## K

1. **Politics is inherently anti-queer – violence to queers is inevitable because civil society is founded on the abuse and domination over queer bodies, the aff links by talking about creating new utopian political systems, we need to tear them down.**

**Gang 09** Mary Nardini Gang 2009 (criminal queers from Milwaukee, Wisconsin “toward the queerest insurrection” 2009) https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/mary-nardini-gang-toward-the-queerest-insurrection

A fag is bashed because his gender presentation is far too femme. A poor transman can’t afford his life-saving hormones. A sex worker is murdered by their client. A genderqueer persyn is raped because ze just needed to be “fucked straight”. Four black lesbians are sent to prison for daring to defend themselves against a straight-male attacker. [[3]](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/mary-nardini-gang-toward-the-queerest-insurrection#fn3) Cops beat us on the streets and our bodies are being destroyed by pharmaceutical companies because we can’t give them a dime. **Queers experience**, directly with our bodies, **the violence and domination of this world.** **Class, Race, Gender, Sexuality, Ability; while often these interrelated** and overlapping **categories of oppression are lost to abstraction, queers are forced to physically understand each. We’ve had our bodies and desires stolen from us, mutilated and sold back to us as a model of living we can never embody.** Foucault says that “power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the processes which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.” **We experience the complexity of domination and social control** amplified through heterosexuality. When police kill us, we want them dead in turn. When prisons entrap our bodies and rape us because our genders aren’t similarly contained, of course we want fire to them all. When borders are erected to construct a national identity absent of people of color and queers, we see only one solution: every nation and border reduced to rubble. **The perspective of queers within the heteronormative world is a lens through which we can critique and attack the apparatus** of capitalism.We can analyze the ways in which Medicine, the Prison System, the Church, **the State**, Marriage, the Media, Borders, **the Military and Police are used to control and destroy us.** More importantly, **we can use these cases to articulate a cohesive criticism of every way that we are alienated and** **dominated.** Cooper’s Donuts was an all night donut shop on a seedy stretch of Main Street in Los Angeles. It was a regular hangout for street queens and queer hustlers at all hours of the night. Police harassment was a regular fixture of the Cooper’s, but one May night in 1959, the queers fought back. What started with customers throwing donuts at the police escalated into full-on street fighting. In the ensuing chaos, all of the donut-wielding rebels escaped into the night. **Queer is a position from which to attack the normative** more, a position from which to understand and attack the ways in which normal is reproduced and reiterated. In destabilizing and problematizing normalcy, we can destabilize and become a problem for the Totality.

**Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater who best utilizes the position of queerness to challenge anti-queer structures, like the State.**

**Violence against queer people is overkill – overkill is ontologically different from other types of violence – it’s an attempt to do violence on all queer bodies thus, pushing queers out of existence. Don’t let them weigh their case – their impact calculus will never understand what it means to do violence to that which is nothing.**

