# Round 6 – NC

### Non Topical Affs

#### Interpretation: If the AFF doesn’t defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution by government actors, they must disclose every past 1AC on the 2021-2022 NDCA wiki 30 minutes after its broken.

#### Violation- screenshots

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

**They also asked us the message them on facebook, which wasn’t on their wiki and then rerouted us to their email, which they didn’t respond to.**

**Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated**

#### C. Standards

#### Predictability: Absent disclosure I have no way to tell what they’re running; untopical positions just make it worse because reading the literature doesn’t indicate what they might be running. They can discuss literally anything because they aren’t bound by government policy related to the resolution, and there aren’t any limits to this, which kills substantive engagement because I can’t know what they’re running.

#### 2. Clash: My interp ensures both sides can discuss the method in depth. Absent disclosure, I might not know the method and be able to make strong answers in round. I might just resort to theory which is worse, killing substantive clash because we aren’t truly debating.

#### 3. I coopt and turn back all of the reasons in the AC for why discussion of this aff is key. If we care about oppression and a focus on methods to solve, I should at least be able to know how to engage with the arguments they’re going for

#### D. Voter: The voter is substantive engagement, which exists when debaters directly answer each other’s content instead of just avoiding it.

**Prefer my voter to their impacts since**

#### 1. It gives us the best methodologies, sicne both of us have to be responsive and comparative. Otherwise, we just yell in the dark and don’t compare real solutions

#### 2. Debate’s fundamental value comes from teaching us how to defend our beliefs, as that’s a skillset that applies in any context, like politics, job interviews, and everyday conversations.

#### Drop the debater: If the aff advocacy isn’t topical, the round shouldn’t have happened to begin with. Dropping the arg is severance. *The AC frames the rest of the debate, so there’s no way to evaluate who did the better debating based on the entire round, when the round was skewed from the outset. It’s impossible to undo the fact s/he read his/her advocacy, so the round has to stop.*

#### No RVIs: They force the round to be decided on theory—the round ends once the judge determines who wins theory. That kills all substantive engagement because there’s no topical debate.

#### Competing interps- reasonability causes judge intervention.

### T

#### Interpretation: The affirmative should defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

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

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

#### Standards:

#### 1] Topicality’s a procedural constraint for effective debate –

#### A] they get to pick the topic ex post facto which incentivizes vague argumentation that’s not grounded in a consistent, stable mechanism – they’re playing dodgeball with hand grenades – caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their model.

#### B] The ability to select anything to say is bad for debate and makes the terms affirmative and negative meaningless. Being forced to switch-sides is debate’s greatest value and it solves all of their exclusion offense.

#### C] their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus every 2 months

#### 2] Structurally favoring the AFF is bad since it manipulates debate’s balance and kills competitive equity – some level of equity is necessary to sustain the activity – if it didn’t exist, then there wouldn’t be value to the game since judges could literally vote whatever way they wanted regardless of the competing arguments made.

#### 3] key to have well-prepared opponents. They transform debate into a monologue which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subjected to well researched scrutiny.

#### 4] Key to research – forces debaters to explore the topic literature instead of having the same debates throughout their entire career

#### 5]Topical version of the aff solves – they can still have all their advantages under TVA

#### Vote neg – they’ve destroyed the round from the beginning and topicality’s key to set the correct model of debate which means it comes first. Fairness is an impact – [1] it’s an intrinsic good – some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity – if it didn’t exist, then there wouldn’t be value to the game since judges could literally vote whatever way they wanted regardless of the competing arguments made [2] probability – your ballot can’t solve their impacts but it can solve mine – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but can rectify skews [3] internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education [4] comes before substance – deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it – any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. This means they don’t get to weigh the aff.

#### 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 No impact turns to T—T is a procedural that determines case’s validity and every argument says the aff is bad

### Case

#### Every part of the 1AC’s method from musicality to queer negation has been predicted, captured, mastered, and promoted by neoliberalism. Turns the case.

