# 1AC Loyola R2

### The Disabled Narrative

#### It’s time for the system to hear our outcries – abled subjectivity is tied up in a two-tiered affective response that explains disabled life – primary pity which reflects disability upon the ego threatening its ability status, which invokes secondary pity to overcorrect for the shattered-ego necessitating disabled death.
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Much as the differentiation between the inseparable processes of primary and secondary narcissism rests on a distinction between building up and breaking down the ego, a similar heuristic distinction gives structure to my concepts of primary and secondary pity. To be clear, pity and narcissism are not the same thing: if narcissism can be understood as love of the self, pity involves a complex affective reaction to the suffering of someone else. Primary pity entails a response to the image of another person succumbing to what I have termed the “tragedy of disability.”121 Primary pity arises when one witnesses a fall of the self, a collapse of the ego; such falling is at once painful and pleasurable to observe. In other words, primary pity could be described as a vicarious experience of the tragedy of disability. A great deal of the pain and pleasure of primary pity center on questions about what, or who, this fallen self is. When most people think about pity, we refer to an affect in which, to adopt Edelman’s phrase, we purport to “feel for the other.” But as with primary narcissism, in which the self has not yet been constituted, and therefore cannot be said to enter into intersubjective relations with an “other,” primary pity entails a mixing up of self and other such that the ego, in becoming permeable to pain that may properly belong to “someone else,” is profoundly threatened in its integrity. Primary pity is that intense pain-pleasure complex that is provoked by the image of a suffering other who, it seems momentarily, both is and is not one’s self. This affective response can feel unbearable, as seen in Siebers’s formulation: one “cannot bear to look...but also cannot bear not to look.” Primary pity is difficult to bear because it involves a drive toward disability (one cannot bear not to look), which menaces the ego’s investments in health, pleasure, and control—because to contemplate another person’s suffering is to confront the question, “Could this happen to me?” Such a prospect, although frightening, may also be compelling; in this way, primary pity replicates the self-rupturing aspects of sexuality. Indeed, the unbearability of primary pity reflects its coextensiveness with sexuality. Sex, or the Unbearable, a book coauthored by Edelman and by Lauren Berlant, argues that sex “unleashes unbearable contradictions that we nonetheless struggle to bear” (back cover). This claim accords with Freud’s account of sexuality as a “pleasurable” “unpleasure” that the ego can never fully master or control (Three 49,75). As Leo Bersani puts it in his reading of Freud, “the pleasurable unpleasurable tension of sexual enjoyment occurs when the body’s ‘normal’ range of sensation is exceeded, and when the organization of the self is momentarily disturbed”; thus, “sexuality would be that which is intolerable to the structured self” (Freudian 38). Primary pity is also intolerable to the structured self, because it entails a fascination with the fantasy of a self in a state of disintegration or disablement. Secondary pity is something else, although it cannot wholly be differentiated from primary pity. Secondary pity attempts to heal primary pity’s self-rupturing effects by converting primary pity into a feeling that is bearable. As with secondary narcissism, secondary pity involves both an attempt to get back to that ego-shattering state of painfully pleasurable primary pity, and at the same time to defend against that threat to the ego by aggrandizing oneself at someone else’s expense. Secondary pity refers to all those ego-bolstering behaviors that most people think of when they talk about pity. Disabled people are all too familiar with these behaviors: the saccharin sympathy, the telethon rituals of “conspicuous contribution,” the insistence that “they” (i.e., nondisabled people) could never endure such suffering. More commonly known in our culture simply as “pity,” secondary pity encompasses our culture’s most clichéd reactions to disability: charity, tears, and calls for a cure. Correlatives of these commonplace manifestations of secondary pity are the obligatory claims that disabled people’s suffering is “inspiring.” Indeed, the speed with which conventional cultural representations of disability segue from overt expressions of pity to celebrations of “the triumph of the human spirit” highlights the ways in which secondary pity, as a defense against primary pity’s incursions, reinforces the ego’s fantasy of sovereignty. Secondary pity, in other words, can be seen as a variation of secondary narcissism: these affects enlarge the ego of the pitier or the narcissist at the expense of someone else. But primary pity is not the same as either primary narcissism, secondary narcissism, or secondary pity. Unlike primary narcissism, a feeling that emerges out of a relation to the world in which notions of “self” and “other” do not obtain, primary pity does depend upon the constructs of self and other, although these constructions are unstable and are continually threatening to come undone. Primary pity can thus be envisioned as a threshold category occupying a liminal position between the total denial of the other that is inherent to primary narcissism and the rigid structure of (superior) self and (inferior) other that constitutes secondary narcissism and secondary pity. My concept of primary versus secondary pity also differs from Freud’s primary- secondary narcissism distinction at the level of genealogy. Like Freud’s account of primary and secondary narcissisms, my model of primary and secondary pities involves a temporal transition; but whereas Freud imagines the movement from primary to secondary narcissism as a passage from an earlier to a later stage of an individual’s development, the temporal shift from primary to secondary pity happens much more quickly than this. It happens in an instant: that moment in which we feel primary pity and then, almost before we can blink, deny that we feel or have felt it. The denial is understandable: who wants to admit that one gets pleasure from the sight of another person’s suffering—or, to make matters worse, that this pleasure derives in part from the specter of disability’s transferability, the possibility that this suffering could be—and, fantasmatically, perhaps already is—an image of one’s own self undone?

#### Debate is a sphere of “fiat” and “futurism” which reifies rehabilitative futurism where the signifier of the fantasmatic child is placed forward to eradicate and cure disability. When the question of disability arises, communicative projects such as debate are centered around solely optimism and trying to create the ‘better future’ – this obsession with optimism pathologizes the disabled Child that cannot be in the better future – this 1AC serves as an ‘perspective shift’ that differs from the current form of how disability is presented – absent questioning the form of argumentation the content of argumentation becomes unethically flawed – thus, the role of the ballot is to disrupt biopolitical systems of productivity and futurity.
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“Let us begin our reexamination of Tiny Tim with a discussion of No Future, a text in which Tiny Tim takes a prominent position. No Future is a text with a target: the book takes aim at “the Child whose innocence solicits our defense,” a trope that Edelman names as the emblem of an ideology that he terms “reproductive futurism” (2). According to Edelman, commonplace cultural invocations of the figure of the Child (“not to be confused with the lived experiences of any historical children”) uphold “the absolute privilege of heteronormativity” (11, 2). Defying pronatalist social imperatives, Edelman names queerness as “the side of those not fighting for the children‟” (3) and urges queers to accept the culture’s projection of the death drive onto us by saying explicitly what Law and the Pope and the whole of the Symbolic order for which they stand hear anyway in each and every expression or manifestation of queer sexuality: Fuck the social order and the Child in whose name we’re collectively terrorized; fuck Annie; fuck the waif from Les Mis; fuck the poor, innocent kid on the Net; fuck Laws both with capital ls and with small; fuck the whole network of Symbolic relations and the future that serves as its prop. (No Future 29) Elsewhere, I have argued that No Future’s impassioned polemic is one that disability studies might take to heart. Indeed, the figure that Edelman calls “the disciplinary image of the ‘innocent’ Child” is inextricable not only from queerness but also from disability (19). For example, the Child is the centerpiece of the telethon, a ritual display of pity that demeans disabled people. When Jerry Lewis counters disability activists’ objections to his assertion that a disabled person is “half a person,” he insists that he is only fighting for the Children: “Please, I’m begging for survival. I want my kids alive,” he implores (in Johnson, Too Late 53, 58). If the Child makes an excellent alibi for ableism, perhaps this is because, as Edelman points out, the idea of not fighting for this figure is unthinkable. Thus, when Harriet McBryde Johnson hands out leaflets protesting the Muscular Dystrophy Association, a confused passerby cannot make sense of what her protest is about. “You’re against Jerry Lewis!” he exclaims (61). The passerby’s surprise is likely informed by a logic similar to that which, in Edelman’s analysis, undergirds the use of the word “choice” by advocates of legal abortion: “Who would, after all, come out for abortion or stand against reproduction, against futurity, and so against life?” (16). Similarly, why would anyone come out for disability, and so against the Child who, without a cure, might never walk, might never lead a normal life, might not even have a future at all? The logic of the telethon, in other words, relies on an ideology that might be defined as “rehabilitative futurism,” a term that I coin to overlap and intersect with Edelman’s notion of “reproductive futurism.” If, as Edelman maintains, the future is envisaged in terms of a fantasmatic “Child,” then the survival of this future-figured-as-Child is threatened by both queerness and disability. Futurity is habitually imagined in terms that fantasize the eradication of disability: a recovery of a “crippled” or “hobbled” economy, a cure for society’s ills, an end to suffering and disease. Eugenic ideologies are also grounded in both reproductive and rehabilitative futurism: procreation by the fit and elimination of the disabled, eugenicists promised, would bring forth a better future.” (68-69)

