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## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may only defend that a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### A just government is a moral government – that’s a hypothetical gov

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Just”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/just // MNHS NL

fair; morally correct:

#### Recognize means to accept as legal

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Recognize”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recognize // MNHS NL

to accept that something is legal, true, or important:

The international community has refused to recognize (= officially accept the existence of) the newly independent nation state.

[ + (that) ] He sadly recognized (that) he would die childless.

You must recognize the seriousness of the problems we are facing.

#### A worker is one who works manually or in an industry for a certain wage

Merriam Webster ND <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worker> VM

“one that works especially at manual or industrial labor or with a particular material”

#### They violate— they don’t defend a just government implementing the right to strike.

#### Vote neg to preserve substantive engagement --

#### 1] Preparation- changing the topic gives the aff a huge edge, they can prepare for 6 months on an issue that catches us by surprise. Preparation is better than thinking on your feet- research demonstrates pedagogical humility and research skills are the only portable debate training – the process of debate outweighs the content – only our interp generates the argumentative skills needed to rigorously defend their affirmative out of round and create engaged citizens

#### 2] Limits- there are an infinite number of non topical affirmatives. not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months.

#### 3] Truth testing - you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### 4] Switch side debate is good -- it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives which prevents ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

#### 5] fairness – debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary for any benefit to the activity. That outweighs om decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments. Also, they say debate shouldn’t be viewed as a game. There a bunch of debaters, even queer debaters, that engage within debate. If you view it as bad, you can simply choose not to engage within debate. What does voting aff do to prove any of these impacts?

#### 6] small schools disad: under-resourced are most adversely affected by a massive, unpredictable caselist which worsens structural disparities

#### TVA: read an aff in which the just government enforces the unconditional right to strike for queer bodies– none of their offense indicts a just government, but even if it does, the aff can rectify problems in the squo via policy

#### Disads to the TVA prove there’s negative ground and that it’s a contestable stasis point, and if their critique is incompatible with the topic reading it on the neg solves

#### Winning their thesis doesn’t answer T because only through the process of clash can they refine their defense of it—they need an explanation of why we switch sides and why there’s a winner and loser under their model

#### Reject the team—T is question of models of debate and the damage to our strategy was already done. Drop the team on theory generally to deter infinite abuse

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary, you can’t be reasonably topical, and causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### RVIs and impact turns encourage all in on theory which decks substance and incentivize baiting theory with abusive practices.

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

## 2

#### Their idea that by hacking the resolution and debate they can challenge capitalist capture is false. Capitalism thrives on that narrative of “escape”. Disrupting a logic or social system cannot solve, boring analysis of structures is necessary.

Bluhdorn 07 – (May 2007, Ingolfur, PhD, Reader in Politics/Political Sociology, University of Bath, “Self-description, Self-deception, Simulation: A Systems-theoretical Perspective on Contemporary Discourses of Radical Change,” Social Movement Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1–20, May 2007, google scholar)

