# 1NC vs Lexington JB

## 1

Interp: The aff may not restrict the negs ability to respond framework and offense layer

Violation – u did read Long 95 tag and AFC

## 2

#### The AFF insists you presume their side in instances of uncertainty, this is the very foundation of rape culture and perpetuates the passive voice of the survivors of sexual violence and reinforces the notion that this violence is acceptable.

Fraser ’15 – Brackets for clarity Fraser, Courtney. From “Ladies First” to “Asking for It”: Benevolent Sexism in the Maintenance of Rape Culture (n.d.): n. pag. Jan. 2015. Web.

The problem of **sexual violence against women** has been **analyzed with an eye to the causal significance of misogyny**, but legal analysis has neglected the role played by other facets of sexism, including ostensibly “benevolent” sexism (or **chivalry), in the perpetuation of rape culture**, which **normalizes** this **violence**. Additionally, discussions of sexual violence often overlook the epidemic of acquaintance rape, although it accounts for the majority of sexual assaults committed. This Comment draws on social psychology and gender theory to posit that benevolent-sexist ideologies construct women as creatures devoid of agency, leading men to routinely presume women’s consent to sexual activity whether or not such consent in fact exists. **The legal treatment of women’s rape and sexual harassment claims** shows thise catastrophic effects of this process as women are relegated cognitively, **socially, and legally to a the role of passive receptivity—forced to prove an absence of consent as men are taught to assume its presence**

#### This presumption is the cause of repeated sexual violence and the dominant ideology that justifies sexism and exploitation.

Krohn ’14 – Brackets for clarity  Jesse Krohn, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, and Students with Special Needs: Crafting an Effective Response for Schools, 17 U. Pa. J.L. and Soc. Change 29 (2014).

MacKinnon’s early ideas recognized, above all, that law divided women into two categories: **those who are presumed to say yes and those who are presumed to say no**. . . . Feminists respond to this legal situation with strategies (e.g., rape shield laws) that don’t disrupt the categories but seek instead to show that women who encounter sexual violence are on the innocent side of the divide. **This** strategy **has provoked** the not uncommon, but perhaps unfair, **criticism that feminist advocates focus so intently on the victimization of women** that they actually contribute subject to further **disempowerment by** emphasizing **weakness and vulnerability**, and they alienate potential feminist allies, both male and female, **with an overall attitude towards sexuality that is grim and obsessed with exploitation.**

#### Reject the aff’s rhetoric that reinforces rape culture in the debate space- they didn’t have to read presumption arguments to win the case page.

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. **All** of the **arguments that talk about how debate is** a **unique** space for questioning assumptions **make an assumption of safety**. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. **That is not true** for everyone. **When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape**, lynching, etc., **we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is** the definition of **privilege**, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. **People who face the actual effects** of the aforementioned things **cannot question those assumptions, and making debate** a space **built around the idea that they can is hostile**. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "**debate is not the real world**". **Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate.** That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. **At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone** involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people**. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments**. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you're just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsafe for certain people.

## On Case

# Accessible Formatting

#### The AFF insists you presume their side in instances of uncertainty, this is the very foundation of rape culture and perpetuates the passive voice of the survivors of sexual violence and reinforces the notion that this violence is acceptable.

Fraser ’15 – Brackets for clarity Fraser, Courtney. From “Ladies First” to “Asking for It”: Benevolent Sexism in the Maintenance of Rape Culture (n.d.): n. pag. Jan. 2015. Web.

sexual violence against women analyzed with an eye to the causal significance of misogyny chivalry), in the perpetuation of rape culture normalizes violence The legal treatment of women’s rape and sexual harassment claims socially, and legally to a the role of passive receptivity—forced to prove an absence of consent as men are taught to assume its presence

#### This presumption is the cause of repeated sexual violence and the dominant ideology that justifies sexism and exploitation.

Krohn ’14 – Brackets for clarity  Jesse Krohn, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, and Students with Special Needs: Crafting an Effective Response for Schools, 17 U. Pa. J.L. and Soc. Change 29 (2014).

those who are presumed to say yes and those who are presumed to say no This has provoked criticism that feminist advocates focus so intently on the victimization of women disempowerment by weakness and vulnerability with an overall attitude towards sexuality that is grim and obsessed with exploitation.

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

debate is an assumption of safety When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism we make debate unsafe for certain people. People who face effects cannot question those assumptions making debate hostile If you care about people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments