## T-spec a gov

#### Interpretation: The aff must specify only one government that ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that refers to a specific noun

Part of Speech, no date, "What Part of Speech is “A”," Part of Speech, http://partofspeech.org/what-part-of-speech-is-a/

The word “a” is categorized under indefinite articles because it is used to mention a singular noun that is unspecified. In the sample sentence below:

It was taken by a man in the basement.

The word is considered as an indefinite article because it is used to refer to a singular noun (man)

#### 1] Limits – under the c/I, the aff can spec any number of permutations of governments which explodes neg prep burden – decks any engagement with the aff because all governments have different conditions.

#### 2] Depth – each government has their own history and indepth topic lit about a worker’s right to strike, depth ows breadth, debates are only 40 min long, means its impossible to have depth with multiple governments/countries - prefer depth because A. provides better education B. only fair option – breadth means impossible neg prep skew

**3. Pics bad flows neg, we stop abusive neg pics with aff spec.**

**And it’s not what they do it’s what they justify, if they win that their aff is good, it justifies any aff that’s consistent with only some words of the resolution turns CI offense.**

**TVA: Read the aff defending India**

**TVA: Read the aff defending Navajo Nation**

#### Voters:

#### 1. Fairness— People will quit debate

#### 2. Education—Terminal Impact to debate

#### Drop the debater because their advocacy is their argument 2. Round already skewed

#### Competing interpretations because reasonability A. encourages judge intervention and B. justifies a race to the bottom. C. reasonability collapses to C/Is since we debate about which interp is most reasonable. D. it’s more educational to have clashing interps. E. There’s no brightline

#### No RVI – A) They’ve obviously frontlined our interp B) Deters us from checking abuse C) Logically incoherent – it’s your burden

#### D) And to avoid epistemological flight from their reps if they go for an rvi you grant me K comes before T so they can’t use it to sever out of their advocacy, they should have to justify their scholarship E) this also justifies 1AR shells aren’t Drop the debater.

#### 1. 1AR theory isn’t drop the debater no RVIS otherwise the interp could be negative debater must concede the round, which kills debate. 2. they shouldn’t get drop the debater shells without nc initating theory because it kills substance debate

## K – Baedan

#### Demanding representation and recognition of identity is rooted on simple reformism – the struggle for representation always situated within the prospects of the future. That means any attempts to identify queerness ruptures possibilities of unintelligibility – making the perm impossible

baedan 12 (baedan. “Journal of Queer Nihilism.” The Anarchist Library, 2012, theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan.)VHS//RBA [Bracketed for Exclusive Language]

We’ll turn briefly to another of Hocquenghem’s texts: The Screwball Asses. In it, he levels a critique of the (communist and homosexual) Left that is quite applicable to the various leftist and revolutionary political formations we still encounter.¶ His simple yet crucial pronouncement is that “to demand the recognition of [queerness] homosexuality as it is is simple reformism.” This single line foregrounds our entire refusal of identity politics and the quest for intelligibility with which it is solely concerned.¶ He continues:¶ Like the women’s liberation movement that inspired it, the revolutionary homosexual platform emerged with Leftism and traumatized it to the point of contributing to its debacle. But while they fissured Leftism by revealing its phallocentric morphology and its censure of marginal sexualities (and of sexuality in general), these autonomous movements, despite their refusal of hierarchy, continued and continue to replicate the conditioned reflexes of the political sector that produced them: logomachy, the replacement of desire by the mythology of struggle.¶ Politics, even a queer politics, must always be based on the sacrifice of desire in the service and representation of this or that struggle. For Hocquenghem, activist structures and militant organizations are as much a part of the self-constituted prisons he argues against. He goes on to write: “We might have hoped that homosexuality could tear classic activism away from non-desire and create a true celebration of our colluding desires, but that was without taking into account the bad conscience of homosexuals. We must admit that the wildfire was short-lived.”

#### The liberatory potential of strikes as the destruction of the state is decimated by the aff’s investment into futurity. Strikes are used as extortion to the state – a demand to be met – that secures the future of the economy, the state’s hegemony, the world order – the gears that churn the machine of futurity. This forever pushes queerness into a lifeless cadaver. They make the same mistake as all political organizations - they build the social order in order to solve a lack present inherently within it, unknowingly reproducing the harms they aim to solve. No future exists for the kweer.

