## 1

#### Interpretation – Debaters must cite cut cards from any and all articles used on case

#### Violation – coverstone can’t be found anywhere online and there’s no cite/link

#### [1] evidence ethics – impossible to verify that you didn’t highlight, change words, or bracket unethically because there’s no primary source to verify it – that’s a voter for academic integrity which outweighs on portability

#### [2] Strat skew – you can read articles that don’t exist which makes responding unpredictable and kills ability to answer with other cards through citations

#### Fairness is a voter debate is competitive vote for the better debater don’t vote for an abusive cheater

**Education is a voter reason why schools fund debate and the only skill we can use outside debate**

**Evidence ethics is a voter - it's a voter because if you can cheat in debate that puts u at an irreciprocal advantage, and you will be punished severely in college or class whcih means even if ur not dropped now, your practices will destory your career later**

#### No RVIs – creates a chilling effect and you shouldn’t win for proving your not abusive

#### DTD – they will learn and wont abuse in other rounds

## 2

#### The affirmative’s use of state action reinforces the political and the futurity of the child which by definition is inaccessible to queer bodies. State action conceded in cross x

Edelman 04 Edelman, Lee. No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive. , 2004. Print //Lex MS  
"This is the father picture," he complained in the pages of the Times, "this is the daddy bear, this is the head of the political household. There's nothing that helps him more." 1 But what helped him most in these public appeals on behalf of America's children was the social co􀄞􀄟ensus that such an appeal i􀄥.im possible to refuse. Indeed, though these public service announcements concluded with the sort of rhetorical flourish associated with hard-fought political campaigns ("We're fighting for the children. Whose side are you on?"), that rhetoric was intended to avow that this issue, like an ideological Mobius strip, only permitted one side. Such "self-evident" one-sidednessthe affirmation of a value so unquestioned, because so obviously unquestionable, as that of the Child whose innocence solicits our defense-is precisely, of course, what distinguishes public service announcements from the partisan discourse of political argumentation. But it is also, I suggest, what makes such announcements so oppressively politicalpolitical not in the partisan terms implied by the media consultant, but political in a far more insidious way: !,olitical insofar a􀄠 . tlle f􀄡utas!􀄢ubtending the image of the Child invariably shapes the logic within which, the political itself must be thought. That logic compels us, to the extent that we would register as politically responsible, to submit totheframing of political debate-and, indeed, of the political field-as defined by the terms of what this book describes as ':l'l"oductive futurism: terms that impose an ideological limit on political discourse as such, preserving in the process the absolute privilege of heteronormativity by rendering unthinkable, by casting outside the political domain, the possibility of a queer resistance to this organizing principle of communal relation􀄣􀄤 For politics, however radical the meaus by which specific constitu- - - encies attempt to produce a more desirable social order, remains1 at its 2 ·1 : core, conservative insofar as it works to affirm a structure, to authenticate social order, which it then intends to transmit to the future in the form of its inner Child. That Child remains the perpetual horizon of every acknowledged politics, the fantasmatic beneficiary of every political intervention. Even proponents of abortion rights, while promoting the freedom of women to control their own bodies through reproductive choice, recurrently frame their political struggle, mirroring their anti-abortion foes, as a "fight for our children -for our daughters and our sons," and thus as a fight for the future.2 '-Vhat, in that case, would it signifY not to be "fighting for the children"? How could one take the other "side," when taking any side at all necessarily constrains one to take the side '1f, by virtue of taking a side within, a political order that returns to the Child as the image of the future it intends? Impossibly, against all reason,.!"y Il􀄦oject stakes its claim to the very space that "politics" makes unthinkable: the space outside the framework within which politics as \\,;' kn()w 􀄧\_ appears and so outside the conflict of visions that share as their pre· supposition that the body politic must survive. Indeed, at the heart of my . . polemical engagement with the cultural text of politics and the politics of cultural texts lies a simple provocation: that queerness names the side --'-'-\_ ... . 􀃃􀃂􀄨􀄩,,"."-t'<fighting for the children," the side outside the consensus by which all politics confirms the absol􀄪te value of reproductive futurism. The ups and downs of political fortune may measure the social order's ' pulse, but queerness, by contrast, 􀃁¥􀄫res, outside and beyond its political symptoms, the place of the social order's death drive: a place, to be. sure, of abjection expressed in the stigma, sometimes fatal, that follows from reading that figure literally, and hence a place from which liberal politics strives-and strives quite reasonably, given its unlimited faith in reason-to disassociate the queer. More radically, though, as I argue here, queerness attains its ethical value precisely insofar as it accedes to tllat place, accepting its figural status as resistance to the viability of the social while insisting on the inextricability of such resistance from every social structure. To make such a claim I examine in this book the pervasive invocation of the Child as the emblem of futurity's unquestioned value and propose against it the impossible projec!\_()f.",\_queer oppositionality that would oppose itself to the structural determinants of politics as such, which is also to say, at wEl!I􀃇LopPQ􀃃􀃈JtseILto theJogic of opposition. This paradoxical formulation suggests a refusal-the appropriately perverse refusal that characterizes queer theory-of every substantialization of identity, which is always oppositionally defined,' and, by extension, of history as linear narrative (the poor man's teleology) in which meaning succeeds in revealing itself-as itself-through time. Far from partaking of this narrative movement toward a viable political future, far from perpetuating the fantasy of meaning's eventual realization, t􀃄e qu . : e􀃅􀃆es to figure the bar to every realization of futurity, the resistance, internal , - , . -􀒅''''''''-- to the social, to every social structure or form.

