## Edelman 2AC

#### Disabled people are definitely socially excluded- they are treated as the Other; society tries to create the ideal human. Aff’s questioning of the social order solves.

Costas Douzinas, professor of law and Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities at Birkbeck College, 2007 [Human Rights and Empire: The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism pp. 105-106]

But conflict does not disappear. The alternative view of politics or the political' returns to Marx and unavoidable conflict. Politics proper is a form of disruption of the established social order by a group or class that has no place in it. Antagonism is the result of the tension between the structured social body, where every group has its role, function and place, and what Ranciere calls 'the part of no part' or the `supernumenary' part. Such groups have been radically excluded from the social order; they are invisible, outside the' established sense of what exists and is acceptable and their irruption upsets the overall established equilibrium. The excluded may try to claim political recognition by adopting existing -rules of the game and turning their demands into regional expressions of the established order. This is the case with reformist social movements. There is another scene however in which the excluded group or the banned ideology challenges the social hierarchy. This kind of antagonism or `dissensus', 'is not a conflict of interests, opinions or, values; it is a division put in the "common sense": a dispute about what is given, about the frame within which we see something as given'. Politics proper erupts only when an excluded part demands to be included and must change the rules of inclusion to achieve this. In this process, a new political subject is constituted, in excess to the hierarchised and visible group of groups, places and functions in society.The creation of the Athenian demos is an early example of this process. The people as a body had a fixed place in the social edifice but demanded to be included, to be heard on an equal footing with the rulers. In doing so, the demos emerged as a group and was recognized as a partner in political dialogue and the exercise of power. The demos were the people who had no qualification for exercising power. Democracy is the 'power of those who have no specific qualification for ruling, except the fact of having no qualification' .24 Something similar happened when Olympe de Gouges and other women protested, after the French revolution, that if they were political enough to be sent to the scaffold for anti-revolutionary activities, they should also be given political rights. Women were both included in the political process as targets of repression and excluded from the rights of man. By mobilizing this contradiction they realized the potential of revolutionary rights... Another example is the proletariat in Marxist theory. The working class has no place within bourgeois political society, it does not exist politically.26 But in organizing and pursuing its own sectional interests, the proletariat acts for the whole society: its emancipation will free the whole of humanity, including its capitalist enemies. Normal politics is exercised when a community is limited to its recognized parts. When politics breaks out, a supplement is added and the uncounted are counted for the first time by changing the rules of counting.When the radically excluded protest the wrong they suffer, they present themselves as representatives of the whole society, as stand-ins for the uni­versal. We, the nobodies, they proclaim, are everything against those who stand only for their particular interests. Political conflict brings together the struc­tured whole and the excluded representative of the universal into one place and rewrites the rules of inclusion and exclusion. The inclusion of the invis­ible part overthrows the rules of the game and interrupts the natural order of domination. A new order is precipitated and transforms social visibility. The irruption of the excluded is the political event par excellence: it changes the political scene and then disappears. Before the transformation, political change is a matter of policing and consensus. After the change, politics returns to normality; its terrain has been modified, however, through the inclusion of the new group or subject and the redefinition of the rules of political legitimacy.

#### Edelman’s politics are factually inaccurate and politically suicidal – he ignores the possibilities of contemporary politics

John Brenkman, Distinguished Professor of English and Comprative Literature at CUNY Graduate Center, 2002[Narrative, “Queer Post-Politics”, Volume 10, Issue 2, p. 174-180, Project Muse]

