## OFF

#### Interpretation: the affirmative may not specify a type of appropriation

#### ‘The’ indicates that appropriation is generic – no spec is allowed

Merriam **Webster’s 19** Online Dictionary, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### Violation: they spec <>

#### Standards

#### 1] Limits – they can spec infinite different types of appropriation like space mining, satellite orbit types, colonization, etc. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of entities, governments, and appropriation.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. PICs aren’t aff offense – a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

#### D] Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

## OFF

#### The psychic and structural imposition of liberalism legitimizes securitized rhetoric and biopolitical control in domestic spheres which justifies the affs heternormative logic

Melanie Richter-Montpetit, 03-17-2017, ("Queer International Relations," No Publication, <https://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-265>) SP

While there is increasing awareness of certain non-normative sexualities (“homosexuality”) and sexual practices (“Men-who-have-Sex-with-Men”), with few exceptions, key international actors and policy frameworks in the area of peace and security rest on what Queer and Transgender theory describes as cisprivilege. Cisprivilege refers to people whose gender assigned at birth matches their gender identity (“cisgender”). As Jamie Hagen (2016) explores in the context of the UN’s Women, Peace and Security (WPS) architecture, heteronormativity and cissexism obscure a wide set of practices of violence and exclusions negatively affecting people that are not straight or cisgender. Hagen shows how deploying a limited understanding of a heteronormative gender binary allows WPS policy and monitoring to account for the security needs of heterosexual cisgender women, while obscuring LGBT subjects and their safety. This framework also reproduces insecurities for the “women” it is meant to protect, in particular those with queer sexualities and non-normative gender expression. For instance, trans people and gender non-binary people are typically refused medical care, safe access to bathrooms in shelters, and refugee camps (see also Jauhola, 2010, 2013). Neither is sexual and gender-based violence against gay men recognized and accounted for under the WPS architecture, even though their presumed lack of masculinity makes them vulnerable to rape during conflict (Hagen, 2016, p. 315f.). Military Masculinities and Soldiering Queer IR builds on the rich body of Feminist IR scholarship on the seemingly inextricable linkages between modern militaries, war, and masculinities. Queer IR agrees with Feminist Security Studies [link] about the significance of gendered norms and discourses of masculinity for producing soldiers, militaries, and militarism and extends this research by inquiring in more depth into the “heterosexist premises of military masculinity.”52 Queer IR demonstrates the foundational role of particular normativities around sexuality and gender in producing soldiers and war, while it simultaneously complicates understandings of the modern military and military masculinity as structured by clear-cut gendered and sexualized dichotomies, such as male/female and heterosexual/homosexual. Contrary to commonsense understandings of soldiering involving only “manly” tasks, modern militaries (including the U.S. military) rely on service members to also perform unmasculine practices and inhabit subjectivities commonly coded as feminine. Examples for this embrace of the “unmasculine” range from cleaning toilets and polishing boots to enduring anal rape during hazing. Queer IR adds to our understanding of these seeming contradictions by demonstrating how these practices and subject positions get recoded as affirming a soldier’s overall military masculinity (Belkin, 2012; Cohn, 1998). In conversation with Feminist Security Studies, Queer IR argues that the military may in fact provide men the rare opportunity to safely transcend the boundaries of acceptable heteromasculinity. The military is among the very few institutions where men are allowed to engage in emotional, erotic, and sexual encounters and impulses otherwise suppressed in the civilian world for fear of being seen (by others or themselves) as queer and therefore not real men (Cohn, 1998, p. 17). A burgeoning body of Queer IR scholarship examines the increasing inclusion of LGBT people and associated representational practices in modern militaries. These works offer important insights for IR theory and policy, challenging in particular dichotomous frameworks regarding the agency of LGBT recruits, such as subversion/co-optation (Bulmer, 2013) or power/resistance (Richter-Montpetit, 2014b). Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira’s (2008) groundbreaking work coined the concept of “intimate investments” to understand how queer soldiers—historically themselves cast as threats to the nation and national security—seek to actively participate in the military and military violence. Queer IR scholarship examines whether the inclusion of LGBT soldiers in the United Kingdom (Bulmer, 2011, 2013) and the United States (Agathangelou et al., 2008; Richter-Montpetit, 2014b) or homoerotic visual representations of soldiers (Caso, 2016) challenge the heteropatriarchal character of the military and/or contribute to militarization and imperial geopolitics. Finally, Queer IR also speaks to the generative character of war and the military in shaping sexual and gender identities, practices, and normativities (Crane-Seeber, 2016; Howell, 2014; Wool, 2015). Security Governance/Regimes Queer IR demonstrates that certain normativities around sexuality and gender also play a central role in global security governance, including security regimes in the Global South. For example, Paul Amar’s work explores how the governance of stigmatized sexualities and gender expressions plays a key role in shifting figurations of global security regimes. Amar’s (2013) most recent book The Security Archipelago: Human-Security States, Sexuality Politics, and the End of Neoliberalism focuses on Cairo and Rio de Janeiro, two megacities said to be at the forefront of new and innovative security practices, actors, and governance structures. Amar traces a range of new and complex securitization projects and practices and the ways in which they are shot through with sexual and gender normativities. Central to the consolidation and expansion of these security regimes is the rise of a new doctrine of human security that casts human rights as beneficial to both national and societal security. Military and police security apparatuses and associated parastate actors prosper by focusing their efforts on constructing non-normative sexualities and gender expressions as threats to public safety. These new security regimes bring together a set of strange bedfellows, including ultra-conservative and self-identified progressive mass movements around morality, sexuality, and labor. For other Queer IR scholarship examining the construction of men who have sex with men as national security threats, see Nicola Pratt on the Queen Boat case in Egypt (2011). Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of Military Interventions Over the past decade, the thesis that powerful and otherwise highly heteronormative and patriarchal states in both the Global North and South increasingly harness queer sexualities and LGBT populations for their geopolitical ambitions has ushered in a rich and vibrant research agenda in Transnational Queer Studies and more recently, Queer IR.53 This shift has given rise to two dominant figurations of homosexuality and the homosexual—“the perverse homosexual” and “the normal homosexual” (Weber, 2016a). Progressive discourses recognize the latter as a “normal” sexual subject looking for love within the framework of monogamous couplehood, making “‘the LGBT’ as normal as any other loving human being” (Agathangelou, 2013; Agathangelou et al., 2008; Weber, 2016b). Much of Queer IR scholarship has been critical about the ways in which queer sexualities and increasingly also the rights of trans people have been taken up as tools of chauvinist or imperial statecraft. To make sense of what they see as problematic practices of diplomacy and foreign policy, critics in Queer IR have deployed the influential concepts of “homonationalism” (Puar, 2007) and “pinkwashing” developed in Transnational Queer Studies and activism (Puar & Mikdashi, 2012; Schotten & Maikey, 2012) and/or developed new terminology, such as “homocolonialism” (Rahman, 2015). Other Queer IR scholarship examines how the production of the figure of the respectable homosexual is made possible through structures of settler colonialism (Leigh, 2015; Richter-Montpetit, 2014b) and anti-Blackness (Agathangelou, 2013; Richter-Montpetit, 2014b). A classic example in Queer IR on the central role of cultural ideas about heteromasculinity—and performances of queer masculinities—in legitimizing military interventions is Cynthia Weber’s work on U.S. relations with various Caribbean states in the wake of the Cuban Revolution (1959–1994). Feminist analyses of military interventions typically show the critical role gendered “rescue” narratives play in producing the conditions of possibility for so-called humanitarian interventions. These gendered “rescue” narratives typically frame (post)colonial spaces and peoples as variously feminized and in need of forceful yet benign masculine intervention by major powers like the United States. Weber shows that the U.S. state did not simply seek to project itself as hyper-masculine and hyper-heterosexual. Rather the U.S. state relied upon non-normative codes of gender and sexuality—queer performativities—as an unlikely strategy to pacify the Caribbean region, regain its heteromasculine national identity, and thus reclaim its status as a potent and virile global super power. Other Queer IR scholarship explores how to techno-strategic discourses about nuclear warfare (Cohn, 1993) are shot through with heteronormative cultural logics. Terrorism and Counter-Insurgency Building on the pathbreaking work by Jasbir K. Puar and Amit Rai (2002) and Puar’s later solo work (2004, 2005, 2006, 2007) in Transnational Queer Studies, Queer IR scholarship has demonstrated the role of non-normative understandings of gender and sexuality in representations of the figure of the Muslim terrorist and/or insurgent and the ways in which these knowledges have shaped security practices in the War on Terror.54 Queer IR draws our attention to how the will to knowledge about sexuality and gender in this context is deeply shaped by cultural ideas about racial difference and colonial forms of power to construct internationally dangerous figures—like “the terrorist” and/or “the insurgent”—and those who need to be secured from them like “the docile patriot” (Puar & Rai, 2002). For example, Queer IR scholarship on U.S. and British Counterinsurgency (COIN) efforts in the so-called War on Terror shows how Orientalist discourses about