Yet the **established patterns of self-construction, which** thus **have to be defended and** further **developed** at any price, **have fundamental problems** attached to them: ﬁrstly, **the attempt to constitute, on the basis of** product choices and acts of **consumption, a Self and identity** that are **distinct from and autonomous vis-a`-vis the market is a contradiction in terms**. Secondly, **late-modern society’s established patterns of consumption are known to be socially exclusive and environmentally destructive**. Despite all hopes for ecological modernization and revolutionary improvements in resource efﬁciency (e.g. Weizsa¨cker et al., 1998; Hawkenet al., 1999; Lomborg, 2001), **physical environmental limits imply that the lifestyles and established patterns of consumption** cherished by advanced modern societies **cannot even be extended to all residents of the richest countries**, let alone to the populations of the developing world. For the sake of the (re)construction of an ever elusive Self, **in their struggle against self-referentiality** and in pursuit of the regeneration of difference, **late-modern societies are** thus **locked into the imperative of maintaining** and further developing the principle of **exclusion** (Blu¨hdorn, 2002, 2003). At any price they have to, and indeed do, defend **a lifestyle that requires ever increasing social inequality, environmental degradation, predatory resource wars, and the tight policing of potential internal and external enemies**.14 For this effort, **military and surveillance technology provide ever more sophisticated and efﬁcient means**. Nevertheless, the principle of **exclusion is ultimately still unsustainable, not only because of spiralling ‘security’ expenses but also because it** directly **contradicts the** modernist **notion of the free and autonomous individual** that late-modern society desperately aims to sustain. For this reason, late-modern society is confronted with the task of having to sustain both the late-modern principle of exclusion as well as its opposite, i.e. the modernist principle of inclusion. Very importantly, the conﬂict between the principles of exclusion and inclusion is not simply one between different individuals, political actors or sections of society. Instead, it is a politically irresolvable conﬂict that resides right within the late-modern individual, the late-modern economy and late-modern politics. And if, as Touraine notes, late-modern society no longer believes in nor even desires political transcendence, the particular challenge is that the two principles can also no longer be attributed to different dimensions of time, i.e. the former to the present, and the latter to some future society. Instead, late-modern society needs to represent and reproduce itself and its opposite at the same time. If considered **within this framework** of this analysis, the function of Luhmann’s system of protest communication, or in the terms of this article, **the signiﬁcance of** late-modern societies’ **discourses of radical change becomes immediately evident**. **At a stage when the possibility** and desirability **of transcending** the principle of **exclusion has been pulled into** radical **doubt but when**, at the same time, the principle of **inclusion is vitally important**, **these discourses simulate the validity of the latter as a social ideal**. In other words, **latemodern society reconciles the tension between the** cherished but exclusive **status quo** – for which there is no alternative – **and the non-existent** inclusive **alternative** – on whose existence it depends – **by means of simulation**. The analysis of Luhmann’s work has demonstrated how the societal self-descriptions produced by the system of protest communication, or late-modern society’s discourses of radical change, fulﬁl this function exactly. **They are** an **indispensable** function system not so much because they help to resolve late-modern society’s problems of mal-coordination, but because by performing the possibility of the alternative they help to cope with the fundamental problem of self-referentiality. In this sense, late-modern society’s discourses of sustainability, democratic renewal, social inclusion or global justice, to name but a few, suggest that advanced modern society is working towards an environmentally and socially inclusive alternative – genuinely modern – society, but they do not deny the fact that the big utopia and project of late-modern society is the reproduction and further enhancement of the status quo, i.e. the sustainability of the principle of exclusion. Protest movements as networks of physical actors and actions complement the purely communicative **discourses of radical change** in that they bring their narrative and societal selfdescription to life. Whilst the declarations of institutionalized mainstream politics cannot escape the generalized suspicion that they are purely rhetorical, social movements **provide an arena for** the physical expression and **experience of the authenticity and reality of the alternative**

#### Their model of queer activism through transgression replicates neoliberalism by refusing the promise of collective transformation

Drucker 15 [Peter Drucker (Peter has emerged in the 21st century as a leading Marxist scholar in queer studies. His special contributions concern the roots of 'homonormativity' in neoliberalism, the impact of neoliberal globalization on same-sex sexualities in dependent countries, and links between queer and anti-capitalist resistance. He is also working on a series of studies on gender and sexual dimensions of Islamophobia, in both Europe and the Middle East. Finally, he continues his long-term work on the history of US and European socialism, connecting it to the left's record on feminist and LGBTIQ issues.); 2015; “Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anti-Capitalism”; <https://books.google.com/books?id=_ByoBgAAQBAJ&pg=PA301> //BWSWJ]

