## OFF

#### Policies are pursued for the sake of the future generations in an endless cycle of reproductive futurism that excludes the queer.

**Baedan 12:**

https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan#toc7 *baedan.* Journal of queer nihilism issue one. Accessed 11/04/18. AQ.

Edelman’s critique of politics begins with the figure of the Child. **All political positions**, he argues, **represent  themselves as** doing what is **best for the children.** Politicians, whatever their parties or leanings, universally  frame their debates around the question of what policies are best for the children, who keeps the Child safest, or what type of world we  want to be building for our children. The centrality of the Child in the field of the political is not limited to electoral politics or political  parties. Nationalist groups organize themselves around a necessity to preserve a future for *their children*, while **anarchist** and  communist **revolutionaries concern themselves with** revolutionary organizing meant to create a  **better world for future generations.** Politicians concern themselves with different children depending on  their varying from ideologies, but the Child stays constant as a universal Möbius strip, inverting itself and flipping so as to be the  unquestioned and untouchable universal value of all politics. **Politics**, however supposedly radical, **is**simply **the** universal  movement of **submission to the** ideal of the **future**—**to preserve**, maintain and upgrade **the  structures of society** and to proliferate them through time all for the sake of the children. The Child must always name  the horizon and the beneficiary of every political project. It is for this reason that Edelman contends that queerness finds itself missing  from all political discourse: For the liberal’s view of society, which seems to accord the queer a place, endorses no more than the  conservative right’s the queerness of resistance to futurism and thus the queerness of the queer. While the right wing imagines the  elimination of queers (or of the need to confront their existence), **the left would eliminate queerness by  shining** the cool light of **reason** upon it, hoping thereby **to expose it as merely a mode of  sexual expression** free of the all-pervasive coloring, the determining fantasy formation, by means of which it can seem to

portend, and not for the right alone, the undoing of the social order and its cynosure, the Child. **Queerness**thus **comes to  mean nothing** for both: for the right wing, the nothingness always at war with the positivity of civil society; for the left,  nothing more than a sexual practice in need of demystification. The Child, of course, has very little to do with real children. Like all  people, children are enslaved under the political order of the state and capital, expected to bear the burden of being the innocent  beneficiaries of political initiatives. No, rather **the Child is the fantastic symbol for** the **eternal  proliferation of class society.** The Child represents the succession of generations and the continuation of this  society beyond the lifespans of its living members. All politics, being concerned primarily with the Child, then reveal themselves to be  only ever a process by which to manage and secure the continued existence of society. As enemies of society, we are also enemies of  politics. To quote Edelman: 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 relations. If the varying discourses of politics are only ever about the Child (as society’s future), **queerness must  be anti-political because it marks a** fundamental **interruption of**the societal **norms** and  apparatuses **that** exist to **mandate the reproduction the Child.** Yes, queer sex can be non-reproductive  sex, but we cannot define queerness through such overly-simple and naturalistic logics. **Queerness, beyond being  the negation of** the **heteronormative family** matrix, **must** also **be practiced as a** willful **refusal of**the political **imperative to reproduce class society.** In a world where all social  relations are enchanted by our obligation to the Child as the future of the social order, we must break those communal relations and  break the stranglehold of politics over our daily lives. Queerness must be an outside to politics, an antagonism against the political, or  it isn’t queer at all. By Edelman’s account: **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… More radically, though, as I argue here,  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 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 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.

#### STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE DA: Structural violence is based on a consequentialist foundation. Consequentialism focuses on the magnitude of impacts and is often used by policy makers to make decisions. A consequentialist f/w at the end of the day is focused on protecting populations facing violence right now to make sure they can survive and reproduce in the future. The focus is to help people right now as to ensure some greater good for society. I.E helping families in poverty because it help the future economy and so on. Their f/w prioritizes this notion of doing things for the future which feeds into the idea of reproductive futurity. This results in the exclusion of queer bodies because we cannot take part in reproductive futurity. The continued exclusion of queer bodies is made worse by the perpetual repetition of the image of the child that happens in the heteronormative that locks us into a death drive.