#### Debate is a communicative sphere which is systematically structured to exclude disability – communicative spaces privilege those who can conform to marketable forms of affect by rewarding normality and conformity and excluding those who are deemed incompetent through perceiving disabled affect as parasitic due to literally slowing down information. The drive to perform means disability is always constituted by affective labor and regulated to the bottom of the communicative register causing violence and exclusion.

St. Pierre 17 (Becoming Dysfluent: Fluency as Biopolitics and Hegemony Joshua St. Pierre Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 11, Issue 3, 2017, pp. 339-356 (Article) Published by Liverpool University Press) [BRACKETED FOR ABLEIST RHETORIC] //Lex VM Recut by ACCS JM

“Given that compulsory able-bodiedness emanates from everywhere and nowhere, it is perhaps more fruitful to parse this consensus through the mode by which compulsory able-bodiedness circulates and is translated across different ideas, practices, and institutions rather than isolating the specific sites where this consensus, this hegemony, is produced. For McRuer, “the experience of the able-bodied need for an agreed-on common ground” is a common experience that “links all people with disabilities under a system of compulsory able-bodiedness” (8), and I suggest that this “common ground” of disability oppression is a how as much as a where or a what. That is, a common ground is never just found, but must be cleared away and maintained with effort through time. “Fluency” can accordingly be understood as a technology operating at the intersection of biopower and hegemony that smooths over and straightens discontinuous semiotics, temporalities, and materialities to eliminate frictions within productive, biopolitical systems and thus secure social order within the material realm. An attention to fluency moves beyond the orthodox focus on ideology as the essential vehicle of hegemony to locate, alongside Jon Beasley-Murray’s notion of “posthegemony,” the production of consensus and the security of social order not within the realm of representation but the governance of bodies and life itself. Fluency attempts to regulate and collapse not merely the time between encounters, but the embodied time of encounter and access and judgment. Fluency attempts to cover over political spaces—to mitigate (when it cannot eliminate) interruption and disruption—thus facilitating in one move the rationalization and naturalization of embodied difference that seems to emanate from everywhere and nowhere, as if everyone agrees. But whatever else it may be, fluency is first a process enacted and lived within the material and corporeal**.** Here I start from the semiotic and expand outwards. The vast array of rhythms, semiotic modes, tempos, dictions, and (racialized or disabled) accents that constitute practices of aural “communication” have become the objective domain of the biomedicalizing industry of Speech-Language Pathology. Barry Guitar, in his well-used textbook on speech impediments, offers an exemplary definition of fluency: “simply as the effortless flow of speech” (13). Yet there is hardly anything simple about this definition, which is offered amid caveats and backtracking. Guitar readily admits (12) that fluency is difficult to pin down and that researchers within Speech-Language Pathology often focus on what it is not—namely, dysfluency. There are a few characteristics: Fluent speech is marked by a lack of hesitation, and Speech-Language Pathology is forced to make (dubious and highly arbitrary) distinctions between “normal” and “abnormal” hesitations (Goldman-Eisler) since breaks and hesitations crop up in all speech. Fluent speech is marked by rhythmical (read: thoroughly normalized) patterning. Fluent speech is similarly marked by the lack of “extra sounds” interjected into culturally dominant phonetic patterns. Fluency is defined by the overall rate of speech, which includes not just the rate of vocal flow but of information flow (Starkweather). And lastly, fluency is often defined by a lack of “effort” on the part of the speaker; a conceit of mastery over language that highlights the twinned meaning of “fluency.” Transposing this definition into a critical register, the “effortless flow of speech” can be read as a coordinated—yet often strained—performance of bending the energies and capacities of bodies toward stable and univocal futures. [Those with Autism] ~~Autistics~~ are compelled to restrict stimming, to sit on their hands (to have “quiet hands,” Bascom), and thereby reroute bodily capacities to the smooth performance of so-called intelligible communication. Dyslexic bodies that process information piecemeal and slowly are forced out of social time (Cosenza 7). As Zach Richter has argued, the facial tics and erratic gestures of dysfluent speakers are likewise never communicative inflections, but are made abject and cast out of the communicative realm altogether by what I am here calling technologies of fluency. Tics of loud cursing and grunting from a public speaker with Tourette’s are imagined as an interruption to communication. Dysfluencies are erased from closed captions and courtroom transcripts. What is thus left is a univocal and fluid semiotic operation that instrumentalizes our relations with others. Or more precisely, if fluency is a type of Foucauldian technology, then the function of this biopolitical strategy is to regulate and focus the communicative event toward specific, technical ends through the logic of optimization and closure.” (342-344)

#### Vote affirmative as an endorsement of dysfluency and the failure of disability to be productive – this 1AC is a performative affective intervention by diverting from what is expected in a space that is meant to purposefully exclude disability in the name of productivity – this 1AC serves as a reminder of the failed ASL movement that the PRL instantly stopped in the name of productivity and efficiency. Only a refusal of this world addresses ableism as the basis of communication—we defend the 1AC’s affective pessimism as an example of a die-in within topic discussions, a refusal to breathe life into the resolution. Pessimistic die-ins break from institutional participation as a starting point for politics in favor of disrupting the circulation of discourses predicated upon optimism and disabled death. This hijacks communicative spheres by purposefully forefronting discussions of disabled killability.