Afghan, Arab, and or Muslim men’s (allegedly) failed masculinity and perverse sexualities shaped COIN practices at the operational and tactical level. In her study of Western representations of Afghan—in particular Pashtun—men, Nivi Manchanda (2015) identifies a strong preoccupation with the alleged prevalence of “illicit sex” among Pashtun men in both U.S. counter-insurgency documents and U.S. and British media reports. Manchanda shows how that “truth” about Pashtun men’s sexualities informed both operational and tactical considerations in U.S. counter-insurgency in Afghanistan. For instance, COIN training materials for U.S. soldiers contains information about queer sexualities and effeminate gender presentation, including the use of eyeliner among the local population. These knowledges produce the figure of the “Queer Pashtun” or “perverse” “terrorist” masculinities, which make it possible for both official COIN and media discourses to frame “violence against Americans [.º.º.] as a much-needed release of the terrorists’ bottled-up sexual rage” (Manchanda, 2015, p. 12). Other Queer IR scholarship shows how associated Orientalist ideas about “the Arab mind” and its monolithic moral framework of honor and shame anchored in a distinctly heteropatriarchal Islamic sex-gender regime shaped many of the actual torture techniques documented in the Senate Torture Report about the U.S. post-9/11 torture regime (Owens, 2010; Richter-Montpetit, 2007, 2014a, 2015). Featuring prominently among reported torture practices are highly sexualized carceral practices aimed at feminizing male prisoners. The underlying assumption is simple: The concerted effort at humiliating and destroying Muslim/Arab prisoners’ (presumed) sense of masculinity would “soften them up” and getting them to “confess” terrorist crimes they had committed, were planning to commit, and/or share valuable intelligence about other terrorists/insurgents (Owens, 2010; Richter-Montpetit, 2007, 2014a, 2015). At the center of these feminizing torture techniques were forced nudity; rape and sexualized assault; forced simulation of anal and oral “gay sex”; and forcing otherwise naked male prisoners to wear “women’s” underwear, including on their head. These sexualized carceral practices did not “simply” apply Orientalist stereotypes about Islam and Arabs but in fact produced Muslim prisoners as sexually deviant—they cast the tortured “as racially queer” (Richter-Montpetit, 2014a, p. 56). Taking seriously the influential role of cultural logics about racialized sexuality and gender in counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency practices helps IR make sense of the large number of prisoners that were detained and tortured for years even though they were officially known to be “innocent” and/or without any intelligence value (Richter-Montpetit, 2014a, 2015). This research opens up critical IR analyses beyond explanatory and moral frameworks such as failed intelligence gathering, “state of exception,” or “human rights abuses” toward a more comprehensive understanding of seemingly illiberal security practices in the War on Terror. Finally, like Postcolonial and Decolonial IR, Queer IR contributes to IR debates on the ongoing raciality and coloniality of international relations by showing how counter-terrorism practices and the larger War on Terror they are part of are not only shaped by Orientalism, but also anti-Blackness and settler colonialism (Agathangelou, 2013; Leigh, 2015; Puar, 2007; Richter-Montpetit, 2014a, 2015). Securitization Theory Queer IR has also contributed to debates about the conceptual and empirical validity of securitization theory. For example, Alison Howell’s work on Global Health challenges the argument that health has been securitized. In fact, Howell questions the validity of analytics of securitization generally. Bringing Critical War studies into conversation with Queer theory and Critical Disability studies or Crip theory, Howell argues that modern warfare and modern medicine emerged in tandem rather than medicine and psychiatry being “abused” by military actors. Howell evidences her understanding of medicine as an instrument of violence by exploring medicine’s role in the violent management of “abnormal” populations, such as homosexuals and trans women. Taking queer and trans people seriously in global politics renders visible the routine character of practices of force inherent in—and indeed constitutive of—liberal rule and its use of “social warfare” (Howell, 2014, p. 970). Howell’s queer analysis thus contributes to IR theory and Critical Security Studies by rethinking the validity of the norm/exception and politics/security distinctions underwriting securitization theory. Border Security Queer IR scholarship shows that ideas about normative sexuality and gender are also central to everyday security practices at the border (Frowd, 2014). The management of border security is based on calculations about risk and danger of certain bodies and relies on and is productive of certain normativities around gender. For instance, airport security assemblages with their use of biometric data and body scanners mobilize knowledges of gender to assess the truth about travelers’ bodies, which produces trans and non-binary people as deceptive, deviant, and dangerous bodies (Sjoberg & Shepherd, 2012; Wilcox, 2015). In conversation with Transgender theory, Queer IR approaches to border security thus extend the insights of feminist and critical race analyses on the role of gendered and racialized knowledges to problematic ontologies of cisnormativity.