As long as alliances with broader forces of the anti-capitalist left remain few and limited, radical queer activists face the task themselves of working out positions for queer anti-capitalist politics and translating them into public organ-ising and activism. Self-identified radical queer groups have existed, at least intermittently, for the past quarter-century, as a `punky, anti-assimilationist, transgressive movement on the fringe of lesbian and gay culture',7' and a milieu that is 'disgusted by marriage and military and that longs to return' to a radical vision.72 Politically, a wave of Queer Nation groups, following on the 1987 March on Washington and the rise of ACT UP, originated in the us as part of the largest and most militant wave of LGBT activism since the 197os. The different forms of AIDS activism and queer activism that emerged initially in the us and Britain in the late 198os and early 199os posed a radical challenge to established lesbian/gay rights organisations. Self-defined queer activist groups have also appeared more recently in a number of countries in continental Europe. The Pink Panthers in Paris and Lisbon73 have forged a dynamic, Latin European variant of international queer radicalism. Queer-identified groups are also beginning to spring up here and there in dependent countries. But queer radicals' ability to contend for influence in LGBT movements or to set the agenda of sexual politics more generally has been held in check by a number of factors. Queer radicalism emerged in an overall context of societal reaction, in which LGBT militancy was largely isolated from and unsupported by its logical allies. This led to some disturbing ambiguities. Queer ideology has been hard to pin down. In the imperialist countries that have so far been radical queers' main base, the predominant ideological current among them has been a fairly diffuse anarchism. Queer groups have yet to show much of an orientation towards large-scale mobilisation, to take root among the racially and nationally oppressed, or to prove their lasting adaptability to the dependent world.74 While large anti-capitalist parties have rarely made links with Queer radicalism, queer radicals have rarely found their way to a broad political audience. In this sense, the limits of anti-capitalist parties and of small radical queer groups mirror each other. The early Queer Nation groups reflected a certain break in the movement's memory. Although many of the practical stands and philosophical or theoretical points they made had originally been made by an earlier generation of the lesbian/gay liberation movement, young queers were often unaware of this. The emergence of Queer Nation as a distinctive, insurgent current thus showed the failure of lesbian/gay liberation to transmit its history, to make its values prevail in actually existing LGBT communities, or to sustain a vibrant left wing in the LGBT movement. By comparison with early lesbian/gay liberationists, early Queer Nation groups had an even more voluntarist or even idealist mind-set. They tended to see queer identity as consciously chosen and crafted. Many LGBT identities have in fact had a voluntary dimension. In some cases, this has distinguished LGBT oppression from oppression based on race, gender or disability, which are generally not chosen but visible, material and unavoidable. But this is only one aspect of LGBT oppression. The fact that women living apart from men have lower living standards is not chosen; the fact that even the most closeted LGBT people could for generations lose their jobs or homes was not chosen; the fact that the great majority of LGBT people still grow up in straight families is not chosen. Many trans people, however well they fit into a queer milieu as 'gender queers, also do not feel that they have chosen their identities. As early as 1992, failure to tackle trans issues effectively in Queer Nation San Francisco led to the formation of a separate Transgender Nation, though overall the queer milieu proved more supportive than lesbian/gay and feminist milieus had been in the 1970s. The intersex community, which began organising politically with the founding in 1993 of the Intersex Society