## 1

#### A] Interpretation: The affirmative should defend the desirability of hypothetical action in which public colleges and universities in United States stop restricting constitutionally protected speech.

#### Resolved reflects policy passage before a legislative body.

**Parcher 01** (Jeff, Fmr. Debate Coach at Georgetown University, February, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>)

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill**.** American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve**: 1. To make a firm decision about.** 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constituent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.  (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations**, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction.** They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debatewhich will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate**. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies.**

#### Protected speech is a legal doctrine relating to the 1st Amendment.

**FLD 16** "Freedom of Speech", Definition. http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Freedom+of+Speech  
The Framers of the Constitution guaranteed freedom of speech and expression to the citizens of the United States with the First Amendment, which reads, in part, "Congress shall make no law … abridging the freedom of speech." Almost since the adoption of the [**Bill of Rights**](http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Bill+of+Rights), however, the judiciary has struggled to define speech and expression and the extent to which freedom of speech should be protected. Some, like Justice hugo l. black, have believed that freedom of speech is absolute. But most jurists, along with most U.S. citizens, agree with Justice oliver wendell holmes jr., who felt that the Constitution allows some restrictions on speech under certain circumstances. To illustrate this point, Holmes wrote, "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic" (schenck v. united states, 249 U.S. 47, 39 S. Ct. 247, 63 L. Ed. 470 [1919]).

#### B] Violation: You don’t defend the topic.

#### C] Net Benefits:

#### 1] Fairness: absent a topical requirement the aff will be biased by competitive incentives to find the most uncontroversial advocacy possible. The only way to make sure that debates are fair is to have one chosen by a 3rd party topic committee. This is supercharged because the topic provides a statis point that both of us can prepare for and clash on. Under their model of debate the aff destroys the neg with massive frontlines since they prep one aff while the neg preps infinite because the aff can defend whatever it wants. Even if the topic is good, it’s always bad to the let the aff pick it since they will structurally have more opportunity to prep: there are 85 debaters at the TOC: if any of them wanted to discuss any random issue, they would always know more and be prepped more for the arbitrary discussion they chose to hold. That outweighs: a) Evaluation – even if their arguments seem true, that’s only because they already had an advantage – fairness is a meta constraint on your ability to determine who best meets their ROB. If one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the truth value of who wins on the AC so cross-applications don’t work. b) Tangibility - the K has no terminal impact- voting aff doesn’t educate anyone or cause us to make some societal shift whereas theory norms are set all the time like nibs and brackets. The judge isn’t really voting for anything when they affirm: you can’t set a norm with this aff. c) Dialogue – constraints and procedural guidelines are a pre-condition to engagement in discussion.

JohnDryzek 6, Professor of Social and Political Theory, The Australian National University, Reconciling Pluralism and Consensus as Political Ideals, American Journal of Political Science,Vol. 50, No. 3, July 2006, Pp. 634–649  
Mouffe is a radical pluralist: “By pluralism I mean the end of a substantive idea of the good life” (1996, 246). But neither Mouffe nor Young want to abolish communication in the name of pluralism and difference; much of their work advocates sustained attention to communication. Mouffe also cautions against uncritical celebration of difference, for some differences imply “subordination and should therefore be challenged by a radical democratic politics” (1996, 247). Mouffe raises the question of **the terms in which engagement across difference might proceed.** Participants should ideally accept that the positions of others are legitimate, though not as a result of being persuaded in argument. Instead, it **is a matter of being open to conversion due to adoption of a particular kind ofdemocratic attitude**that converts antagonism into agonism, fighting into critical engagement, enemies into adversaries who are treated with respect. Respect here is notjust (liberal) toleration, but positive validation of the position of others. For Young, a communicative democracy would be composed of people showing “equal respect,” under **“procedural rules of fair discussion and decisionmaking**” (1996, 126). Schlosberg speaks of “agonistic respect” as “a critical pluralist ethos” (1999, 70). Mouffe and Young both want pluralism to be regulated by a particular kind of attitude, be it respectful, agonistic, or even in Young’s (2000, 16–51) case reasonable. Thus **neither proposes unregulated pluralism as an alternative to (deliberative) consensus. This regulation cannot be just procedural, for that would imply “anything goes” in terms of the substance of positions**. Recall that Mouffe rejects differences that imply subordination. Agonistic ideals demand judgments about what is worthy of respect and what is not. Connolly (1991, 211) worries about **dogmatic assertions**and denials **of identity that fuel existential resentments that would have to be changed to make agonism possible**. Young seeks “transformation of private, self-regarding desires into public appeals to justice” (2000, 51). Thus for Mouffe, Connolly, and Young alike**, regulative principles for democratic communication are not just attitudinal or procedural; they also refer to the substance of the kinds of claims that are worthy of respect.** These authors would not want to legislate substance and are suspicious of the content of any alleged consensus. But in retreating from “anything goes” relativism, **they need principles to regulate the substance of what rightfully belongs in democratic debate.**

