## 1

#### A. Interpretation: : The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense

#### Multiple ways the AC violates: aff mentions a vague ROB in the form of an impossible standard for the neg with no link to offence

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Engagement

#### 2. Strat Skew

#### Framing:

#### D. Voter: Fairness first and it’s a voter

#### 1] Fairness is constitutive process of debate 2] Self Defeating-

#### Education is a voter

#### Drop the

#### Use competing interps

## 2

#### US outer space goals are decided on by what bodies can succeed in space. Dreams of colonization are particularly insidious because they discuss only heterosexual sex and female bodies as only for reproduction. This framework solidifies heterosexual male bodies as the superior standard to compare all other ways of being.

Penny Griffin Senior Lecturer University of New South Wales B.A. Hons. (French and Politics), MSc. International Relations, MSc. Research Methods, Ph.D. Politics and International Relations (UNIVERSITY of Bristol) School of Social Sciences Jan 30 2009 Securing Outer Space: International Relations Theory and the Politics of Space Chapter from the Book: Securing Outer Space: International Relations Theory and the Politics of Space Edited by Natalie Bormann, Michael Sheehan Routledge pages 59-74]cdm/eec

The operations of gender as a norm, and normalizing principle, in dis- courses of outer space need nor be explicit. The reproduction of heteronormative gender identity(ics) instead implicitly governs the 'social intelligibility of action", to borrow Butler's terminology, in outer space; that is, it governs the means by which the politics of outer space makes sense. Hereronormative, heterosexist gender confurarions reside, for example, in discussions of the viability of outer space exploration and human spaceflight, where human involvement in space is articulated as inherently exciting, dangerous and challenging, both technically and psychologically (see, e.g. Manzey 2004; Mendell 2005; Seguin 2005). Outer space exploration and colonization is heavily naturalized in US discourse as an inevitability of human activity, rather than a simple possibility. What can and cannot be done in and/or to space are defined according to those physical, hormonal and performative forms (re)produced and normalized according to heteronormative, heterosexual, discursive parameters. If, for example, humans are to colonize space, as much scientific writing would have us believe, it is essential that they perform reproductively: human sexuality in space is thus framed and reified such that it pertains only to heterosexual intercourse, and women appear only in reference to their 'sexual nature and procreative function\* (Casper and Moore 1995: 319). In January 2006, for example, NewScientist.com revealed that of its top ten most accessed space stories of 2005, the most popular was the aptly named report, 'Our-of-This-World Sex Could Jeopardise Missions' (McKec 2005). Thirteen years after a married couple were first sent on a space shuttle mission, prompting at the time a flurry of public curiosity and controversy concerning 'celestial intimacy' (Casper and Moore 1995: 312), the New Scientist's article opens with the line, 'sex and romanric entangle-ments among astronauts could detail missions to Mars and should therefore be studied by NASA". NASA has already long been studying the prospect of sex (as sexual intercourse) in outer space. As the Nap Scientist's article goes on to make clear, however, 'the question of sexuality' and 'sexual issues' in space- flight and future outer space exploration is essentially, for NASA at least, a question of heterosexuality. Humans, suggests Crawford, 'bring speed, agility, versatility and intelligence to exploration in a way that robots cannot', justifying to many the employment of astronauts as 'field scientists' on other planets (Crawford 2005: 252). The consistent discursive articulation of" outer space as a frontier, a "threshold' for human intervention requiring the utmost in human performance, depends on a regulatory framework wherein 'humanity' is able consistently and without obstacle (material, psychological or otherwise) to seize the challenge of\* exploiting and controlling its natural environment and resources. Rarely conceived of purely in technological, aphysical terms, Space is a politics (in US discourse) entirely constituted in reference to the corporeal attributes of the (neo-liberally) human. Within the heteronormative, heterosexual, regulatory framework of US outer space discourse, the ideal, space-able, individual is constructed and reproduced within an unspoken bur unequivocal heteronormative framework of reproductive sexuality, as a model that others should approximate: a person, evolved of heterosexual binaries, who is reactive but calm, reproductive bur sexually restrained, agile but not hyperactive, versatile but not sexually ambiguous, rational but not mechanical, adventurous but competent (see, e.g. Seguin 2005). Located within a 'masculine context", such a framework has only solidified the sense of male bodies existing as the norm against which female bodies are evaluated, and male physiology the standard by which female bodies are judged (Casper and Moore 1995: 316-319). This regulatory masculinism has undoubtedly resulted in the overwhelming dominance of male astronauts in space. Although the first American female went into space in 1983, in 2001 of an active astronaut corps of 158, only thirty-five were women (NASA 2001), and of the 2004 class of astronauts, only two of eleven were female (NASA 200\*1). But the predominance of male astronauts also stems from the gendered nature of space discourse itself. The quest to conquer space that began with the Cold War 'space race' has long been coded (heterosexually) masculine, dependent on an articulation of masculine prowess realized through gendered assumptions of physical and technical expertise, strength, endurance and intelligence. The portrayal of the earliest astronauts as popular heroes in the US media, and beyond (Bush, for example, pays homage, in 2004, to two of the 'veterans' of the space age, Tom DcLay and Senator Bill Nelson), sedimcnteel an image of masculine achievement that, although highly contingent on the militarized aggressively of Cold War discourse at that time, has proved enduring. Armstrong's famous announcement that the Apollo 1 1 Moon landing was 'one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind' thus in this instance Speaks more specifically than universally, a continuation of the Western history's overarching belief in men's 'natural' ability, indeed prerogative, to conquer for the good of everyone.