of North America,75 seems less easy to include under a queer umbrella, largely because intersex people usually have no choice at all about being intersex. Despite its implicit and increasingly explicit opposition to neoliberalism, queer radicalism has also had an ambivalent relationship to the commercial gay scene. It has resisted the assimilationism that it sees the commercial scene as promoting. But a whole series of Queer Nation actions in the 199os focused on invading shopping malls and modifying logos on t-shirts — a tac-tic that risked replacing critiques of consumerism with alternative forms of consumption.76 This contrasted with more frontal rejections of consumerism that were also present in queer direct action groups, like the chant We're here, we're queer, we're not going shopping!' used by ACT UP San Francisco a few years earlier. The sexual radicalism of queer politics has had a complex and contradic-tory relationship to the realities of gender, race and class. Initially, ACT UP reflected the manifest need to respond to AIDS with 'a new kind of alliance politics ...across the dividing lines of race and gender, class and national-ity, citizenship and sexual orientation'.77 Yet queer activism has sometimes obscured rather than highlighted these realities, with an exclusive focus on sex that can erase its intersections with gender, class and race. This erasure can be facilitated by queer politics' slippage from radical anti-separatism to one more form of identity politics, which can rest on 'an unspoken appeal' to a white middle-class model.78 For women in particular, the emphasis on sexual agency that has always been central to queer, while avoiding seeing women exclusively as victims, risks divorcing 'pleasure and sexuality ... from the social structures that organize them'.79 Although the name Queer Nation and its angry separatist spirit were reminiscent of Lesbian Nation, only 20 percent of the original group was lesbian. Its lesbian, working-class and black members began reproaching it early on for being oblivious to their concerns.80 Barbara Smith complained that for Queer Nation 'racism, sexual oppression and economic exploitation [did] not qualify' as queer issues.81 Queer politics in the late 198os and early 1990s largely failed to appeal to alternative scenes and identities rooted among people of colour and women; a number of Queer Nation groups split amid charges of racism and sexism. Nor did the queer contingents and groups that emerged within or joined in the global justice movement, particularly after the 1999 Seattle protests — a promising component of the queer left — succeed to any great extent in linking up with or contributing to shaping alternative queer identities. Clearly there is no straightforward correlation between queer radicalism and working-class politics as such. On the contrary, LGBT working people and particularly non-whites have sometimes reacted against queer radicalism when it demanded visibility of them that would make their lives more difficult in their communities, families or unions. The problem arises when the alternative to assimilation or homonormativity is defined not as organised resistance in forms compatible with long-term survival, but as 'transgression' or 'freedom from norms. This implies the exclusion of those who are 'positioned as not free in the same way'.82 Even when queer anti-capitalists work inside existing queer radical groups, they need to put forward a distinctive approach that challenges the limitations of these groups' politics. Resisting the retreat from class in LGBT activism, queer anti-capitalists should challenge not only heterosexism among straights and gay normality, but also blanket hostility to straights and non-queer-iden-tified gays where it exists among some self-identified queers. When directed against gay men, this hostility risks selectively reproducing traditional homophobic stereotypes of gays as privileged and powerful: images that are seduc-tive in a time of rising homonormativity, but problematic if they do not reflect the ongoing reality of gay oppression. Avoiding all these pitfalls will require seeking new tactics and forms of organising within queer groups.