Selck 16 [Selck, Michael L. "Crip Pessimism: The Language of Dis/ability and the Culture that Isn't." (Jan 2016) // WHSRS and Lex VM]

“The disabled are dying and with them dis/abled culture is being eradicated. In the time between formulating this project and its completion already too many disabled souls have been taken from this world, including pivotal disability studies influences for this research. I barely had enough time to mourn the loss of disability advocate and inspiration porn critic Stella Young before grieving the loss of disability studies exemplar Tobin Siebers. Attached to the grief I feel as a result of the fading disability studies community is the perpetual grief I harbor since my disabled Father’s suicide and in turn the grief concomitant to the claiming of a disabled identity. I choose to start out this project with grief because it communicates the tenor of this research; this is not the disability studies project of inspiration or utopia. My entry point to the disability studies dialogue is riddled with grief, anger, and pain and it is as such that this project plots a course of disability research that attempts to make a space free from the ideological constraints of optimism. The language surrounding dis/ability is highly political. Entire words, phrases, and identities are stretched between, in, and out of the nexus of dis/ability. The choice, for instance, to include a backslash in the word dis/ability represents for Goodley (2014) a desire to delineate and expand each of the categories in the face of global neoliberalism. My initial research inquired about the impact of dis/abled terms and phrases. I went to interrogate rhetoric like “special education”, “handicapable”, and one of the most glaringly overused insults in the American education system “retard”. The scholarship I was coming up with was plentiful but was for the most part located entirely outside of intercultural communication programs like the one I was attending. For the most part the few and far between intercultural communication projects about dis/ability I was able to locate were without modal complexity and didn’t bear semblance to so many of my own experiences. I was beginning to notice a layer of optimism that has been communicatively imprinted upon the negotiation of dis/abled identity. The angst started to manifest as I questioned if I was in the correct field or if dis/ability even was ‘cultural’. I felt a very real cultural erasure of dis/ability in academia and ultimately that glaring lack of consideration is what pushed me to performance studies. I first worked to close the apparent research gap by crafting a collaborative performance titled Under the Mantle (UTM), which put dis/ability, communication scholarship, and pessimist philosophy on stage. The larger purpose of this research report is to antagonize the erasure of dis/ability from communication studies by autoethnographically analyzing the crip-pessimist performance art project Under The Mantle.” (1-2) This research report will first detail the components of the theoretical work that was drawn on to create UTM. Next I offer a literature review to demonstrate the combination of optimism and neglect dis/ability has undergone in intercultural communication models. Following that section I mark my shift to performance methods as I explain how narrative autoethnography can illuminate cultural misconceptions regarding the dis/abled. In the last sections of this report I offer a textual analysis of the performance UTM and analyze three significant arguments of the instillation before concluding. Contextualizing Critical Dis/Ability Theory Often used interchangeably, critical disability theory (CDT) and critical disability studies (CDS) contest dis/ablism (Goodley, 2011, 2014; Devlin & Pothier, 2006; Hosking, 2008). There are several unique additions made to CDS with every new instantiation. Scholars in European countries and Canada attend to the theory, with United States academics often underrepresented. There are three concurrent themes of CDT that I will synthesize in this section with some dis/ability studies authors claiming there are as many as seven themes of CDT (Hosking, 2008). In the introduction to their edited collection of dis/ability essays, Richard Devlin and Dianne Pothier (2006) present three themes of CDT as, first, to highlight the unequal status to which persons with disabilities are confined; second, to destabilize necessitarian assumptions that reinforce the marginalization of persons with disabilities; and third, to help generate the individual and collective practical agency of persons with disabilities in the struggles for recognition and redistribution. (p. 18, emphasis mine) Already the connections between the CDT and the critical communication paradigm are visible as each respectively forefronts notions of power, privilege, identity, and agency. Outlined in more detail, the first theme of CDT argues that there is systemic micro and macro level discrimination against bodies with disabilities. To some critical communication scholars, this theme might be obvious, but it seldom is when “the resulting exclusion of those who do not fit able-bodied norms may not be noticeable or even intelligible” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). As the bumper sticker on my laptop proudly disclaims, “Not all disabilities are visible,” which necessarily adds a level of nuance and complexity to the way that dis/ability studies attend to the prospect of discrimination and violence. Often times, “social organization according to able-bodied norms is just taken as natural, normal, inevitable, necessary, even progress” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). It might be true that the lack of collaborative work between critical communication studies and dis/ability studies is because neoliberalism is supremely effective at rebranding marginalized oppression as a marker of its progress. The implications of this assertion are dire but essential to the basis of crip-pessimism. Theoretical approaches based in pessimism and skepticism are often necessary to distinguish the instruments of self destruction that have been mistaken for those of self betterment. Thus, a key question remains, what is regarded as progress and to whom does it count? The politics of progress call for the second tenet of CDT, which is a destabilization of neoliberal practices that strip power and agency from bodies with disabilities. Devlin and Pothier (2006) use the language of “anti-necessitarian” (p. 2), which refers to the efficacy of social organizations and an unflinching skepticism of liberalism. For Shildrick and Price (1999), “disabled bodies call into question the ‘giveness’ of the ‘natural body’ and, instead, posit a corporeality that is fluid in its investments and meanings” (p. 1). Anti-necessitarian logics ask questions that remain innocuous to the critical communication paradigm. Can the architectural proliferation of stairs and multiple levels on buildings be attributed to neoliberalism and active disablism? If stairs seem to focus too exclusively on physical impairments, then what about the sensitivity of the building’s lighting, acoustics, and spatiality? Finally, if neoliberalism fights to protect its grand narrative of progress then is the social exclusion of bodies with disabilities necessary for the day-to-day operation of our globalized world? As Donaldson (2002) posits: “theories of gendered, raced, sexed, classed, and disabled bodies offer us critical languages for ‘denaturalising’ impairment’” (p. 112) at the level of the subjective and inter-subjective. The third theme of CDT is to attend to the agency of bodies with disabilities in the struggle for recognition. One key element of extending agency to the disabled is the use of social experience. Experience is subjective “but experience remains intimately connected to political and social existence, and therefore individuals and societies are capable of learning from their experiences” (Siebers, 2008, p. 82). Though absolutely necessary, it is not enough to write treatises on the oppression of the disabled over time. Academics, theorists, intercultural trainers, and storytellers alike should be aware of the constant risks of representation. Representation and context are at the core of critical disability studies. The notion of agency is as unstable as the notions of dis/ability. There is no one-size-fits-all human rights based approach that will be suitable to address all disabled experiences, as the theoretical call for crip-pessimism will remind us. Instead of a universal abstract Rawlsian concept of social justice, CDS “attend(s) to the relational components of dis/ablism” (Goodley, 2011, p. 159). By a Rawlsian concept of social justice I mean a model that relies on distributive justice with utopist equality at its core. Where utopist equality projects highlight human sameness to the point of purity. CDT unavoidably invites a discussion about difference into the folds as postmodern and post-structural thinkers position the self as defined constantly in relation to others. Therein lies the difference between an equality model and a justice model of social identity. Often in the attempt to open up spaces for reconsidering self and other, CDS celebrates disability as a positive identity marker. This essay offers a strong argument of caution that the inclusion of CDS in critical communication studies might rely too heavily on celebrations of disabled identity. Nothing better demonstrates that reliance on celebrating identity than the myriad language choices used to describe a disabled identity including: differently-abled, special needs, person with disability, disabled person, temporarily able-bodied, and others. Often, able- bodied audiences have a tendency to sensationalize the presence of disability in a space that has not traditionally welcomed it. Examples of this are highlighted by the increasingly popular discussion of ‘inspiration porn’ (Young, 2014) and Hollywood’s representation of disability. The tendency is to inspirationalize the disabled for achieving tasks that would not be celebrated if they were accomplished by an unimpaired body. Crossing the street, showing up on time, entering a building by oneself are all tasks profoundly routine to the non-disabled and yet simultaneously cherished as markers of progress for the disabled. Philosophical pessimism is articulated next as a way to temper the risk of sensationalizing dis/ability. The theories ultimately fuse together like orchids and wasps to generate the larger theme of crip-pessimism. Philosophical Pessimism Throughout the 19th century pessimism was one of the most popular intellectual and philosophical strains, crossing countries and continents. Authors such as Rousseau, Leopardi, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche overwhelmingly created and lead the spirit of pessimism. Contemporarily however, the word ‘pessimism’ is pejorative and describes a body’s emotional discontent rather than intellectual engagement with the world. Dienstag (2009) writes, “Since pessimism is perceived more as a disposition than as a theory, pessimists are seen primarily as dissenters from whatever the prevailing consensus of their time happens to be, rather than as constituting a continuous alternative” (p. 3). Power is responsible for ontological shifts, and during shifts some populations benefit while others are harmed. The turn in thinking about pessimism from an intellectual position to an emotional state has been particularly gratuitous for bodies with disabilities. I come to pessimism because of my experience with disability. My anxiety disorder comes with an exteriority of anti-social behavior that has branded me pessimistic. The concern for my anxiety in public situations is often commented on as overly critical, negative, narcissistic, and most often pessimistic. I experience an anxious state of becoming different, and after years of failing to rehabilitate my sameness to able-bodied standards, I have come to a comfort with pessimism.