#### 2] Critical Engagement: Requiring the debate to be topical forces them to interrogate the issue of oppression from multiple perspectives. This enriches our understanding of how oppression operates.

Keller, et. al, 01 – Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago(Thomas E., James K., and Tracly K., Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago, professor of Social Work, and doctoral student School of Social Work, “Student debates in policy courses: promoting policy practice skills and knowledge through active learning,” Journal of Social Work Education, Spr/Summer 2001, EBSCOhost)

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, **debates may help to stimulate critical thinking by shaking students free from established opinions and helping them to appreciate the complexities involved in policy dilemmas.**Relationships between Policy Practice Skills, Critical Thinking, and Learning Policy practice encompasses social workers' "efforts to influence the development, enactment, implementation, or assessment of social policies" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8). Effective policy practice involves analytic activities, such as defining issues, gathering data, conducting research, identifying and prioritizing policy options, and creating policy proposals (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984,pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities: value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions; conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options; interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner; political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and position-taking skills for recommending, advocating, and defending a particular policy. These policy practice skills reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative ways of thinking and acting, and arriving at commitments after a period of questioning, analysis, and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. Developing policy practice skills seems to share much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking.R.W. Paul (as cited in Gambrill, 1997) states that **critical thinkers acknowledge the imperative to argue from opposing points of view and to seek to identify weakness and limitations in one's own position**. Critical thinkers are aware that there are many legitimate points of view, each of which (when thought through) may yield some level of insight. (p. 126)John **Dewey, the philosopher and educational reformer, suggested that the initial advance in the development of reflective thought occurs in the transition from holding fixed, static ideas to an attitude of doubt and questioning engendered by exposure to alternative views in social discourse** (Baker, 1955, pp. 36-40). Doubt, confusion, and conflict resulting from discussion of diverse perspectives "force comparison, selection, and reformulation of ideas and meanings" (Baker, 1955, p. 45). Subsequent educational theorists have contended that **learning requires openness to divergent ideas in combination with the ability to synthesize disparate views into a purposeful resolution** (Kolb, 1984; Perry, 1970). On the one hand, **clinging to the certainty of one's beliefs risks dogmatism, rigidity, and the inability to learn from new experiences**. On the other hand, if one's opinion is altered by every new experience, the result is insecurity, paralysis, and the inability to take effective action. The educator's role is to help students develop the capacity to incorporate new and sometimes conflicting ideas and experiences into a coherent cognitive framework. Kolb suggests that, "if the education process begins by bringing out the learner's beliefs and theories, examining and testing them, and then integrating the new, more refined ideas in the person's belief systems, the learning process will be facilitated" (p. 28).The authors believe that **involving students in substantive debates challenges them to learn and grow** in the fashion described by Dewey and Kolb. **Participation in a debate stimulates clarification and critical evaluation of the evidence, logic, and values underlying one's own policy position. In addition, to debate effectively students must understand and accurately evaluate the opposing perspective. The ensuing tension between two distinct but legitimate views is designed to yield a reevaluation and reconstruction of knowledge and beliefs pertaining to the issue.**