#### The alternative is to theorize through Marxist Materialism – only collective action focused on a unified front can produce a queer anti-capitalism

Drucker 11 [Peter Drucker; “The Fracturing of LGBT Identities under Neoliberal Capitalism”; Historical Materialism 19.4 (2011) 3–32; <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1000.69&rep=rep1&type=pdf> //BWSWJ]

Recognising the deep roots of the fracturing of same-sex identities necessarily puts in question any universalism that ignores class, gender, sexual, cultural, racial/ethnic and other differences within LGBT communities. These communities and identities are being fractured in large part by fundamental changes in the productive and reproductive order of gendered capitalism. Young queers, working-class and poor LGBTs, transgendered people and other marginalised groups have increasingly found themselves in objectively different situations from people in the consolidating gay mainstream. It is thus no surprise that they have tended to some extent to define distinct identities. The forms taken by alternative, non-homonormative sexual identities do not necessarily win them easy acceptance among feminists or socialists. The lesbian/gay identity that emerged by the 1970s had much to commend it from the broad-Left’s point of view (once the Left had largely overcome its initial homophobia). By contrast, transgendered and other queers can raise the hackles of many on the Left, since their sexuality strikes many as at variance with the mores to be expected and hoped for in an egalitarian, peaceful, rational future. One may doubt, however, whether any sexuality existing under capitalism can serve as a model for sexualities to be forecast or desired under socialism. Nor is it useful to privilege any particular existing form of sexuality in present-day struggles for sexual liberation. Socialists’ aim should not be to replace the traditional ‘hierarchical system of sexual value’85 with a new hierarchy of our own. As Amber Hollibaugh pointed out many years ago, sexual history has first of all to be ‘able to talk realistically about what people are sexually’.86 And in radical struggles over sexuality, as in radical struggles over production, the basic imperative is to welcome and stimulate self-organisation and resistance by people subjected to exploitation, exclusion, marginalisation or oppression, in the forms that oppressed people’s own experience proves to be most effective. This is not to say that Marxists should simply adopt a liberal attitude of unthinking approval of sexual diversity in general, in a spirit of ‘anything goes’. Our central concern must be to advance the sexual liberation of the working class and its allies, who today include straights, LGBs and – particularly among its most oppressed layers – transgendered and other queers. Resisting the retreat from class in LGBT activism and queer studies, Marxists should combat heterosexism and bourgeois hegemony among straights, homonormativity and bourgeois hegemony among LGBs, and blanket hostility to straights and non-queer-identified gays where it exists among self-identified queers. This will require seeking new tactics and forms of organising within LGBT movements. The post-Stonewall lesbian/gay movement waged an effective fight against discrimination and won many victories on the basis of an identity widely shared by those engaged in same-sex erotic or emotional relationships. But this classic lesbian/gay identity has not been the only basis in history for movements for sexual emancipation. In the German homophile-struggle from 1897 to 1933, for example, Magnus Hirschfeld’s Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, the wing of the movement closer to the social-democratic Left, tended to put forward polarised ‘third sex’-theories.87 This is what one might predict on the basis of the evidence that egalitarian gay identities were at first primarily a middle-class phenomenon, while transgender and gender-polarised patterns persisted longer in the working class and among the poor.88 Today in the dependent world as well, transgender identities seem to be more common among the less prosperous and less Westernised.89 Rather than privileging same-sex sexualities more common among the less oppressed, however superficially egalitarian, the Left should be particularly supportive of those same-sex sexualities more common among the most oppressed, however polarised. Another important consideration is the challenge that alternative, nonhomonormative sexualities can sometimes pose to the reification of sexual desire that the categories of lesbian, gay, bisexual and straight embody. Marxists question the fantasy of consumers under neoliberalism that obtaining the ‘right’ commodities will define them as unique individuals and secure their happiness; we should not uncritically accept an ideology that defines individuals and their happiness on the basis of a quest for a partner of the ‘right’ gender.90 How will LGBT communities and movements be structured in a time of increasingly divergent identities? Self-defined queer activist-groups, which emerged initially in the US and Britain in the early 1990s, have also appeared in recent years in a number of countries in continental Europe. They pose a radical challenge to mainstream lesbian/gay organisations, although they have yet to show much of an orientation towards large-scale mobilisation, to take root among the racially and nationally oppressed, or to prove their adaptability to the dependent world.91 In countries where civil rights and same-sex marriage have been won, the process of seeking new horizons and finding appropriate forms of organising seems likely to be a prolonged one – especially since the LGBT social and political landscape seems likely to remain more fragmented and conflict-ridden than it was in the immediate post-Stonewall period. While lesbian/gay identity has lost the central place it occupied in the LGBT world of the 1970s and ’80s, it is still far from marginalised; on the contrary, the new homonormativity shows no signs of succumbing to queer assaults in the foreseeable future. In the dependent world particularly, the diversity of LGBT communities has resulted in an alliance-model of organising as an alternative or a supplement to the model of a single, broad, unified organisation. The broadest possible unity across different identities remains desirable in basic fights against violence, criminalisation and discrimination as well as more ambitious struggles for equality, for example in parenting. On other issues, LGBT rights can be best defended by working and demanding space within broader movements, such as trade-unions, the women’s movement and the global justice movement.92 At the same time, an alliance-model has in some cases facilitated the process of negotiating unity among constituencies – such as transgendered people on the one hand and lesbian/gay people on the other93 – who are unlikely to feel fully included in any one unitary structure. It can constitute a united front between those whose identities fit the basic parameters of the gay-straight divide and those whose identities do not, fostering the development of a truly queer conception of sexuality that, in Gloria Wekker’s words, is ‘multiple, malleable, dynamic, and possessing male and female elements’.94 In a more visionary perspective, developing an inclusive, queer conception of sexuality can be seen as a way to move towards that ‘truly free civilization’ that Herbert Marcuse described a half-century ago in Eros and Civilization, in which ‘all laws are self-given by the individuals’, the values of ‘play and display’ triumph over those of ‘productiveness and performance’, the entire human personality is eroticised, and the ‘instinctual substance’ of ‘the perversions . . . may well express itself in other forms’.95

