#### We affirm the entirety of the 1ac except for the plan text.

#### It’s net beneficial –solves better because it doesn’t start at the place of the state or include the pretended fiated action we will get links to.

#### The assumption of 1AC solvency papers over reality with normative legal talk, emotionally disconnecting them from the implications of the speech act- this strengthens bureaucratic institutions and destroys individual autonomy by buying into a system that prevents us from addressing the root causes of our problems

Delgado 1991 [Richard (Professor of civil rights and critical race theory @ University of Alabama Law School), “Norms and Normal Science: Toward a Critique of Normativity in Legal Thought,” U Penn Law Review, Vol. 139: 933, http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3742&context=penn\_law\_review, Accessed 7/21/15, pg. 957-958, AX]

Normativity not only anesthetizes powerful actors, making it easier for them to do their work, it can ~~paralyze~~ the rest of us, leading us to cooperate passively in our own mistreatment. The principal danger to human autonomy and worth today is large bureaucracies -- corporations, Health Maintenance Organizations, mega-universities, and the like. Because of their own internal structures and needs, these organizations function best if they can treat the rest of us like numbers, according to routine. 99 Yet this must not appear to be so -- we would revolt, would demand more personalized treatment, which would disrupt the routine. Bureaucracies thus adopt the discourse of normativity to make us think we are being treated with care and consideration when we are not. And they employ a host of smiling agents -- publicists, insurance adjusters, account clerks, claims agents, and other "front" persons to talk soothing normatives with us. "We want, of course, to do what is fair. You must, however, acknowledge your responsibility in this situation. Surely you don't think our HMO should grant every claim -- we must think of our other patients." Yet the script always ends up having been written by the Home Office. The insurance adjuster, it turns out, does not really care for us as persons. 100 If we enter into this numbing, but vaguely reassuring formal discourse, we will cause little trouble. But we will, from time to time, get a small jolt -- end up blind-sided by the inexorable weight of the bureaucracy behind the adjuster. We are like the doe in the headlights, transfixed at the approaching automobile. Like the doe, we sometimes think we have been spared. The automobile swerves, the kind driver slows. The adjuster turns out to have a little discretion, which he or she exercises in our favor: The doctor will see us next month, after all. But the doe's problem is not the car -- it is the road. Another car will come along. Staring at the headlights prevents the doe from seeing that problem, just as entering into platitudinous, scripted discourse with the various insurance [\*958] adjusters of the world prevents us from appreciating our own dilemma.

#### The preoccupation with pretending to be policymakers traps them in a spectator position and bars them from recognizing the bureaucratic violence of the legal praxis

Schlag 90(Pierre Schlag, professor of law@ univ. Colorado, stanford law review, november, page lexis)

All of this can seem very funny. That's because it is very funny. It is also deadly serious. It is deadly serious, because all this normative legal thought, as Robert Cover explained, takes place in a field of pain and death. n56 And in a very real sense Cover was right. Yet as it takes place, normative legal thought is playing language games -- utterly oblivious to the character of the language games it plays, and thus, utterly uninterested in considering its own rhetorical and political contributions (or lack thereof) to the field of pain and death. To be sure, normative legal thinkers are often genuinely concerned with reducing the pain and the death. However, the problem is not what normative legal thinkers do with normative legal thought, but what normative legal thought does with normative legal thinkers. What is missing in normative legal thought is any serious questioning, let alone tracing, of the relations that the practice, the rhetoric, the routine of normative legal thought have (or do not have) to the field of pain and death. And there is a reason for that: Normative legal thought misunderstands its own situation. Typically, normative legal thought understands itself to be outside the field of pain and death and in charge of organizing and policing that field. It is as if the action of normative legal thought could be separated from the background field of pain and death. This theatrical distinction is what allows normative legal thought its own self-important, self-righteous, self-image -- its congratulatory sense of its own accomplishments and effectiveness. All this self-congratulation works very nicely so long as normative legal [\*188] thought continues to imagine itself as outside the field of pain and death and as having effects within that field. n57 Yet it is doubtful this image can be maintained. It is not so much the case that normative legal thought has effects on the field of pain and death -- at least not in the direct, originary way it imagines. Rather, it is more the case that normative legal thought is the pattern, is the operation of the bureaucratic distribution and the institutional allocation of the pain and the death. n58 And apart from the leftover ego-centered rationalist rhetoric of the eighteenth century (and our routine), there is nothing at this point to suggest that we, as legal thinkers, are in control of normative legal thought. The problem for us, as legal thinkers, is that the normative appeal of normative legal thought systematically turns us away from recognizing that normative legal thought is grounded on an utterly unbelievable re-presentation of the field it claims to describe and regulate. The problem for us is that normative legal thought, rather than assisting in the understanding of present political and moral situations, stands in the way. It systematically reinscribes its own aesthetic -- its own fantastic understanding of the political and moral scene. n59Until normative legal thought begins to deal with its own paradoxical postmodern rhetorical situation,it will remain something of an irresponsible enterprise. In its rhetorical structure, it will continue to populate the legal academic world with individual humanist subjects who think themselves empowered Cartesian egos, but who are largely the manipulated constructions of bureaucratic practices -- academic and otherwise.