## OFF

#### Interpretation: debaters must disclose the aff 30 mins before the round either on the wiki or through theory

#### Violation: my opponent did not disclose at all

#### Standards:

#### Strat skew: The entirety of the neg strat is entirely reactive to the aff. Knowing the aff is the only way I can have some form of proper strat. The aff gets to decide the course of the debate – the least they could have done is at least tell me what that looks like. This is an internal link to fairness.

#### Clash: the neg cannot not properly engage with the aff if they have never seen the argument before. This hurts education in round. We can literally learn everything else outside of round, clash is the only way to effectively learn in round. Internal link to education.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness: the game only has purpose if it is fair. Hurting another side’s chances b4 the round even starts ruins the while point of debate.

#### Education: debate is only valuable because of the education that it provides. Without education it is nothing.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### Prefer competing interpretation, it is the only way to set norms in debate and ensure that abusive tactics are not used just in the name of the ballot

#### Drop the debater, only way to set a precedent

#### No RVIs, only goes on to punish the debater for calling out abuse

## Case

#### Mars colonization efforts are a pre-requisite to fighting climate change

Swenson 21 – Freelance writer for the Medium [Matt, “To Save Earth, We Must First Colonize Mars”, Medium, 10/14/21, https://medium.com/@mswens/to-save-earth-we-must-first-colonize-mars-d9a1fe793bde]//AV