#### The aff’s drive to prevent extinction is a form of masculine survivalism where gendered bodies become the unwilling tools to sustain humanity

Mitchell 15 (Audra Mitchell, Audra Mitchell is a settler scholar who lives and works on the Ancestral and treaty lands of the Neutral (Attawandaron), Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas of the New Credit (please see Honouring the Land). She currently holds the the Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at Wilfrid Laurier University. From 2015-18 she held the CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs Audra is an Associate Professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada, 8-3-2015, "Gendering extinction," Worldly, <https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2015/08/03/gendering-extinction/>, JKS)

The reproduction of survival/ the survival of reproduction

Extinction is almost always understood against the horizon of survival and the imperative to sustain it – at least for life forms deemed to be of value to humans. In many cases, this imperative takes the form of deliberate strategies for enforcing existence. Donna Haraway’s influential book When Species Meet devotes considerable attention to the logics, practices and politics of Species Survival Plans. These plans monitor and enforce reproduction amongst ‘endangered’ species, not least by collecting data on populations, genetic profiles and genetic materials to enable selective breeding. This strategy assumes that all organisms can, should, and can be made to exercise their reproductive capacities in order to resist extinction, and it actively mobilizes members of ‘endangered species’ into this project. In so doing, it helps to entrench norms regarding gender, sexuality and reproductive labour that are deeply entrenched in modern, Western human cultures. Attention to these programmes highlights an important way in which extinction is gendered in dominant scientific and policy frameworks. Specifically, strategic breeding programmes share in the belief that reproduction is an imperative for those capable of reproducing if ‘the species’ is at risk’. This belief is directly related to Western norms of the reproductive imperative for women. Indeed, Haraway points out that it is precisely “‘woman’s’ putative self-defining responsibility to ‘the species’ as this singular and typological female is reduced to her reproductive function”. In a similar sense, within SSPs and other strategies of enforced survival, entire life forms are reduced to their reproductive capacities. Moreover, programmes of enforced survival can, in the context of sexual reproduction, disproportionately burden female organisms with the task of avoiding extinction. This logic is particularly fraught in discussions of the possibility of human extinction, in which female fertility (captured in the standard policy language of ‘births per woman’) is framed simultaneously as a threat to survival, and the only hope for escaping extinction (see, for instance, Alan Weisman’s comments on this). In these ways, the securitization of survival entrenches the intersectional categories of gender, species and race discussed above. Dominant discourses of extinction and conservation also entrench and privilege sexual reproduction, in ways that entrench heteronormative assumptions and norms. This is reflected in the way that the subjects of extinction and conservation are framed. The standard object of conservation is the biological ‘species’, a term which is defined by the ability of organisms to reproduce sexually. As Myra Hird has pointed out, this conception of ‘species’ makes it appear as if sexual reproduction is the ‘best’ means of sustaining the existence of a life form. However, Hird’s work demonstrates that Earthly life forms actually engage in myriad forms of reproduction, from the free exchange of DNA between bacteria to the hermaphroditic practices of some fish. The upshot of these arguments is that Earthly life is sustained through a huge variety of reproductive activities that do not conform to biological understandings of life processes or species. Crucially, Hird argues that there is no necessary hierarchy between forms of reproduction. In Darwinian terms, all species that manage to survive are equally successful. However, by conflating survival with sexual reproduction, existing discourses of extinction embed hetero-normative frameworks that devalue other forms of reproduction. They also reduce reproduction to the imperative to survive, ignoring the myriad cultural, political, aesthetic, sensual and other dimensions of reproduction.

#### The 1AC perpetuates this fear of death that is rooted in violence against non – normative bodies, we become the scapegoats for violence in the name of preserving a future-to-come that never quite arrives.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 184)CJQ

While death is unarguably a part of the human condition, for Bataille the fear of death is a historically habituated response, one that grounds cultures of advanced capitalism and phallicized whiteness. In those frames of late modernity, death introduces an ontological scarcity into the very human condition: it represents finitude, the ultimate limit. We must distance ourselves from such threats, and we do so most often by projecting them onto sexualized, racialized, and classed bodies. But for Bataille, servility to the order of knowledge is as unnecessary as servility to the order of utility. To die humanly, he argues, is to accept “the subordination of the thing” (1988– 91, 2:219), which places us in the schema that separates our present self from the future, desired, anticipated self: “to die humanly is to have of the future being, of the one who matters most in our eyes, the senseless idea that he is not” (1988–91, 2:219). But if we are not trapped in the endless anticipation of our future self as the index of meaning in our lives, we may not be anguished by this cessation: “If we live sovereignly, the representation of death is impossible, for the present is not subject to the demands of the future” (1988–91, 2:219). To live sovereignly is not to escape death, which is ontologically impossible. But it is to refuse the fear, and subsequent attempts at disavowal, of death as the ontological condition that defines humanity. Rather than trying to transgress this ultimate limit and prohibition, the sovereign man “cannot die fleeing. He cannot let the threat of death deliver him over to the horror of a desperate yet impossible flight” (1988–91, 2:219). Living in a temporal mode in which “anticipation would dissolve into NOTHING” (1988–91, 2: 208), the sovereign man “lives and dies like an animal” (1988–91, 2:219). He lives and dies without the anxiety invoked by the forever unknown and forever encroaching anticipation of the future. As Bataille encourages us elsewhere, “Think of the voracity of animals, as against the composure of a cook” (1988–91, 2:83).

#### The alternative is THE ABORTION OF REALITY, to sign your ballot for NONE OF THE ABOVE in an act of queer mutiny that throws into question heterosexual logics of reproduction and efficiency that would straightwash the violence done to queers by articulating it only as individual criminal acts. This social order has given nothing to queers that they couldn’t build on their own: use your ballot to embrace a queer reclamation of this and every other space.

