# NEG – Disability [1nc]

## Part 1 – The Ideal Child

#### The WTO’s medical industry is designed to profit off of disabled folks through medicalized processes of capacitation – this demands an a priori interrogation of the forces at work behind the medical industry. (Fritsch 15)

Fritsch 15 [Fritsch, Kelly Michelle. "The Neoliberal Biopolitics of Disability: Towards Emergent Intracorporeal Practices." Diss. York U, Toronto, 2015. YorkSpace Institutional Repository. York University, 16 Dec. 2015. Web.] //Lex VM

Puar argues that all bodies in neoliberal capitalism are “being evaluated in relation to their success or failure in terms of health, wealth, progressive productivity, upward mobility, [and] enhanced capacity” (2011, 155). As such, there is no body that meets the standard of adequately able-bodied anymore, only “gradations of capacity and debility” (2011, 155) that blur the distinction between disabled and non-disabled. Puar contends that given biopolitical developments in neoliberal capitalism, normalizing the disabled body is no longer the major focus of medical intervention. She claims that a biopolitical shift has occurred focusing on the differential capacitation of all bodies, not the achievement of a normative able-bodiedness. That is, through capacitating processes like genetic therapies, surgeries, supplements, prosthetic enhancements, and healthism, there is a shift from regulative normality that cures or rehabilitates to ongoing biological control, where bodies are to be capacitated beyond what is thought of as the able-body. Capacitating or enhancing the body beyond the traditional boundaries of what has been marked and produced as the able-body can be traced through Dumit’s (2012) research. For example, Dumit attends to the ways in which cure is an intervention that occurs only once, and thus is limited in the scope of its potential profitability. In comparison, life-long interventions, such as being prescribed drugs for hypertension, diabetes, or high cholesterol are much more profitable because they are taken “not to cure the condition but to reduce the risk factor and potential future events, such as heart disease or heart attacks” (2012, 5). This profitability comes to influence our very understandings of health and the body, shifting the dichotomous terrain of the able/disabled, normal/abnormal. The imperative is for as many people as possible to constitute an “at risk” group, such as those requiring cholesterol lowering drugs, so as to lower their risk through taking drugs. As Dumit’s research shows, 106 through the production of risk, the use of statistics in clinical trials, and the power of the pharmaceutical industry, it has become commonly accepted within medical communities to prescribe cholesterol-lowering drugs to everyone over 30 in America (2012, 13). Even further, Dumit’s research shows that not only is this practice widely accepted but that the pharmaceutical industry itself, alongside public health discourses, have managed to morally obligate the use of preventative pharmaceutical treatments for those deemed “at risk” (13). According to Puar, neoliberalized biopolitics mobilizes the tension between capacity and debility to break down the binaries between normative/non-normative, disabled/abled because “debility is profitable to capitalism, but so is the demand to ‘recover’ from or overcome it” (2011, 154) through processes of capacitation, such as that of taking cholesterol drugs everyday. An economy of debility and capacity serves the interests of neoliberal biocapitalism and reshapes formations of disability. As a result, disability is not a uniformly oppressed identity category or form of embodiment that lacks or is abnormal. Although oppression may be part of the story, disability can be caught up in processes of both debility and capacity. Rather than clear distinctions being made between who is normal and who is abnormal, emphasis instead is placed on “variegation, modulation and tweaking;” (2011, 155) forms of inclusion/exclusion that involve modes of differential inclusion; and with self and other or subject and object displaced in favour of the “construction of micro-states of subindividual differentiation” (2011, 155). In contrast to the sub-subjective nature of debility and capacity, the disability rights perspective usually focuses on the ways in which disability has been cast as an oppressive identity through structural forms of ableism that produce disability as a diminished state of being. For example, the ways by which disabled people have been excluded from paid work 107 has led some disability activists and scholars to highlight the importance of disabled people’s inclusion in productive work (Gleeson 1999; Taylor 2004). This has been, and continues to be, an important fight for disabled people, for as Wilton and Schuer (2006, 187) note, “neoliberalism’s privileging of paid work as a marker of citizenship has intensified the costs associated with failing to access the workplace.”