#### Disability controls proximate cause to and explains all other violence – treating those as inferior is only justifiable through the guise of disability.

**Siebers et al. 17** Tobin, et al. (2017): Culture – Theory – Disability: Encounters between Disability Studies and Cultural Studies, Siebers began his career at the University of Michigan in 1980. He has authored ten books, including field-defining Disability Aesthetics (UM Press, 2010) and Disability Theory (UM Press, 2008). In 2004 Siebers was named the V. L. Parrington Collegiate Professor. Siebers was a Chair of the LSA Comparative Literature Program (currently the Department of Comparative Literature). In 2009, the University of Michigan Council for Disability Concerns presented Siebers with the James T. Neubacher Award in recognition of extraordinary leadership and service in support of the disability community. Siebers has been selected for fellowships by the Michigan Society of Fellows, the Guggenheim Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the Institute for the Humanities at the University of Michigan. Tobin Siebers passed away in January 2015. In March 2015, the University of Michigan announced the establishment of the Tobin Siebers Prize for Disability Studies in the Humanities "for best book-length manuscript on a topic of pressing urgency to Disability Studies in the humanities.", DOI: 10.14361/9783839425336-002 SJCP//JG

The use of disability identity as a prop to denigrate minority politics has a long and pernicious history on the right, although it is bewildering to find the usage alive and well in Butler, Brown, and other cultural critics on the left.5 (This surprising agreement between the right and left gives one small clue to the tenacious hold that ability as an ideology exercises over political thinking today.6 ) Indeed, the idea that the political claims made by people of color and women are illegitimate because their identities are disabled would be outrageous if it were not such a familiar and successful ploy. Historical opponents of political and social equality for women, Douglas Baynton shows, cite their supposed physical, intellectual, and psychological flaws, stressing irrationality, excessive emotions, and physical weakness, while similar arguments for racial inequality and immigration restrictions involving particular races and ethnic groups invoke their apparent susceptibility to feeble-mindedness, mental illness, deafness, blindness, and other disabilities (see Baynton 33). Moreover, disability remains today, Baynton explains, an acceptable reason for unequal treatment, even as other justifications for discrimination, based on race, ethnicity, sex, and gender, have begun to fall away. It is no longer considered permissible to treat minority people as inferior citizens, although it happens all the time, unless that inferiority is tied to disability. As long as minority identities are thought disabled, there is little hope for the political and social equality of either persons with these identities or disabled people, for there will always be one last justification for inferior treatment. There will always be the possibility of proving the inferiority of any given human being at any given moment as long as inferiority is tied to physical and mental difference. Moreover, that pain in itself leads to inferior identities, ones given to greater self-recrimination or frequent victimizing of others, relies on a fallacious psychological scenario prejudiced inherently against disability.7 Once touching a person, pain is apparently transformative, to all intents and purposes serving as an organic and natural cause whose psychological formation evolves with little variation according to the internal logic of the psyche. First, the psychology of pain links mental and physical suffering inextricably, and, second, it names pain, opposed to all other causes, as transformative of individuals, compelling them to withdraw into selfish, narcissistic, and anti-social behavior. Any attempt to sketch a political theory, especially of minority identity, based on this misleading psychology will produce the same predictable and deplorable results.

#### Put away your psychoanalysis indicts – we integrate intersection with feminist, queer, colonialist, and anti-white supremacist theorization that accounts for lacks in original psychoanalytic theories which accounts for and revises Freudian and Lacanian theorization.
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The theoretical trajectory that I will trace, which begins with Dora‟s account of hysteria as a disorder afflicting a minority of disabled subjects, and ends with Beyond the Pleasure Principle‟s universalizing account of the death drive, is not explicitly articulated by Freud. Throughout his career, Freud held fast to his construction of hysteria; therefore, the death drive cannot be seen as supplanting hysteria in Freudian thought. But my reading of hysteria as both a precursor to the theory of the drive and a way for Freud to avoid naming and confronting the drive demonstrates that a rearticulation of Freud‟s concept of hysteria can be a starting point for a more universalizing approach, grounded in the concept of the disability drive. Departing from Freud‟s tendency to pathologize individual disabled people, such a model may yield more nearly universal insights about psychic life. Questions about universalism are among the most compelling and difficult aspects of psychoanalysis, a discipline that posits a set of psychic structures that are said to govern the lives of all subjects. Does psychoanalysis‟ universalizing model mistake the psychological determinants of middle-class members of western capitalist societies for universal norms? This question can in part be answered by way of a distinction: although Freud specifies that the structure of the psyche that he delineates is universal, his model leaves room for the theorization of a great diversity of particular content that might fill that structure. Factors such as gender, queerness, race, class, colonialism, disability, and historical context can radically alter the ways in which constructs such as “the ego,” “the drive,” and “sexuality” come to be figured. The potential fluidity of Freud‟s paradigm has been the basis of important interventions by social theorists who, working within and beyond the discipline of psychoanalysis, have rethought Freud‟s arguments from the vantage points of feminist, antiracist, postcolonial, and queer criticism.22 My project builds upon this work by bringing a critical disability studies perspective to bear upon Freud‟s concept of the death drive. In the chapters that follow, I will examine the 9 ways in which cultural projections of the disability drive shape intersections of multiple modalities of oppression, including ableism, misogyny, homophobia, fatphobia, white supremacy, classism, and colonialism. I also wish to emphasize that although my argument about the disability drive unfolds within a psychoanalytic framework, in which the structuring components of the psyche are said to be universal, I am not suggesting that a psychoanalytic epistemology should be seen as trumping other ways of knowing human minds, bodies, and bodyminds. Nonwestern models of mind and body, for example, may differ significantly from the frame within which I situate my analysis. For this reason, I will neither assume nor attempt to establish that the psychoanalytic ways of thinking that I employ in this dissertation will be useful or meaningful to every subject and culture. However, I will also not assume in advance that my elucidation of the disability drive does not apply to specific groups or individuals, as I am wary of the danger of effecting harmful and unnecessary exclusions by prematurely designating an argument as inapplicable to particular subjects or experiences**. It is for this reason that throughout this thesis I use the term “our culture” to reference the social world(s) in which I understand cultural manifestations of, and defenses against, the disability drive to take shape. I intend for the phrase “our culture” to signify expansively, issuing a deliberately open-ended and indeterminate invitation to any person to whom the language and concepts in this dissertation may be accessible and illuminating. The words “our culture” cannot, of course, reference every person in the world; but because the ableist social and psychic structures that I delineate in this project seem to me to potentially exceed the bounds of demarcations such as “US American culture,” “the West,” or “modern industrial societies,” I employ this “our” to leave open questions about the extent to which my analyses may or may not apply to particular geographies and cultural locations.** The problematic of universalism versus exclusions in this project can be illustrated by raising a set of questions regarding my arguments‟ relation to asexual people‟s experiences and identities. If this dissertation‟s opening assertion of disability‟s sexiness were taken to mean that sexiness is a quality that disabled people should aspire to embody—and conversely, that an absence of sexual desire is grounds for social discrediting—then this assertion would contribute to our culture‟s stigmatization of asexual people. Such a reading, however, would run directly counter to my project‟s central aim: the sexual model of disability is intended to complicate efforts to highlight sexualities as causes for pride or empowerment. In conceiving of sexuality as inextricable from failure, loss, and suffering, I hope to make visible sexuality‟s incompatibility with proud identity claims. Yet even this approach presents risks. As I will discuss in the next section of this chapter, some queer theorists‟ citations of sexuality‟s identity-disturbing effects have been articulated in ways that seem to imply that the more sex one has, or the more that one engages in particular sexual practices, the more effectively one can challenge heteronormative cultural imperatives. “The Disability Drive” will not forward such an argument. I emphasize the sexiness of disability to counter our culture‟s widespread desexualization of disabled people; this emphasis, however, is not meant to suggest that disabled people have, or should have, “more” or “better” sex than nondisabled people (whatever those comparatives might mean), or that we should aim to secure social legitimacy by establishing our “attractiveness” to sexual partners. The sexiness of disability that I highlight refers less to attributes of individual subjects than to aspects of disability as it is envisioned and sometimes experienced. Additionally, although Freud assumed that sexuality was universal, I will not make this assumption, since such a claim would contradict many asexual people‟s lived experiences. This 10 does not mean, though, that the sexual model of disability must be irrelevant to asexual people. The Asexual Visibility and Education Network (AVEN) defines an asexual person as someone “who does not experience sexual attraction”; however, AVEN‟s website notes that many (but not all) asexual people experience sexual arousal, have sexual fantasies, or masturbate.23 Even nonlibidoists, those asexuals who “have no sexual feelings at all,” may nonetheless have experiences that fall within the extremely broad rubric of what Freud designates as sexuality. According to Freud, intellectual work, strong emotion, illness, athletic activity, eating, swinging, warm baths, and train travel can all potentially be regarded as sexual.24 On the other hand, just because such activities and feelings can be described as sexual does not mean that they have to be, and to force the application of the label “sexual” would effect a discursive violence upon subjects who have determined that this term does not apply to their lives. Thus, although I postulate the sexual model as one means of theorizing the disability drive, I do not suggest that it is the only such method.