By investing resources and efforts towards colonizing Mars, we will concurrently fight climate change, because all successful colonization scenarios entail the creation of a solution for two problems. First, protection from future extinctions on Earth, not just for humans but any living species on the planet that is threatened or impacted from climate change or other extinction event, like the asteroid that killed most of the dinosaurs. Second, for us it would be motivation for our species. Certainly, we could develop the technology to colonize Mars and not actually do it, and that would help solve climate change. We could launch satellites focused on monitoring Earth, develop improved waste recycling, and more, and apply our innovations to Earth orbit and Earth itself. But those two added problems — extinction and philosophical motivation — need solutions. We might as well actually go to Mars to solve those if we’re developing the capability to do so anyway. My goal is to convince those who are averse to space exploration and motivated to help Earth that there is no need to choose between the two. Technology and our society have advanced to the point where we can do both. Why Mars? Moral Reason for Existence One question often asked is “are we alone in the universe?” This is one of the fundamental unknowns that drives a significant portion of science and space exploration: Answers that help to further our understanding of ourselves, how we got here, and how life forms are at the core of the matter. Dr. Ellen Klein, a philosopher and scholar, states that “it is humanity’s number one global moral imperative to provide the educational and technological resources, as well as develop the overall mindset, for the advancement of space exploration and colonization.” For the sustainability of our species and to develop the technology needed to survive on other planets, we need to first go to Mars. Another moral question that philosophers often ponder is the value of life and humans as a species. Klein goes on to argue that if human life is intrinsically valuable, then we have a moral duty to explore other planets to ensure our survival as a species. In addition to this moral duty, she mentions that although there is debate as to how much our biological drive to reproduce affects our everyday life, there is at the very least some drive or requirement that we should reproduce to continue our species. Others more critical of this view might point out, however, that life besides humans is also valuable. If that is the case, and all life is valuable like animals, plants, and more, then we have a duty to protect Earth for the sake of them. According to this argument, we cannot and should not divest resources from saving them. This, however, presents a logical fallacy of choices. If we are helping save Earth by colonizing Mars, then we have a third choice that is not limited to one extreme or the other. Motivational Purpose and Contingency Planning Elon Musk argues “there have to be reasons that you get up in the morning and want to live.” If there aren’t, and we are stuck on this planet not believing in our capability to be explorers, it’s arguably incredibly depressing. If we know we are confined to Earth, we also know that eventually there will be some extinction event, given our understanding of Earth’s history and our current theories for the extinction of previous life. In order to minimize the probability of human extinction scenarios, Musk argues, we need to spread to other planets so that any planetary extinction event in the future, like the asteroid that killed the dinosaurs, does not result in the death of humans as species. If there’s a sliver of hope of going to other planets to save ourselves, we should do so. If we can plan for future eventualities now, like climate change and extinction events, we should do so. If society falls apart and climate change becomes a bigger problem than it already is, we will be left with no options but to turn to other planets for survival. In this case, only a small portion of us will be sent to Mars, with no guarantee we will survive. Why Choose to Colonize a Planet Rather Than Interstellar Travel? On the scale of colonizing worlds and journeying into the solar system, Mars is much easier, relatively speaking. It still presents a huge challenge, but once we conquer the present issues, we open up a whole range of options for exploring further. In addition, solving the problems present on Mars will still yield sufficient technology to save Earth. The difference between Mars and travel between other solar system bodies is largely the duration of missions and the long-term survival of humans in space. Once fundamental problems unique to those aspects are solved, it is largely a function of developing technology beyond our current rockets to journey outside of the solar system for interstellar travel, which aren’t needed to help Earth’s climate. Both Mars and interstellar travel bring up the same question: Is it even possible to pay for such an endeavor? One of the companies in the race to go to Mars is SpaceX. As a private company, they need to generate enough revenue in order to pay for the development and operation of their rockets. SpaceX’s Starlink service aims to provide the revenue generation to fund trips to Mars, along with paying customers once Starship becomes operational. Starlink is a massive constellation of satellites in low Earth orbit that enable high speed global internet coverage. In contrast to traditional satellite internet, these satellites are placed just a fraction of the orbital distance away from Earth, improving speed, reliability, and allowing for higher capacity and more paying customers. By leveraging SpaceX’s current innovations in reusable rockets, compared to traditional satellite internet, Starlink internet can be fast, relatively cheap, and accessible to all corners of the world. Musk, the founder of SpaceX, is therefore banking on Starlink to provide a significant revenue stream for the development and operation of Starship. This means that public taxpayer dollars will not necessarily need to go towards space exploration. (Just to note, NASA’s current total annual budget is less than 0.5% of the entire federal government’s expenditures, and yet, as I explain later, their research and development has led to a wealth of technologies adapted from space exploration that have directly benefited Earth’s climate.) Climate Change: What is the State of the Planet? How Does Rocket Exhaust Affect Our Atmosphere? Many think modern rocketry is destructive to the environment, however, this is not the case when compared to the airline industry, which is a good analogy for systems that transport people and cargo. First, a common misconception is that on launch, the massive cloud of dust that gets kicked up around the launch pad when a rocket lifts off is polluting the air. In fact, that cloud of dust is actually just harmless water vapor, mixed with some dirt from the ground. Rockets create so much force, noise, and vibrations that on launch, a water deluge system is used to dampen the effects on the launch pad, which instantly turns into steam when it contacts the exhaust. This is also why after most rocket launches (unless SRBs are used), there is no smoke or cloud emitted from the rocket. In order for rockets to work, most today use two types of chemicals, a fuel and oxidizer, which