#### Our impact is especially true in context of racialized law- one step reforms are trumpeted as complete wins and used to ignore systemic problems

Delgado 1991 [Richard (Professor of civil rights and critical race theory @ University of Alabama Law School), “Norms and Normal Science: Toward a Critique of Normativity in Legal Thought,” U Penn Law Review, Vol. 139: 933, http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3742&context=penn\_law\_review, Accessed 7/21/15, pg. 945-946, AX]

The ability of normative assertion to change the way we perceive reality was demonstrated by Stanley Milgram in an experiment now considered a classic.40 Milgram, a psychologist at Yale University, told volunteers that they would be participating in an experiment on learning. In fact, the purpose of the experiment was to see whether the subjects could be induced to violate their ethical norms and inhibitions. Each subject -was seated in front of a console with acalibrated dial, and told that by turning the dial they would administer electric shocks to a "learner" seated in another room. The subjects were told in no circumstances to turn this dial beyond a point marked with red-doing so could administer a fatal dose of electricity to the other subject. After the rules were explained, a second investigator, wearing a white coat and an authoritative demeanor, entered the room and directed the subjects to turn the dials to particular settings. Each time, a trained actor in the other room emitted a realistic groan or exclamation of pain. The investigator directed the subjects to turn the dial to higher and higher settings and eventually to exceed the point marked in red. A high percentage of the subjects cooperated with the experiment, even administering what they thought might be a lethal dose ofelectricity. Afterward, many subjects confessed to doubts aboutwhat they were doing, but said they went along with the experiment because, "If he (meaning the high-authority doctor in charge) said it was all right, then it must be so." Apparently, the investigator's assurances that administering pain was permissible and part of theexperiment actually changed the way they saw their behavior.41Ordinary life is full of similar examples in which the mere pronouncement of something as normatively good or bad changes our perception of it. The decision in Brown v. Board of Education changed the way we thought about minorities. Reagan and Reaganomics changed things back again.43 During war, we demonize our enemies, and thereafter actually see them as grotesque, evil and crafty monsters deserving of their fate on the battlefield.44 Later, during peacetime, they may become our staunch allies once again. Derrick Bell and other Critical Race theorists have been pointing out the way in which standard, liberal-coined civil rights law injures the chances of people of color and solidifies racism.45 Accordingto these writers, one function of our broad system of race-remedies law is to free society of guilt. Although the remedies are ineffective, they enable members of the majority group to point to the array of civil rights statutes and case law which ostensibly assure fair and equal treatment in schools, housing, jobs, and many other areas of life. With all these elaborate anti discrimination laws on the books, if black people are still poor and unhappy-well, what can be done? The law's condemnation of racism thus enables us to blame the victim, praise ourselves for our liberality, and thereby deepen the dilemma of people of color.

#### It’s legit – they get 100% of the plan to generate offense versus the cp, this is a necessary test against critical affirmatives.