#### The affirmative prioritization on the protection of future children and generations places the burden on the present to reproduce or be condemned, marking a pervasive and disastrous heteronormativity.

Lee Edelman is a professor in the English Department at Tufts University. Lee Edelman began his academic career as a scholar of twentieth-century American poetry. He has since become a central figure in the development, dissemination, and rethinking of queer theory. His current work explores the intersections of sexuality, rhetorical theory, cultural politics, and film. He holds an appointment as the Fletcher Professor of English Literature and has served as the Chair of the English Department. He gained international recognition for his books about queer theory, post-structuralism, psychoanalytic theory, and cultural studies. He has a Ph.D. from Yale University, a M. Phil. from Yale, an M.A. from Yale, and a B.A. from Northwestern University. Duke University Press 2004 [“No Future Queer Theory and the Death Drive” available online at http://zinelibrary.info/files/Edelman%20-%20No%20Future%20-%20Queer%20Theory%20and%20the%20Death%20Drive.pdf]eec

Thus, while lesbians and gay men by the thousands work for the right to marry, to serve in the military, to adopt and raise children of their own, the political right, refusing to acknowledge these comrades in reproductive futurism, counters their efforts by inviting us to kneel at the shrine of the sacred Child: the Child who might Witness lewd or inappropriately intimate behavior; the Child who might find information about dangerous "lifestyles" on the Internet; the Child who might choose a pro­ vocative book from the shelves of the public library; the Child, in short, who might find an enjoyment that would nullify the figural value, itself imposed by adult desire, of the Child as unmarked by the adult's adulterating implication in desire itself; the Child, that is, made to image, for the satisfaction of adults, an Imaginary fullness that's considered to want, and therefore to want for, nothing. As Lauren Berlant argues force­ fully at the outset of The Queen of America Goes to Washington City, "a nation made for adult citizens has been replaced by one imagined for fetuses and children." 22 On every side, our enjoyment of liberty is eclipsed by the lengthening shadow of a Child whose freedom to develop undisturbed by encounters, or even by the threat of potential encounters, with an "otherness” of which its parents, its church, or the state do not approve, uncompromised by any possible access to what is painted as alien desire, terroristically holds us all in check and determines that political discourse conform to the logic of a narrative wherein history unfolds as the future envisioned for a Child who must never grow up. Not for nothing, after all, does the historical construction of the homosexual as distinctive social type overlap with the appearance of such literary creations as Tiny Tim, David Balfour, and Peter Pan, who enact, in an imperative most evident today in the uncannily intimate connection between Harry Potter and Lord Voldemort, a Symbolic resistance to the unmarried men (Scrooge, Uncle Ebenezer, Captain Hook) who embody, as Voldemort's name makes clear, a wish, a will, or a drive toward death that entails the destruction of the Child. That Child, immured in an innocence seen as continuously under seige, condenses a fantasy of vulnerability to the queerness of queer sexualities precisely insofar as that Child enshrines, in its form as sublimation, the very value for which queerness regularly finds itself condemned: an insistence on sameness that intends to re­ store an Imaginary past. The Child, that is, marks the fetishistic fixation of heteronormativity: an erotically charged investment in the rigid same­ness of identity that is central to the compulsory narrative of reproductive futurism.

#### Impact - The regulatory norm of heterosexuality denies subjectivity and invokes social death on deviant identity performances. This serves to sacrifice the survival of bodies defiant to the norm of heteronormativity.