#### 3] T version of the aff solves: here’s some examples:

a) read a queer anarchy aff that says that universities are oppressive , and therefore cannto be trusted to impose speech restrictions, which would affirm. Solves your offense about state bad since you can be a negative state action.

b) read protests good for queer anarchy. Just because you read some rando card for free speech bad doesn’t mean you can’t defned the topic: that’s like reading a hate speech disad in your 1ac and saying “I can’t affirm anymore”. Obviously there will be opposing lit to any topic, meaning the logic you justify is absurd.

This means you cannot leverage any of the case impacts against framework since my interpretation still allows your discussion. Also you should evaluate T version as a counterplan/disad debate – even if T version doesn’t replicate the exact discussion the 1AC wants, the fact that it solves the vast majority of their offense means the disad, i.e. the net benefit to framework should outweigh.

#### D] Voting issue: Drop the debater on T: Drop the arg is severance since you jump shift from your advocacy which perpetuates abuse since it allows you to restart the round. Competing interps: 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline 2. Collapses- you use offense-defense to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps 3. Reasonability makes no sense on T- you’re either topical or you’re not, you can’t be 87% topical.

## 2

#### Queer theory emulates capitalism—it sees the logic of individualism as a good model for queer anarchy but fails to interrogate the late capitalist underpinnings.

**Kirsch 6** (Max, PhD Florida Atlantic University, “Queer Theory, Late Capitalism and Internalized Homophobia,” Journal of Homosexuality, Harrington Park Press, Vol. 52, No. ½, 2006, pp. 19-45, DES.)

This mirroring of late capitalism in queer theory has unforeseen consequences for the individual in society and has hindered its practioners from engaging important ways of envisioning collective action. Queer theory promotes the “self” of the individual as an alternative to wider social interaction [but], disassembling the social ties that bind. Recognizing that oppression and violence, symbolic and physical, are part of the daily reality for those of us who do not correspond to dominant standards is compromised by queer theory’s rejection of the category of identity, and indeed, categories as a whole. The stance that it is limiting to pose categories of behavior and belief, even if those constructs are fluid and changing, puts the individual subject in the position of internalizing thoughts and feelings without the benefit of peer feedback.

#### Queer theory’s fragmentation hinders community and prevents identification

**Yep 03** [Gust Yep, Karen Lovaas, and John Elia (Professors @ San Francisco University, Journal of Homosexual Studies, Vol. 45, No. 2/3/4, p. 45]

On the other hand, queer theorists are criticized for their neglect of community organizing, based on a shared identity, to promote social change. Kirsch (2000), for example, argues that instead of focusing on specific areas of oppression and strategies to change them, queer theory focuses on the individual as a site of change. Such a move insulates individuals and hinders community building. In other words, collective identities and power in numbers are politically effective. Collective identities require clear membership boundaries, that is, discrete in-group/out-group distinctions (Gamson, 1997). Kirsch (2000) cautions us that queer theory, with a focus on individual self-expression, might actually be harmful to people by making it more difficult to identify with others. Queer theory, Kirsch vociferously argues, “needs to be refocused to take into account the realities of everyday life in a capitalist world system. This means an end to academic posturing, where obfuscation is more valued than strategies for recognition and community-building” (2000, p. 123).

#### Commodification turns case and outweighs—destroys value of free speech and kills value to life by making them mere objects.