#### The 1AC method is compatible with a form of conspiratorial communism – it’s the only solution to neoliberalism.

Culp 16 (Andrew Culp teaches in the MA Program in Aesthetics and Politics at the California Institute of Technology. He is interested in the afterlives of media technologies born out of the anti-globalization movement. He is currently completing a manuscript, Persona Obscura. He serves on the Governing Board of the Cultural Studies Association. His work has appeared in numerous venues, including Radical Philosophy, Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities, Quarterly Journal of Speech, parallax, and boundary 2 online, “Dark Deleuze”, <https://track5.mixtape.moe/frhirn.pdf>) SJBE

“Deleuze happily embraces a Marxism so anti-State that it refuses the project of democracy. It is up to us to render his Marxism in darker terms than Rancière, who would rather break down the state through the democratic dissensus of aesthesis acting as “the power of an ontological difference between two orders of reality” (Dissensus, 180). Outright, darkness begins by subverting Negri’s joyous celebration of democracy, which offers a productivist composition of forces as both the conditions of and resolution to capitalism (Ruddick, “Politics of Affect”). If Negriism was true, the only thing left for us to do is to “dump the bosses off our backs” (Hardt, “Common in Communism”). But the balance of power is far too ambivalent to make the epochal declaration that a revolutionary subject, such as the multitude, has already been produced and merely needs to be found. Our mad black communism is not a reworking of Marx’s universalism, which is the seamless unity of thought and action that can be found in productivist appeals to immanence as immediate and unmediated, that is to say, automatic (PI, 29; DR, 29). On this account, an a priori communism is too dangerously close to Kant (DI, 60 “). We have no use for the judgment of a communist natura, which comes from the Joyous Deleuzians’ confusion of metaphysics for politics. Neither automatic or automated, our communism is not tempted by the fully automated luxury communism of cybernetics, which is a temptation only from the perspective of control societies. Our communism is nothing but the conspiracy of communism (against ontology). It is the conspiracy to destroy the factory of production. As a conspiracy, communism is a war machine that turns the autoproductive processes of the Real into weapons for destroying any project built on metaphysical consistency. It targets the collusion between the creation of concepts and the reproduction of this world. In this sense, it wages a guerilla struggle against those who joyfully affirm “the ontology of Deleuze.” It is a conspiracy for at least two reasons: first, it has a penchant for negativity that makes its revolutionary force appear as a conspiracy against everything that the joyful take as a given; second, its inclination toward collective forms of asymmetric struggle sets it wholly at odds with scholarly common sense. It dares any communism worth its name to wage a war of annihilation against God, Man, and the World itself.”

#### Kant’s criteria for personhood violently excludes the disabled.

Lucas G. Pinheiro 17 [(Lucas G. Pinheiro, ) The Ableist Contract Intellectual Disability and the Limits of Justice in Kant’s Political Thought, Cambridge Core Online publication date: March 2017, pp 43-78] AT

