===Topicality 1nc===

====A. Interpretation – The affirmative must advocate the resolution through an instrumental defense of action by the United States federal government====

====Resolved requires a policy ====

\*\*Louisiana House\*\* 3-8-20\*\*05\*\*, [[http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm-http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm]]\*\* \*\*

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor~’s veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

====United States federal government is only three branches====

\*\*Black~’s Law 90\*\* (Dictionary, p. 695)

"~~[Government~~] In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments."

===="Economic engagement" is limited to expanding economic ties====

\*\*Çelik 11\*\* – Arda Can Çelik, Master~’s Degree in Politics and International Studies from Uppsala University, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies, p. 11

Introduction

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement

AND

position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.

B. Violation – they don~’t advocate a government policy enacted by the USFG that expands economic ties

Vote Negative:

1. Predictability - The resolution proposes the question the negative is prepared to answer – even if it~’s good to talk about the 1AC, they have to prove that we could have logically anticipated it – that~’s key to Advocacy Skills because otherwise affirmatives will never have to defend their position against well prepared negative arguments.

====That~’s key to the aff – a predictable topic forces pre-round internal deliberation which is the only way to convince people you~’re right====

\*\*Goodin and Niemeyer 03\*\* (Robert and Simon, Australian National University, "When Does Deliberation Begin? Internal Reflection versus Public Discussion in Deliberative Democracy" Political Studies, Vol 50, p 627-649, WileyInterscience)

What happened in this particular case, as in any particular case, was in

AND

least one possible way of doing that for each of those key features.

====2. Switch Side Debate –Defending a topical affirmative is the only way to ensure that teams must research and debate both sides of an argument and learn from multiple perspectives about the topic. Forcing a rigid adherence to the topic facilitates the advocacy of things you don~’t necessarily believe in.====

====That~’s key to critical thinking====

\*\*Harrigan 8\*\* (Casey, Associate Director of Debate at UGA, Master~’s in Communications – Wake Forest U., "A Defense of Switch Side Debate", Master~’s thesis at Wake Forest, Department of Communication, May, pp. 6-9)

Additionally, there are social benefits to the practice of requiring students to debate both

AND

Hunt and Louden, 1999; Colbert, 2002, p.82).

====3. Policymaking Education – debates about government policy are key to connect theory and practice, regardless of whether we become policymakers====

\*\*Esberg %26 Sagan 12\*\* (Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University~’s Center on International Cooperation. Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford~’s Center for International Security and Cooperation "NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy," 2/17 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108)

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for

AND

quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

===Counter Plan===

====Counter Plan Text: The United Mexican States Supreme Court should rule sexual harassment to be a form of sexual discrimination and therefore illegal and make law that employers are responsible for ensuring a healthy working environment, free from discriminatory practices, including sexual harassment.====

====Awareness of sexual harassment is key – Addition of constitutional violations creates awareness and solves====

\*\*MAGALLÓN 6\*\*

\*\*(The Colectiva Feminista Binacional, Servicio Desarrollo y Paz, A.C. (SEDEPAC), and Comité de Obreras y Obreros en Lucha are Mexican non-profit action groups whose aim is to create better working conditions for maquiladoras. ROSARIO ORTIZ MAGALLÓN was the project coordinator for their September 1, 2006 publication: "Hostigamiento Sexual: Una Realidad en la Maquila" or "Sexual Harassment: A Maquila Reality." 5-6 CVS)\*\*

One result of repeated sexual harassment is the transformation of the workplace into a damaging

AND

finger. A change in civil status can change a woman~’s employment options.

===Case===

====Impossible to stop femicide entirely – laundry list of motives that can~’t be prevented through the plan====

Fragoso,~’03

(JULIA MONARREZ FRAGOSO, Ph.D. candidate in the Universidad Autcinoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco and researcher at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, specializes in research on gender and violence, "Serial Sexual Femicide in Ciudad Jugrez, 1993-2001", April of 2003, [[http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf-http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf]])

In reality, the motive for femicide can be hatred, pleasure, anger, malice, jealousy, separation, arguments, robbery, or simply the sensation of possessing and dominating the woman and ultimately exterminating her. The victimizer can be a father, lover, husband, friend, acquaintance, stranger, or boyfriend, among others. In all cases these are violent men who believe they have the right to kill women.

====Turn - Prevention campaigns for these murders are empirically classist, misogynist, and heterosexist causing all of their impacts ====

Fragoso,~’03

(JULIA MONARREZ FRAGOSO, Ph.D. candidate in the Universidad Autcinoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco and researcher at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, specializes in research on gender and violence, "Serial Sexual Femicide in Ciudad Jugrez, 1993-2001", April of 2003, [[http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf-http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf]])

Prevention campaigns in this city have centered on making women responsible for any aggression that

AND

asserts, are classist, misogynist, and heterosexist (1998, 10).

====The murders taking place are not a "femicide" and can be caused by a laundry list of external factors====

Fragoso,~’03

(JULIA MONARREZ FRAGOSO, Ph.D. candidate in the Universidad Autcinoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco and researcher at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, specializes in research on gender and violence, "Serial Sexual Femicide in Ciudad Jugrez, 1993-2001", April of 2003, [[http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf-http://aztlanjournal.metapress.com/media/eafy7beyyqdrun8vkyvm/contributions/r/2/3/2/r23251g8v8297643.pdf]])

It is important to note that, while all of the studies cited establish gender

AND

ideological ~’forces~’ that exist"(McWi1liams 1998, 112; italics mine).

====The alt doesn~’t solve: feminism cannot exist in a vacuum. Examining race as a "metalanguage" is key to truly understanding gender as an analytic category. ====

Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham 1992. "African-American Women~’s History and the Metalanguage of Race," Signs 17:2 (Winter 1992): 251–74.

Feminist scholars, especially those of African-American women~’s history, must accept the

AND

to the tradition of syncretism that has characterized the Afro-American experience.

====Biopolitics does not result in genocide====

Ojakangas, ~’05

 (Mika Ojakangas, PhD in Social Science and Academy research fellow at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies at University of Helsinki, "The Impossible Dialogue on Biopower: Foucault and Agamben", May 2005, Foucault Studies, No. 2, http://wlt-studies.com/no2/ojakangas1.pdf)

Admittedly, in the era of biopolitics, as Foucault writes, even "massacres

AND

whatever arguments it chooses, be it God, Nature, or life.