Edelman 2004 (Lee, Prof. English Tufts, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive,” Pp. 4-5)//Raunak

Rather than rejecting, with liberal discourse, this ascription of negativity to the queer, we might, as I argue, do better to consider accepting and even embracing it. Not in the hope of forging thereby some more perfect social order-such a hope, after all, would only reproduce the constraining mandate of futurism, just as any such order would equally occasion the negativity of the queer-but rather to refuse the insistence of hope itself as affirmation, which is always affirmation of an order whose refusal will register as unthinkable, irresponsible, inhumane. And the trump card of affirmation? Always the question: If not this, what? Always the demand to translate the insistence, the pulsive force of negativity into "some determinate stance or "position" whose determination would thus negate it: always the imperative to immure it in some stable and positive form. When I argue, then, that we might do well to attempt what is surely impossible-to withdraw our allegiance, however compulsory, from a reality based on the Ponzi scheme of reproductive futurism -I do not intend to propose some "good" that will thereby be assured. To the contrary, I mean to insist that nothing, and certainly not what we call the "good," can ever have any assurance at all in the order of the Symbolic. Abjuring fidelity to a futurism that's always purchased at our expense, though bound, as Symbolic subjects consigned to figure the Symbolic's undoing, to the necessary contradiction of trying to turn its intelligibility against itself, we might rather, figuratively, cast our vote for "none of the above," for the primacy of a constant no in response to the law of the Symbolic, which would echo that law's foundational act, its self-constituting negation. The structuring optimism of politics to which the order of meaning commits us, installing as it does the perpetual hope of reaching meaning through signification, is always, I would argue, a negation of this primal, constitutive, and negative act. And the various positivities produced in its wake by the logic of political hope depend on the mathematical illusion that negated negations might somehow escape, and not redouble, such negativity. My polemic thus stakes its fortunes on a truly hopeless wager: that taking the Symbolic's negativity to the very letter of the law, that attending to the persistence of something internal to reason that reason refuses, that turning the force of queerness against all subjects, however queer, can afford an access to the jouissance that at once defines and negates us. Or better: can expose the constancy, the inescapability, of such access to jouissance in the social order itself, even if that order can access its constant access to jonissance only in the process of abjecting that constancy of access onto the queer.

#### The judge should treat the AC as an artifact. The aff must defend their epistemic orientation prior to debating a risk of fiated solvency.

#### Resolvability­– no fiat can’t pass policies but your ballot can change community norms. EX: debate community going from K’s are cheating to a more middle ground f/w

#### Rep shape policy implementation– The epistemic justifications for what we debate function in what we do

#### Repetition compulsion– Heteronormative logics normalize themselves in academic arenas. Using procedurals of debate to shield themselves from criticism, anti-queer violence becomes naturalized in this space. Your role as an educator is to maintain a space that all bodies can feel comfortable in entering. Accessiblity comes first, bc it determines the ability for queer individuals to access the benefits of this model.

#### The ontopolitical nature of gender encodes of cispirvellege shapes the way we conceptualize of IR – Your theorizations relies on violence against genderqueer and trans bodies to justify itself.

Shepherd and Sjoberg 12 (Laura J, Australian Research Council Future Fellow and Professor of International Relations at Sydney University, and Laura, PhD USC and associate professor of Political Science at the University of Florida, Trans- bodies in/of war(s): Cisprivilege and contemporary security strategy, Feminist Review) //Raunak Dua

Taking cisprivilege seriously draws attention to the fact that even the most inclusive interpretations of security exclude the ambiguous (Munoz, 1999: 2), the cross (McCloskey, 2000: xii; Roen, 2002), the invisible (Bettcher, 2007: 52), the disidentified (Heyes, 2003: 1096) and the 'in' (Shotwell and Sangray, 2009: 59). We argue here that this is neither incidental nor accidental, even if it is not a conscious practice of exclusion, and that these exclusionary practices are forms of violence. Foucault suggested that '[a] relationship of violence acts upon a body or upon things; it forces, it bends, it breaks, it destroys or it closes off all possibilities' (1983: 340). Violence perverts, inverts or renders unintelligible certain ways of being in the world while endorsing others; in this, violence is perhaps best conceptualised as a specific relation of power that is not necess- arily repressive but productive. A conceptualisation of violence inspired by Foucault can allow for the admission of 'the exclusionary presuppositions and foundations that shore up discursive practices insofar as those foreclose the heterogeneity, gender, class or race of the subject' (Hanssen, 2000: 215) as acts of violence that are simultaneously practices of power. On this view, violence is not reducible to (physical) constraint or repression but rather encompasses regulative idea(l)s and performs ordering functions in our collective cognitive frameworks. If we accept that representing transpeople and queer bodies specifically as in- and hypervisible in war stories and security strategy is a form of violence, and that this violence has its foundation in unexamined and often unconscious privilege enjoyed by cispeople, then we can begin to understand how a nuanced and sophisticated gendered theory of security needs to incorporate corporeality, including trans- corporeality. We can note parallels between transphobic violence (policing and actively (re)producing the boundaries of gender) and transnational violence (policing and actively (re)producing the boundaries of religions, states, ethnicities and/or alliances. Laura Shepherd (2008: 78; see also Shepherd, 2010c) terms these processes 'the violent reproduction of gender' and 'the violent reproduction of the international'). The borders of gender are policed as a part of an active policing of the borders between states, the borders between states and non-states, and the borders between the (safe) self-state and the (dangerous, terrorist) other. Narratives of the international fetishise and Orientalise the exotic 'Other' (be it a colonial other, a trans- other or a terrorist other) to associate Otherness with violence and inspire violence towards the Other. 'Non-violent' resisters of existing (engendered) social orders are often addressed by the dominant (gendered) social order violently, much like non-violent transpeople are often attacked for the very presentation of trans-ness in the face of a social order that excludes their existence both de jure and de facto. We suggest that these are ontopolitical practices; as Michael Dillon explains, 'all political interpretation is simultaneously ontopolitical because it cannot but disclose the ontology sequestered within iť (1999: 112). The ontopolitical (representational) practices of security have thus far been founded on embedded cisprivilege. The ontology of security, even of gendered security theory, has conventionally relied on gender/sex certainty and gender/sex hierarchy. If it is analytically and conceptually productive to see transphobic violence as the violent reproduction of a stable sex/gender system that 'naturally' privileges cisgender performances because such performances are associated with normality and safety and trans- performances are associated with danger and discomfort, it then becomes possible to ask questions about the ways that trans-in(/hyper)visibiIity, cisprivilege and a regulative, exclusionary ontopolitical social order are violently reproduced in inter/transnational relations. In tentative conclusion, we suggest that this might be a creative and constructive way forward that resists the dominant ontopolitical practices of security-as-matter and gender-as-binary, both of which bring into being a disguised and disfigured (corpo)reality of genderqueer and trans- bodies in/of war.