#### Big pharma’s structure of value fuses the ideal child with maximized productivity. This ideal mold erases the value of disabled bodies, framing “disability” as an impediment to a child having any meaning or value. The aff necessarily increases access to pharmaceuticals with ZERO acknowledgement of the medical world’s active capacitation of all people.**(Fritsch 2)**

Fritsch 2 [Fritsch, Kelly Michelle. "The Neoliberal Biopolitics of Disability: Towards Emergent Intracorporeal Practices." Diss. York U, Toronto, 2015. YorkSpace Institutional Repository. York University, 16 Dec. 2015. Web.] //Lex VM

What Berardi (2011) and Edelman (2004) do not account for are the ways in which the Child as the image of the future is not only central to the notion of progress, but how this Child relies on an economy of disability that is deeply entrenched in neoliberal practices. As I have marked in other chapters, this not only to alludes to the multifaceted ways in which neoliberal practices produce disability or are complicit in rising rates of disabling conditions, but also marks the ways by which the practices of neoliberalism that demand that some succeed at the expense of others cannot be fully accounted for without addressing disability. This is to say, Paige’s withering is related to the enhancement of others and simply capacitating Paige within the context of neoliberal futurity does not address the myriad ways in which disability functions within neoliberal economies. Thus, while Edelman (2004) is correct in asserting that the contemporary political order favours heteronormativity in the ways in which it incites the Child as the image of the future, this image of the Child of the future also continuously incites compulsory enhanced bodiediness as the child of reproductive futurity is not only not to be disabled, but must be better than able-bodied. McRuer, in the context of Edelman’s work comments: “‘everybody,’ after all, or so the saying goes, ‘wants a healthy baby.’ At the same time, despite this commonplace desire, the imagined future is actually inescapably inaccessible; no real, flesh-and-blood child can ever embody the innocence, health, and ability associated with the sacred Child” (2008). I agree with Edelman’s sharp and scathing critique of 146 reproductive futurity, and while I also agree with McRuer that Edelman’s Child is ablebodied, what neither Edelman or McRuer elucidate is how reproductive futurity relies on both a capacitated and bodily enhanced Child that shapes the ways the political gets mobilized in the name of the future, and for some disabled children to grow up at the expense of others who are never intended to grow up. Edelman is right, then, about the ways in which the figure of the Child re-inforces heteronormativity but he fails to take stock of the ways in which the Child is also always, already able-bodied, or how the Child is capacitated and enhanced. While McRuer is right to point out that no child can fully embody the desirable able-bodied child, and, thus, sets up disability as the impediment to a desirable future, I am interested in how the better-than-able-bodied Child requires some disabled children to grow up at the expense of other disabled children in order to give the Child meaning. Thus, the disabled child is the figure of no future, as will be demonstrated in the case of Emily Rapp (2013) desiring to terminate pregnancy on the basis of disability, and in the case of infanticide and filicide on the basis of disability. However, the disabled child is also the figure of the future in that the suffering child creates particular neoliberal futures through the mobilization of biocapital, cure, and enhancement. Therefore, as I will go on to show, we are deeply invested in narratives of suffering children, but some of those children are always supposed to remain children, never growing up, while others are celebrated, enhanced, and capacitated precisely because they can be made to slide into the neoliberal promise of the future. As I will argue, it is precisely in sliding into neoliberalism’s forms of capacitation and enhancement that incapacitates and disables others.

#### Thus, my method is a heterotopic reimagination of disability that views disability outside the neoliberal ideologies of “problem solving”. In order to create meaningful change, I bring light to how the WTO constructs desirability around the ideal able-bodied model which is a necessary prerequisite to dismantling it and an independent reason to negate. The product is a figure of disability not as something to overcome or medicalize but as a life worth living. (Fritsch 3)

Fritsch 4 [Fritsch, Kelly Michelle. "The Neoliberal Biopolitics of Disability: Towards Emergent Intracorporeal Practices." Diss. York U, Toronto, 2015. YorkSpace Institutional Repository. York University, 16 Dec. 2015. Web.]// UTDD recut Lex VM