James 14

(Robin James- Associate Professor of Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte, From “No Future” to “Delete Yourself (You Have No Chance to Win)”: Death, Queerness, and the Sound of Neoliberalism, Journal of Popular Music Studies, Volume 25, Issue 4, p. 501-508)//TR

Introduction Death is one of the West’s oldest philosophical problems, and it has recently been the focus of heated debates in queer theory. These debates consider the political and aesthetic function of a specific concept of death— death as negation, failure, an-arche, or creative destruction. However, as Michel Foucault (1990) argues, death is an important component of the discourse of sexuality precisely because it isn’t a type of negation. The discourse of sexuality emerges when “the ancient right to take life or let live was,” he argues, “replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (Foucault 138).1 “Sexuality is the heart and lifeblood of biopolitics” (Winnubst 2012: 79) because it—or rather, as other scholars like Laura Ann Stoler (1995), LaDelle McWhorter (2009), and Jasbir Puar (2013) have demonstrated, racialized sexuality—is one of the main instruments through which liberalism “fosters” or “disallows” life. So, insofar as it pertains to sexuality, death isn’t a negation or a subtraction of life, but a side effect of a particular style of life management. In late capitalist neoliberalism, “death” only appears indirectly, not as a challenge to or interruption of life, but as its unthinkable, imperceptible limit.2 What are the theoretical, political, and aesthetic implications of neoliberalism’s reconceptualization of death as divested, or “bare,” life?3 What if we reframe ongoing debates about queer death, futurity, and antisociality by replacing the punk metaphorics of “No Future” with the cyberpunk/digital hardcore mantra “Delete Yourself (You Have No Chance To Win)”? Asking the question in this way, I use some methods, concepts, and problems from queer theory to think about a few pieces of music; I then use my analyses of these musical works to reflect back on that theory. Taking Atari Teenage Riot’s “Delete Yourself (You Have No Chance To Win)” as the basis for theorizing queerly racialized biopolitical death, my method involves pushing what Tavia Nyong’o calls “the fundamental and productive misprision between punk [music] and queer [theory]” (107), and what José Esteban Muñoz calls the “sticky interface between the interracial and the queer” in punk performance (93). Beginning with the role of the Sex Pistols’s (1977) “God Save the Queen” in Lee Edelman (2004) and J. Jack Halberstam’s (2010) debates about queer death and failure, I follow a musical motive (the main guitar riff) from the Pistols track to its reappearance in Atari Teenage Riot’s (ATR’s) 1995 “Delete Yourself (You Have No Chance To Win).” In this song, as in much of ATR’s work from the 1990s, overlapping (and often appropriated) queer and Afro-diasporic aesthetics condense around the idea of death or “bare life.” ATR’s musical strategies treat this death as a form of de-intensification and divestment— not, as in Edelman or the Pistols, as a form of negation (of the future or the political). I will show that ATR’s musical recontextualization of the Pistols’s riff mirrors the political recontextualization of queerness and queer death from negation to disinvestment. Pushing this misprision or sticky interface between cyberpunk, queer, and Afro-diasporic musical aesthetics, I use ATR’s music to consider how queer death might work as a political response to neoliberal demands to invest in “normal” life. In what follows, I first discuss the traditional concept of death as negation in both the Pistols song, and in Edelman and Halberstam’s formulations. I then argue that “Delete Yourself” describes a neoliberal, biopolitical concept of death, death as carefully administered divestment. Finally, I use Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) discussion of drugs, and Ronald Bogue’s (2004) Deleuzian reading of deathmetal to identify and explain how “MIDIjunkies” and “Into the Death” complicate the biopolitical/neoliberal management of death by reworking traditional black/queer