## 1.

#### Interpretation – the aff must defend an embodied defense of the resolution .

**Lanning 14** (Eric Lanning< Eric Lanning was a debater at the University of Houston and former National Debate Tournament Champion.> January 22, 2014, “What is Access?”, access debate, http://accessdebate.com/2014/01/22/what-is-access/ The website is now no longer working, but you can access an archive of the website through this link: https://web.archive.org/web/20151215072330/http://accessdebate.com/2014/01/22/what-is-access/ Brackets already in the article)

I’ve been thinking a lot lately about what “access” means in the context of the debate community. I don’t have all (or even a lot) of the answers to this question, but I’m beginning to think that might be the point. We can’t figure this out alone. **We need each other.** Disability Studies gives the means, motives and opportunity to reframe this “dependence” as inevitable, necessary and valuable. **What would it mean to universally design debate? What would it mean to ask and answer this question together? I believe that “access” is the process (not outcome) of answering that question over and over. It is the process of destabilizing our assumptions about what debaters “are” and “do”.** What assumptions do we make about debaters inherent “abilities” or natural “capabilities” when we debate in particular ways and in particular spaces? What changes should we make to debate practice and culture? These are questions that I am asking and answering in every negative debate – but the “pre-requisite” for me to asking and answering these questions in any debate was my own disability consciousness. The most portable skill debate ever gave me was consciousness. Debate gave me a vocabulary and audience to articulate what my lived experience with disability teaches me everyday. It gave me the experience and environment to develop and explain my own consciousness of disability. For me, that is the beginning of access. Before we can debate about what access means, it is worth thinking about the status quo – what does it mean for debate to be “inaccessible” to particular debaters and particular identities?  What is wrong with the status quo? For many years and for most debaters, “ableism” was nothing more than a list of words you should not use: blinded, silenced, paralyzed, crazy, lame, disabled, crippled, etc. To be clear, I think that ableist language is problematic and constitutes a micro-aggression against disabled people that we should all work to stop. But it is about SO much more than language. **Disability is an embodied experience.** In a poem I wrote called “Broken” – I explain this distinction as, “disability is not something you have, its something you are” (If you’re interested in hearing/reading the entire poem, I’ve included a link at the end). **This recognition of the lived experience of disability – of disability as a social and political fact – of disability as a category of human existence is missing from our current debates about ableism and access.** One of the most meaningful and empowering contributions of disability studies is expressed in the mantra, “nothing about us without us”. **It is a call to foreground and privilege the experience of disability.** This is not to say that TABS (temporarily abled bodies) can’t participate and contribute to the conversation about access, but instead it is a call to reverse the history of marginalization of disabled people experience in the academy and our society.  Obviously not every debater has a lived experience with disability, but we all do research. **In debate, this research is a reflection of our priorities – if you want to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem: read a book! Cut some cards!** Ask and answer (yourself) the question, “what is access”! In my negative debates this year, I’ve learned a lot about disability and access. **I’ve learned that the process of “debating it out” is powerful and revolutionary. I’ve learned that** my opponent’s willingness to listen and engage with my arguments makes me a better advocate. But even more than the potential of the debate round – I’ve been inspired by the potential of the debate community. I’ve had countless conversations, emails and chats with disabled and non-disabled debaters, coaches and judges that have fundamentally changed my answer to the question, why do you debate? Debate made me the person I am today. Everything I love about my self and my life is a result of my decision to debate. Why do I debate? For access. I debate because I believe in this activity and community. I believe we could and should make debate accessible to everyone, but we can’t do it alone. We need each other. I’ll end **with a quote: “[Access] is not a thing that can be delivered by politician, policymakers or educators, but a process of struggle that has to be joined”**

#### CX and the absence of a plan prove there’s no I-meet.

Words and Phrases 64 (Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or **determination by resolution or vote**; as ‘it was resolved **by the legislature**;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”**.

#### 4 types of IP.

Rumore 5/17 [Martha M. Rumore (pharmacist-attorney in Frier Levitt’s Life Sciences Department). “Why every medical practice should care about intellectual property”. Medical Economics. May 17, 2021. Accessed 8/7/21. <https://www.medicaleconomics.com/view/why-every-medical-practice-should-care-about-intellectual-property> //Xu]

As a service provider, you know the name and reputation of your medical practice goes a long way toward the success of your practice. But are you aware that Intellectual Property is one of the most important business assets you have. Intellectual property refers to the legal field that involves protection of creations of the mind and may take many different forms. There are basically four different types of intellectual property and these are detailed in Table 1. More than one type of intellectual property can be used to protect your medical practice. You can have a patent on a drug or device used in a procedure, a trademark on your practice’s name and logo, a copyright on your website content or a publication, and, in some jurisdictions, your patient list may constitute a trade secret. Types of Intellectual Property Trademarks, Copyrights, Patents, and Trade Secrets Trademarks- A Trademark is a distinctive word, name, slogan, symbol, sign, symbol, or combination of these that serves to identify the particular source of products or services and distinguish from other similar or competing products. Copyrights – Copyright protection grants exclusive rights of use to the authorship of an original work. Patents – Patent protection grants exclusive rights of use to the invention of or discovery of any new and useful process, machine, article of manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof.“Anything under the sun made by man.” Trade Secrets –Trade Secret protection grants exclusive rights of use forany formula, practice, process, design, instrument, pattern, or compilation of information which is not generally known or reasonably ascertainable, by which a business can obtain an economic advantage over competitors or customers.