Challenging the undesirability of disability is a shared responsibility and goes beyond the inclusion of disabled people within the exploitative and individualized relations of neoliberal capitalism. That is, challenging the undesirability of disability requires more than individualized access to education, employment, or vibrant social lives. Challenging the undesirability of disability requires that disability be imagined differently, that is, imagined in ways that ensure that disability can be collectively practiced and experienced differently. In order to imagine disability differently, it is imperative to understand how the neoliberal hegemonic social imagination both works to curtail who is considered desirable and informs the production of a good, individualized neoliberal subject that limits disabled and able-bodied people alike. Neoliberal policies and practices individualize both able-bodied and disabled bodies through forms of debility and capacity (Puar 2011) and through the economization of social relations and life itself (Murphy 2013) such that being critical of these forms of social, economic, and political relations is not enough to extricate ourselves from our role in maintaining and reproducing these relations. In order to desire disability differently, we must begin with marginal, heterotopic imaginations whereby disability is practiced as not something to overcome or merely tolerate, but rather as a part of a life worth living. Building on Michel Foucault’s concept of heterotopia (1998), a concept that marks “outside places” by their discontinuity and multiplicity, and drawing on the work of Mel Chen (2012) and Rod Michalko (1999), I argue that the heterotopic imagination reconfigures how disability emerges, with whom it emerges, and where. When disability is viewed through the lens of the heterotopic imagination, it becomes an intracorporeal, non-anthropocentric, multiplicity that exceeds the individualized human body inscribed by 175 neoliberal biocapitalism. To elaborate on disability as this emergent multiplicity, I read Chen’s and Michalko’s work alongside Thomas Lemke’s (2015) work on Foucault’s concepts of the milieu and government of things, as well as the agential realism of feminist materialist Karen Barad (2007; 2008). Desiring disability differently does not merely allow the current formulation of disability to become desirable. On the contrary, desiring disability differently through the heterotopic imagination radically alters what disability is, how it is practiced, and what it can be.

## Part 2 – Methodology

#### Semio-capital ideologies have weaponized the disabled body, requiring disability enhancers as a baseline citizen. This inflicts psychological violence on young people and overmedicalizes their suffering in attempts to turn their bodies into mindless cogs of the economy. THIS IS SUPERCHARGED BY THE ABLEIST CULTURES PRODUCED IN DEBATE. Berardi 17

(Franco ‘Bifo’ Berardi, Professor of Social History of the Media at the Accademia di Brera, “Futurability, The Age of Impotence and the Horizon of Possibility”, Verso 2017, pg. 87 - 92)