critical aesthetics. In these songs, ATR undermine biopolitical neoliberalism’s demand to invest in and intensify regular “normal” life: rather than treating death as a nadir of intensity, they intensify it–that is, they go into the death. This strategy of going “into the death” is one possible queer necropolitical response to neoliberalism. I Wanna Be An-Arche: Death as Negation4 Because it emerged during the Enlightenment, liberal humanism has been the West’s dominant epistemic and evaluative paradigm. It organizes the world in ways that privilege the ideals of teleological development, authenticity, rationality, and autonomous agency, or choice.5 Many wellknown queer theories and theorists respond to, critique, and try to queer not “hegemony” in general, but a classically liberal conception of hegemony. For example, “no future” is a radically queer claim only in a context where teleological development and progress are hegemonic ideals (similarly, “anarchy” is radical only in response to a rigid insistence on arche). The musical structure of The Sex Pistols’s “God Save the Queen” makes this clear. This song, with its refrain, “no future,” has been central to Jack Halberstam’s critique of Lee Edelman’s 2004 book No Future, and to Halberstam’s own concept of queer failure.6 Especially because Halberstam’s primary critique of Edelman is the latter’s “excessively small archive” (Halberstam Queer Art 109), it is interesting that neither Halberstam’s initial critique nor Edelman’s response addresses the song’s music; they only discuss lyrics.7 This is a particularly narrow approach to analyzing a song. Attending to the song’s music helps to clarify some theoretical limitations of the debate about “death” and “no future” as queer rallying cries. So what goes on, musically, in this track? Though its lack of guitar solo and stripped-down aesthetic make it a conventionally punk reaction to glammy excess, “God Save the Queen”—especially its harmony, formal composition, and instrumentation—is a rather conventional tonal rock song in the key of A. The A chord is easy to play on the guitar, hence its common use in punk songs. The song begins with a riff that plays the leading tone, G#, against the tonic, A. A very powerful and common way of creating tension, the same strategy is used in the well-known Jaws theme. This riff also concludes the song. The journey from and back to this riff includes a foray into E in the two bridges with lyrics, and into B in the instrumental bridge near the end. E is the dominant (V) of A, and B is the dominant of E. So, the song uses a lot of very conventional harmonic gestures, like modulation to the dominant, to compose an even more conventional overall song structure. Though this song might have been very different than thenmainstream radio rock, its use of tonal harmony is rooted in 200-plus years of Western musical tradition. We can thus criticize the Pistols’s music for the same flaw that Halberstam identifies in Edelman’s text: it “does not fuck the law, big or little L” (Queer Art 107). In its use of harmony, “God Save” “succumbs to the law of grammar, the law of logic” (Halberstam Queer Art 107).8 This song (like many punk songs) does not fuck the laws of tonal harmony so much as distill them to their essence.9 “God Save” isn’t musically an-archic.10 “God Save’s” conventional tunefulness distinguishes it from Edelman’s example of the sonic properties of queer death. Working from Hitchcock’s The Birds, he argues that queer death sounds like meaningless repetition, “random signals,” white noise, or “electronic buzzing.”11 Following from what he identifies as the “repetitive insistence of the sinthome (No Future 56), Edelman argues that meaningless, un(re)productive repetition is key to the critical force of queerness or, in his terms, “sinthomosexuality (No Future, 33).”Western sexual, epistemic, and aesthetic structures overemphasize “reproduction” to conceal the presence and importance of repetition. Reproductive futurity is “blin[d]” to “its own ‘automatic reiteration’ of the logic that always tops our ideological charts,” i.e., to its own compulsion to repeat and reinstall itself.12 In more Freudian terms (1927), “reproduction” is