#### Baedan 12

(baedan. “Journal of Queer [kweer] Nihilism.” The Anarchist Library, 2012, theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan.)VHS//RBA

One way to contextualize interruption is to think through the strike. This should also be inter- esting in light of recent attempts at rekindling the flame of the revolutionary general strike, in relation to which the discourse around violence has appeared again as a trap on all sides. While the model of the strike is explicitly referenced in the “Critique of Violence,” it is absent— rather conspicuously—from the “Concept of History.” In the former, he writes about the strike which appears in the class struggle as a form of violence. He distinguishes between different aspects. On the one hand is the strike as extortion—violence used by labor as a means toward securing an end, which the state sanctions as a legal right in order to “forestall violent actions [such as the burning of factories] the state is afraid to oppose.” The revolutionary general strike departs from the strike-as-extortion and becomes a crisis to which the state understands it must respond with violent suppression. It has to do this lest the strike find its way to the very heart of the state. Because, in such a strike, “the state fears above all else that function of violence which it is the object of this study to identify as the only secure formulation of its critique.” What then is this secure formulation of the critique of violence? It is the critique of the state itself. Given that any strike is a kind of interruption or stoppage, nevertheless it is generally understood that there will be a return to work once a demand is met. In what Benjamin calls the political general strike, a set of politicians take this method beyond the demands particular to a workplace and apply it to a demand for them (the politicians) to take power, at which point there will be a return to work. All of this bears only the most superficial resemblance to what Benjamin describes as the form of the strike that takes place rooted “in the determination to resume only a wholly transformed work, no longer enforced by the state.” In contrast to the political general strike, this other “form of interruption of work,” the proletarian general strike, is “pure means,”“nonviolent,” and “anarchistic.” The reason that these two forms are “antithetical in their relation to violence” bears some further inquiry. To Benjamin the political general strike is violent because it “causes only an external modification of labor conditions,” which are in themselves violent, and has as its aim the strengthening of state power, which is both violent and the arbiter of violence. The proletarian general strike is nonviolent because it is the abolition of the state—the real critique of violence put into effect. And the “really effective critique” of violence “coincides with the critique of all legal violence.” Figured another way, the task of interruption requires us to locate the clocktower that we could fire upon to stop the day. Homogenous time no longer flows through the monolithic machines in the city centers. Now, a range of technological advancements have diffused and integrated the machinery of time into our very thoughts and rhythms. Everywhere we go, we are surrounded by and permeated with devices which serve to manage the regime of time. Where once a singular apparatus mediated our relationship to time, its dictatorship is now imposed by an innumerable array. A desire for interruption must now reckon with the countless apparatuses that segment our memory and integrate our very being into capitalist time. But rather than waste time lashing out against all these clocks one after another, let us cut through to what underlies them. History’s servants promise us a shining future. Whether by means of technological innovation, hard work and sacrifice, or the Revolution, we are assured of a heaven-on-earth of light and crystal. But all of these glimmering apparatuses can only serve to adorn the monumental pile of wreckage in which we live. All around us, the carnage and corpses of our ancestors form the architecture of our daily existence. Not only the walls and freeways and shopping centers, but the smart phones, pornography, surveillance and entertainment systems—all monuments to the same enemy that has never ceased to be victorious. Capital, Leviathan, civilization, society: so many names for the process which turns life into an assemblage of death, which would integrate us as machines into a grander machinery. **Futurity is the logic that drives this regime of subjection and assimilation**, but is also the science which desecrates our memory of those who also struggled; the treachery which turns their struggles into so many more ideological cadavers. Where living beings once struggled to be free from futurity’s domination of their lives, we are told that they dutifully sacrificed themselves for society’s future. We too are called upon to procreate and raise up children who might one day live better lives than we. But just as we were born into the halls of the dead, so too would our children be the stillborn janitors of these halls, breathing circuits embedded in a massive cybernetic cadaver. Ghosts call out to us: they ask that we tear apart the sutures of this Frankenstein’s monster which they’ve come to constitute. They call on us to cremate their remains and bury the ashes, to end the reign of the dead over the living.