The geopolitical model of the nation state is no longer able to explain the daily business of life. A new model of interpretation is needed, and it must be based on the digital technological transformation. Only, apparently the nation states are the holders of power: they control the territories, but the true actor of our time is digital abstraction, financial automatism and the process of automation of cognitive activity. While subsuming the activity of the social brain, the financial market globalization and the online economy tend to displace power from the nation states to agencies of governance. Deterritorialized spheres of power are replacing the disempowered territorial agencies that sink in the global fragmentary war. Less and less is the state the agent of social control. More and more, social control is incorporated in the biotechnical sphere. Neither politics nor military force can command the increasing complexity of life forms, social knowledge and productivity that are spreading in the networked world. Control must be transferred to the bodies themselves, to the relations among bodies. This is why we speak of bio-power. The relations among individuals are wired and subjected to automatic connections: political power, therefore, is replaced by a system of techno-linguistic automatisms inclined towards the automation of every space of life, cognition and production. Marx distinguished between formal domination and real domination: formal subsumption he defined as the brutal strength that forces individuals to accept exploitation in primordial conditions of absolute surplus value extraction. Thanks to the development of industrial machines enabling the increase of productivity and the extraction of relative surplus value, the system enters the regime of real subsumption: command is embodied in the machines and the act of subjugation is automated. When we shift from the industrial to the informational machine, the regulation of the acts of production is no longer dependent on mechanical automation, but is incorporated in language and cognition. At this point, we might speak of hyper-real subsumption implying in it mental subsumption, the capture and re-formatting of the mind. Neurology of Ants and the Evolution of Man ‘The Net is an emblem of multiples. Out of it comes swarm being – distributed being – spreading the self over the entire web so that no part can say ‘I am the I’ … It conveys the power both of Computer and Nature, which in turn convey a power before understanding.’ 9 In almost mystical terms, Kevin Kelly here outlines a philosophical vision of the replacement of conscious political control with the distribution of embedded rules of compliance inside the individual organism and within the superorganism. As very large webs penetrate the made world, we see the first glimpses of what emerges from that net - machines that become alive, and evolve, a neo-biological civilisation. There is a sense in which a global mind also emerges in a network culture. The global mind is the union of computer and nature, of telephones and human minds and more. It is a very large complexity of indeterminate shape governed by an invisible hand of its own. We humans will be unconscious of what the global mind ponders. This is not because we are not smart enough, but because the design of a mind does not allow the parts to understand the whole. The particular thoughts of the global mind - and its subsequent actions - will be out of our control and beyond our understanding.10 Kelly is well placed to see the current mutation as emergence of a neo-biological civilization: in a double process of becoming, the body is wired and automated by the insertion of electronic devices in the flow of communication, and the machine introduced to the network of biological complexity. The automaton and the cyborg are two different manifestations of the process. The automaton is a machine that behaves as an intelligent body, while the cyborg is a human body incorporating electronic devices. In Kelly’s vision, the creation of the net converges with the creation of a global interconnected mind that acts as an invisible hand leading individuals to merge with the swarm. ‘The hive possesses much that none of its part possesses. One speck of a honeybee brain operates with a memory of six days; the hive as a whole operates with a memory of three months, twice as long as the average bee lives.’11 In the ’70s, when the world capitalist strategy was veering towards deregulation and the dismantlement of the welfare state, the concept of socio-biology entered the ideological debate: the Darwinist concept of natural selection was transferred to the cultural and economic sphere, and biological self-regulation adopted as the paradigm of social evolution. Edward Wilson was one of the prominent theorists of this kind of social Darwinism and developed his socio-biological concepts in books on the social history of insects, such as The Super organism. Nothing in the brain of the worker ant represents a blueprint of the social order. There is no overseer or brain caste who carries such a master plan in its head. Instead, colony life is the product of self-organisation. The superorganism exists in the separate programmed responses of the organisms that compose it. The assembly instructions the organisms follow are the developmental algorithms, which create the castes; together with the behavioural algorithms, which are responsible for moment-to-moment behaviour of the caste members. The algorithms of caste development and behaviour are the first level in the construction of a superorganism. The second level of construction is the genetic evolution of the algorithms themselves. Out of all possible algorithms, generating the astronomically numerous social patterns they might possibly produce, at least in theory, only an infinitesimal fraction have in fact evolved. The sets of algorithms actually realised, each of which is unique in some respect to a living species, are the winners in the arena of natural selection. They exist in the world as a select group that emerged in response to pressures imposed by the environment during the evolutionary history of the respective species.12 Speaking of leafcutter ants (several species of ants living in tropical parts of South, Central and North America) Wilson writes: Leafcutter colonies can be better understood as complex organic structures with a single purpose: the conversion of plant life into more colonies of leafcutter ants. They are civilisations designed by natural selection to replicate themselves in as many copies as possible before their inevitable death. Because they possess one of the most complex communication systems known in animals, as well as the most elaborate caste systems, air conditioned nest architecture, and populations in the millions, they deserve recognition as Earth’s ultimate superorganisms ... If visitors from another star system visited Earth a million years ago, before the rise of humanity, they might have concluded that leafcutter colonies were the most advanced societies this planet would ever be able to produce.13 The ants, bees, wasps and termites are among the most