## Case

#### 5] There’s been incredible progress for LGBTQ individuals but there’s more to do---targeting bad policies and institutional engagement is key

Kenneth Roth, Executive Director of HRW, “LGBT: Moving Towards Equality,” 1/23/’15, http://www.hrw.org/news/2015/01/23/lgbt-moving-towards-equality

Almost 2.8 billion people are living in countries where identifying as gay could lead to imprisonment, corporal punishment or even death. In stark contrast, only 780 million people are living in countries where same-sex marriage or civil unions are a legal right. These figures, reported by the International Lesbian and Gay Association in May 2014, show there is still much to be done in the effort to attain universal rights for LGBT communities worldwide. **Yet there has also been significant progress over the past 10 years**, and **this** too **should be acknowledged**. Here, the Outlook on the Global Agenda looks at what has been achieved so far and profiles the challenges that still lie ahead. What progress has there been on LGBT rights since you established Human Rights Watch’s LGBT rights programme? There’s been enormous progress globally and locally. It’s important to note that the fight for LGBT rights is not a Western phenomenon; many of the governments at the forefront of the defence of LGBT rights are from the developing world. The historic LGBT resolution at the United Nations Human Rights Council, adopted in September 2014, was led by governments from the global south, primarily Latin America, and backed by others from **all over the world**, including South Africa. Even governments usually opposed to human rights enforcement, such as Cuba, Venezuela and Vietnam, supported it. How do LGBT rights differ around the world? Yet, because of this global support, we’re recently witnessing an intensifying backlash. To a large degree, this is due to the greater visibility of the LGBT community in societies that have begun to recognize their rights. But LGBT people are also convenient scapegoats for embattled leaders, who are trying to rally support from more conservative sectors of their society. Whether it’s Uganda, Nigeria or Russia, the decision to scapegoat the LGBT community is an outcome of serious challenges to the regime, for widespread corruption or abusive authoritarianism. The status of the LGBT community is a good litmus test for the status of human rights in society more broadly, precisely because it is such a vulnerable minority – similar to the proverbial canary in the coal mine. Where the rights of LGBT people are undermined, you can be sure that the rights of other minorities and critical members of civil society will soon also be in jeopardy. When you look back over the last decade, what do you think was the main driver for change, in regulation and people’s mindset? Broader changes in society have driven some of the greater recognition of LGBT rights, such as more equitable relations between genders, the rights revolution generally and the greater respect for individual autonomy. Within that context, you saw the LGBT population gradually coming out, so people suddenly discovered that they had a gay brother or son or neighbour or close colleague, which started shaping public perception and reinforced the social changes. It’s easy for bigotry to exist in a context of ignorance, but when you’re being bigoted toward a close friend or neighbour, you start thinking: “Maybe LGBT people are really just people; maybe I should recognize their rights. Why can’t they love whom they choose, just like I can?” Yet the lingering fear of ‘the other’ is also applicable to some of the other trends we see in this year’s Outlook on the Global Agenda – like increasing nationalism and anti-immigrant sentiment. Conversely, that ties back to what you said about scapegoating; by making the LGBT community less visible – and thus less relatable – unscrupulous leaders can take political advantage... Yes. In Uganda for example, the LGBT community is scapegoated in an artificial context – the narrative is that homosexuality in general is a foreign import, not part of the traditional culture. There’s a great irony here because much of that homophobia