# 1NC

### 1NC – T

#### I don’t disclose my framework shell to prevent prepping it out and reading an abusive aff – you don’t disclose your 1AR counter interps / answers either –

#### Contact me if you have questions

## Case

### UV

#### Yes theory – key to check abuse

#### 1] Presume neg – A] aff has infinite prep to pick a strategic advocacy B] sets the debate C] first & last speech D] Disincentives affs that do nothing – they need to have a tangible change from the squo – key to neg ground

#### 2] No RVIs on Framework A] illogical to win for being fair B] Chills checking abuse which incentivizes further abuse C] Aff also gets theory – resolves skew D] Good responses check tradeoff – the neg is incentivized to only read theory with real abuse – resolves their norms

#### 3] We get new responses to their paradigm issues specific to the shell they read – ie we can’t make brightlines for reasonability if we don’t know the shell

#### 4] Don’t buy this contradictions bs – we can weigh in specific instances, and theory spikes bad – they are exclusionary and deck education -- don’t buy aff theory legit no matter what – new responses specific to the shell key

### Statephobia

#### Refusing the state is a concession to neoliberal rationalities that seek to drain the state of its vitalism and relevance—your radical resistance to authority is just more grist for the ideological mill of neoliberalism

Villadsen and Dean 2012 (Kaspar and Mitchell, Associate Professor of Sociology at Copenhagen Business School and Research Professo or Sociology at Newcastle University, “State-Phobia, Civil Society, and a Certain Vitalism”, *Constellations* 19.3)

Governmentality, in short, is an analysis of the state and not something that lies beyond it. It shows the conditions of experience of the “state” as that which confronts an external domain – civil society – to which it must grant a measure of free action in order for government to function. It grows out of a diagnosis of the present as one in which the state has come to be regarded as essentially despotic, the source of evil in the world, and as a repressive force that deforms our subjectivity, from the inside as much as the outside, limiting our potentiality in the world. For Foucault, this is a view shared not only by the ultra-left that seeks a violent overthrow of the state, but also by variants of neoliberalism in the twentieth century. This view is rooted in the anti-state eschatology of the nineteenth century, which has the notion of civil society at its core.¶ In Foucault’s context, to reject a theory of the state was to reject a Marxist theory of the state and to take note of anti-institutional movements in both liberal democracies and those opposed to state socialism. Today, any rejection of analyses conducted in statist terms takes place in a changed context: in the context of the repeated mantra of “governance” theorists who speak of a shift from government to governance and of a “hollowing out the state”; against the backdrop of conceptions of globalization that claim that global flows of trade, finance, information, and culture have undone the “container” of the national state39; and in the presence of political analyses that claim that struggles directed toward the state have been displaced by grassroots movements conducting sub-, micro-, and transversal politics underneath, across, and above the territorial state. In short, to reject a theory of the state in favor of an analysis of local struggles in the 1970s marked a break with a prevailing left intellectual problematic and an attempt to open up the discussion of government and state. In our own time, to dissolve the concept of the state has the opposite effect: it merely reinforces what has become a kind of anti-political orthodoxy that has rendered the left a meaningless term. This dissolution easily makes an accession to political agendas fatally shaped by the militant intellectual and political “thought collective” of which Foucault was an early analyst – to neoliberalism.40

#### State-phobia reifies the political ontology of neoliberalism

Oksala 2011 (Johanna, Senior Feminist Researcher at University of Helsinki, *Constellations* 18.3, “Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality”)

Many commentators now see the year 1979 when Foucault delivered his lecture series at the Colle`ge de France on neoliberal governmentality as the inauguration of the formal period of the dominance of neoliberal economic policy in Europe and the United States.8 Almost 30 years after its expanding application, Foucault’s topic and his insights appear farsighted, almost prophetic. His point in spending so long on the analysis of the history of neoliberalism was to show how it formed “his actuality.”9 He was concerned about the “state phobia” prevalent in the social critiques of his day. Similar to his aim in The History of Sexuality, vol. 1, which was to show that the fervent mission to liberate our repressed sexuality was fundamentally misguided, he was again trying to show how the most popular forms of social and political critique were in fact attacking the wrong enemy: “What is presently at issue in our reality. . .is not so much the growth of the state. . .but much more its reduction.”10 His problem was not the unlimited growth of the state, its omnipotence or its continuous and unified expansion. The risk was not that the unlimited expansion of the welfare state or the administrative apparatus on which it rested would inevitably lead to a totalitarian state like the Nazi or Stalinist state: “All those who share in the great state phobia should know that they are following the direction of the wind and that in fact, for years and years, an effective reduction of the state has been on the way.”11¶ Foucault criticised not only the tendency to demonise the state in political thought – to see it as the simple enemy and the root of all political problems – but also the attempts to theorise its essence: “The state is not a universal nor in itself an autonomous source of power. . .the state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities.”12 The idea of governmentality thus radically historicises the state and dissolves its fixed identity into a multiplicity of institutions, procedures, analyses and reflection, calculations, and tactics: “The state is a practice. . .inseparable from the set of practices by which the state actually became a way of governing, a way of doing things.13¶ What makes his philosophical interpretation of neoliberalism interesting and original in my view is his critical analysis of it, not as an ideology or a political doctrine, but as a specific, rationally reflected and coordinated way of governing: a form of governmental rationality or governmentality.14 Neoliberalism and the state cannot be understood as simply antithetical to each other when they are understood to combine in the form of a rationally coordinated set of governmental practices.¶ Hence, in signalling the reduction of the state Foucault did not claim that neoliberalism leads to a lack of actual government. Regarding political violence, this means that the rise of neoliberalism does not automatically amount to the reduction of state-violence. By approaching neoliberalism as a governmental rationality, Foucault attempted to show that neoliberal governmental intervention was no less dense, frequent, active, and continuous than any other system of governmental rationality. Only the domains and methods of governmental intervention were new.¶ Political critics of neoliberalism often argue that at the heart of the model is the idea that the job of government is not to govern, because it must subcontract the task to the more efficient and generally superior private sector. The political scientist Michel Wolfe, for example, has formulated this idea by comparing neoliberals trying to govern to vegetarian chefs trying to prepare a world-class boeuf bourguignon: if you believe that what you are called to do is wrong, you are unlikely to do it very well.15 Foucault’s analysis of neoliberalism as a form of governmental rationality questions this idea. The theoretical strength of his approach is that it construes neoliberalism not as lack of government, but as a specific governmental form and doctrine. It is a “governmental regime” that is directed towards specific objectives and regulates itself through continuous reflection.¶ Foucault’s lectures analyse in detail the historical shift from classical liberalism to neolib- eralism in order to highlight this. His aim is to identify the difference between them in order to grasp neoliberalism “in its singularity.”16 His usage of “neoliberalism” is non-standard from the current point of view because he traces its earliest form to 1930s Germany. The initial German form was represented by the proponents of the Freiburg School of economists such as Walter Eucken and Wilhelm Ro ̈pke, also called “Ordoliberals” after to the journal Ordo. It was strongly linked to the critique of Nazism and, after the War, to post-war reconstruction. The later, American form was the neoliberalism of the Chicago School, which was derived from the former but was in some respects more radical.17¶ For Foucault, neoliberalism was not just the revival of classical liberalism after a period of socialist dominance, but involved a fundamental shift within liberalism itself: on the level of political ontology, neoliberalism effected a move away from naturalism. 18 It did not only introduce some refinements to the liberal economic doctrine, but more importantly, it introduced a new political ontology: it was a form of anti-naturalism. Ordoliberals completely rethought the relations between economy and politics and, consequently, the whole of the liberal art of government.

#### And complete rejection of institutional logic crushes politics—vote NEG to invest in macro political solutions to counter neoliberalistic federal government policies

Kimberle **Crenshaw 88,** Law @ UCLA, “RACE, REFORM, AND RETRENCHMENT: TRANSFORMATION AND LEGITIMATION IN ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAW”, 101 Harv. L. Rev. 1331, lexis

Questioning the Transformative View: Some Doubts About Trashing The Critics' product is of limited utility to Blacks in its present form. The implications for Blacks of trashing liberal legal ideology are troubling, even though it may be proper to assail belief structures that obscure liberating possibilities. Trashing legal ideology seems to tell us repeatedly what has already been established -- that legal discourse is unstable and relatively indeterminate. Furthermore, trashing offers **no idea of how to avoid the negative consequences of engaging in reformist discourse** or how to work around such consequences. Even if we imagine the wrong world when we think in terms of legal discourse, **we must nevertheless exist in a present world** where legal protection has at times been a blessing -- albeit a mixed one. The fundamental problem is that, although Critics criticize law because it functions to legitimate existing institutional arrangements, it is precisely this legitimating function that has made law **receptive to** certain demands in this area. The Critical emphasis on deconstruction as the vehicle for liberation leads to the conclusion that engaging in legal discourse should be avoided because it reinforces not only the discourse itself but also the society and the world that it embodies. Yet Critics offer little beyond this observation. Their focus on delegitimating rights rhetoric seems to suggest that, once rights rhetoric has been discarded, there exists a more productive strategy for change, one which does not reinforce existing patterns of domination. Unfortunately, **no such strategy has yet been articulated**, and it is difficult to imagine that racial minorities will ever be able to discover one. As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward point out in their [\*1367] excellent account of the civil rights movement, popular struggles are a reflection of institutionally determined logic and a challenge to that logic. 137 **People can only demand change in ways that reflect the logic of the institutions that they are challenging**. 138 Demands for change that do not reflect the institutional logic -- that is, demands that do not engage and subsequently reinforce the dominant ideology -- will probably be **ineffective**. 139 The possibility for ideological change is created through the very process of legitimation, which is triggered by crisis. Powerless people can sometimes trigger such a crisis by challenging an institution internally, that is, by using its own logic against it. 140 Such crisis occurs when powerless people force open and politicize a contradiction between the dominant ideology and their reality. The political consequences [\*1368] of maintaining the contradictions may sometimes force an adjustment -- an attempt to close the gap or to make things appear fair. 141 Yet, because the adjustment is triggered by the political consequences of the contradiction, circumstances will be adjusted only to the extent necessary to close the apparent contradiction. This approach to understanding legitimation and change is applicable to the civil rights movement. Because Blacks were challenging their exclusion from political society, the only claims that were likely to achieve recognition were those that reflected American society's institutional logic: legal rights ideology. Articulating their formal demands through legal rights ideology, civil rights protestors exposed a series of contradictions -- the most important being the promised privileges of American citizenship and the practice of absolute racial subordination. Rather than using the contradictions to suggest that American citizenship was itself illegitimate or false, civil rights protestors proceeded as if American citizenship were real, and demanded to exercise the “rights” that citizenship entailed. By seeking to restructure reality to reflect American mythology, Blacks relied upon and ultimately benefited from politically inspired efforts to resolve the contradictions by granting formal rights. Although it is the need to maintain legitimacy that presents powerless groups with the opportunity to wrest concessions from the dominant order, it is the very accomplishment of legitimacy that forecloses greater possibilities. In sum, the potential for change is both created and limited by legitimation.