socially advanced non-human organisms of which we have knowledge. In biomass and impact on ecosystems, their colonies have been dominant elements of most of the land habitats for at least 50 million years. Social insect species existed for more than an equivalent span of time previously, but were relatively much less common. Some of the ants, in particular, were similar to those living today. It gives pleasure to think that they stung or sprayed formic acid on many a dinosaur that carelessly trampled their nests. The modern insect societies have a vast amount to teach us today. They show how it is possible to ‘speak’ in complex messages with pheromones. And they illustrate, through thousands of examples, how the division of labor can be crafted with flexible behavior programs to achieve an optimal efficiency of a working group. Their networks of cooperating individuals have suggested new designs in computers and shed light on how neurons of the brain might interact in the creation of the mind.14 The ability to detect and interpret signs, the ability to communicate and to fulfil tasks compatible with the needs of the colony is an example of social life driven by automatisms inscribed in the neurology of the ants. How does a superorganism arise from the combined operation of tiny and short-lived minds? The highly organised cooperative foraging of the leafcutters depends on information transfer and social communication ... several behavioural studies revealed a rich diversity of scent-guided behaviour and astounding odour sensitivity in leaf cutter ants ... sensory neurones carry the information about the odorant molecules to the antennal lobes, which are part of the brain ... where sensory neurons connect with projection neurons.15 Marx says (in the Introduction to Grundrisse) that the anatomy of man is the key to understanding the evolution of the anatomy of the ape. At this point we might say that the neurology of ants and bees is the key to understanding the current evolution of man. The insertion of devices for cognitive automation, and the bio-genetical and psychopharmacological programming of the human brain are transforming the anthroposphere into a swarm-like superorganism. In the ’70s a line of enquiry calling itself socio-biology appeared on the philosophical scene. It presented itself as a description of the overall logic of evolution, including the natural evolution of man. As description, it was false and assumed natural selection as a given event in human affairs. Socio-biology itself, however, was rather a project, a political strategy, and in this sense, we should admit that it was successful. Today, in fact, while political attention is captured by the fragmentary global civil war, in a separated sphere (of the bunker), the bio-info superorganism is emerging as the meeting point of bioengineering and cognitive automation. It is the implementation of a social engineering project that has led to natural selection being inscribed in the psychocultural composition of the social brain. But this process of implementing the socio-biological vision is not without conflicts, without suffering, without laceration. Late modernity has been described as the century of the self.16 What’s happening to self-perception in the current transition to the swarm? The reshaping of the self is linked to the epidemics of psychotic behaviour and the booming economy of psychopharmacology accompanying the ongoing becoming of the swarm: this is going to be a central field of investigation for psychoanalytical and neurological reflection in our time. The Exploding Self Two articles on drugs appeared in the 19 April 2015 issue of the New York Times. The first, ‘Workers Seeking Productivity in a Pill Are Abusing ADHD Drugs’ by Alan Schwarz, described the spread of Adderall among American professionals. Adderall contains a combination of amphetamine and dextroamphetamine, two central nervous system stimulants that affect brain and nerves, contributing to hyperactivity and impulse control. In recent decades, millions of American children have been diagnosed with ADHD, with Ritalin as the suggested therapy. Now it is the turn of young cognitive workers, engaged in the market of attention: they take Adderall because they need to accelerate their mental performance in order to compete. Alan Schwartz interviewed some of them: ‘Elisabeth, a Long Island native in her late twenties, said that not taking Adderall while competitors did would be like playing tennis with a wooden racket.’ On the same day in the same newspaper, an op-ed by Sam Quinones titled ‘Serving All Your Heroin Needs’, started with the notice that ‘fatal heroin overdoses in America have almost tripled in three years’, and goes on to describe the normalization of heroin distribution in American towns: a system that according to Quinones ‘resembles pizza delivery’. On 10 November 2015, the New York Times published the alarming article ‘A.D.H.D. Rates Rise Around Globe, but Sympathy Often Lags’ by Katherine Ellison about the spread of Attention Deficit Disorders worldwide. While global diagnoses of A.D.H.D. are on the rise, public understanding of the ~~disorder~~ has not kept pace. Debates about the validity of the diagnosis and the drugs used to treat it - the same that have long polarized Americans - are now playing out from Northern and Eastern Europe to the Middle East and South America. Data from various nations tell a story of rapid change. In Germany, A.D.H.D. diagnosis rates rose 381 percent from 1989 to 2001. In the United Kingdom, prescriptions for A.D.H.D. medications rose by more than 50 percent in five years to 657,000 in 2012, up from 420,000 in 2007. Consumption of A.D.H.D. medications doubled in Israel from 2005 to 2012. The surge in use of the medications has prompted scepticism that pharmaceutical firms, chasing profits in an $11 billion international market for A.D.H.D. drugs, are driving the global increase in diagnoses. In 2007, countries outside the United States accounted for only 17 percent of the world’s use of Ritalin. By 2012, that number had grown to 34 percent. I think ~~diseases~~ of this kind that affect the ability to focus on an object and the ability to produce a consistent flow of enunciation may be viewed as the signals of a process of psychological mutation that is marked by the externalization of the self. The fragmentation and acceleration of the flow of info-stimulation, the multitasking effect and the competitive pressure that is tied to the ability to follow the rhythm of the Infosphere are provoking the explosion of the centred self and a sort of psychotic deterritorialization of attention. The intensification of the info-flow provokes a disturbance in the cognitive ability to detect and interpret signs, but simultaneously pushes us towards a swarm-like automation of the functioning of the mind. The self is both pressured from the outside world and replicated by the surrounding world of other minds. The faster the act of interpretation of info-stimulus, the more the process of interpretation is shared and homologated. The swarm mutation is proceeding both from the outside world and from the interaction with other minds.

#### The alt is to reject the topic - enacting dysfluencies in communicative spheres and creating frictions that disrupt the semiotic flows of both debateand our notions surrounding the topic. By engaging in the critical debate and rejecting the topic, I disrupt the fluency of out academic sphere and recognize meaning in rejecting normative productivity. This card is bracketed for ableist language. (St. Pierre 3)

St. Pierre 3 [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] //Lex VM

“In conclusion, we might consider that for McRuer, following Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, **“disability” can refer to “the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of bodily, mental, or behavioral functioning aren’t made** (or can’t be made) **to signify monolithically”** (156–57). **An attention to dysfluent voices as material enunciations offers one specific way to think about this crip excess, particularly as resistance to hegemony. Fluent voices presume to signify monolithically and thus anticipate and linearly sustain the givenness of what is**—**fluency must be decomposed for a [disabled] politic to flourish.** Yet **while fluency may have the first word** (my speech arrives always a hesitation), **it certainly never has the last—the impulse of fluency is totalizing but “something always escapes!”** (Beasley-Murray xxi). Chris Eagle has written that **an attention to dysfluency within disability studies would “understand mastery over language as always already tenuous, fragile, and partial”** (6) and **we might in this way begin to imagine dysfluency not as a communicative “breakdown” but as a type of escape or,** **in Deleuzio-Guattarian terms, flight.** In Lexicon of the Mouth: Poetics and Politics of the Voice and the Oral Imaginary, Brandon LaBelle suggests that **by “considering interrupted speech, we enter into a politics of the mouth. By tripping over the word, stuttering evidences the deep performative drive of the mouth under the spell of the** linguistic. It stumbles precisely over a syllable, a grammar, a phoneme; the mouth gasps along the fault lines of a given vocabulary, to lisp over words, and in doing so, raises the volume on the very question as to what constitutes ‘proper speech’” (139; emphasis added). I have always imagined LaBelle’s offhanded remark a playful engagement with the Germanic fable the “Pied Piper.” In many versions of this classic tale, the piper leads all but three of the entranced village children into the river to drown. These are three crips, in fact: the first, physically disabled who could not keep pace; the second, deaf, who like Odysseus who could not hear the piper’s song; and the third, blind. Only those transformed by disability could resist the irresistible, the linear pull into deep water. In a similar way, **the spell of fluency lures and strings words from our mouths in the lock-and-file order of “proper speech,” intelligibility, and surplus value.** To what world and what dangers does this straightening syntax lead? **The [disabled] mouth, on the other hand, stumbles over and along the major grammar. It cannot follow and in this excess forms a collective site of material agency that stubbornly resists the spell of the linguistic. Against the liberal sirens (those masters of consensus) the agential capacity of dysfluency lies precisely in its flight from understanding and intelligibility.**” (353-354)

## Part 3 – Framing

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debate who best discursively and methodologically challenges oppression. The exclusionary nature of debate means that accessibility is a multiplier for all other impacts in the round because it control who is able to access those impacts in the first place.