**Stanley 11** (Eric, Sad Gay “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)

Overkill is a term used to indicate[s] such excessive violence that it pushes a body beyond death. Overkill is often determined by the postmortem removal of body parts, as with the partial decapitation in the case of Lauryn Paige and the dissection of Rashawn Brazell. The temporality of violence, **the biological time when the heart stops pushing and pulling blood, yet the killing is not finished**, suggests the aim is not simply the end of a specific life, but the ending of all queer life. This is the time of queer death, when the utility of violence gives way to the pleasure in the other’s mortality. If queers**, along with others,** approximate nothing**,** then **the task of ending, of** killing that which is nothing must go beyond normative **times of life and** death. **In other words, if Lauryn was dead after the first few stab wounds to the throat, then what do the remaining fifty wounds signify?** The legal theory that is offered **to nullify the practice of overkill often functions under the name of the trans- or gay-panic defense. Both of these defense strategies** argue[s] that the murderer **became so enraged after the “discovery” of either genitalia or someone’s sexuality they** [was] forced to protect themselves from **the threat of** queerness. **Estanislao Martinez of Fresno, California, used the trans-panic defense and received a four-year prison sentence after admittedly stabbing J. Robles, a Latina transwoman, at least twenty times with a pair of scissors. Importantly, this defense is often used, as in the cases of Robles and Paige, after the murderer has engaged in some kind of sex with the victim. The logic of the trans-panic defense as an explanation for overkill, in its gory semiotics, offers us a way of understanding queers as the nothing of Mbembe’s query.** Overkill names the technologies necessary to do away with that which is already gone. Queers then are the specters of life whose threat is so unimaginable that one is “forced,” not simply to murder, but to push them backward out of time, out of History, and into that which comes before. 27 In thinking the overkill of Paige and Brazell, I return to Mbembe’s query, “But what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing?**”**28 This question in its elegant brutality repeats with each case I offer. By resituating this question in the positive, the “something” that is more often than not translated as the human is made to appear. Of interest here, the category of the human assumes generality, yet can only be activated through the specificity of historical and politically located intersection. To this end, the human, the “something” of this query, within the context of the liberal democracy, names rights-bearing subjects, or those who can stand as subjects before the law. The human, then, makes the nothing not only possible but necessary. Following this logic, the work of death, of the death that is already nothing, not quite human, binds the categorical (mis)recognition of humanity. The human, then, resides in the space of life and under the domain of rights, whereas the queer inhabits the place of compromised personhood and the zone of death. As perpetual and axiomatic threat to the human, the queer is the negated double of the subject of liberal democracy. Understanding the nothing as the unavoidable shadow of the human serves to counter the arguments that suggest overkill and antiqueer violence at large are a pathological break and that the severe nature of these killings signals something extreme. In contrast, overkill is precisely not outside of, but is that which constitutes liberal democracy as such. Overkill then is the proper expression to the riddle of the queer nothingness. Put another way, the spectacular material-semiotics of overkill should not be read as (only) individual pathology; these vicious acts must indict the very social worlds of which they are ambassadors. Overkill is what it means, what it must mean, to do violence to what is nothing.

**The alternative is an affirmation of pure negativity – we choose NOT to establish a place for queers, NOT to partake in failed methods of queer politics**

**This is another link for the aff, the aff embraces utopianism and an “ideal future”, instead we embrace a continuous struggle of negativity against every possible form of civil society. This is how to better the racial marginalized groups mentioned in the AC.**

**Baedan 12** Baedan. The Anarchist Library. N.p., Summer 2012. Web. 02 Nov. 2016. https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan

Leftist notions of reform, progress**, tolerance,** and social justice always come up against the harsh reality that any progressive development **can** only mean a more sophisticated system of misery and exploitation; that tolerance means **nothing;** that justice is an impossibility. **Activists**, progressive and revolutionary alike, **will always respond to our critique of the social order with a demand that we articulate some sort of alternative.** Let us say once and for all that we have none to offer.Faced with the system’s seamless integration of all positive projects into itself, we can’t afford to affirm or posit any more alternatives for it to consume.Rather we must realize that our task is infinite, not because we have so much to build but because we have an entire world to destroy. Our daily life is so saturated and structured by capital that it is impossible to imagine a life worth living, except one of revolt. We understand destruction to be necessary, and we desire it in abundance. We have nothing to gain through shame or lack of confidence in these desires. There cannot be freedom in the shadow of prisons, there cannot be human community in the context of commodities, there cannot be self-determination under the reign of a state. This world—the police and armies that defend it, the institutions that constitute it, the architecture that gives it shape,the subjectivities that populate it**,** the apparatuses that administer its function, the schools that inscribe its ideology**, the activism** that franticly responds to its crises, the arteries of its circulation and flows, the commodities that define life within it, the communication networks that proliferate it, the information technology that surveils and records it—must be annihilated in every instance, all at once. **To shy away from this task, to assure our enemies of our good intentions, is the most crass dishonesty.** Anarchy, as with queerness, is most powerful in its negative form. Positive conceptions of these, when they are not simply a quiet acquiescence in the face of a sophisticated and evolving totality of domination, are hopelessly trapped in combat with the details of this totality on its own terms.

## Line by line

#### We solve for ROB better. We don’t even give the world computer our utopian ideologies to work off of, we reject the systems as a whole that lead to the perpetuation of this information and issue. Rejection is the way to achieve the aff, not utopianism.

#### The aff mentions those harmed by postmodernity and computers but has no solvency through this. Whether its individual people or computers, society will continue to harm and oppress minority groups through more and more complex forms of oppression. The only way out and way to come to terms is the alt of pure negativity.