## Case

#### Nuclear winter is rooted in divisive technostrategic discourse that prevents effective anti-nuclear activism – their ev might be rights that debates about nuclear war are good but it shouldn’t center around nuke winter

Joenniemi, PhD, 87

(Pertti. PoliSci@Copenhagen, SeniorResearchFellow@COPRI, "DECODING NUCLEAR WINTER; HAS WAR LOST ITS NAME?" Current Research on Peace and Violence 10, no. 1, 20-31)

The discourse established might also have the weakness that it only indirectly calls for concrete countermeasures and action to stop the nuclear arms race. The image of nuclear winter rebels against the dominant forms of conceptualizing essential security matters, but is societally very mild and sophisticated in its consequences. It results in appeals rather than demands. The descriptions of nuclear winter, developments that might render Earth uninhabitable, no doubt frighten the public. But this does not as such impel people to take a stand against nuclear weapons and dominant strategic thinking. The net result could also be one of inactivity, staying aside and observing the rather sophisticated debate of the experts and their cautious advice to the decision-makers. Nuclear winter, being a product of the scientific community, takes the form of expert knowledge. It has already from the beginning been connected with an effort to increase the understanding of the public of the various physical, biological and medical consequences of the large scale use of nuclear weapons. It stands for an endeavour to inform, but also to inform in a particular and selective way. The view put forward on Nature tends to be orgasmic and mechanistic. This is what all the map-making and model-building is about. There is an emphasis on the rational and the calculable with complicated computer models seen as the final, decisive proof. This way of presentation splits and divides rather than opens and invites for a broad and comprehensive dialogue in issues that require unifying understanding. The abstraction of nuclear winter and the nuclear winter theory are therefore two different things working in different ways. This narrowness of the theory also comes out in the way of reporting results. In preparing a study on the environmental consequences of nuclear war the International Council for Scientific Unions stressed the need for a report that "would be unemotional non-political, authoritative and readily understandable" (Crutzen 1985, p. 7). The terms established for informing about the nuclear winter theory are quite selective. They divide rather than unify. The approach chosen is an explicitely reductionist one openly acknowledging that the way of presentation is fragmentized. This mode of presentation might have its merit if seen strictly from a scientific point of view. But there is more to it, more than logic and physics. There is also metaphysical dimension, that is the images, visions and symbols and not only the logical propositions. As these metaphysical aspects are laid aside in the presentations the discourse becomes narrow and elite oriented. It adds to the alienation among the public rather than reduces it. Also values, emotions and human feelings are by and large excluded from the discourse, not to speak of judgement on moral or ethical issues. It excludes a number of qualities and aspects that would be quite familiar to the public. War, with its social and cultural aspects, is reduced to a natural catastrophe to make it more approachable. With the stress on authoritative presentations, backed by the prestige of the natural sciences and scientists, a dialogue is created that easily places the public in the position of a listener, an object rather than subject and participant in an exchange of views and judgements. The dialogue with its stress on instrumentality is reduced to those aspects that are particularly favourable to the natural scientists. For example the issue of human life is approached in the following way: "Recent studies projecting the consequences of nuclear war estimate that from 750 million to 1.1 billion humans in the Northern Hemisphere could die from blast, thermal, and radiation effects of large-scale nuclear war. In addition, the number of individuals suffering serious injury and trauma, many of whom would not recover, could reach hundreds of millions." This text (Grover 1984, p. 7) resembles to some extent those of strategists and nuclear planners. It refers in its narrative to entities rather than human beings, persons, citizens and individuals. Also the strategic parlance is devoid of values, human feelings and ethics. In a similar vein it aspires to the unemotional, nonpolitical and authoritative. In the above text there is no reference to imply that it would speak about "us". Death is presented as something happening to others, not to us. The victims have no specific characteristics or personality. This tends to leave the reader outside uninvolved in regard to the issue described. It makes him an object and bystander rather than a subject with deep concern for what is being described. The text does not bring home its human dimension strongly enough. Consequently, it is not easy for the reader to identify with millions and to be a part of the picture. The holistic approach and the communal ideology underlying the nuclear winter discourse turns easily into an anti-individualistic stance. The text above is perhaps not too different from those that sometimes use the deeply dehumanizing concept of "megabodies" in describing the potential effects of nuclear war. This is a measure equal to a million human deaths. By using this measure strategists and researchers in nuclear policies may approach their subject unemotionally, without too much risk of identification and attachment of feelings. "Megadeath", like nuclear winter, allows the discourse to stay unemotional and authoritative. By its very essence it deprives the audience of opportunities for intense moral reactions of ought and ought not. As nuclear issues are not classified into good or bad they offer few opportunities for linkages with our group feelings. We can extend our "we" feelings to our parents, ancestors and children, and in this way gain an increased sense of security and certainty. But nuclear issues are nebulous, and reduce our perceptions of life, the world, and our boundaries, as has been observed by Rita R. Rogers. Linkages to ancestors and progeny are nonexistent. "Our lives possibly become more "now" oriented, more hedonistic, more frantic and also more diminished in feelings. The nuclear threat creates only feelings of bland, non-participatory aloofness" (Rogers 1982, p. 18). The image of nuclear winter does not even strive to meet and mobilize our emotional capacities. It aspires to the unemotional and gives in general the impression that it is something particularly for top politicians, not ordinary people, to worry about. This is not as things should be. Far too often the nuclear winter parlance is devoid of emotions and human feelings. It deliberately strives for expressions that are technical in their essence and tend to preserve a distance from what is discussed. It approaches the receiver in an exact, rational and distinctively informative way. Thus it also avoids approaching the mental structures that for the individual are decisive for a stand to be taken. The nuclear threat, in spite of its existence and our cognitive awareness of it, does not fully penetrate our human fantasy. It remains there and we here. We tend to see it as another realm. Nuclear winter further adds to this awareness but does not sufficiently increase the psychological and cultural armament to deal with the issue. It seems that the theory of nuclear winter goes some way in preparing the ground. It is something of a counterconcept initiated by a scientific community that has thus far not very strongly engaged itself in matters of security and nuclear war. It is as such an important sign of resistance and rethinking within this community. However, as to society at large no real breakthrough has taken place.