is the product of interventions by a well financed US evangelical movement, and the prohibitions in place are a continuation of the British colonial-era bans on same-sex relations. Moreover, it’s not like the West has been secretly airdropping gays into other cultures – an LGBT population has existed in all societies for all time; gays have simply been more or less open, depending on the politics and the mentality of the moment. Given the backlash, **who should we be targeting to combat it? Begin with the leaders** doing the scapegoating **and their** policies. In response to the homophobic environment created around the Sochi Olympics, the International Olympic Committee recently announced new rules for the selection of host cities, including a requirement of full non-discrimination. That implicitly says that if Russia had been fostering the homophobic environment at the time of selection, Sochi would not have been selected. **That’s a** very important signal **to send.** At the same time, there must be a broader coordinated educational effort. Anything that helps to increase the visibility of LGBT people, to move beyond past stereotypes and ignorance, to show that gays occupy the same range of positions in life and society as everyone else, that will help to make societal change happen more quickly. The young are the core of societal change; what pressures do they face? In many ways the younger generation is much more accepting than their elders. I see a positive trajectory as young people grow up with variations in sexual orientation around them being the norm. But the younger generation is also a battleground. A lot of the leaders that promote homophobia do so by insisting that they’re not anti-gay, but just trying to shelter the impressionable young from ‘gay propaganda’. In many ways, they see that the trends are going in favour of LGBT rights and they’re trying to fight back with the younger generation. What role can non-governmental stakeholders play, such as businesses? Business is a very important stakeholder in this debate. A significant section of consumers insist on respect for LGBT rights, so the global corporate giants can’t get away with permitting discrimination in the workplace or embracing homophobia in any sense. That becomes important, because these companies operate globally and so can become oases of respect for LGBT rights, even in societies where the government hasn’t caught up with the agenda. Where business currently falls short, though, is in embracing role models. Lord Browne regretted not being more open about being gay when he was CEO of BP, and it’s sad that many corporate leaders still feel that they have to live in the closet. The more that corporations can highlight the LGBT people among their leadership, the quicker these societal transformations will be encouraged. That said, if you look at the number of business or political leaders coming out now compared to a decade ago, we’re seeing good progress. Do you think the international community is a good driver for LGBT rights? Positive action is taken at several different levels – local, national and global. What happened at the UN is important as part of the effort to legitimise LGBT rights; to have such an overwhelmingly positive vote is an important rebuke to those governments that want to pretend homophobia and bigotry are consistent with international human rights standards. They’re not. Other things the international institutions can do is to collect information on the treatment of the LGBT community worldwide to probe governments that fall short of recognition of its rights. Perhaps most critical, though, is to defend the **political space** **in which** local **human rights and LGBT activists operate**. International multistakeholder **organizations**, such as the World Economic Forum, could **clearly play a leadership role in this debate**, by holding sessions devoted to trends in the rights of LGBT people. For example, a session on best business practices with respect to LGBT rights would give an opportunity to talk about, not just the formal non-discrimination steps, but also the more personal leadership role that corporations might play.