#### On computationalism being a struggle between the oppressed and the powerful, everything is a struggle between the oppressed and the powerful. All systems implemented, computer or otherwise oppress these minorities and continue these fights, we need to reject it and tear it all down.

#### On colonialism mindsets, reject the AC. There is no solvency. If you don’t believe in negativity and want to take more action, the AC fails. Just because discourse caused colonialism does not mean that decolonization discourse will get rid of it --- material focus key, the AC lacks this.

Allesi 9 (Ryan, Materiality of Discourses on Decolonization, massthink.wordpress.com/2009/10/20/materiality-of-discourses-on-decolonization/)

This begs the question as to what Mignolo is trying to do. Towards the end of the chapter, he writes about the two types of representation (the European and the Amerindian) that “they are constantly teaching us not only that maps are not the territory, but also that the process of inventing and putting the Americas on the map was not an everlasting episode of the past, but an open process toward the future” (311). Because the link between the discursive representation (which has something to do with the colonization of the imagination) and the material situation (of colonization) is not explicitly made, while from this statement it is clear that Mignolo is suggesting that a change of representations (a change in maps, in identity) is possible, it is not clear how that relates and what that does to the material context, to (material) colonization itself. If the colonized change their perspectives and their representations, what does that do to their colonized situation? If they change their representations, does that mean that they are no longer colonized? In contrast to his analysis of representation that encompasses both its imaginary and material aspects, is Mignolo concerned merely with the colonization of the imagination and not material colonization, the fact that, in addition to suppressing and imposing representations, colonizers are—materially—occupying and ruling the territory of the colonized?¶ In Writing Without Words, Elizabeth Hill Boone has a similar concern. Expanding the definition of writing (beyond language) to include non-phonetic types allows Boone to say that the Inca, even before the conquest, had a writing culture (e.g. the quipu). This way, these Incan cultures become represented along with the other cultures that have writing. Again, the question is: what does this do? Through discursive moves like Mignolo and Boone, representations of the colonized become recognized and perhaps even adopted and disseminated, yet without linking representation to the material context of colonization, the discourse of Mignolo and Boone do not make clear what their move does to material colonization itself. The discourse of the colonizers, as Mignolo chronicles, contributed to the material act of colonization, in that way successfully performing the function of discourses of colonization. Perhaps the assumption of scholars like Mignolo that aim to represent the discourse of the colonized is that merely by having them represented, the discourse of the colonized would, as discourses of decolonization, have equally potent effects. Mignolo’s is not a discourse of decolonization, however. It is a discourse that talks about the colonized and their representations (like the hybrid “maps”) that may lead to their decolonization—i.e. a discourse on (discourses of) decolonization. It is not, like the discourses of colonization, the discourse itself that, through its representations, contribute to decolonization (that would be the Amerindian “maps” themselves), but merely the discourse that talks about and attempts to make recognized those discourses of decolonization (a sort of meta-discourse about a discourse). Is this a worthwhile move? What sort of material potency does a discourse on decolonization like this have, especially when, despite being a meta-discourse, it does not really theorize the relation between the discursive and the material?

#### On the ROB, what does this mean. AFF K’s ought to make it comprehensible to people in the round, we can’t further understanding of critical theory to affect our day to day lives if the aff.’s ROB is inaccessible. We need to be clear about our methods of liberation that we share in round so that we can fulfill the point of debate, prefer the neg K.

## Afro futurism poem

#### Interp: white debaters ought not commodify black narratives for the ballot

#### Violation: reads sun ra in the AC and the 1AR, literally using black afro futurism narratives for the ballot

Standards: 1. inclusivity debaters don’t get their voices heard and represented if we encourage other people speaking for them, this is bad for the debate space and lets people talk over marginalized groups to win ballots

Voters: safety. Debaters cannot feel safe in a space where other debaters are co opting their narratives to win rounds, critical arguments are super important to the debate space but make it seem like cheap shots when people can make critical args about groups they aren’t apart of and can’t speak for, vote down the AC on face

This is ok to read in the 2N for two reasons. First, makes a response to queer pess about co opting movements but that’s growing off of movements, this is just co opting. Second my opponent read MORE sun ra in the 1AR making the violation more egregious