#### They conveniently forgot the last paragraph of this evidence.

Sample 19 Ian Sample 7-19-2019 “Apollo 11 site should be granted heritage status, says space agency boss” <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2019/jul/19/apollo-11-site-heritage-status-space-agency-moon> (PhD at Queens Mary College 1-22-2022 amrita

But **Wörner believes heritage can go too far**. “I would say let’s limit it to the important ones,” he said. “**If** you define each and **everything** on Earth **as heritage**, you **cannot move** and it will be the same on the moon. We should not make heritage the brake for the future.”

#### Status quo checks—private companies will work *with* NASA- we’ll read blue.

Tillman 19 Nola Taylor Tillman 7-31-2019 "Will Private Companies Beat NASA to the Moon?" <https://www.space.com/nasa-private-companies-moon-race.html> (Science Journalist)//Elmer recut amrita

With private companies setting their sights on sending humans to the moon in the near future, it's possible that one could touch down on the lunar surface before NASA astronauts do. But **the resulting "public versus private" space race isn't one that NASA feels** overly competitive **about. The** space **agency's plans** to reach the moon involve **rely**ing **on private** corporations **rather than challenging** them. "The challenges differ for the public and private sector, though they all do come down to money," Wendy Whitman Cobb told Space.com by email. Whitman Cobb, an associate professor at the U.S. Air Force's School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, examines the institutional dynamics of the policymaking behind space exploration. She stressed that her views are her own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Air Force or Department of Defense. "Technology is not a problem for either sector — the ability to get to the moon has existed since the 1960s," Whitman-Cobb said. "What is different is the will to do it." A Worldwide Team NASA's current lunar push kicked into high gear in December 2017, when President Donald Trump signed a space-policy directive to send humans to the moon and establish a sustainable presence there. Earlier this year, Vice President Mike Pence told NASA to put boots on the moon by 2024, rather than the previous goal of 2028. NASA's Artemis program aims to reach that goal. (In Greek mythology, Artemis was the twin sister of Apollo and goddess of the moon.) The agency's Orion spacecraft will carry human explorers to the Gateway outpost, a small space station that NASA plans to start building in lunar orbit in the early 2020s. Landers will then carry astronauts from the Gateway to the lunar surface. The **space agency** won't be hitting these goals on its own. "We're already **partnering with** our **commercial** partners to build these systems, **and** later on we'll continue to work with our international partners to build up the Gateway," Marshall Smith, director of the human lunar exploration program at NASA's headquarters in Washington, told Space.com by email. The space agency is currently working with 11 companies on Gateway and its associated systems. In May 2019, NASA awarded a contract to Maxar Technologies to build, launch and demonstrate in space the first major Gateway piece — the Power and Propulsion Element. The space agency also announced then that it had signed contracts with three companies to carry experiments to the moon via small robotic landers (though one of those three recently dropped out). In June, NASA asked industry to figure out ways to deliver cargo to the Gateway — much like the companies SpaceX and Northrop Grumman make robotic resupply runs to the International Space Station. In addition to working with private companies, NASA is also cooperating with **other countries** on the Artemis program. "International partners are a vital part of our lunar plan and will contribute **to** the goal of **creating a sustainable lunar presence** by 2028," Smith said. But private industry isn't solely focused on helping NASA make it to the moon. Companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin have stated their intentions to design their own lunar exploration programs. Advertisement Elon Musk's SpaceX is currently working on a 100-passenger vehicle called Starship, which the company envisions carrying people to the moon and Mars. Starship will be lofted off Earth's surface by a huge rocket called Super Heavy. SpaceX already has one Starship-Super Heavy passenger flight planned for 2023. The company hopes to begin commercial operations of the pair as early as 2021, most likely with commercial satellite launches. Blue Origin, operated by Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, is