combine in the engines to combust and produce thrust. The table below gives an overview of the types of fuels used in modern rockets, and their main byproducts when the chemicals are combusted. Based on the byproducts, Hydrolox and Methalox are the best for the environment, whereas the others pollute the air with soot, carbon monoxide, or other toxic chemicals, which are known greenhouse gasses. There are many different rocket and fuel types, and some use fuels that are way more toxic or polluting than others. Modern rockets, namely those that are aiming for Mars like SpaceX’s Starship rocket, are more efficient and use the less toxic fuels, Hydrolox or Methalox. Older rockets that are still in use today utilize outdated and more polluting fuels, which means that in order to lessen the effects of rocket exhaust on the atmosphere, new rockets will have to be created and used. How is the Rocket Industry Innovating to Reduce Pollution? How Bad is Rocket Pollution to Our Atmosphere? Rockets need to be reusable to cut costs, cut production emissions, and for rapid turnaround to increase launch mass to orbit. Nonetheless, rockets would need to be launched at a rate 40,300 times more often to equal airline emissions with its current distribution of propellants, rocket types, and missions. This is because the number of airline flights per year is astronomical when compared to rocket launches. There were 331,579 times more airline flights than rocket launches in 2018, so even factoring in the greater effects per launch that rocket pollution has on our atmosphere, it is reasonable to say that we can colonize Mars without even coming close to airline pollution and climate effects on a yearly basis. In fact, even with SpaceX’s Starship, which is the largest rocket ever built, there would need to be 937 rocket launches per day to equal what the airline industry emits yearly. That’s plenty more than needed to develop, test, research, and use the technology needed to colonize Mars and save Earth. Although rockets on average pollute more when compared to airlines on a per vehicle basis, the current scale of airline flights and the relatively minuscule scale of rocket launches needed to bring humans to Mars mean that rockets do not pollute the climate in any significant way, both now and in the near future. How Can Innovation and New Technology to Travel to Mars Help Us on Earth? NASA Research into Preventing and Fighting Climate Change NASA has had a huge impact on commercial technology and the push towards solving climate change. From preventing disasters to renewable energy, the research and development that has gone into many of NASA’s space probes, landers, and rovers has directly benefited the climate on Earth. The Viking landers were designed to study the atmosphere of Mars, as well as detect signs of life. Due to their small size, they required miniaturized chromatography, which is a method to separate gasses and measure their concentrations. The research and development of this method, but in a small form factor for the Viking landers, eventually led to an application in portable gas analyzers that can be used in public and industrial settings to detect gas leaks before they become hazardous to humans. In addition to preventing potential disasters, NASA technology had an impact on firefighting. Portable life support developed for the Apollo missions was used to create better oxygen breathing systems for firefighters. The old technology was so bulky and cumbersome that most firefighters opted to not wear them, breathing in smoke instead. The new systems were significantly lighter and more mobile, directly leading to increased utilization and fewer smoke related issues in firefighters. Predictions and Weather Locating and fighting climate related problems is just a piece of the total impact that NASA technology has had on Earth. Significant scientific research is currently being invested in prediction models and weather mapping to determine how the climate is changing and where human activity, if any, is causing it. One of the main ways this is being done is with the help of weather satellites, including a system called METPRO. This system uses numerous satellites in low Earth orbit to photograph, map, and predict major storms and storm systems all across the globe. It was instrumental in predicting and warning Taiwan in 1989 of a major typhoon, and it has helped forecasters in other countries with knowing how and when to expect storms. This has lead to more effective response teams, fewer lives in danger, and less overall impact from the storms. Many more weather satellites have been launched since the system’s introduction, leading to further benefit to those that depend on it. Renewable Energy and Recycling Arguably the most important impact NASA technology has had on Earth is in renewable energy and the efficient use of resources. Solar energy is one of the few ways that’s currently viable to power a spacecraft in space. NASA pioneered solar panels in space, and it’s a significant part of the world’s renewable energy infrastructure today. JPL, or the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, is a part of NASA and is primarily responsible for all the modern innovations to today’s solar technology, out of a need to supply more powerful and demanding spacecraft. In addition to renewable sources of energy, managing our waste and recycling has become a critical part of living in an environmentally friendly way. The ISS, or International Space Station, uses waste recycling in order to conserve as much oxygen and water as possible. Even so, it still needs to be resupplied with vital cargo approximately every two months. More advanced waste recycling systems need to be used if a trip to Mars is to become feasible, and current NASA research is doing just that. Plant research into recycling human waste is a vital part of a Mars colonization. Self-contained hydroponics that use waste as food for plants to grow, which in turn produce oxygen and nutrients for human consumption, is under development and could improve recycling and waste treatment facilities on Earth. It could also prove useful in new hydroponic plants growing around the world, as the need for land to grow crops increases. So Now What? By exploring space and colonizing Mars, we are actually helping solve climate change at the same time. Colonizing Mars will do two things. One, it will provide a solution to climate change, and two, it is an endeavor that advances the human condition and motivates us as a species. Humanity needs a moral reason for existence. We need to have something to strive towards. The idea of sticking to living on Earth and not exploring the possibility of other life is incredibly depressing. Based on Earth’s history, if we do not expand to other worlds, we will eventually go extinct. Vital technologies that are helping to solve climate change right now have only been possible thanks to research and development into protecting and helping astronauts, space probes, and rovers survive in space. By innovating in harsh environments, NASA and other companies can apply those technologies to Earth and fix our climate. The time to colonize Mars is now. We have a plan, and we have much of the technology that will be needed already. In doing so we will help solve climate change, ensure our survival, and motivate our species. So, let’s innovate, explore, and just do it.