But Edelman interprets this nonrecognition in very different terms from those I have just used. When he asserts that "there are no queers in that future as there can be no future for queers," he is not making a mere statement of protest; rather, he is announcing the theoretical position that is the explicit stake of his entire argument. I [End Page 175] now want to turn to his theoretical project, which involves an argument in political theory and an argument from psychoanalysis and a link between the two. The Political Theory Argument For Edelman the image of the child-as-future is more than a powerful trope in the political discourse of the moment. It in effect defines the political realm: "For politics, however radical the means by which some of its practitioners seek to effect a more desirable social order, is conservative insofar as it necessarily works to affirm a social order, defining various strategies aimed at actualizing social reality and transmitting it into the future it aims to bequeath to its inner child" (19). The burden of this argument is that a genuinely critical discourse cannot arise via the marking or symbolizing of the gap between the present and the future. Such symbolizing has indeed been the defining feature of modern critical social discourse, whether among the Enlightenment's philosophes, French revolutionaries, Marxists, social democrats, or contemporary socialists and democrats. Jürgen Habermas, in The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity, defines modern time-consciousness itself as a taking of responsibility for the future. Edelman sees in such a time-consciousness an inescapable trap. For him any such political discourse or activity steps into "the logic by which political engagement serves always as the medium for reproducing our social reality" (26). Certainly the political realm—whether viewed from the perspective of the state, the political community and citizenship, or political movements—is a medium of social reproduction, in the sense that it serves the relative continuity of innumerable economic and non-economic institutions. But it is not simply a mechanism of social reproduction; it is also the site and instrument of social change. Nor is it simply the field of existing power relations; it is also the terrain of contestation and compromise. Edelman compounds his reductive concept of the political realm by in turn postulating an ironclad intermeshing of social reproduction and sexual reproduction. Here too he takes a fundamental feature of modern society, or any society, and absolutizes it. Sexual reproduction is a necessary dimension of social reproduction, almost by definition, in the sense that a society's survival depends upon, among many other things, the fact that its members reproduce. Kinship practices, customs, religious authorities, and civil and criminal law variously regulate sexual reproduction. However, that is not to say that the imperatives of social reproduction dictate or determine or fully functionalize the institutions and practices of sexual reproduction. The failure to recognize the relative autonomy of those institutions and practices underestimates how seriously feminism and the gay and lesbian movement have already challenged the norms and institutions of compulsory heterosexuality in our society. They have done so through creative transformations in civil society and everyday life and through cultural initiatives and political and legal reforms. The anti-abortion and anti-gay activism of the Christian Right arose, in response, to alter and reverse the fundamental achievements of these movements. How then to analyze or theorize this struggle? A motif in Edelman's analysis [End Page 176] takes the rhetoric and imagery of the Christian Right and traditional Catholicism to be a more insightful discourse than liberalism when it comes to understanding the underlying politics of sexuality today. I think this is extremely misguided. The Right does not have a truer sense of the social-symbolic order than liberals and radicals; it simply has more reactionary aims and has mobilized with significant effect to impose its phobic and repressive values on civil society and through the state. The Christian Right is itself a "new social movement" that contests the feminist and gay and lesbian social movements. To grant the Right the status of exemplary articulators of "the" social order strikes me as politically self-destructive and theoretically just plain wrong.

#### Blindfolding ourselves to the future possibilities in the world, opens us up to the past horrors that we must not allow, i.e. the Holocaust. However dystopian visions allow us to pressure the government into fixing possible calamities.

Kurasawa, 04 (Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Fuyuki, Constellations Volume 11, No 4, 2004).

In the twenty-first century, the lines of political cleavage are being drawn along those of competing dystopian visions. Indeed, one of the notable features of recent public discourse and socio-political struggle is their negationist hue, for they are devoted as much to the prevention of disaster as to the realization of the good, less to what ought to be than what could but must not be. ' The debates that preceded the war in Iraq provide a vivid illustration of this tendency, as both camps rhetorically invoked incommensurable catastrophic scenarios to make their respective cases. And as many analysts have noted, the multinational anti­war protests culminating on February 15, 2003 marked the first time that a mass movement was able to mobilize substantial numbers of people dedicated to avert­ing war before it had actually broken out. More generally, given past experiences and awareness of what might occur in the future, given the cries of 'never again' (the Second World War, the Holocaust, Bhopal, Rwanda, etc.) and 'not ever' (e.g., nuclear or ecological apocalypse, human cloning) that are emanating from different parts of the world, the avoidance of crises is seemingly on everyone's lips - and everyone's conscience. From the United Nations and regional multilat­eral organizations to states, from non-governmental organizations to transnational social movements, the determination to prevent the actualization of potential cat­aclysms has become a new imperative in world affairs. Allowing past disasters to reoccur and unprecedented calamities to unfold is now widely seen as unbearable when, in the process, the suffering of future generations is callously tolerated and our survival is being irresponsibly jeopardized. Hence, we need to pay attention to what a widely circulated report by the International Commission on Interven­tion and State Sovereignty identifies as a burgeoning "culture of prevention," 3 a dynamic that carries major, albeit still poorly understood, normative and political implications.