difference, which” he derives “from the Afro-American idiom.”48 Signifyin' is "often characterized by pastiche, and, most crucially, it turns on repetition of formal structures and their differences."49 Signifyin' may "include marking, loud-talking, testifying, calling out (of one's name), sounding, rapping, playing the dozens, and so on."50 **The Louisville debaters repeat traditional practices and engage in a strategic reversal of those practices in an effort to create new meanings and norms**. Through this process, the debaters critically analyze the race, class, and gender ideologies critical to the normative practices

and procedures of the community. Such practices and procedures that are under review include the use of and dependence on expert evidence in debate speeches. Green and Jones, in particular, also engage in the signifyin’ practice¶ of loud-talking, most evidently in the cross-examination period where debaters directly engage one another.¶ Policy debate is distinct from other kinds of debate competition in its commitment to highly evidenced speeches that require the extended citation of quotation materials from reliable media or expert sources. In debate lingo, "cards" refer to such extended evidence quotations. Such quotations are usually a paragraph or more long and are preceded by a brief one to two sentence summary of the evidence. Policy debate is so research intensive that each college debate team may produce thousands of pages of research briefs relevant to that year's debate topic. Debaters rely on media news reports, academic journals, books, congressional reports, and so on. Debate privileges these institutional sources of knowledge over other sources.¶ The Louisville Project critiques the policy debate community's over reliance on expert or objective evidence. In the First Affirmative Constructive or 1AC of the octo-final round against the team of Hall and Carroll from Wake Forest (ranked in the sweet sixteen), Jones attempts to problematize and revise our understanding of the power relations involved in the definition of objectivity and expertise:¶ And do they know about the cards we hold Like stories of homes heated with stoves Unequal education, no healthcare, empty stomachs Past due rent bills and pockets filled with lint Mothers are cryin’ as their children’s tears hit concrete floors And clocks tick away at childhood.51¶ Implied in Jones’ interpretation of "cards" is a certain ownership over the knowledge produced by experience. Such ownership is implied by the traditional use of evidence as well. Cards are¶ not just resources, they are strategic tools in attacking the positions of one's opponents. Those who hold the "best" evidence as defined by community standards have a greater control over the judgment of their argumentative efforts. In other words, traditional "cards" grant institutional authority to the debaters using them. Those debaters who choose to forego this community standard can be characterized as anti-intellectual if they eschew their commitment to the use of acceptable forms of evidentiary claims.¶ Jones argues that real “cards” are held by those who suffer the most in a society. In other words, those who are subjugated in a social community are often uniquely situated to comment upon the normative social and political practices engaged in by dominant social group members that maintain that subjugation.52 As Cheryl Kleinman notes, “people on the margins have the distance required to stand back and analyze the mainstream world.”53 However, if they lack conventional status, subjugated voices are often overlooked. They can be ignored as expert voices stand as the final word on any given subject. The pain of subjugation often only becomes real when it is sanctioned by expert authority. For the Louisville debaters, real “cards” represent experiential knowledge that is “legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination...”54¶ Jones does not simply create a dialectical opposition between debate “cards” and the “stories” told by the subjugated. Instead, she reconfigures the meaning of “cards,” signifyin’ on its traditional meaning in the debate community. In Jones’ performance, “stories” become “cards.” The meaning of “cards” is not simply reversed, resulting in the replacement of traditional evidence as the measure of expertise. Instead, Jones seeks to revise our understanding of what counts as knowledge. Such an expansion will necessitate a re-negotiation of the power and authority afforded this type of expertise. For it is important to recognize that what is¶ discounted as knowledge is the very basis upon which what counts as knowledge can be defined. It is their dialectical negotiation that maintains the normative significance of expertise and authority. It is necessarily a negative dialectic that posits expertise as the good and experience as the bad; only expertise can be trusted.¶ In Green’s first speech (the second affirmative constructive or 2AC) in the Wake Forest debate, she provides a similar criticism of expertise. In the following quote, she responds to a piece of traditional evidence (or card) read by the opposing team in the first negative constructive (the negative’s first speech):¶ It doesn’t take a genius to recognize that the USFG is a superpower And has used its privileged power and greed for its self benefit It doesn’t take a brain surgeon to recognize that the US is the number one military spender And out of 220 countries combined still doesn’t add up to how much we spend It doesn’t take a policy expert to recognize that NATO justifies its power of militarization when it chooses because it has the determination or the authority to determine what is and is not a war.55¶ Green’s repetition of the phrase it “doesn’t take” is delivered in an angry and rhythmic tone. Green appears to be “loud-talkin” her opponents, in essence she indicates her frustration and disgust with their reliance on expertise. The repetition of the phrase seems designed to demonstrate the irony of experts who identify and define for people what is occurring when people have the ability to observe it for themselves. Even more important, her tone implies distrust for expertise, particularly the kind that often attempts to mask reality or convince people to ignore what they see, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Her intent seems to be to raise¶ the common knowledge of the average person to the level of real knowledge. In other words, she **questions the normative acceptance of expert testimony in contrast to lay testimony.** She notes that the common person can make observations about the practices of state institutions and international organizations. Such observations may be even more legitimate as the average person has less direct connection to the levers of institutional power. Green’s argument also represents the significance of social knowledge as oppositional to expert knowledge within the traditions of black communication practices. If expertise is not a necessity in interrogating the actions and practices of institutional state apparatuses, then Green’s argument begs the question of why the debate community continues to privilege expert evidence. **Such a privileging of expertise creates parameters through which certain kinds of speakers have the right to speak through public discourse.** It is not that Louisville rejects the use of traditional evidence types. Note the following argument from Green’s 2AR in the octo-finals against Wake Forest: “One of the things that they talk about how – they talk about debate research is a unique space and things of that nature. Ok, granted, we understand that you know, we’re not saying that research is bad or things of that nature, it’s how you use that research is what becomes the problem.”56 In other words, the practice of signifyin’ is not as simple as an outright rejection or negation of traditional or dominant practices.