### Link Wall

#### Nielson et al 19 – move towards productivity in the workforce as a means to an end

recognizing the right to strike ensures every agent has the ability to positively and productively reshape their work environment by forming more meaningful relations

#### jaeggi 3 – social roles as identity markers

“The human being cannot abolish his status as a Doppelgänger without negating his humanity.

### ROTJ

#### The Role of the Judge is to embrace individual resistance to futurism – our bodies have become the playing field upon which reason and ethic is staged in opposition to the desire of our flesh.

baedan 12 (baedan. “Journal of Queer Nihilism.” The Anarchist Library, 2012, theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan.)//LK

The outcome is reminiscent of the medieval skirmishes between angels and devils for the possession of the departing soul. But the conflict is now staged within the person who is reconstructed as a battlefield, where opposite elements clash for domination. On the one side, there are the forces of Reason: parsimony, prudence, sense of responsibility, self-control. On the other, the low instincts of the Body: lewdness, idleness, systematic dissipation of one’s vital energies. The battle is fought on many fronts because Reason must be vigilant against the attacks of the carnal self, and prevent “the wisdom of the flesh” from corrupting the powers of the mind. In the extreme case, the person becomes a terrain for a war of all against all.¶ Others have described this ‘war of all against all’ as the fundamental condition of an omnipresent civil war that is consistently raging, permeating the social order and interrupting the myth of social peace. This narrative is quite similar to a conception of queerness developed by Hocquenghem and later elaborated by Edelman, which understands queerness to be an ever-present violence, a potential which any body is capable of. If we follow Federici here in understanding the conflict between Reason (and its servant: language) and the Passion of the body, we can situate our queerness as a partisan force within this battle. Federici goes on:¶ This conflict between Reason and the Body, described by the philosophers as a riotous confrontation between the better and the lower sorts… the battle which 17th century discourse on the person imagines unfolding in the microcosm of the individual has arguably a foundation in the reality of the time. It is an aspect of that broader process of social reformation, whereby, in the age of reason, the rising bourgeoisie attempted to remold the subordinate classes in conformity with the needs of the developing capitalist economy… That battle against the body that has become its historic mark… The reform of the body is at the core of the bourgeois ethic because capitalism makes acquisition “the ultimate purpose of life,” instead of treating it as a means for the satisfaction of our needs, thus it requires that we forfeit all spontaneous enjoyment of life.¶ Here we are reminded of Hocquenghem’s explanation of jouissance as “blissful enjoyment of the present.” Federici’s historicism temptingly offers a historical-material structure for the whole of our critique. The desperate struggle of bodies against the future and in pursuit of jouissance is the same struggle which opposes capitalist development from the beginning. The conquest of Reason over Passion corresponds to the domination of the bourgeois order over the rebel body, because it is precisely the same struggle, manifest in each and every body.¶ The body, emptied of its occult forces, could be caught in a system of subjection, whereby its behavior could be calculated, organized, technically thought and invested of power relations… The development of the body into a work-machine, [was] one of the main tasks of primitive accumulation…. Like the land, the body had to be cultivated and first of all broken up, so that it could relinquish its hidden treasures. For while the body is the condition of the existence of labor-power, it is also its limit, as the main element of resistance to its expenditure. It was not sufficient then, to decide that in itself the body had no value. The body had to die so that labor-power could live.