With these theoretical considerations in mind, this chapter probes the political and moral spaces occupied by intellectually disabled subjects in the political, ethical, and moral thought of Immanuel Kant. To this end, I place particular emphasis on the ways in which Kant’s “empirical” observations on disability fundamentally impact his political formulations of justice, freedom, citizenship, personhood, and the human species. My approach to interpreting intellectual disability in Kant’s theory of justice begins with a close reading of his practical definitions of disability in lesser-known works on anthropology, physical geography, and natural history. I then deploy this reading as a source for contextualizing his political ideas and thus uncovering the meaning and political significance of his exclusionary terminology in the Metaphysics of Morals as it pertains to the treatment of intellectually disabled subjects in his theory of justice. It is important to note that, in the context of Kant’s political and moral philosophy, I use the term “contract” figuratively, since my argument applies broadly to contractarian ideas of rights, freedom, civil society, and justice in the history of modern political thought as a whole. So, with respect to Kant, “contract” operates as a placeholder for the totality of his political constituency which is composed by his moral laws, doctrines of rights and duties (private and public), theory of the state, scale of progress, and formulation of civil society. To be sure, Kant’s political ideas – including his definitions of justice, personhood, freedom, rights, duties, citizenship, and the state – are not limited to the Metaphysics of Morals, just as they are not exclusive to his writings on practical and transcendental philosophy. Much the contrary, in fact, Kant articulates his political theory through an expansive and eclectic array of sources, scattered across an impressively diverse range of fields and genres well beyond his strictly political writings and moral philosophy.8 Although perhaps unfamiliar to a contemporary political theory audience, Kant’s empirical works encompass a detailed, rich, and intricate sociopolitical system, whose relevance to his political ideas I attempt to recover by interpreting his onomasiology of intellectual disability. Indeed, as I will argue, Kant’s understanding of disability affects and informs his theory of justice in such constitutive ways that its continual neglect has resulted in an insufficiently critical and accurate interpretation of Kant’s political thought writ large. From a broader perspective, my interpretation of disability in Kant seeks to recast the political thrust of Kant’s theory by rearticulating its relationship to other strains of the Kantian corpus that, while less accepted, less philosophical, and undoubtedly less agreeable, are, on my account, no less politically and philosophically significant to his thought than the “strictly” political and philosophical works. As of late, a host of scholars in disability studies have vocally contested Kant’s moral theory of personhood. This burgeoning literature on Kant and disability is largely composed of critical responses to the works of Jeff McMahan (1995, 1996, 2002, 2005, 2009) and Peter Singer (1994, 2009), both of whom vindicate non-human moral standing by grounding the corporeal existence of animals within an ethically defensible, intra-species moral realm, akin to that of Kant’s person. In his work, McMahan (2009: 583–4) invokes cognitive disability as the premise of a reduction argument that figures the severely intellectually disabled as a rhetorical device tasked with exposing the logical contradiction of theories that grant moral status to the severely mentally disabled while denying it to non-human animals with commensurate cognitive capacities. Singer likewise argues that, since many non-human animals possess cognitive capacities that are often on a par with or superior to, those of severely intellectually disabled humans, it is altogether groundless and unjustifiable – that is, “speciesist” – to deny the former group (animals) moral standing while extending it to the latter (the disabled) (1994, 2009: 567–8). In building their philosophical arguments for intra-species moral standing, both Singer (2009: 573–4) and McMahan (2002: 245–6, 252–5) rely prominently on Kant’s personhood–animality split as a means to support their formulations of extra-corporeal moral status, grounded on intellectual predispositions and cognitive capacities. Yet, both philosophers part ways with Kant insofar as they believe human animality and species membership should play no role as criteria for determining moral life (Singer 2009: 572–3; McMahan 2002: 148, 209–17).9 McMahan’s (2009: 604) idea that “differences of moral status are grounded in differences of psychological capacity” prefigures Singer’s (2009: 575) suggestion to “abandon the idea of the equal value of all humans” and replace it with a “graduated view in which moral status depends on some aspects of cognitive ability.” As a result, both Singer and McMahan advocate integrating non-human animals to a moral community of “persons” at the expense of denying personhood to humans who fall below a Kantian moral threshold rooted entirely in cognitive capacity as opposed to human animality. Unsurprisingly, Singer and McMahan have received ample criticism from scholars seeking to include or maintain the cognitively disabled within the bounds of our moral community of persons. As I see it, the central and most politically salient aspect of these critiques resides in the Kantian discourse Singer and McMahan mobilize in support of their projects. Pushing back against rationalist conceptions of moral status, philosopher Eva Kittay (2001, 2005a, 2005b, 2009a, 2009b) has argued that species membership alone should suffice as a criterion for equal moral status among human beings. Licia Carlson (2009, 2010), who furthers Kittay’s critique of reason-centric moral theories, questions the political discourse through which these conceptions of personhood have been articulated. She recalls, for example, that viewing humans as animals “is precisely the basis on which the most horrific atrocities are justified” (2010: 160). Carlson also outlines important ways in which critiques of speciesism, such as Singer’s, “rely on ableist assumptions and arguments” (2010: 157). Although Kittay and Carlson do not comment directly on Kant’s specific formulation of moral personhood, they effectively highlight how and why elevating cognitive capacity to the role of arbiter for moral life, as is the case with Kant’s theory of personhood, has deeply problematic repercussions for the intellectually disabled.10 Other scholars writing on disability and political theory have also expressed profound skepticism toward rationalist formulations of moral personhood rooted in Kant’s categorical imperative.11 One notable critic of Kantian personhood from the standpoint of disability is Barbara Arneil (2009), whose key charge against Kant’s moral theory is his crowning of rational autonomy as the foundation for human dignity (2009: 224). In its quest to “protect human dignity through the mutual recognition of others as rational self-legislating ‘persons,’” Arneil remarks, Kant’s moral theory consequently figures the “irrational” as “not ‘autonomous’ and strictly speaking not ‘persons’ and therefore not due the dignity accorded to ‘rational beings’” (2009: 224–5).12 Moreover, Arneil exposes how Kant’s formulation of personhood has pervasively found its way to the backdrop of influential political theories of justice by the likes of John Rawls and Charles Taylor. Because Kant locates personhood in the human ability to reason, Arneil argues that contemporary authors who draw on Kant (such as Taylor) are consequently “forced to define those incapable of ‘rationality’ as outside the ‘normal’ meaning of personhood,” as possessing an unrealizable potential to become human (2009: 225, 228). Together, these works by critical disability scholars illustrate how Kant’s moral philosophy has sustained a political discourse that categorically exempts the disabled from the remits of justice. Overall, three important conclusions can be drawn from the literature on Kant and disability. First, scholars working on intellectual disability and political theory have provided convincing arguments as to how Kantian conceptions of personhood misrecognize the inherent humanity of the intellectually disabled. Second, these scholars have compellingly identified why, from a political standpoint of justice, liberty, and equality, it is desirable to move away from such reason-centric formulations of moral status that privilege the able-minded over the intellectually disabled. Third, many of these commentators have conclusively outlined how Kant’s moral philosophy is conceptually, albeit indirectly, implicated in the political marginalization of the disabled persons. Notwithstanding the merits of their projects, the authors in question have limited their critiques of Kant’s political thought to his moral and practical philosophies, or what is colloquially known as the “pure” segment of his work. Take Tobin Siebers’ (2011: 89) following claim for instance: “Theories of rationality […] configure rationality itself in terms of the objective properties and identifying characteristics of those agents whom Kant called rational beings, and these characteristics do not allow for the inclusion of people with disabilities.” Siebers’ point here illustrates a general trend in critiques of Kant’s moral philosophy from the perspective of disability in which Kant’s empirical views on the disabled are persistently overlooked. Because of this oversight, discussions of Kant and disability are limited to speculative arguments that hinge on the impenetrability of Kant’s moral theory by the intellectually disabled. As such, Kant’s extensive definitions of cognitive disability and lively figurations of disabled subjects have yet to be weighed against the political arguments of his moral and practical philosophy in an effort to assess how these views may effectively, rather than merely potentially, impact the meaning of his ideas about justice and thus sway their political and theoretical significance. As I argue throughout this chapter, Kant’s empirical writings on disability are critical to this scholarly debate for two reasons. First, it is in these texts that Kant entertains political questions concerning the civil and moral standing of intellectually disabled subjects. Second, Kant’s empirical works are essential to our understanding of his transcendental philosophy and political system, especially regarding the categorical imperative, because it is here – in his construction of the intellectually disabled – that Kant outlines the identity of those exceptional, irrational beings barred from the political concessions of justice. By turning my attention to how, where, and why Kant’s approach to justice fails with respect to the intellectually disabled, I intend to cast light on what I consider to be the margins of his moral philosophy and, as a result, delineate the limits of his political theory of justice. This marginal space wherein the intellectually disabled are enclosed exemplifies what Uday Mehta (1999) describes as the explicit exclusion of the unfamiliar, along with the erasure of their “sentiments, feelings, sense of location, and forms of life” (1999: 20–1). Such occult “spaces” of exception are, in Mehta’s words, “places that when identified by the grid of Enlightenment rationality [become] only spots on a map or past points on the scale of civilizational progress, but not dwellings in which peoples lived and had deeply invested identities” (1999: 21).13 To the extent that it moves toward recasting the meaning of his theory of justice, my interpretation of disability in Kant endeavors to reaffirm the political and conceptual significance of disability to the history of political thought and contemporary politicized identity. Read as such, I intend for the reach of my argument to stretch beyond interpretations of Kant. By demonstrating just how problematic Kant’s conception of justice is with regards to intellectual disability, this chapter consequently interrogates contemporary political theories whose ambit of justice, in being bound by reason, effectively forecloses the intellectually disabled from freedom, citizenship, and personhood.