#### Reality is defined by the Real and the Symbolic, but the Symbolic can never capture the Real, resulting in a fundamental lack. Vying imaginary political projections require a coherent subject, for those futures to apply to, casting this lack onto queers. To access imaginary futures, society requires reproductive futurism and the fantasy of the Child, which exists in opposition to queerness.

Edelman 04 [Lee Edelman (English Professor @ Tufts). “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive,” Duke University Press, December 2004, Pg. 1-3, 7-9, <https://www.dukeupress.edu/no-future//>] //Lex AKo

But what helped him most in these public appeals on behalf of America's children was the social consensus that such an appeal is impossible to refuse. Indeed, though these public service announcements concluded with the sort of rhetorical flourish associated with hard-fought **political** campaigns ("We're fighting for the children. Whose side are you on?"), that rhetoric was intended to avow that this issue, like an ideological Mobius strip, only permitt**ed one side**. **Such** "**self-evident" one-sidedness-the affirmation of a value so unquestioned, because so obviously unquestionable, as that of the Child** whose innocence solicits our defense-is precisely, of course, what distinguishes public service announcements from the partisan discourse of political argumentation.But it is also, I suggest, what **makes** such announcements so oppressively political-political not in the partisan terms implied by the media consultant, but **political in a far more insidious way:** political insofar as the fantasy subtending **the image of the Child invariably shapes the logic within which the political itself must be thought. That logic compels us,** to the extent that we would register as politically responsible, **to submit to the framing of political** debate-and, indeed, of the political field-**as** defined by the terms of what this book describes as **reproductive futurism: terms that impose an ideological limit on political discourse as such, preserving in the process the absolute privilege of heteronormativity by rendering unthinkable,** by casting outside the political domain**, the possibility of a queer resistance to this organizing principle of communal relation. For politics,** however radical the means by which specific constituenciesattempt to produce a more desirable social order, remains at its core, conservative insofar as it works to affirm a structure,to authenticate social order, which it then intends to **transmit to the future in the form of its inner Child. That Child remains the perpetual horizon of every acknowledged politics, the fantasmatic beneficiary of every political intervention.** Even proponents of abortion rights, while promoting the freedom of women to control their own bodies through reproductive choice, recurrently frame their political struggle, mirroring their anti-abortion foes, as a "fight for our children -for our daughters and our sons," and thus as a fight for the future.2 What, in that case, would it signify not to be "fighting for the children"? How could one take the other "side," when taking any side at all necessarily constrains one to take the side of, by virtue of taking a side within, a political order that returns to the Child as the image of the future it intends? Impossibly, against all reason, my project stakes its claim to the very space that "politics" makes unthinkable: the space outside the framework within which politics as we know it appears and so outside the conflict of visions that share as their pre· supposition that the body politic must survive. Indeed, at the heart of my polemical engagement with the cultural text of politics and the politics of cultural texts lies a simple provocation: that **queerness names the side of those not “fighting for the children,” the side outside the consensus by which all politics confirms the absolute value of reproductive futurism.** The ups and downs of political fortune may measure the social order’s pulse, but queerness, by contrast, figures, outside and beyond its political symptoms, **the place of the social order’s death drive:** a place, to be sure, of abjection expressed in the stigma, sometimes fatal, that follows from reading that figure literally, and hence a place from which liberal politics strives- and strives quite reasonable, given its unlimited faith in reason, to disassociate the queer. More radically, though, as I argue her, queerness attains its ethical value precisely insofar as it accedes to that place, accepting its figural status as resistance to the viability of the social while insisting on the inextricability of such resistance from every social structure.