### CROB

#### The Role of the ballot is to evaluate the material consequences of the aff and neg world. Prefer:

#### A] Fairness—Arbitrary self-serving frameworks moot the 1NC and destroy our possibility of engaging with the affirmative.

#### B] Clash—Debate is about process of iterative testing through specific points of contestation. This turns the Aff—critical thinking skills through an unrestrained framework is necessary for any revolutionary strategy.

C] Their model doesn’t explain how to evaluate the debate when both debaters rupture normativity – only our ROB is evaluative

#### D] Rupturing normativity can be done BADLY which results in MORE violence – they don’t have a way to filter out bad from good –

#### If you buy their ROB: Vote negative without granting the aff any further speeches – that ruptures the normativity of debate, and if they stand up to give their speech or CX you negate under their ROB because they uphold normativity.

### Substance

#### Vote neg on presumption —

#### 1) They have no intrinsic benefit to reading their aff within debate and thus no reason to affirm their strategy.

#### 2) Movements don’t spill up – competition means you ally yourself with people who vote for you and alienate those who are forced to debate you ensuring the failure of the movement. Lepp talks about queer utopia in spaces of queerness – Debate is not a space of queerness – it’s a space of binaries – 1 winner and 1 loser is the binary that DEFINES debate – so this space is constructed to oppose your claims and you always fail

#### 3) The 1AC’s regurgitation of knowledge proves they’re not a departure from the status quo, but they get coopted by academia.

#### On Advocacy Text –

#### 1] Voting aff doesn’t criticize extending heteronormativity to space – governments are still anti-queer which means they don’t solve

#### 2] Everyone in this room will just move onto the tourney – you fail

#### 3] Resisting the shepherd requires LEARNING how the shepherd thinks and moves so you are ABLE to stray from the flock – that’s 1NC Zanotti – means our methodology is key to real-world solvency

#### Next, Oman-Reagan –

#### 1] No warrant -- Their ev says terraforming is anti-queer but it just makes life possible on Mars, there’s nothing anti-queer about living

#### 2] No credibility – its published on Medium by a random person – be skeptical of its academic value

#### 3] Their ev concedes suppression of queer identity was done through the military, a PUBLIC ENTITY, *and* reforms have led to enabling queer existence within the military – EDGEMONT IN BLUE

Oman-Reagan 15 [Michael Oman-Reagan, NO CREDENTIALS LOL, 09-11-2015, "Queering Outer Space," Medium, <https://medium.com/space-anthropology/queering-outer-space-f6f5b5cecda0>] //EDGEMONT AA

Astronaut Sally Ride was queer, a fact that wasn’t publicly revealed until after her death. Of 330 American astronauts, that means one has been identified as queer, and only after death. Part of this is certainly related to the fact that most astronauts came to the program through the military, which until recently didn’t allow queer identity to exist openly.

#### 4] This proves A) Public entities means the 1AC doesn’t solve anything B) private entities aren’t the problem C) Progress is possible – queer identity is now possible for astronauts, which means queer methods can be inserted into space – the net benefit is allowing an access to space -- they say they just need to prove the resolution is a true statement – that requires viewing consequences – that’s how people are affected – means weighing public vs private is key – ie some harms is better than all the harms

#### 5] They say space is queer so Space exploration is key to accessing queer spaces – the aff is blocking queer bodies from accessing the freedom and queerness of space

#### Munoz

#### Spade

#### Stanley

#### Brammer

#### Paur

#### Psarrou