#### 6] Edelman's way too totalizing

Power 09

Nina Power is a Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at Roehampton University, Borderlands, 2009, "Non-Reproductive Futurism", Vol 8, No 2, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol8no2\_2009/power\_futurism.pdf

Edelman could of course protest that his is not an empirical point, but a symbolic one, and there is certainly something enlightening about being able to ‘spot,’ in the wake of Edelman’s analysis, reproductive futurism whenever it rears its smiling, big-eyed, irresistible head. But in the light of the relative empirical paucity of this normative notion of the family, and of the child taken care of by the father’s wage and the mother’s domestic care, a question arises as to how far Edelman’s notion of the ‘queer’ extends. If ‘queerness names the side of those not “fighting for the children”’ (Edelman, 2004: 3) it must by definition exclude any family arrangement, however non-child oriented. Can you have family arrangements of those who take care of children but nonetheless are not ‘fighting for the children’? Can one have a generic attitude towards children, or has the logic of reproductive futurism filtered all the way down such that it is impossible to think of children as anything other than ‘special,’ as ‘little angels’? There are, however, plenty of children being raised in situations where very little was staked on their future, and plenty of family structures in which caring for young people is far more a question of pragmatics than of ideology. Edelman makes clear that he is not talking about really existing families and actual children, but it must be noted that Edelman sometimes slips from the figural to the literal, or at least certainly seems to position the woman on the side of the children in a rather dubious way. As Fraiman puts it in her reading of Edelman: ‘Figurations of women’s bodies … are subtly de-eroticised and assimilated to the figurative child’ (Fraiman, 2003: 131). Does Edelman fall too far into the rhetoric of the Christian Right by associating women too quickly with childbirth and some sort of supposedly natural maternal desire that in turn is supposed to characterise reproductive futurism? Edelman seems to assimilate all notions of the family with notions of the future, and to reify families as solid, reactionary entities to be opposed by identity-shaking queer negativity.

But what is the ‘identity’ of the family as such? It’s not a real one in the sense of being the majority composition of living arrangements (at least in the British case, as noted above). It’s not a seamlessly ideological one either, seeing as the image of the family presented by (primarily right-wing) politicians is, in practice, rife with contradiction. It seems more likely the case that the ideology must be so extreme in order to cover over the real truth of the family as the economic support for an increasingly precarious labour market. In the 1950s, a male breadwinner’s wage was enough to support an entire ‘classical’ family, now both partners must (in most cases) work to earn anywhere near the same amount. If women are now fully included in the workforce it is because men’s wages have been depressed, even as women still fail to earn as much as their male counterparts. Who looks after the children is an increasingly complicated question, and neither the state nor the classical family seem able to do it effectively and affordably. Politics is so pro-child in theory because it is so anti-child (and anti-woman) in practice.

The supposed futural ‘reason’ of representative politics is in effect profoundly fractured and contradictory, not in the least bit reconciled to either its image of the child, or to its image of itself. Edelman’s notion of the queer nevertheless seems to depend on an overly homogenous picture of the social world. To write, as Edelman claims to, from ‘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’ (Edelman, 2004: 3) involves deliberately superimposing various ‘political’ categories onto various non-political categories. Thus, Edelman conflates democracy with the child, rationality with a naïve concept of progress and heterosexuality with reproduction, sweeping away the possibility of collective organisation and action. As John Brenkman puts it: ‘Edelman compounds his reductive concept of the political realm by in turn postulating an ironclad intermeshing of social reproduction and sexual reproduction’ (Brenkman, 2002: 176).

By neglecting the contradictory economic imperatives at work in political conceptions of the family and fusing politics with reason Edelman leaves no room at all for what we could call a ‘queer reason’– queer from the standpoint of representational politics, and neither committed to the child nor to sexual essentialism. It is here that Rancière’s ideas are relevant. If a ‘queer reason’ is to make any sense, it is important to separate out two different kinds of rationalism, which Edelman refuses to do. In a section in Disagreement entitled ‘The Rationality of Disagreement,’ Rancière states the following:

Political rationality is only thinkable precisely on the condition that it be freed from the alternative in which a certain rationalism would like to keep it reined in, either as exchange between partners putting their interests or standards up for discussion, or else the violence of the irrational (Rancière, 1999: 43).