¶ Federici describes how this disciplinary war was waged so as to separate bodies from their capacity for jouissance, in order to commodify them as labor-power.¶ By transforming labor into a commodity, capitalism causes workers to submit their activity to an external order over which they have no control and with which they cannot identify. Thus, labor process becomes a ground of self-estrangement… This too leads to a sense of dissociation from the body, which becomes reified, reduced to an object with which the person ceases to be immediately identified.¶ It is this fundamental estrangement, located in the process of primitive accumulation which she says forms the basis of our contemporary alienation from our bodies, our terminal enslavement to abstraction and language.¶ Federici explains that this disciplinary violence has always focused on the eradication of non-productive ways of being:¶ The violence of the ruling class aimed at a radical transformation of the person, intended to eradicate in the proletariat any form of behavior not conducive to the imposition of a stricter work-discipline… Nakedness was penalized, as were many other unproductive forms of sexuality and sociality.¶ Here we see the tyranny of the Child traced back through time and embedded in language itself. The assault upon the body by Reason and Language has always been to eliminate all non-productive desires and capacities. Reproductive futurism then becomes the framework through which certain forms of social engagement are militarily enforced while others are eradicated.¶ This militaristic and scientific approach to disciplining the body functions through the body’s capture within language. Federici argues that “in mechanical philosophy we perceive a new bourgeois spirit that calculates, classifies, makes distinctions, and degrades the body only in order to rationalize its faculties, aiming not just at intensifying its subjection but at maximizing its social utility.” Here the linguistic and discursive institutions of Identity and Sexuality function alongside all other racializing and gendering apparatuses encode alienated bodies with particular values and functions—values and functions which serve to reproduce society in every body and every instant. Federici argues that this is necessary for the regime of any capitalist future.¶ From a capitalist viewpoint… here the future can be anticipated only insofar as the regularity and immutability of the system is assumed; that is, only insofar as it is assumed that the future will be like the past, and no major change, no revolution, will upset the coordinates of individual decision-making… The fixation of the body in space and time, that is, the individual’s spatio-temporal identification, is an essential condition for the regularity of the work-process.¶ She continues later:¶ Also from the point of view of the abstraction process that the individual underwent in the transition to capitalism, we can see that the development of the human machine was the main technological leap, the main step in the development of the productive forces that took place in the period of primitive accumulation. We can see, in other words, that the human body and not the steam engine, and not even the clock, was the first machine developed by capitalism.¶ If Federici is correct, if our very bodies have been destroyed and re-made into work-machines, and if these machines are the original machines which constitute the capitalist social order, then we must take our very bodies as machines to be sabotaged; our very corporeality, as Hocquenghem argues, must be the field of combat.¶ The battlefield is within each of us. The war of passion against reason, beyond being an external struggle must also be a struggle we wage against ourselves. We must struggle no less violently within ourselves as individuals than we struggle against the external enemies who seek to enforce the disciplinary regime of society’s future. In the list of managers and police with whom we battle, we must include the managerial and policing apparatuses which operate in our very being.