**Morgaridge 98** [Morgaridge, Clayton, Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College, 1998, Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html]

Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior. The 20th century proves otherwise. What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response? This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the **putting the world at the disposal of** those with **capital has done more damage to** the **ethical life than anything else**. To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism**, Marx writes, **everything** in nature and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for, or** an **obstacle, to** the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of **markets**, **and** the circulation of **money**. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. **Mountain streams, clean air, human lives** -- **all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only** if they can be used **to turn a profit**.[1] If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. **Capital profits from** the **production of** food, shelter, and all the **necessities** of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. **Therefore ethics**, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, **is left out of deliberations about what** the heavyweight **institutions of** our **society are going to do**. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC’s representations and to entirely withdraw from the logic of capital—a collective epistemological reorientation is key to solve

**Kovel 07** (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard, The Enemy of Nature, pg 77-79)

Relentless criticism can delegitimate the system and release people into struggle. And as struggle develops, victories that are no more than incremental by their own terms- stopping a meeting stopping the IMF, the hopes stirred forth by a campaign such as Ralph Nader’s in 2000 – can have a symbolic effect far greater than their external result, and constitute points of rupture with capital. This rupture is not a set of facts added to our knowledge of the world, but a change in our relation to the world. Its effects are dynamic, not incremental, and like all genuine insights it changes the balance of forces and can propagate very swiftly. Thus the release from inertia can trigger a rapid cascade of changes, so that it could be said that the forces pressing towards radical change need not be linear and incremental, but can be exponential in character. In this way, conscientious and radical criticism of the given, even in advance of having blueprints for an alternative, can be a material force, because it can seize the mind of the masses of people. There is no greater responsibility for intellectuals.

#### Historical materialism provides the best frame for analyzing the fragmentation of queerness—that means the alt solves case better

**Drucker 11** [Peter, International Institute of Research and Education; 2011; <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/156920611x606412>; The Fracturing of LGBT Identities under Neoliberal Capitalism; 06/29/15]

Whether they cite Marx, Foucault, or both, **historians’ analysis of** lesbian/**gay identity has linked its emergence** to the development of modern, industrialised, urbanised societies. Some historians3 have linked its emergence, in a more-or-less explicitly Marxist way, **to the development of capitalism**. This connection has continued to be made by writers working within a Marxist framework.4 Recently, Kevin Floyd has detected more broadly a ‘greater openness [in queer thought] to the kind of direct engagement with Marxism that emphasizes its explanatory power’.5 Yet some theorists have seemed uneasy in recent years about the questions that were initially not asked in these accounts. Once this specific form of lesbian/gay identity has been explored and its emergence mapped, the question arises: is this the end of the story? Especially as more writings have charted the spread of LGBT communities in Asia and Africa, some have wondered whether **all other forms of** same-sex **sexuality are surrendering** to what Dennis Altman has critiqued as **the triumphant ‘global gay’, a monolithic figure riding the wave of capitalist globalisation**.6 In much the same way that homo sapiens was once naively viewed as the culmination of biological evolution, and liberal democracy (according to Francis Fukuyama) as the culmination of human history, one might have sometimes imagined that all roads of LGBT history 2. For example, Fernbach 1981; D’Emilio 1983a and 1983b. A word on terminology: the term ‘lesbian/gay’ in this article refers to a historically specific phenomenon, defined in Section I below. ‘LGBT’ (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) is used as a broader term for people with same-sex sexualities or identities. Although the word ‘queer’ is sometimes used by others to refer generally to LGBT people, I try to reserve the word in this article to those who self-identify as queer, who are often rebelling, not only against the heterosexual norm, but also against the dominant forms of lesbian/gay identity. I sometimes use ‘gay’, ‘lesbian/gay’ or ‘LGB’ particularly to refer to more ‘respectable’ people who emphatically do not identify as queer. 3. See, for example, D’Emilio 1983a. 4. See, for example, Hennessy 2000; Sears 2005. 5. Floyd 2009, p. 2. 6. Altman 2003. P. Drucker / Historical Materialism 19.4 (2011) 3–32 5 led to Castro Street in San Francisco. A few queer theorists have tried to undermine any such monolithic vision of gay identity, rejecting the onedimensional focus on gender-orientation that underlies it.7 But, **despite** their **abstract championing of ‘difference’,** **[queer theorists]** they **have rarely engaged concretely with** the **historiography** that sometimes seems to suggest that LGBT history is a one-way street. In Paul Reynolds’s words, they have ‘centred on the social production of categories discursively rather than determinantly through essential causality and power of the social relations of production’.8 This article argues that there are socioeconomic forces that have been leading LGBT people to question lesbian/gay identity as it took shape by the 1970s. A historically-based, social constructionist, Marxist approach9 can examine historically different sexual identities under capitalism, without privileging any particular form of identity; can chart not only the emergence of lesbian/gay identities, but also shifts in sexual identities in recent decades, exploring connections between shifting identities and successive phases of capitalist development. One useful tool is the Marxist theory of capitalist long waves, and specifically Marxist analyses of the mode of capitalist accumulation that was on the upswing until the early 1970s and turned sharply downward with the recessions of 1974–5 and 1979–82.10 **A historical-materialist analysis** of this kind may **provide a more solid theoretical basis for addressing** a central political concern of recent **queer theory** – the defence of nonconformist or less privileged LGBT people against ‘homonormativity’11 – than queer theory itself offers, while helping to lay the foundation for a queer anticapitalism. It is by now nothing new to link the rise of what might be called classic lesbian/gay identity to the rise of a ‘free’ labour-force under capitalism. This has taken centuries, and historians have generally looked at it as a long process. But the breakthrough of gay identity as we know it on a mass-scale is in fact very recent, more a matter of decades than of centuries. On closer examination, **the** **consolidation** and spread **of gay identity**, especially among the mass of **working-class people**, **took place** to a large extent during what some Marxist economists refer to as **the expansive long wave of** 1945–73. Gay identity on a mass-scale, emerging gradually after a period of repression from the 1930s to the 1950s,12 was dependent on the growing prosperity of the working and middle-classes, catalysed by profound cultural changes from the 1940s to the 1970s (from the upheavals of the Second World-War13 to the mass-radicalisation of the New Left years) that prosperity helped make possible. This means that gay identity was shaped in many ways by the mode of **capitalist accumulation** that some economists call ‘Fordism’: specifically by mass-consumer societies and welfare-states.