#### You should adopt epistemological disablement over certainty. Their attempt to construct a universal guide to action ignores the ways in which uncertainty, confusion, and the overall drive determine us. This means their framework should be ep suspect because it is contingent on a complete knowledge of the self which the disability drive denies.

**Mollow 15** The Disability Drive by Anna Mollow 2015 // UTDD

“How, then, might we begin to acknowledge our own determination by the drive? **Any knowing of the drive** that we might hope to achieve **must**, on account of the structural barriers that render the drive unthinkable, **be an effort characterized by failure and incompletion—that is**, we might say, by **epistemological disablement.** The term “epistemological disablement” will appear frequently in this dissertation, as I will argue that **coming into close proximity with the disability drive produces states of cognitive and affective uncertainty, confusion, and incapacity that are akin to disability.** In the works that I shall analyze, epistemological disablement will often be performed on a textual level, as theorists and narrators seem to lose control of what they want to say about disability. **These moments of epistemological disablement are often disavowed by theorists and narrators and are instead projected onto disabled people. When this happens, disabled people’s impairments are depicted as the result of an insufficiency of self-knowledge that is assumed not to determine nondisabled subjects.** I will challenge these characterizations of disabled people not only by arguing for the value of “cripistemologies” (that is, ways of knowing that arise from disabled people‟s lived experiences) but also by using **drive theory** to **undermine belief in the possibility of a transparent and wholly knowable self**, whether disabled or nondisabled.18 My two-pronged approach to the issue of epistemological disablement may seem to present a paradox: on the one hand, I am asserting that disabled people’s lived experiences generate important knowledge about disability; yet at the same time I am seeking to destabilize the very notion of self-knowledge. Let me be clear, then, that in undertaking this double endeavor I do not forward all-or-nothing claims either “for” or “against” the possibilities of self- knowledge. I will not assert that people cannot ever know anything reliable about themselves, but I will also not suggest that truth claims derived from personal knowledge about disability are infallible. Instead, **this** dissertation **highlights the limits of complete self-knowledge for nondisabled and disabled subjects alike, while at the same time interrogating the social dynamics that give rise to imbalances in the distribution of epistemological authority to particular subjects on the basis of their perceived status as disabled or nondisabled.**” (4)

#### Epistemology must begin with the question of real world ableism inside of the status quo – ideal theorization lacks accountability, forgets the value to know the unknown, and contains generalizations that exclude material suffering – the affirmative is uniquely key to bring humility and provides the necessary empirical realities that stipulate the definitions of your idealized world.

Kittay 09 Eva Feder Kittay is an American philosopher. She is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy (Emerita) at Stony Brook University [Kittay, Eva Feder. “The Ethics of Philosophizing: Ideal Theory and the Exclusion of People with Severe Cognitive Disabilities.” Feminist Ethics and Social and Political Philosophy: Theorizing the Non-Ideal, 2009, pp. 141–143.] BRACKETED FOR ABLEISM //Found by ACCS JM & Cut by Lex AKo + Lex VM

Consider the first maxim, epistemic responsibility. Philosophy, by many accounts, is concerned with ‘truth’. The truth cannot be served if philosophers do not acquaint themselves with the basic facts about the subject under consider. As I have indicated, both Singer and McMahan fail to do so in their discussions of individuals with mental retardation. One might ask, ‘Why is such a clear violation of a philosophical value tolerated?’ Here a pernicious effect of idealization displays itself. Empirical realities give way to idealized descriptions and ‘stipulative definitions,’ in order to construct a theory which then can be ‘applied’ to the real world. But these idealizations and stipulative definitions may well construct a theory that is not applicable, or not applicable to that part of the real world that it purports to cover. Consider, in contrast, the way in which a naturalized care ethics is theorized. The practice of caring requires attention to the actual condition of the individuals who need care. Broad generalizations and presumptions—such as ‘the severely mentally ~~retarded~~ [disabled] cannot have aesthetic experiences’—cannot be the basis of good care for the severely mentally ~~retarded~~ [disabled], since the principal source of joy for many people with cognitive impairments derives from aesthetic experiences. A carer intent on giving good care must reject stereotypes and be attentive to what and how the 142 E.F. Kittay person in front of her responds. (Certainly this no less true of health care situations, although practical pressures result in a considerable relaxation of this demand of care.) A care ethic thus expresses the central values of attentiveness and responsiveness to actual conditions, and with that the responsibility to make oneself knowledgeable about the facts on the ground. That is to say, it values epistemic responsibility of the sort that I discuss above. Not only do we need to be responsible and insure that our philosophizing does not ignore salient empirical realities that are known, we have to be humble in the face of that which is as yet unknown (the third maxim). It seems hardly necessary to remind philosophers of what Socrates taught, that the greatest wisdom is to know what one does not know. Yet idealized theorizing, with its tendency to prefer clear lines of definition and opposition, makes it easy to forget to keep a focus on knowing what we do not know. Humility in the face of ignorance also reflects a value, one might say a necessary virtue, in the practice of caring. When we presume to know what we don’t know we are likely to fail in truly meeting the needs of the one for whom we care. In the practice of medical care, such hubris can easily cost lives. With respect to the third maxim, we can point out a dominant philosophical position is that of liberalism. Central to liberalism is the recognition of a plurality of goods. This elevates the avoidance of an arrogance of imposing one’s own values as the true and sole values to a central precept of contemporary philosophy. Reasonable value pluralism (as distinguished from value relativism, where anything goes) is, if you will, the received view. But philosophers frequently neglect this very maxim by presuming the overriding value of reason. An antidote for such presumption is found in the very practice of care. Many who need care are not in a position to exercise their rational functioning (to whatever degree they possess it). Yet for the carer who does good care the value of, and respect owed, the person is never in doubt. The very act of care (when it is good care and not a merely perfunctory carrying out of assigned duties) attests to the value we place on the person’s life and well-being whether or not they are capable of rational deliberation. Caring for one who is seriously dependent on our ministrations can, however, tempt one to presume to know what is good for another and what is of value. It can tempt us to think that we can (or even should) impose our own view on the other. However, such caring, I maintain, is not respectful caring, caring that respects another’s agency. Thus, I believe, best practices of care equally demand that we do not presume that what we value is the only thing that is valuable.21 Finally, there is the issue of accountability, the final maxim. Most practices require some accountability. The need for accountability is inherent in any practice, for without it, one cannot guarantee a consistency of standards. This is evident in practices of care. Parents are held accountable for their children’s actions when harmful actions were foreseeable and preventable. In medical practice, physicians similarly must be held accountable for foreseeable consequences. Any ethic of care must include the importance of being accountable for what we do. Yet, philosophical practice has been strangely inattentive to the importance of accountability. In this philosophers appear to take their cue from theoretical science, 8 The Ethics of Philosophizing 143 in which practitioners claim that they are only after the truth, and if others use their discoveries in a harmful fashion, that is not the pure scientist’s concern.