#### Rocket launches are increasing now and are close to matching other major sources of carbon emissions

**Gammon 21**[Katharine Gammon, 7-19-2021, "How the billionaire space race could be one giant leap for pollution," Katharine Gammon has served in the Peace Corps in Bulgaria, and attended MIT and Princeton University and won the 2020 Society for Environmental Journalists fellowship, 2017 Columbia University Reporting Fellowship on Early Childhood Development, 2014 National Health Journalism Fellowship, 2013 MIT Knight Science Bootcamp, the 2012 Woods Hole Ocean Science Journalism Fellowship, a 2013 National Press Foundation Fellowship, a 2011 Fellowship from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and others.<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/19/billionaires-space-tourism-environment-emissions>]//DebateDrills ww

When rockets launch into space, they require a huge amount of propellants to make it out of the Earth’s atmosphere. For SpaceX’s Falcon 9 rocket, it is kerosene, and for Nasa it is liquid hydrogen in their new Space Launch System. Those fuels emit a variety of substances into the atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, water, chlorine and other chemicals. The carbon emissions from rockets are small compared with the aircraft industry, she says. But **they are increasing at nearly 5.6% a year**, and Marais has been running a simulation for a decade, to figure out at what point will they compete with traditional sources we are familiar with. The rocket motor on Richard Branson’s Unity 22 burns as it heads toward space. The rocket motor on Richard Branson’s Unity 22 burns as it heads toward space. “For one long-haul plane flight it’s one to three tons of carbon dioxide [per passenger],” says Marais. **For one rocket launch 200-300 tonnes of carbon dioxide are split between 4 or so passengers**, according to Marais. “So **it doesn’t need to grow that much more to compete with other sources**.” Advertisement Right now, the number of rocket flights is very small: in the whole of 2020, for instance, there were 114 attempted orbital launches in the world, according to Nasa. That compares with the airline industry’s more than 100,000 flights each day on average. But emissions from rockets are emitted right into the upper atmosphere, which means they stay there for a long time: two to three years. Even water injected into the upper atmosphere – where it can form clouds – can have warming impacts, says Marais. “Even something as seemingly innocuous as water can have an impact.” Closer to the ground, all fuels emit huge amounts of heat, which can add ozone to the troposphere, where it acts like a greenhouse gas and retains heat. In addition to carbon dioxide, fuels like kerosene and methane also produce soot. And in the upper atmosphere, the ozone layer can be destroyed by the combination of elements from burning fuels. “While there are a number of environmental impacts resulting from the launch of space vehicles, the depletion of stratospheric ozone is the most studied and most immediately concerning,” wrote Jessica Dallas, a senior policy adviser at the New Zealand Space Agency, in an analysis of research on space launch emissions published last year.