## Case

#### Movements fail without a conception of queerness that can deconstruct underlying capitalistic institutions- your author

Mary Nardini Gang 8 [The Mary Nardini Gang, “Towards the Queerest Insurrection”, 2008, http://www.weldd.org/resources/towards-queerest-insurrection]

If history proves anything, it is that capitalism has a treacherous recuperative tendency to pacify radical social movements. It works rather∂ simply, actually. A group gains privilege and∂ power within a movement, and shortly thereafter∂ sell their comrades out. Within a couple∂ years of stonewall, affluent-gay-white-males∂ had thoroughly marginalized everyone that∂ had made their movement possible and abandoned∂ their revolution with them.∂ It was once that to be queer was to be in direct conflict with the forces of control and domination.∂ Now, we are faced with a condition of utter∂ stagnation and sterility. As always, Capital∂ recuperated brick-throwing street queens into∂ suited politicians and activists. There are logcabin-Republicans∂ and “stonewall” refers to∂ gay Democrats. There are gay energy drinks∂ and a “queer” television station that wages war∂ on the minds, bodies and esteem of impressionable∂ youth. The “LGBT” political establishment has become a force of assimilation, gentrification,∂ capital and state-power. Gay identity has become both a marketable commodity and∂ a device of withdrawal from struggle against∂ domination.∂ Now they don’t critique marriage, military or the∂ state. Rather we have campaigns for queer assimilation∂ into each. Their politics is advocacy for such grievous institutions, rather than the∂ annihilation of them all. “Gays∂ can kill poor people around the world as well as straight∂ people!” “Gays can hold the reins of the state and capital as well as straight people!” “We∂ are just like you”.∂ Assimilationists want nothing∂ less than to construct the homosexual as normal - white,∂ monogamous, wealthy, 2.5∂ children, SUVs with a white picket fence. This construction,∂ of course, reproduces∂ the stability of heterosexuality, whiteness, patriarchy, the gender binary, and capitalism∂ itself.