María do Mar Castro Varela is Professor for Gender and Queer Studies at the Alice Salomon University Berlin, Germany Nikita Dhawan is Junior Professor of Gender and Postcolonial Studies at Goethe-University Frankfurt, Germany 2011 [“Hegemony and Normativity: Revisiting the Political in Queer Politics - Chapter 4: Normative Dilemmas and the Hegemony of Counter-Hegemony pages 92-96]cdm

This brings us back to our initial question, namely, how does heterosexuality become hegemonic? It is important to clarify that heteronormativity is not a simple account of the fact that the majority of the population is 'heterosexual'; rather it is a critical term that unfolds how heterosexuality operates 'within social practices as the implicit standard of normalization' (Butler 2004: 41) inciting each of us to conform to heterosexual standards. Another important aspect of heteronormativity is the mutual constitution of normative heterosexuality and the rigid binary gender order, whereby there arc only two genders and one can only belong to one category at a time. As an intrinsic aspect of 'normalizing society', heterosexuality may be coercively implemented through an edict or law but generally operates much more subtly as a 'disciplinary norm' affecting every aspect of daily life, informing social relations and influencing public policy (Foucault 2003: 39). Heteronormativity as a concept is not simply the detection of discrimination against non-normative sexualities and bodies; rather it unpacks the extent to which everyone, straight or queer, is expected to consent to the heterosexual norm, so that 'heterosexual desire and identity are not merely assumed, they arc ... rewarded and privileged' (Chambers and Carver 2008: 145). Here it is instructive to bear in mind Foucault's insightful analysis on processes of production of consent. He argues that we should not ask why and how subjects agree to being subjugated but rather should focus on how hegemony manufactures subjects (Foucault 2003: 45). How are certain bodies, gestures, desires and pleasures identified and constituted as heterosexual and thereby as normative? How do diverse operations of hegemony support and reinforce one another, thereby guaranteeing that they function (2003: 45-6)? Here, subjects are not 'inert or consenting targets of power'; rather, as Foucault argues, 'power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them' (2003: 29). This unfolds how politics governs social and sexual relations; it also determines the mechanisms of regulation of that which is to be regulated. Any attempt to denaturalize gender through the critique of heteronormativity is deeply linked to uncovering the 'normative violence implied by ideal morphologies of sex and to uproot the pervasive assumptions about natural or presumptive heterosexuality' (Butler 1999: xx). Normative violence is the violence of particular norms that determine not only who ultimately counts as human, but also regulates what is legible and intelligible within a specific framework. Those vulnerable to not being recognized as legitimate subjects risk 'social death' (Mills 2007: 137). In our everyday understanding, violence is seen to be exerted on an autonomous subject, whereby it is condemned precisely because it violates the subject's sovereignty. In contrast, normative violence is not exerted on preformed subjects but exercised in the formation of subjectivity. Gender norms exert violence on those bodies that violate such norms (Chambers and Carver 2008: 76), whereas those who conform to the norms profit. The body docs not exist prior to violence; instead it is constituted through it, thereby being an effect rather than simply a recipient of violence. Furthermore, Butler's notion of normative violence does not attribute the agency of violence to erring homophobes but to the norms themselves, so that normative violence both enables typical physical violence, while simultaneously erasing the trace of the violence (2008: 76). Thus the capacity of norms to exert violence is twofold: On the one hand there is the occasional and incidental violence that relates to the particular manifestation of the norm. On the other hand is the violence internal to norms by virtue of their constitutive 'world- making' and 'reality-conferring capacity\* (Mills 2007: 140).One of the biggest challenges lies in the difficulty of making normative violence visible - unfolding how 'norms of recognition function to produce and to deproduce the notion of the human' (Hurler 2004: 32), thereby making some lives 'impossible' and 'unlivable' (1999: viii). Certain forms of violence are deemed as legitimate and permissible, since those at the receiving end fall outside the hegemonic norms of recognition. The threat of violence in the face of non-compliance with hegemonic norms is a constant reminder that to defy norms is to court death (2004: 34). The very possibility of a 'lived life' depends on being recognized as a legitimate and legible subject. Normative intelligibility is deeply linked to survival, as 'we continue to live in a world in which one can risk serious disenfranchisement and physical violence for the pleasure one seeks, the fantasy one embodies, the gender one performs' (2004: 214).