#### Privatization is key to sustainable rocket launches – reliance on public entities is bad because they are too limited, expensive, and undo critical strides being made right now

**Kapoor & Todi 21**[Khushi Kapoor and Keshav Todi On March 20, 2021, 3-20-2021, "The Privatisation of Space Exploration – Finance and Investment Cell, SRCC," Finance and Investment Cell Shri Ram College of Commerce is a student-driven initiative to facilitate knowledge sharing on matters of finance, geopolitics and economy, at Shri Ram College of Commerce and at the university level. The cell aims to provide a stimulus to develop financial instincts among young minds through regular workshops, events and continued collaboration with the industry, to bridge the gap between pedagogy and practice. A small step, that will hopefully yield some great dividends. [https://ficsrcc.com/the-privatisation-of-space-exploration/]//DebateDrills](https://ficsrcc.com/the-privatisation-of-space-exploration/%5D//DebateDrills) ww

**Privatisation** of space exploration has had many benefits for the space industry in the 21st century. Private companies have a greater degree of autonomy in making decisions, which **enables** them to take up **new projects** while taxpayer-funded institutions are accountable to **the Government** and hence, have to often **limit themselves**. Moreover, there is quick decision making in **private companies** while the same process in a public enterprise would have to pass through a number of stages. This advantage has allowed companies like SpaceX, Blue Origin, etc. to cut their costs substantially and perform operations like **launch**ing a rocket to ISS **at** merely **$57 million per seat** as compared to **$80 million per seat** if aboard a Russian shuttle**, and $450 million** each mission before NASA ended its space shuttle program. Moreover, **making reusable landing rocket launchers, improvements in assembly lines and other** such **operations** further ensure lower costs. Due to the well- known success of the top few **p**rivate **s**pace **c**ompanies, many new small companies such as Firefly systems and Vector launch have been able to raise substantial private capital as well. The growth in the space industry also provides employment to millions all over the world, and the rise in the number of private space companies promotes competition amongst them and encourages constant improvements and advancements. Lastly, the publicity of their operations, like live streaming launches, has sparked widespread interest in space exploration among the general public.

#### The affirmative has no enforcement mechanism – private corporations can just circumvent since they have the funding to launch rockets on their own.

**Sheetz 21** [Michael, “Elon Musk’s SpaceX raised about $850 million, jumping valuation to about $74 billion”, CNBC. 16 February 2021. https://www.cnbc.com/2021/02/16/elon-musks-spacex-raised-850-million-at-419point99-a-share.html] //DebateDrills LC

**SpaceX completed another monster equity funding round of $850 million last week**, people familiar with the financing told CNBC, sending **the company’s valuation skyrocketing to about $74 billion.**

**The company raised the new funds at $419.99 a share**, those people said — or just 1 cent below the $420 price that [Elon Musk](https://www.cnbc.com/elon-musk/) [made infamous in 2018](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/09/28/sec-says-elon-musk-at-tesla-chose-420-price-as-pot-reference.html) when he declared **he had “funding secured” to take**[**Tesla**](https://www.cnbc.com/quotes/TSLA)**private** at that price.

The latest round also represents **a jump of about 60% in the company’s valuation** from its previous round in August, when [S**paceX raised near $2 billion at a $46 billion valuation**](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/10/14/tesla-investor-ron-baron-spacex-has-a-chance-to-be-just-as-large.html).

SpaceX did not immediately respond to CNBC’s request for comment. In addition to SpaceX further building a war chest for its ambitious plans, **company insiders and existing investors were able to sell $750 million in a secondary transaction**, one of the people said.

The people spoke on condition of anonymity because SpaceX is not a publicly traded company and the fundraising talks were private. SpaceX raised only a portion of the funding available in the marketplace, with one person telling CNBC that **the company received “insane demand” of about $6 billion in offers over the course of just three days**.