the fetishistic recognition and disavowal of “repetition.”13 For Edelman, queer death is the negation of teleological rationality, the an in an-arche. To conventionally trained Western ears, it sounds anarchic. This is more or less the exact claim that African American Studies scholars Tricia Rose (1994) and James Snead (1981) make about the way Western music “secrets” repetition. According to Rose, Snead claims that European culture “secrets” repetition, categorizing it as progression or regression, assigning accumulation and growth or stagnation to motion, whereas black cultures highlight the observance of repetition, perceiving it as circulation, equilibrium . . . : “In European culture, repetition must be seen to be not just circulation and flow, but accumulation and growth. In black culture, the thing is there for you to pick up when you come back to get it. If there is a goal . . . it is always deferred; it continually ‘cuts’ back to the start . . . .” (69) As Rose and Snead indicate, Afro-diasporic musics tend to foreground repetition and, rather than trying to create a sense of evolutionary continuity—what Edelman calls “the genealogy that narrative syntax labors to affirm”—use “cuts” to create loops, which are then repeated over and over again (Edelman, No Future 23.) In the same way that a DJ cuts into the breakbeat and loops it back to the beginning, sinthomosexuality is a “textual machine . . . like a guillotine,” that uses the cut to “reduc[e] the assurance of meaning in fantasy’s promise of continuity to the meaningless circulation and repetitions of the drive” (Edelman, No Future 23 and 39). The mutual privileging of repetition and “the cut” is one of the main ties between Edelman’s theory of queerness and Afro-diasporic cultural and cosmological views. The queer-critical potential of looping, cutting, and the rejection of teleo-evolutionary development is also central to J. Jack Halberstam’s work on queer/trans cinema. For example, “queer time” involves the refusal of “growing up” (subjective evolutionary development to “normal” adulthood), and the “reveal” of a transgender character breaks linear narrative development by forcing viewers to revisit prior scenes in light of new knowledge about a character’s gender identity.14 If, in white heteropatriarchial hegemony, blackness and queerness are mutually implicative, the similarities between Edelman, Halberstam, and Snead and Rose should not be surprising. They are not just responding to the same interwoven networks of privilege and oppression, but to a specific way of understanding power: “reproductive futurity” and the European ideology of teleological “accumulation and growth” are both classically liberal frameworks whose centering of wholeness, resolution, development, and assimilation encourage the elision and misconstrual of “repetition.”15 Negation is a counter-hegemonic response to this supposedly coherent arche of teleological development, accumulation, and growth. Destroying is radical only if hegemony wants you to build. These queer, Afro-diasporic strategies of repetition, cutting, and meaningless noise are not responses to power in general; rather, they are specifically targeted critiques of a classically liberal concept of power. Sounds are meaningless, random, and “noisy” only when evaluated against a specific standard of audiological significance, logic, andmusicality.16 Noisy an-arche sounds queer and illogical only to ears tempered by a logos that privileges development, teleology, euphony, virtuosity/perfection/mastery, and rationality. Neoliberalism, however, doesn’t care about linear progress. It has a different logic, one that co-opts classically queer negation, redistributing it and putting it in the service of privileged groups. In the next section, I examine Atari Teenage Riot’s use of the Pistols’s riff from “God Save.” The riff’s musical recontextualization demonstrates that the queer/Afro-diasporic negations of classically liberal ideals of teleological arche have, in the intervening twenty years, been used to condense queer/black assemblages around a different kind of logic of death—death not as negation (the an in an-arche), but as disinvested, “bare” life.