#### Reasonability against disabled debaters – [A] a brightline of link turn and impact turn ground solves judge intervention. [B] Competing interps is a form of improving into future rounds within communicative spheres at the expense of disabled death.

# Accessibility

### The Disabled Narrative

#### It’s time for the system to hear our outcries – abled subjectivity is tied up in a two-tiered affective response that explains disabled life – primary pity which reflects disability upon the ego threatening its ability status, which invokes secondary pity to overcorrect for the shattered-ego necessitating disabled death.

Mollow 15

pity involves a reaction to the “tragedy of disability.” Primary pity is unbearable to contemplate another person’s suffering is to question, “Could this happen to me?” Secondary pity attempts to heal the ego at someone else’s expense and calls for a cure. we feel primary pity and then deny that we have felt it.

#### Debate is a sphere of “fiat” and “futurism” which reifies rehabilitative futurism where the signifier of the fantasmatic child is placed forward to eradicate and cure disability. When the question of disability arises, communicative projects such as debate are centered around solely optimism and trying to create the ‘better future’ – this obsession with optimism pathologizes the disabled Child that cannot be in the better future – this 1AC serves as an ‘perspective shift’ that differs from the current form of how disability is presented – absent questioning the form of argumentation the content of argumentation becomes unethically flawed – thus, the role of the ballot is to disrupt biopolitical systems of productivity and futurity.

Mollow 2

the image of the Child” is inextricable from disability the Child is a display of pity that demeans disabled people. the Child makes an excellent alibi for ableism because not fighting for is unthinkable. The logic relies on “rehabilitative futurism,” Futurity is imagined that the eradication of disability would bring a better future.

#### Debate is a communicative sphere which is systematically structured to exclude disability – communicative spaces privilege those who can conform to marketable forms of affect by rewarding normality and conformity and excluding those who are deemed incompetent through perceiving disabled affect as parasitic due to literally slowing down information. The drive to perform means disability is always constituted by affective labor and regulated to the bottom of the communicative register causing violence and exclusion.

St. Pierre 17

“Fluency” straightens semiotics to eliminate productive, systems Fluency attempts to cover over embodied difference and is enacted within the material The semiotic have become the domain of Language Pathology. fluency is marked by the flow of speech” a performance of bending bodies toward futures. [Those with Autism] restrict stimming Dyslexic bodies are erased from transcripts.

#### Vote affirmative as an endorsement of dysfluency and the failure of disability to be productive – this 1AC is a performative affective intervention by diverting from what is expected in a space that is meant to purposefully exclude disability in the name of productivity – this 1AC serves as a reminder of the failed ASL movement that the PRL instantly stopped in the name of productivity and efficiency. Only a refusal of this world addresses ableism as the basis of communication—we defend the 1AC’s affective pessimism as an example of a die-in within topic discussions, a refusal to breathe life into the resolution. Pessimistic die-ins break from institutional participation as a starting point for politics in favor of disrupting the circulation of discourses predicated upon optimism and disabled death. This hijacks communicative spheres by purposefully forefronting discussions of disabled killability.

Selck 16

disability is riddled with pain and attempts to make a space free from optimism to antagonize the erasure of dis/ability by analyzing the crip-pessimist neoliberalism is effective at rebranding oppression as progress politics of progress strip agency from bodies with disabilities There is no approach that will address disabled experiences, as crip-pessimism will remind us. after failing to rehabilitate able-bodied standards come to a comfort with pessimism.

#### Disability controls proximate cause to and explains all other violence – treating those as inferior is only justifiable through the guise of disability.

**Siebers et al. 17**

disability denigrate minority politics people of color and women are illegitimate their identities are disabled successful ploy supposed physical psychological flaws irrationality emotions and weakness racial inequality susceptibility to feeble-mindedness disability remains today an acceptable reason for unequal treatment other justifications have begun to fall away no longer to treat as inferior unless tied to disability there will always be one last justification for inferior treatment tied to physical and mental difference

#### Put away your psychoanalysis indicts – we integrate intersection with feminist, queer, colonialist, and anti-white supremacist theorization that accounts for lacks in original psychoanalytic theories which accounts for and revises Freudian and Lacanian theorization.

Mollow 3

although Freud specifies structure his model leaves room for the theorization of great diversity of content that fill that structure Factors such as gender, queerness, race, class, colonialism, disability can radically alter the ways in which constructs such as “the ego,” “the drive,” and “sexuality” come to be figured. The fluidity of Freud‟s paradigm has been the basis of important interventions by social theorists who I examine the ways in which cultural projections of the disability drive shape intersections of oppression including misogyny homophobia white supremacy , and colonialism I will neither assume nor attempt to establish that the psychoanalytic ways of thinking will be useful to every subject and culture . The words our culture” cannot , reference every person but the ableist social and psychic structures exceed the bounds of demarcations such as “US American culture,” “the West,” or “modern industrial societies

#### The 1AC method is compatible with a form of conspiratorial communism – it’s the only solution to neoliberalism.

Culp 16

embrace a Marxism so anti-State that it refuses democracy darkness begins by subverting celebration of democracy which offers a resolution to capitalism Our communism is nothing but the conspiracy of communism (against ontology). the conspiracy to destroy the factory of production a war machine that turns autoproductive processes of the Real into weapons for destroying metaphysical consistency it has a penchant for negativity against everything that the joyful take as a given

#### Kant’s criteria for personhood violently excludes the disabled.

Pinheiro 17

Kant’s “empirical” observations on disability impact his political formulations its continual neglect has resulted in an insufficiently critical and accurate interpretation of Kant’s political thought scholars in disability studies contest Kant’s moral theory of personhood In its quest to “protect human dignity through recognition of others as rational persons Kant’s moral theory consequently figures the “irrational” as “not ‘autonomous and therefore not due the dignity accorded to ‘rational beings Kant’s moral philosophy is conceptually implicated in the political marginalization of the disabled persons. Kant’s approach to justice fails with respect to the intellectually disabled

#### You should adopt epistemological disablement over certainty. Their attempt to construct a universal guide to action ignores the ways in which uncertainty, confusion, and the overall drive determine us. This means their framework should be ep suspect because it is contingent on a complete knowledge of the self which the disability drive denies.

Mollow 15

Any knowing of the drive must be an effort characterized by failure and incompletion—that is epistemological disablement coming into proximity with the disability drive produces states of affective uncertainty These moments are often disavowed by theorists and are instead projected onto disabled people disabled people are depicted as the result of an insufficiency of self-knowledge drive theory undermine belief in the possibility of a transparent and whol self this highlights the limits of complete self-knowledge for subjects while interrogating social dynamics that give rise to imbalances in epistemological authority

#### Epistemology must begin with the question of real world ableism inside of the status quo – ideal theorization lacks accountability, forgets the value to know the unknown, and contains generalizations that exclude material suffering – the affirmative is uniquely key to bring humility and provides the necessary empirical realities that stipulate the definitions of your idealized world.

Kittay 09

Philosophy is concerned with ‘truth’. The truth cannot be served if philosophers do not acquaint with the subject realities give stipulative definitions, these construct a theory applicable to that real world generalizations such as ‘the mentally retarded [disabled] cannot have experiences’ since joy for people with impairments derives from experiences. A care ethic expresses values to conditions idealized theorizing, forget what we do not know This elevates arrogance of imposing one’s values as true care attests value on the life of deliberation. accountability is inherent without it, one cannot guarantee a consistency Yet philosophers take cue that are after the truth