### alt

#### The alternative is to embrace jouissance. To leave all reason and rationality behind and throw our bodies into the destruction of the social order. Jouissance is the pure supersession of pleasure and pain, in favor of the unnamable desire of pure negativity.

Baedan 12
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To articulate such an escape, we must look outside the framework of the teleologies which promise progressive paths toward utopia, outside the abstract symbolic world where politics and identity function. Edelman would urge us to look to the psychoanalytic realm of the Real: the material and affective facts of our existence which escape representation and signification. For Edelman, the real of queerness—which cuts through the positivist baggage of identity—is jouissance. He writes: Queerness undoes the identities through which we experience ourselves as subjects, insisting on the Real of a jouissance that social reality and the futurism on which it relies have already foreclosed. Queerness, therefore is never a matter of being or becoming but, rather, of embodying the remainder of the real internal to the symbolic order. One name for this unnameable remainder as Lacan describes it, is jouissance, sometimes translated as “enjoyment”: a movement beyond the pleasure principle, beyond the distinctions of pleasure and pain, a violent passage beyond the bounds of identity, meaning and law. It is useful, in understanding this concept of jouissance, to follow Edelman in thinking the el- ements of queer reality which escape representation: the remainders, as he’d term them. These remainders are what is left over after capital colonizes the positivities of queerness—its fashions, parties, academic pursuits, aesthetics, labors, social networks—and after politics integrates intel- ligible queerness into its symbolic order. And so what is this remainder? What remains after one subtracts the progressive ideology of inclusion, the humble victim, the upstanding citizens, the eccentric selling points, the fluid permutations of Identity, the volumes of theory? What remains is jouissance. Edelman describes jouissance as a supersession of the boundaries of pleasure and pain, a shat- tering of identity and law. We should analyze this distinction between pleasure and pain as being an inscription of the social order into our bodies. And in the same way, it is the mundane and miniscule pleasures produced through contemporary power arrangements which keep us de- pendent on those arrangements for our well-being. Jouissance, in abolishing both sides of this distinction, severs us from pain as a self-preservation instinct and from pleasure as the society’s alluring bribe. It is the process that momentarily sets us free from our fear of death (literal or figurative) which is such a powerful inhibitor. We can locate this jouissance in the historic moments of queer riot: Compton’s cafeteria, Dewey’s, the White Night, Stonewall, and countless other moments where queer bodies par-ticipated in rupture—throwing bricks, setting fires, smashing windows, rejoicing in the streets. But more to the point, jouissance is located in precisely the aspects of these moments (and of others unknown to us) which elude historians, the ones which cannot be captured in a textbook or situated neatly within narratives of progress for queer people, or of rational political struggle for a better future. Jouissance is the rage which boils over in the first queen to set a fire; the hatred of an entire social order which flows through one’s veins while they set a dozen San Francisco police vehicles on fire. It is the ecstatic bliss that must have shivered its way through the spines of any blessed enough to hear the siren songs of those police cruisers wailing in flames. Jouissance is the way that the sexual encounters immediately following such riots were totally incommensurable to the mundane sex of daily life. Jouissance is the driving élan of queer sex culture, and yet it is precisely that element of queer sex which still cannot be locked up in an industry, sold as a commodity or scheduled at some mass commercialized ritual. While each element of the sex industry attempts to resolve some fundamental lack and to integrate one’s desires into a coherent subjective experience, jouissance is specifically that element of sexual desire which makes such a union impossible. It is a desire for jouissance which sends us into the night seeking to overwhelm our bodily capacity, to disintegrate the corporeal limits of ourselves, to truly flee from what and who we are. It is specifically this remainder, which defines the unbridgeable chasm between the public sex culture of New York and San Francisco in the seventies (massive squatted sex warehouses, perpetual orgies, a culture of cruising which entirely dissolved the distinction between sex and the rest of life) and the so-called cruising of the cybernetic era (Grindr, craigslist, sparsely attended and overpriced parties at failing sex clubs). This distance might also be understood as what separates the anarchy of an orgy from the democratic ideology of purist polyamory. Jouissance is the unnameable desire that one hopelessly attempts to summarize before giving one’s body to another: “I want to be negated.” Jouissance is that essence of queer criminality which cannot be reduced to any vulgar determinism. It is the joy found in the retribution of robbing some bourgeois john, the thrill of theft, the satisfaction of destruction. It is because we are addicted to the intertwining pleasure and pain which brings us again and again into the streets: seeking to riot or fight or fuck. It is specifically the pursuit of the unnameable jouissance which causes, without fail, to risk everything in sacrifice to some more grand chaos. This aufheben of the categories of pain and pleasure is also the overthrowing of our attachments and investments in political activism, stable identity, and reason. The negativity of jouissance is the same that drives us away from obligations to the economy, the family, the law, and, above all, the Future. itself, jouissance evokes the death drive that always insists as the void in and of the subject, beyond its fantasy of self-realization, beyond the pleasure principle. It is worth following Edelman in cautioning against the ways in which jouissance, or more specifically, futile attempts to identify with or name jouissance, can lead to a reification of the categories which we’d call upon jouissance to abolish: To the extent that jouissance, as fantasmatic escape from the alienation intrinsic to meaning, lodges itself in a given object on which identity come to depend, it produces identity as mortification, reenacting the very constraint of meaning it was intended to help us escape. Any attempt to situate jouissance as a positive project can only ever be a step away from it. Circuit parties, pornography, social networking applications, political demonstrations, activist organizations, art: all of these strive to recuperate jouissance into some alternative structure, and yet must always fail because jouissance is inherently that which evades capture and ruptures the coherent narratives which justify such structures. This critique is particularly ironic coming from Edelman, whose own practice as a ‘jouissieur’ never seems to exceed participation in those same circuit parties, academic conferences, senseless hours at the gym and lavish shopping sprees. He specifically advocates “the meaningless eruption of jouissance associated with the ‘circuit parties’ that gesture toward the circuit of the drive.” In his affirmation of this or that element of contemporary gay culture, he fails do the work of locating jouissance within the actual subversive histories of queerness (compared to which, gay culture can only be just a pathetic substitute). It’s important here to reassert that our conception and praxis of jouissance absolutely must go beyond the limitations of Edelman’s work.

# Case