#### The Alternative is to refuse every substantiation of a future for any queer identity. The only ethical queer politics is the death drive. The space outside of the Symbolic that resists the liberal narrative of a viable future for any queer might reveal how our current social constitution makes an affirmative queerness impossible.

Lee Edelman is a professor in the English Department at Tufts University. Lee Edelman began his academic career as a scholar of twentieth-century American poetry. He has since become a central figure in the development, dissemination, and rethinking of queer theory. His current work explores the intersections of sexuality, rhetorical theory, cultural politics, and film. He holds an appointment as the Fletcher Professor of English Literature and has served as the Chair of the English Department. He gained international recognition for his books about queer theory, post-structuralism, psychoanalytic theory, and cultural studies. He has a Ph.D. from Yale University, a M. Phil. from Yale, an M.A. from Yale, and a B.A. from Northwestern University. Duke University Press 2004 [“No Future Queer Theory and the Death Drive” available online at http://zinelibrary.info/files/Edelman%20-%20No%20Future%20-%20Queer%20Theory%20and%20the%20Death%20Drive.pdf]cdm

For politics, however radical the means by which specific constituencies attempt to produce a more desirable social order, remains, at its core, conservative insofar as it works to affirm a structure, to authenticate social order, which it then intends to transmit to die future in the form of its inner Child. That Child remains the perpetual horizon of every acknowledged politics, the fantasmatic beneficiary of every political intervention. Even proponents of abortion rights, while promoting the free- dom of women to control theirown bodies through reproductive choice, recurrently frame their political struggle, mirroring their anti-abortion foes, as a "fight for our children—for our daughters and our sons," and thus as a fight for the future.2 What, i n that case, would it signify not to be " righting forthe children"? How could one take the other "side," when taking any side at all necessarily constrains one to take the side 0/ by virtue of taking a side within, a political order that returns to the Child as the image of the future it intends? Impossibly, against all reason, my project stakes its claim to the very space that "politics" makes unthink-able: the space outside the framework within which politics as we know it appears and so outside the conflict of visions that share as their presupposition that the body politic must survive. Indeed, at the heart of my polemical engagement with the cultural text of politics and the politics of cultural texts lies a simple provocation: that queeness names the side of those not "fighting for the children," the side outside the consensus by which all politics confirms the absolute value of reproductive futurism. The ups and downs of political fortune may measure the social order's pulse, but queemess, by contrast, figures, outside and beyond its politi- cal symptoms, the place of the social order's death drive: a place, to be sure, of abjection expressed in the stigma, sometimes fatal, that follows from reading that figure literally, and hence a place from which liberal politics strives—and strives quite reasonably, given its unlimited faith in reason—to disassociate the queer. More radically, though, as I argue here, queerness attains its ethical value precisely insofar as it accedes to that place, accepting its figural status as resistance to the viability of the social while insisting on the inextricability of such resistance from every social structure. To make such a claim I examine in this book the pervasive invocation of the Child as the emblem of futurity's unquestioned value and propose against it the impossjblejioject ofa\_ queer oppositionality that would oppose itself to the structural determinants of politics as such, which is also to say, that would oppose itself to the logic of opposition. This paradoxical formulation suggests a refusal—the appropriately perverse refusal that characterizes queer theory—of every substantialization of identity, which is always oppositionally defined and, by extension, of history as linear narrative (the poor man's teleology) in which meaning succeeds in revealing itself—as rtw!f— through time. Far from partaking of this narrative movement toward a viable political future, far from per- petuating the fantasy of meaning's eventual realization, the queer comes to figure the bar to every realization of Futurity, the resistance, internal to the social, to every social structure or form. Rather than rejecting, with liberal discourse, this ascription of negativity to the queer, we might, as I argue, do better to consider accepting and even embracing it. Not in the hope of forging thereby some more per-fect social order—such a hope, after all, would only reproduce the con- straining mandate of futurism, just as any such order would equallyocca- sion the negativity of the queer—but rather to refuse the insistence of hope itself as affirmation, which is always affirmation of an order whose refusal will register as unthinkable, irresponsible, inhumane. And the trump card of affirmation? Always the question-. If not this, what? Always the demand to translate the insistence, the pulsivejorce, of negativity into' some determinate stance or "position" whose determination would thus negate it: always the imperative to immure it in some stable and posi- tive jbrm. When I argue, then, that we might do well to attempt what is surely impossible—to withdraw our allegiance, however compulsory, from a reality based on the Ponzi scheme of reproductive futurism—I do not intend to propose some "good" that will thereby be assured. To the contrary, I mean to insist that nothing, and certainly not what we call the "good," can ever have any assurance at all in the order of the Symbolic. Abjuring fidelity to a fiiturism that's always purchased at our expense, though bound, as Symbolic subjects consigned to figure the Symbolic's undoing, to the necessary contradiction of trying to turn its intelligi- bility against itself, we might rather, figuratively, cast our vote for "none of the above," for the primacy of a constant no in response to the law of the Symbolic, which would echo that law's foundational act, its self- constituting negation. The structuring optimism of politics to which the order of meaning commits us, installing as it does the perpetual hope of reaching meaning through signification, is always, I would argue, a negation of this primal, constitutive, and negative act. And the various positivities produced in its wake by the logic of political hope depend on the mathematical illusion that negated negations might somehow es- cape, and not redouble, such negativity. My polemic thus stakes its fortunes on a truly hopeless wager: that taking the Symbolic's negativity to the very letter of the law, that attending to the persistence of something internal to reason that reason refuses, that turning the force of queerness against all subjects, however queer, can afford an access to the jouissance that at once defines and negates us. Or better, can expose the constancy, the inescapability, of such access to jouissance the social order itself, even if that order can access its constant access to jouissance only in the process of abjecting that constancy of access onto the queer.

