## 1

#### A] Interpretation: Affirmative debaters must defend the topic as confined by the resolution

#### B] Violation – they don’t; the aff is [here] embracing queer nation

#### C] standards:

#### [1] Predictable limits and ground – allowing the aff to arbitrarily dictate the grounds for the debate makes negative engagement impossible by skirting a predictable starting point and permitting infinite affs, which renders negative research useless and gives them an insurmountable prep advantage. Their model also creates a race to the margins where they’re incentivized to pick uncontestable advocacies like “racism is bad.” Aff infinite prep and frontlining means they always have the upper hand on whatever small clash I can generate.

#### Also, TVA solves –

#### 1] TVA- Defend that the queer nation bans space exploration by private entities

#### 2] TVA – Deem Space exploration is unjust as a method to disrupt the states ability to escape earth whenever you engage in guerilla warfare

#### 3] TVA – Deem Space exploration unjust as a method of counter-politics bcs it interferes with the interests of the state.

#### 4] TVA – Defend deeming space exploration unjust as a method of rupturing norms bcs the current world cenetred around productive bodies aims to explore outwards.

#### Even if there are disads to the TVA, the benefits outweigh – A] policy-making: cedeing the political lets the alt-right take over and pass more oppressive policies, we need to speak the language of the state B] turn: disads prove there’s neg ground which is the basis for valuable contestation; they aren’t entitled to the perfect aff.

#### [2] Prefer educated hope: we draw from the paranoid schizoid theory to demand more from the state – negativity is not mutually exclusive with revolutionary praxis

Duggan and Muñoz [Lisa and Jose; 2010; “Hope and hopelessness: A dialogue”; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07407700903064946>; Duggan is a prof of social and cultural analysis @ NYU, Muñoz was a Cuban American academic in the fields of performance studies, visual culture, queer theory, cultural studies, and critical theory; BP]

So there is fear attached to hope – hope understood as a risky reaching out for something else that will fail, in some if not all ways. What are the resources, then, for an educated hope that comprehends inherent risk and fear? What are the most reliable building blocks for, and the sturdiest bridges to, concrete utopias? I think these might be found in modes of expansive sociality that generate energy from shared collectivity. Expansive, innovative socialities produce energy for alternative, cooperative economies and participatory politics – because as we know, these can be exhausting even if not defined as ‘‘work.’’ Particularly as a basis for queer hope, loving, fucking and socializing otherwise constitute a practice that moves us toward Feeling Revolutionary, in our economic and political as well as (overlapping) intimate lives. Surely gay respectability politics and the sentimentality of the citizen who only wants to be ‘‘good,’’ now dominant on the US political landscape, do not lead us anywhere else, but only into the moribund institutions that deaden the body politic (marriage, the military). So bad sentiments can lead us (instead) out of dominant, alienating social forms, like alienated labor and the gendered family, and into a collectivity of the cynical, bitter, hostile, despairing and hopeless. This is how I find my people! Can these communities of the politically embittered then lead us, not necessarily down the slippery slope to entropy, but into a generatively energetic revolutionary force? Well, can they? If we cling to what Melanie Klein calls the paranoid schizoid position, perhaps not (see Klein 1975). In that infantile place, we reject the bad breast/world for frustrating us and cling to our impossible wishes for oral/political fulfillment, delivered under conditions we can control. One way of grasping the basis for embittered community is to see it as the political solidarity of the paranoid schizoid. And that’s not a bad thing. Regression to infantile intensities and demands can be vitalizing, can help us throw off the moribund maturities demanded by conventional social forms. Such regressions can operate as queer temporalities of anti-development and refusals of normative, Oedipal maturity. The paranoid schizoid pleasures can be considerable, and productive. But they can also lead to forms of anti-relationality, to anti-sociality, to queer refusals that go nowhere else in the world. Klein’s depressive position, if understood not as an achievement of developmental maturity, but as a sideways move out of an impasse (thank you to Kathryn Stockton), can lead (perhaps) to educated hope, to concrete utopia within the social realm.4 From the depressive position we accept the uncontrollable nature of political reality, we critique the social world but still engage it, we take the risk of hope with full knowledge of the possibility, even the certainty, of failure. We repair our relation to the social and political world that we have also wished to mutilate, explode, destroy. We campaign for Obama, then organize to pressure and transform the political institutions that disappoint or harm us. It hurts me to write a sentence as conventional as the previous one, as if I were an advocate of Rorty-style pragmatism, when my Facebook page describes me as an anti-normotic anarcho-socialist! This is the point at which I find the sideways move so crucial. Queer vitality, Feeling Revolutionary, may require that we straddle the Kleinian paranoid schizoid and depressive positions, escaping and re-entering the scene of educated hope in a contrapuntal dance, moving always sideways, never growing ‘‘up.’’ Can we summarize so far by simply and clearly pointing out that the neoliberal state and economy organize compulsory sociality through alienating institutions of work and politics? Noting that the related institutions of marriage and the family organize intimacy and sociality into domesticity and competitive consumption by regulating and constraining our intimate and social energies. Breaking out requires negative energetic force. That force threatens isolation, pain, poverty, prison and death, and it can also lock an embittered community into a romanticized embrace of the negative, a version of the paranoid schizoid position, producing (among other things) versions of what has been called the queer anti-social thesis.5 But that force can also lay the basis for a sideways step into political engagement in a disappointing world, via the educated hope, the concrete utopia, about which Jose ́ has been so eloquent. This all leads me to postulate that hope and hopelessness exist in a dialectical rather than oppositional relation, and that the opposite of hope is complacency – a form of happiness that will not risk the consequences of its own suppressed hostility and pain.6 And complacency is the affect of homonormativity. Engaged anti-normative left queer politics is powered by the pleasures of bitterness, cynicism and pain, as well as by ecstasy, empathy and solidarity. But it gestures always necessarily through hope to the concrete utopias forged in our experimental intimacies and social forms. Hope is the primary way we bring ourselves to take the risk of breaking out of the constraints of present conditions. Hope is the energy we use to smash, not depression (grief, sadness, despair, hostility, anger and bitterness) but complacency in all its protean disguises.