Smith ’13: (Elijah Smith. “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” Vbriefly. September 6, 2013//FT)

At every tournament you attend this year look around the cafeteria and take note of which students are not sitting amongst you and your peers. Despite being some of the best and the brightest in the nation, many students are alienated from and choose to not participate in an activity I like to think of as homeplace. In addition to the heavy financial burden associated with national competition, the exclusionary atmosphere of a debate tournament discourages black students from participating. Widespread awareness of the same lack of participation in policy debate has led to a growing movement towards alternative styles and methods of engaging the gatekeepers of the policy community, (Reid-Brinkley 08) while little work has been done to address or even acknowledge the same concern in Lincoln Douglas debate. Unfortunately students of color are not only forced to cope with a reality of structural violence outside of debate, but within an activity they may have joined to escape it in the first place. We are facing more than a simple trend towards marginalization occurring in Lincoln Douglas, but a culture of exclusion that locks minority participants out of the ranks of competition. It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.

## Case

### Overview – K link

#### The pharmaceutical industry is more powerful than you think – they’ll privatize the modern nation-state before losing their patents

Preciado 08. Paul Preciado (Spanish philosopher, queer theorist, and king), 2008, “Testo Junkie,” translated by Bruce Benderson, I have a pdf, if you need it, sean!

Contemporary biodrag activism is confronted, fifty years after Agnes, with a new set of violent neoliberal economic and politic strategies, including the privatization of the health system, government deregulation, deep cuts in social spending, and the militarization of social life. In the present context, it’s possible to imagine (at least) two tracks of development for the pharmacopornographic economy in the face of which different modes of activism could be articulated. The first is the preservation of theological-humanist political states that regulate the action of the neoliberal (meaning free trade, either democratic or totalitarian in the context of globalization) pharmacopornographic economy. Current pharmacopornographic corporations would function as free market tentacles inside contemporary nation-states (which would continue to see themselves as sovereign and patriarchal) and would negotiate with them to determine the directives for the production, use, and consumption of chemical prostheses and semiotic gender and sex codes. The second transformation is one into an abstract deterritorialized nation-state of the pharmacopornographic industry. We could also be witnessing a process of privatization of contemporary nation-states, which would be progressively absorbed by the pharmacopornographic industry. This would be the strategy employed by the pharmacopornographic companies to escape pre-1970s regulations imposed by states (to avoid the gradual transformation of pharmaceutical patents into generics, the more or less severe regulation of the production and distribution of pornographic audiovisual material, and attempts to abolish prostitution), as these companies engage in the political direction of new national entities (via the FDA; the International Monetary Fund; the European Union; and the governments of the United States, China, or India) and purchase state institutions (for example, the Department of Health or Department of Justice or the prison-industrial complex) and put them to work to their benefit, refilling such archaic institutions with new content whose only objective would be increasing consumption and pharmacopornographic profits.

### Case – Framing

#### Psychological violence o/w kant, this activity is violent to children. That’s Berardi,

#### Induction –

#### 1] It’s important philosophically but in terms of practical affairs it doesn’t mean anything. I can reasonably make the inductive steps and predict how society will evaluate desirability based off of structures and predictions.

#### 2] When you make this arg, you’re using induction because you think it’ll win you the round which is a consequence.

#### 3] Universalizability is literally the basis of ableism – we choose what is considered desirable and then universalize it. But that only excludes people who fall outside that ideal. They do nothing to reframe neoliberal ideals, so they just solidify what the aff critics.

#### Everyone may respect disabled people but we can’t engage in debate? That’s condescending.

#### 4] Practical reasoning is not objective – they assume everyone’s brain operates the same, this literally paves over and erases disabled people.

## Theory

#### interpretation debaters must not garner offense off of apriori voters To clarify – putting apriori’s in the doc doesn’t solve because every single argument could have an apriori behind it with kills fairness and accessibility.

#### Depth of edu – we don’t get depth when all you win off of is tricks – kills education and meaning discourse

#### Drop the debater – they’ve made this round inaccessible and refuse to give me the ability to engage in their discource which holds their internal link to edu

#### Voters – accessibility is a prereq to fairness and education because it controls who is in the round in the first place let alone the quality of the rounds we have.

#### CI – most inclusive model of debate – if ppl lose to apriori’s every round especially if they ask they’ll quit over time

#### 1] Reasonability on 1ar shells

#### 2] Drop the arg on 1ar shells

#### 3] RVI’s on 1ar theory

#### X apply accessibility voters as the warrants