#### The ROB is to examine method first. The ontology at which the affirmative came to their conclusions is marred in a destructive paradigm. We have to evaluate the genesis of these ideas, before discussing and evaluating plan action. A Queer Method problematizes constructions of norms and creates space for deviant bodies to poke holes in the construction of norms that do violence. Theory comes first under our fwk because it create the best enviornment for queer people setting good norms. Offense under our ROB is pre and post fiat showing change how we operate in the space and in space. Offenseis anything that helps queer people and stopping violence vs them.

E. Manning, BA, BSW, MSW University of Victoria 2009 [“Queerly Disrupting Methodology” pages 1-11 available online at: http://www.kvinfo.su.se/femmet09/papers/pdf/Manning.pdf]cdm

Additionally, I use queer as a verb. To queer something is to question normalcy by problematize its apparent neutrality and objectivity. Britzman (1998: 82) locates what queer theory can do as a practice: “Queer theory is not an affirmation, but an implication. Its bothersome and unapologetic imperatives are explicitly transgressive, perverse, and political”. Queer resists definition, uniformity and cohesion. It examines how normal is made specifically with regards to sexuality. Heteronormativity took root in queer theory as it made explicit how heterosexuality positions itself as neutral, normative and dominant. Similarly, the “new homonormativity” is a set of “politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions but upholds and sustains them” (Duggan 2003: 50). Duggan explains how these neo-liberal views get taken up by gay men and lesbians as a way to normalize their existences. I argue drawing these lines of normalcy is done at the expense of queer, trans and intersex people and reconstitutes us as invisible and deviant. In response, I take up queer in multiple ways to expand on its relationality, disruptions to normativity and intrinsic deviance. Although the violation of compulsory sex/gender relations is one of the topics most frequently addressed within queer theory, this body of knowledge rarely considers the implications of an enforced sex/gender system for people who have defied it, who live outside it, or who have been killed because of it. (Namaste 2003: 9) Transgenderists, feminists, and some queer theorists (Fausto-Sterling 1997; Stryker 2006; Wilchins 2004), push queer theory beyond simply examining the discursive production of sexuality. Where queer theory primarily disrupts the seemingly stable categories of homosexual and heterosexual, gender and transgender theories take this disruption further by problematizing how sex and gender are socially constructed and required. Gender and transgender theories also tease out neo-liberal agendas embedded in the hegemonic lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) movement. These theories offer ways to not only make visible and centre intersex, transsexual, transgender, two-spirit, pansexual and queer people within discourses where we have often been objects, but critique the “natural” construction of sex much touted by science. Disturbing Ontology Modernist ontology permeates multiple research methodologies. “An ontology is a theory about what the world is like – what the world consists of, and why” (italics added, Strega 2005: 201). Modernist ontology inscribes binary constructs in a way that maintains sexual and gender dominance. When researchers fail to question the dualistic nature inherent in certain methodologies, these social, physical and political hierarchies are perpetuated. Methodologies located in positivist paradigms are marked by dichotomous ways of being and thinking, yet some interpretative and emancipatory methodologies are also influenced by this ontology. Conversely, 3 ontologies that embrace complexity, multiplicity and inconsistency are more likely to be useful in producing queer methodologies. Queer methodologies need a “continuous questioning and deconstruction of all knowledge,” particularly knowledges claiming objectivity and truth (Hammers & Brown 2004: 88). During the ‘Age of Reason,’ modernist practice produced and classified knowledge (Hall & Gieben 1992: 8). “Deeply embedded in these [modernist] constructs are systems of classification and representation, which lend themselves easily to binary oppositions, dualisms, and hierarchical orderings of the world” (Tuhiwai Smith 1999: 55). These binary constructs are not limited to sex and sexuality, but also significantly frame constructions of race, ability, etc. Somerville (2000) describes how race and sexuality were classified and enmeshed to construct deviant, knowable and subordinate objects. Wittig (1980: 