#### The result is queer overkill – Liberal democracy creates a category of human that excludes the queer. Antiqueer violence manifests to end queer life – a death beyond death – OW extinction through infinite pain

Stanley 11(assistant professor in the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of California) <https://queerhistory.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/near-life-queer-death-eric-stanley.pdf> Near Life, Queer Death: Overkill and Ontological Capture. Social Text 107. Vol, 29, No. 2. Duke University Press. Eric Stanley. AQ. Accessed 11/05/18.

Overkill is a term used to indicate 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 that the murderer became so enraged after the “discovery” of either genitalia or someone’s sexuality they were 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.

#### Vote negative to affirm the weaponization of queerness to turn the death drive and kill the Child accepting present destruction than future annihilation. Thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater with the best method of traversing the fantasy for a chance of social life within social death

Check Here for Spec – [1] A legitimate advocacy provides a way to traverse the fantasy – by providing a counter method of allowing queer people to exist in the real removing the threat of the child [2] The ROB warrants are contextualized and come first because it triggers the representations of arguments of the AC – which are anti queer based on the links to the aff [3] The K is the highest layer – no theoretical objections outweigh – violations link to the K [4] Weigh between competing advocacies by discussing which is better to traverse the fantasy [5] Use CX to check for anything else – I can’t predict every condition

Baedan 12 baedan, 2012, “baedan,” Journal of Queer Nihilism, The Anarchist Library, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan> //Lex AKo™

The campaign promises a fulfilling world which exists beyond the nightmare of high school, yet somehow fails to mention the waking nightmares of debt, work, family, disease, depression and anxiety which the future must surely deliver. Of these videos the most vile and perhaps the most telling is a recent release by the San Francisco Police Department depicting queer police officers telling their coming-out stories and assuring the viewers of the better future to come. Along with these assurances, they further implore queer youth to call on the police department if in need, declaring “it will get better, and until it does, we’ll be here for you.” The future will continue its mirage-like spectacle, promising redemption yet continually deferring its delivery. The further we progress down its path, the farther we’ll be from the utopia it teases us with. We’ll consistently arrive where we imagined the future would take us, only to 22 find that the desert of modern life continues to stretch out in every direction—that the passage of time has continued to deliver us up anew for pure repetition of the same: the same exploitation, alienation, depression, meaninglessness. If queerness is to be our weapon, we must fanatically avoid any tendency toward reproductive futurism that would dull our daggers. We must refuse the institutions of the future, whether high schools or police departments, that eternally immiserate our present. If we are to cease the skyward growth of the pile of queer bodies sacrificed at the feet of the future, we must silence the chorus of it-gets-betters and attack, here and now, at whatever is making it unbearable. If it is our intention to participate in insurrection against domestication and capital’s futurity, we mustn’t be deceived by the fleeing utopias of reproductive futurism. Instead we must situate ourselves within our present, and studiously explore the methods of sabotage, interruption, expropriation and destruction than refuse futurity’s domination. Or, as Edelman puts it: If the fate of the queer is to figure the fate that cuts the thread of futurity… then the only oppositional status to which our queerness could ever lead would depend on our taking seriously the place of the death drive we’re called on to figure and insisting, against the cult of the Child and the political order it reinforces, that we, as Guy Hocquenghem made clear, are “not the signifier of what might become a new form of ‘social organization,’” that we do not intend a new politics, a better society, a brighter tomorrow, since all of these fantasies reproduce the past, through displacement, in the form of the future. We choose instead not to choose the Child, as disciplinary image of the Imaginary past or as site of a projective identification with an always impossible future. The queerness we propose, in Hocquenghem’s words, “is unaware of the passing of generations as stages on the road to better living. It knows nothing about ‘sacrifice now for the sake of future generations… it knows that civilization alone is mortal.” Even more: it delights in that mortality as the negation of everything that would define itself, moralistically, as pro-life. It is we who must bury the subject in the tomb-like hollow of the signifier, pronouncing at last the words for which we’re condemned should we speak them or not: that we are the advocates of abortion; that the Child as futurity’s emblem must die; that the future is mere repetition and just as lethal as the past. Our queerness has nothing to offer a symbolic that lives by denying that nothingness except an insistence on the haunting excess that this nothingness entails, an insistence of the negativity that pierces the fantasy screen of futurity, shattering narrative temporality with irony’s always explosive force. And so what is queerest about us, queerest within us, and queerest despite us is this willingness to insist intransitively—to insist that the future stops here.