#### The 1AC’s conception of identity politics is essentializing and reduces identity of groups further.

Joan W. **Scott 92** Professor of Social Science at the Institute for Advanced Study, Summer 92, October, Vol. 61, “The Identity in Question,” p. 12-19, JStor

There is nothing wrong, on the face of it, with teaching individuals about how to behave decently in relation to others and about how to empathize with each other's pain. The problem is that difficult analyses of how history and social standing, privilege, and subordination are involved in personal behavior entirely drop out. Chandra Mohanty puts it this way: **There has been an erosion of the politics of collectivity through the reformulation of race and difference in individualistic terms**. The 1960s and '70s slogan "the personal is political" has been recrafted in the 1980s as "the political is personal." In other words, **all politics is collapsed into the personal**, and questions of individual behaviors, attitudes, and life-styles stand in for political analysis of the social. Individual political struggles are seen as the only relevant and legit- imate form of political struggle.5 Paradoxically, **individuals then generalize their perceptions and claim to speak for a whole group,** but the groups are also conceived as unitary and autonomous. This individualizing, personalizing conception has also been be- hind some of the recent identity politics of minorities; indeed it gave rise to the intolerant, doctrinaire behavior that was dubbed, initially by its internal critics, "political correctness." It is particularly in the notion of "experience" that one sees this operating. **In much current usage of "experience," references to structure and history are implied but not made explicit; instead, personal testimony of oppression re-places analysis, and this testimony comes to stand for the experience of the whole group**. The fact of belonging to an identity group is taken as authority enough for one's speech; the direct experience of a group or culture-that is, membership in it-becomes the **only test of true knowledge.** The **exclusionary implications of this are twofold: all those not of the group are denied even intellectual access to it, and those within the group whose experiences or interpretations do not conform to the established terms of identity must either suppress their views or drop out. An appeal to "experience" of this kind forecloses discussion and criticism and turns politics into a policing operation: the borders of identity are patrolled for signs of nonconformity;** the test of membership in a group becomes less one's willingness to endorse certain principles and engage in specific political actions, less one's positioning in specific relationships of power, than one's ability to use the prescribed languages that are taken as signs that one is inherently "of" the group. That all of this isn't recognized as a highly political process that produces identities is troubling indeed, especially because it so closely mimics the politics of the powerful, naturalizing and deeming as discernably objective facts the prerequisites for inclusion in any group.

#### Optimism is justified- reformism alters civil society, not the other way around

**Brenkman** [John, Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the CUNY and Baruch College, Narrative, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2002, p. 188-189]

Innovation is a crucial concept for understanding the gay and lesbian movement, which emerged from within civil society as citizens who were stigmatized and often criminalized for their sexual lives created new forms of association, transformed their own lifeworld, and organized a political offensive on behalf of political and social reforms. There was an innovation of rights and freedoms, and what I have called innovations in sociality. **Contrary to the liberal interpretation of liberal rights and freedoms, I do not think that gays and lesbians have merely sought their place at the table. Their struggle has radically altered the scope and meaning of the liberal rights and freedoms they sought, first and foremost by making them include sexuality**, sexual practices, and the shape of household and family. Where the movement has succeeded in changing the laws of the state, it has also opened up new possibilities within civil society. To take an obvious example, wherever it becomes unlawful to deny housing to individuals because they are gay, there is set in motion a transformation of the everyday life of neighborhoods, including the lives of heterosexuals and their children. [End Page 188] Within civil society, this is a work of enlightenment, however uneven and fraught and frequently dangerous. **It is not a reaffirmation of the symbolic and structural underpinnings of homophobia; on the contrary, it is a challenge to homophobia and a volatilizing of social relations within the nonpolitical realm.**

#### Your reps abstract away from the identities of trans individuals and constructs the trans body as contingent on trans violence.