210) points out, “this necessity of the different/other is an ontological one for the whole conglomerate of sciences and disciplines” she calls the “straight mind”. Positivist scientists view these classifications as objective, neutral and true suggesting they are removed from all social, cultural and political influences. Numerous theorists (Fausto-Sterling 1997 & 2000; Foucault 1990; Hammers & Brown 2004; Tuhiwai Smith 1999) critique science for its claims of objectivity, which produce “patriarchal knowledge and work against knowledge of the realities of gender relations” (Ramazanoglu & Holland 2002: 49). Adrienne Rich (1987, cited in Hammers & Brown 2004: 85) argues, “objectivity is a term given to men’s subjectivity”. To work against objectivity and to position subjectivity in research is necessary in queer methodologies. Although I do not want to position subjectivity as the opposing binary mate to objectivity (as this would be contradictory to my claims of rejecting binaries), I propose to problematize subjectivity by exposing the complexity and contradictions within one’s own subjectivity. In interpretative and emancipatory research paradigms, a researcher can reproduce dominant modernist representations by restricting their own complexity to a binary identification as an insider or outsider. Several feminist theorists complicate the insider/outsider quandary by blurring or queering the line between these dichotomies. Fine (1998: 135) ‘works the hyphen’ between Self and Other and suggests “researchers probe how we are in relation with the contexts we study and with our informants, understanding that we are all multiple in those relations”. Tang (2006: 14) explores occupying insider and outsider roles by “oscillating” between each role, “signifying both being hesitant or embracing of the roles participants might have allocated for me…[having] the agency to switch in between roles if necessary or to remain straddling in ambiguity”. Lal (1996: 196) questions the politics of self in proposing, “with each threshold of an insider boundary that one crosses, there would seem to be another border zone available for one’s definition as outsider”. In these ways, subjectivity can and should become murky, unstable and contradictory by resisting a clear and contained identification within the insider/outsider polarity. Hammers & Brown (2004: 87) point out, “ ‘situating’ of oneself…would not only re-organize the researcher(subject) - researched(object) relationship to be one that is non-hierarchical, equitable, and respectful, but make as central direct, material experience and reality”. Although identifying one’s subjectivity does not entirely level the power dynamics within research, I agree 4 it is necessary to resist claims of objectivity while helping to identify power relations at work within a research project. Subjectivity also allows for multiplicity and complexity to be within the research – something that objectivity would clearly reject. Subjectivity and reflexivity within research is well grounded in feminist and emancipatory research approaches. What I hope to promote is a kind of subjectivity that complicates, questions and deconstructs power relations, discourses and working assumptions within queer methodologies. I see value in claiming space for queer subjectivities so those objectified by science can tell our own stories and lay claim to knowledges previously made deviant and invisible. However, my specific interest is to expose the techniques/technologies of making normal. I am particularly interested in queer methodologies that examine how those who study non-normative sexes, genders and sexualities discursively produce us. My unapologetic and purposeful mission is to poke holes in, deconstruct and destabilize the hegemonic understandings that have classified, ignored, persecuted and killed us. For me, my politics of resistance is deeply rooted in my subjectivity. My subjectivity positions my ontological perspective to incorporate queer, two-spirit, trans, intersex and non-normative sexed, gendered and sexual people within the world. Because of its multiplicity, complications and contradictions, a queer ontology challenges modernist ideas of binary, stable categories. As ontology shapes what existences are made possible and visible, a queer methodology reveals and makes possible queer and trans lives, experiences and encounters. A queer methodology therefore has a distinct ontology and epistemology. Although queer remains elusive, contextual and unstable and should continue to resist solidification, a queer methodology is most incongruent with research paradigms rooted in a dichotomous way of thinking and being epitomized in classical sciences such as biology, psychiatry, and medicine.