#### There is an active tradeoff between the 1AC’s focus on radical politics and the political. Their focus on the discursive, queer performativity, and worldmaking ignores meaningful political criticism that addresses how oppression manifests materially which cements inequality and dooms them to irrelevance

Smulewicz-Zucker 15 – Professor of Philosophy @ Baruch College CUNY

(Gregory, “The Treason of Intellectual Radicalism and the Collapse of Leftist Politics,” LOGOS, Winter edition)

Radical politics in contemporary western democracies finds itself in a state of crisis. When viewed from the vantage point of social change, a progressive transformation of the social order, political radicalism is found wanting. This would seem to go against the grain of perceived wisdom. As an academic enterprise, radical theory has blossomed. Figures such as Slavoj Žižek openly discuss Marxism in popular documentaries, new journals have emerged touting a radical “anti-capitalism,” and whole conferences and sub-fields are dominated by questions posed by obscure theoretical texts. Despite this, there is a profound lack in substantive, meaningful political, social, and cultural criticism of the kind that once made progressive and rational left political discourse relevant to the machinations of real politics and the broader culture. Today, leftist political theory in the academy has fallen under the spell of ideas so far removed from actual political issues that the question can be posed whether the traditions of left critique that gave intellectual support to the great movements of modernity – from the workers movement to the Civil Rights movement – possess a critical mass to sustain future struggles. Quite to the contrary, social movements have lost political momentum, they are generally focused on questions of culture, shallow discussions of class, and are generally obsessed with questions of identity divorced from the questions of material forms of oppression rather than on the great “social question” of unequal distributions of economic and political power which once served as the driving impulse for political, social and cultural transformation. As these new radical mandarins spill ink on futile debates over “desire,” “identity,” and illusory visions of anarchic democracy, economic inequality has ballooned into oligarchic proportions, working people have been increasingly marginalized, and ethnic minority groups are turned into a modern “coolie” labor force. This has been the result, we contend, of a lack of concern with real politics in contemporary radical theory. Further, we believe that this is the result of a transformation of ideas, that contemporary political theory on the left has witnessed a decisive shift in focus in recent decades – a shift that has produced nothing less than the incoherence of the tradition of progressive politics in our age. At a time when the left is struggling to redefine itself and respond to current political and economic crises, a series of trends in contemporary theory has reshaped the ways that politics is understood and practiced. Older thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, and Jacques Derrida, and newer voices like Alain Badiou, Jacques Rancière, David Graeber and Judith Butler, among others, have risen to the status of academic and cultural icons while their ideas have become embedded in the “logics” of new social movements. As some aspects of the recent Occupy Wall Street demonstrations have shown, political discourse has become increasingly dominated by the impulses of neo-anarchism, identity politics, post-colonialism, and other intellectual fads. This new radicalism has made itself so irrelevant with respect to real politics that it ends up serving as a kind of cathartic space for the justifiable anxieties wrought by late capitalism,further stabilizing its systemic and integrative power rather than disrupting it. These trends are the products as well as unwitting allies of that which they oppose. The transformation of radical and progressive politics throughout the latter half of the twentieth and the early decades of the twenty-first centuries is characterized by both a sociological shift as well as an intellectual one. A core thesis has been that the shift from industrial to post-industrial society has led to the weakening of class politics. But this is unsatisfying. There is no reason why class cannot be seen in the divisions of mental and service labor as it was with an industrial proletariat. There is no reason why political power rooted in unequal property and control over resources, in the capacity for some to command and to control the labor of others as well as the consumption of others ought not to be a basic political imperative. To this end, what we would call a rational radical politics should seek not the utopian end of a “post-statist” politics, but rather to enrich common goods, erode the great divisions of wealth and class, democratize all aspects of society and economy, and seek to orient the powers of individuals and the community toward common ends. Indeed, only by widening the struggles of labor and re-thinking the ends of the labor movement – connecting the struggles labor to issues beyond the workplace, to education, the environment, public life, issues of racial and gender equality, culture and the nature of the social order more broadly – can we envision a revitalization of a worker’s movement, one that would have no need of the alienated theory of the new radicals.[1] But this is merely one fringe expression of what we see as a corrupted, simplified and de-politicized “new” radicalism. Once grounded in the Enlightenment impulse for progress, equality, rationalism, and the critical confrontation with asymmetrical power relations, the dominant trends of radical political thought now evade the concrete nature of these concerns. The battles that raged in the 1980s and 1990s between postmodernists and defenders of modernity – while serving as a harbinger of the contemporary split between the radical theorists divorced from reality and those who seek to establish anti-foundationalist conceptions of democratic discourse – were attached to a strong sense that the future of rationalism and radical politics hung in the balance. Today’s radical intellectuals do not feel compelled to defend their arguments or respond to their critics. Their purported radicalism becomes all the more opaque when the coherence of their claims is called into question. A concern for an exaggerated subjectivity, identity politics, anti-empirical theories of power, an obsession with “difference” – all serve to deplete the radical tradition of its potency. Radical intellectuals now formulate new vocabularies, invent new forms of “subjectivity,” and concoct new languages of discourse that only serve to splinter forms of political resistance, consigning radicalism to the depths of incoherence and (academic success notwithstanding) political irrelevance. Indeed, the disintegration of the great radical movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries – from the labor movement to the Civil Rights movement – has detached philosophical thinking from the mechanisms of power and political reality more broadly. The result has been – despite the ironic new turn toward “anti-philosophy” – the conquest of politics by poorly constructed philosophy. Abstraction has been the result, as well as a panoply of shibboleths that have only served to sever “radical” thought from its relevance to contemporary politics and society. It seems to us that the survival of the tradition of rational, radical political and social criticism pivots on a confrontation with these new academic trends and fads.