working on a big lander called Blue Moon, which will deliver science instruments, lunar rovers and, eventually, astronauts to the lunar surface. Bezos sees many potential customers for Blue Moon other than NASA. "People are very excited about this capability to soft-land their cargo, their rovers, their science experiments on the surface of the moon in a precise way," Bezos said at the lander's unveiling in May 2019. "There is no capability to do that today." Then there's Florida-based company Moon Express, which is working to become the first private enterprise to reach the moon with robotic spacecraft systems. In 2016, it became the first company to receive U.S. government approval to send a robotic spacecraft to the lunar surface. "Our vision is really to expand Earth's economic and social sphere to include the moon," Alain Berinstain, Moon Express' vice president of global development, said last year at a lunar-science workshop at NASA's Ames Research Center in California. "We see the moon as the Earth's eighth continent to explore and to also mine for resources, like we have with every other continent on Earth." Pittsburgh-based Astrobotic planned to launch its Peregrine lander to the moon in 2019, but that date has since been since pushed back to 2020 or 2021. "We're really, at Astrobotic, trying to do this the right way, meaning that we're trying to be as technically rigorous as possible," Dan Hendrickson, vice president of business development at Astrobotic, said at a Washington Space Business Roundtable in February. "We're trying to be very upfront with the entire community about our current status." As with NASA, private industry has sufficient access to the technology to get to the moon, Whitman Cobb said. "They also have to demonstrate that their systems are fundamentally safe and reliable in order to attract paying customers — they are a business, after all," she said. Private companies also tend to have a leaner leadership structure than NASA's 60-year-old legacy brings with it. "NASA's bureaucracy has stagnated since the 1960s," Whitman Cobb said. That makes it "more difficult for NASA to contract, make changes and adapt to new circumstances." On the other hand, private companies have demonstrated the ability to move through technology development at a rapid rate, incorporating design and technology changes "almost immediately," she said. That brings its own advantages.

#### YOUR AUTHOR CONCLUDES WE SHOULD STILL ALLOW COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE MOON AND HERITAGE SITES – GG!

#amritaisthebest

OSTP 18 Office of Science and Technology Policy March 2018 “PROTECTING & PRESERVING APOLLO PROGRAM LUNAR LANDING SITES & ARTIFACTS” (The Office of Science and Technology Policy is a department of the United States government, part of the Executive Office of the President, established by United States Congress on May 11, 1976, with a broad mandate to advise the President on the effects of science and technology on domestic and international affairs.)//Elmer recut amrita

While **commercial** robotic **missions create risks** to the protection of lunar scientific and heritage sites, **the U.S. Gov**ernment fully **supports commercialization of the space sector and** commercial robotic missions to **the Moon**. Therefore, the risks to damage lunar heritage sites must be balanced against other national and international interests. The **lunar heritage sites can be protected**, at a reasonable cost, **while** still **fostering commercial space activities** and government-sponsored missions back **to the Moon**. There are approximately a dozen U.S. and foreign companies at various stages of planning lunar robotic missions. These include the five GLXP finalists and other companies from the United States, Japan, India, Israel Germany, and other countries.

Hertzfeld and Pace 13 – has been arguing a threat sine 2013 but nothing got triggered there is no time frame.

**Shekhtman 21 – just talking about current protection efforts, no reason why private en bad.**

Crawford 12 - remedy is to observe from dry deserts, high mountains, or from space.

Lee 20 – concedes that they don’t have enough resources anyways for Civ programs. The hard part is getting enough materials — either enriched uranium or plutonium

### Analytics

#### Hamill 16 says nothing about *preventing* super volcanoes- just that they would be found earlier- means they can’t prevent literally any of the impact chain.

The aff will tell us that we will die but not do anything

#### Cooper 12 says that Alaska is a useful state besides Salmon because of its geopolitical location- means status quo is sufficient to solve nuclear war because we already… have… Alaska…