Sarah Lamble 08, (AHRC Research Centre for Law, Gender & Sexuality, Kent Law School, Eliot College, University of Kent, Canterbury) "Retelling racialized violence, remaking White innocence: The politics of interlocking oppressions in Transgender Day of Remembrance." Sexuality Research & Social Policy 5.1 (2008): 24-42.

Because the archive provides so few details about each case, the cause of death becomes the most powerful marker of inclusion within the community of remembrance. **The gruesome details of violence**, which are repeated at vigils and reiterated through the remembrance archive, **have strong visceral impact; we do not remember the names of the victims so much as we remember the violence that was done to them**. Just as Western feminism’s historical reliance on a universal female victim has tended to define gender as what is done to women, **the gender identity of trans people is signified by what is done to their bodies** (Razack, 2001). **Deliberately unmarked by race, class, age, ability, sexuality, and history, these individuals**— otherwise unknown—**are rendered visible solely through the violence that is enacted upon them**. The very existence of transgender people is verified by their death. Violence thus marks the body as belonging to the trans community. In this way, violence simultaneously obliterates and produces a particular trans subject—both materially (in the act of killing) and symbolically (in the subsequent narration). Defined by the details of brutality, violence is reduced to the snapshot of a crime scene, a momentary fragment in time between perpetrator and victim. **Without history or context, the systemic roots of violence are rendered invisible; violence is comprehensible only at the microlevel whereby individual transphobia becomes the only viable explanation.** Besides being incomplete, **this picture undermines the scope of antiviolence efforts**

**.** Several scholars have illustrated **the problem of using phobias as a primary explanation for violence** (Spade & Willse, 2000). As Gary Kinsman (1996) noted of homophobia, “It **individualizes and privatizes gay and lesbian oppression and obscures the social relations that organize it”** (p. 33). **Hence, the trans murder victim emerges as the product of an individual hatred or fear rather than the result of the accumulative effect of social institutions** (such as legal, economic, and political systems) that are founded on, and perpetuate, complex hierarchies of power and violence (such as White supremacy, patriarchy, and heteronormativity).

#### I’ll win that reformism is possible to take out your pessimism framing, but if you win pessimism, you still negate because the aff wouldn’t be radical enough. Any future order, including anarchy, envisions a cohesive state of reproductive order that is inherently anti-queer. To clarify, this isn’t a proactive warrant for pessimism, it just hijacks your assumption.

Lee Edelman 98, The Future Is Kid Stuff: Queer Theory, Disidentification, and the Death Drive, Narrative, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 18-30 Ohio State University Press 1998 // UH-DD

“But what helps him most in this public appeal for parental involvement with children is the social consensus that such an appeal is distinct from the realm of pol itics; indeed, though these public service announcements conclude with a rhetorical flourish evocative of an ongoing political campaign ("We're fighting for the children. Whose side are you on?"), that rhetoric is intended precisely to assert that this issue has only one side. And while such apparently self-evident one-sidedness the affirmation of so uncontested, because so uncontroversial, a cultural value as that condensed in the figure of the child whose innocence cries out for defense?is precisely what ought to distinguish the public service spots from the more volatile discourse of

political persuasion, I want to suggest that this is also what makes them so oppres sively, and so dangerously, political: political not in the partisan terms implied by the media consultant, but political in a far more insidious way; political insofar as **the universalized fantasy subtending the image of the child coercively shapes the structures within which the "political" itself can be thought. For politics, however radical the means by which some of its practioners 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.** What, in that case, would it signify not to be "fighting for the children"? How, then, to take the other "side" when to take a side at all necessarily constrains one to take the side of, by virtue of taking a side within, a political framework that compulsively returns to the child as the privileged ensign of the future it intend?” (18-19)