#### The alternative is to refuse the 1AC in favor of Queer Public Sociology

#### Our focus on queer, collective, and political action is key to address unequal power relations by building coalitions beyond academia to implement progressive policies

Cristina Santos 12 – Ana Cristina Santos writing for the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. “Disclosed and Willing: Towards A Queer Public Sociology”, Social Movement Studies, 2012, <https://eg.uc.pt/bitstream/10316/79661/1/Disclosed%20and%20Willing.pdf> //katja

In line with this strand of argumentation, I advance the notion of queer public sociology (QPS) to describe a new critical framework invested in changing public policy, law and political and cultural institutions as a way to tackle discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. QPS is proactively engaged in action research,7 methodological triangulation and ethical principles guided by the goals of accountability and reciprocity, intersectionality, reflexivity and sexual justice. According to this perspective, issues such as sexism, heterosexism, homo-, bi- and transphobia become a representational system, a social construction that demands to be studied to be overturned. Discrimination is a collective product that stems from unequal power relations, instead of an individual problem. Therefore, the focus is moved away from the (individual) victim to the structural system that enables and legitimises discrimination. QPS is inextricably linked to the duty to inform the struggle against such structural discrimination and, as such, it willingly embraces political engagement both as an epistemological and as an ethical choice.

The analysis of the mutual implications between sociology and LGBT and queer studies suggests a series of guiding principles regarding the ethics of queer public sociologies.

Accountability and reciprocity can be jointly considered as a first guideline, consisting of building rapport and respecting step-by-step agreements between the different participants in the research process. It also includes retribution of the input participants offer to the research outcome. This may imply service provision, voluntary work and sharing resources accumulated during the research process (e.g. media analysis, databases, annotated bibliographies, etc). An ‘ethics of care’ (Roseneil, 2004; Held, 2006) should therefore support the work of scholar-activists, particularly in situations that involve vulnerability and oppression, such as study and advocacy in the fields of same-sex sexuality and gender identity.

Second, intersectionality should be regarded as a fundamental resource of QPS, focusing on the explanatory potential of a range of identities, contexts and locations. An intersectional approach grants sociological inquiry transversal and interdisciplinary analytical tools that offer greater accuracy and validity to the research process as a whole.

Third, self-reflexivity understood as a vigilant and systematic exercise of self-critique that stresses the researcher’s responsibility and ethical compromise to reject sexually biased—homophobic, transphobic, biphobic, sexist and/or heterosexist—projects. The principle of self-reflexivity must also imply an interest in meta-theory, theory and methodological triangulation as a way to advance a ‘power-reflexive methodology’ (Pfohl, 2004, p. 115). Despite the critique of reflexivity as a profoundly classed product of late modernity (Skeggs, 2004) as well as ‘potentially self-indulgent’, harmful and partial (Sanchez-Taylor & O’Connell Davidson, 2010), this principle can perhaps be more usefully understood as a practice, a ‘relationship [ ... ] between being a sociologist and being a person’ (Gouldner, 2004, p. 383). Therefore, self-reflexivity as it is being proposed in this article is about doing, rather than being.

Finally, as emphasised throughout the article, a commitment to sexual justice implies political engagement beyond the walls of academia, an epistemological and ethical decision to counter the boundaries of otherness that imply a gap between so-called ‘science’ and activism. If the goal is sexual justice, then activism becomes a duty of the responsible academic under the critical framework of QPS. As such, social and cognitive justices become inextricably connected.

These principles may be interpreted as a minimum conceptual standard for studies under the critical framework of QPS. They are not mutually excluding nor overriding, and they should certainly be challenged and adjusted to the empirically based needs of each particular study or project. However dynamic this critical framework should remain, the most innovative aspect of QPS is the ability to reject claims of scientific political disengagement, replacing them with the legitimacy of willing disclosure as a nonnegotiable ethical choice.