#### Fairness is a voter because it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game that requires effective competition to give meaning to the work we do and that benefit can only be actualized through an equal chance to prepare so the judge can decide.

ACCESSIBILITY FIRST

#### Filter impacts through intrinsic-ness – debate doesn’t make us loyal to any content – the only thing that happens is one debater wins and the other loses.

#### Fairness is the highest impact because it calls into question your ability to evaluate substance due to an incongruence in ability to debate – if one debater had ten minutes to speak and another had three, you can’t accurately decide the winner.

#### Impact turns to fairness are non-sensical and concede its validity – you follow rules created to ensure fair debate like speech times and assume the judge will evaluate your arguments fairly.

#### Drop the debater to set a precedent for the best norms of debate and to deter future abuse. Use competing interps because what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. And, don’t vote on the RVI on T 1] because it encourages debaters to bait theory 2] illogical – no one should win for being fair 3] develops a chilling affect against checking actual abuse

#### Fairness above the K

#### 1] Fairness is a prior question to effective dialogue – If fairness is bad writ large vote neg regardless of the flow because it’s unfair

#### 2] If the judge doesn't enforce fairness, none of your scholarship would pass since it would give them the unfair jurisdiction to reject it and vote you down. Even if they don't, rejecting fairness is a practice that would justify a bad norm, which all your arguments are predicated on anyways.

#### 3] We can’t compare or interact to find the best solution to oppression if the unfair nature of your arguments prevents me from strategizing. Fairness is an integral part of your solvency.

#### 4] Unfair practices would make kids quit debate if they can’t check it which means less people to spread your message to so the shell is a prior question.

#### Every reason fairness is a voter is a reason you can’t read substantive take-outs to the shell since it precludes your evaluation of them.

#### Theory isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. Theory doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time.

#### Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### Reject aff pre empts – not clearly delineated, impossible to know implications

## Case

### Debate Good

#### Debate is good: a] Survival – debate allows us to come up with the ways white supremacists will test black people in the real world – people reading anti-black strategies in a space like debate allows a safer platform to learn to combat those systems and apply it to their lives.

#### b] Debate bad is incoherent – debating about the validity of debate concedes the authority of debate since you’re using debate as a platform to reject it – means double bind either you can’t make change in debate so they have no solvency and vote for us on presumption or you can make change which means debate can make liberatory and good change.

#### c] The alternative to debate is tribalism – inability to test ideas forces people to heavily lean ideologically in one direction – that breeds white supremacy as it can isolate those with no experience of idea testing to what they’ve grown around which means it can enhance closed-mindedness and inability to question one’s own antiblack foundations.

### ROTB

#### ROB: Vote for better debater

#### Their ROTB is self serving, arbitrarily limits the scope of engagement, and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

#### Reject framing arguments that over parametricize content – debate should be an open forum to attack ideas from different directions – anything else brackets out certain modes of knowledge production which their ev would obviously disagree w/.