#### First is fairness – radically re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method tangentially related to the topic, which erases neg ground via perms and renders research burdens untenable by eviscerating predictable limits. Procedural questions come first – debate is a game and it makes no sense to skew a competitive activity as it requires effective negation which incentivizes argument refinement, but skewed burdens deck pedagogical engagement.

#### SSD solves

#### DTD – 1AR restarts force late-developing debates that favor the aff since they get a 7-6 time skew and ensure surface-level clash.

#### T isn’t violent –

#### A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time.

#### B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether.

#### No impact turns or RVIs – A] Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position. B] Dead end – strategy guides debates so they’ll desire that people read T to beat them on the impact turn – that proves their strategy is reactive and can’t solve since they rely on the structures they critique.

#### Competing interp – offense defense paradigm is the best method for evaluation since you can compare benefits under both interps easier.

## 2.

### Vote neg on presumption

#### Presumption - there is no relationship between voting aff and their advocacy or solvency – ontology means its cruel optimistic to think voting aff does anything.

#### 1] They have zero solvency – they said in cross-ex that it’s a material embodiment which they haven’t done

#### A] They aren’t radical - they still follow debate trends like spreading

#### B] Competitive incentives distort it - They read kant in other rounds

#### C] They read disclosure and then don’t disclose to disabled debaters

#### 2] it is agency denying to say you don't get to deserve this space. Disabled debaters who see it as home away from physical/social location and denying people that space is inherently violent

#### 3] Even if you're right about how debate works - reactionary pushback from Larpers mean that losing ballots on T go home - heg good instead of framework

#### A] Losing rounds doesn’t have to do with truth-value

#### B] They still hire coaches and try to improve --

#### 4] Being unfair doesn’t destroy debate – it just sustains the hiearchry – ask yourself whether disabled debaters could ever engage with this aff

## Case

#### OV—flag this on the ontology debate—it responds to their Mollow evidence.

#### This is based on psychoanalytic premises we’ll respond to them and also THEY HAVEN’T WARRANTED why psychoanalysis is true but anyways:

#### Psychoanalysis triggers infinite regress: no brightline for when we stop analyzing because there’s infinite things within the mind we don’t know of.

#### Culpability: factors outside of people’s control i.e. emotions and mind and drives things we can’t control so it’s also impossible to solve for and the aff can’t actually guide action which makes it useless.

#### Now go to the warrants behind the first and second order drives:

#### This misunderstands the way that policy or rules work they are meant to exclude the badness that people identify i.e. you obviously would not want rapists or murderers on the street. Some rules or universal understandings are necessary to check back against this which means no impact.

#### This card misunderstands again: the law does not construct “humans” or what that should look like it just provides a guide to action. Anything that can’t do that literally allows for anything which is horrendous.

#### St. Pierre.

#### This is a DA to your performance because it indicates that by becoming a public act of expression, the 1AC forces you to tie your success to your identity—we argue through Deleuze that you should be free of that.

#### Affective labor means that disability is fluid and contingent—if your actions and existence in the space are shaped by your labor and relations with others there is always the possibility for change.

#### Pity

#### Libidinal warrants are unverifiable because psychoanalysts have not done psychoanalyses of people who are reacting to disabled people.

#### There’s no reason this drive structures an ontological condition for the disabled body—the fact that we react in a certain way does not mean we have complete control over the disabled body.

#### Empirically denied: lots of people react to disability with acceptance and an understanding that disabled bodies should be free to act as they want—they rely on an empirical claim but lack the empirical warrant.

#### Futurism

#### This relies on the idea that disabled bodies are ontologically structured by able normative bodies which we disprove.

#### Presumes the disabled body isn’t capable of contributing to society which is reductionist and wrong.

#### Optimism is only bad if ontology is true—if we win progress is possible because the subject is fluid then optimism is a useful pedagogical strategy because it provides contingent gains.

#### Identity

#### The solution to internalized ableism is to work against exclusion in society because that’s the institution which reinforces that violence.

#### Disabled bodies don’t have to assume another identity if their identity is compatible with societal structures.

#### Sentimentality DA -- Affective investment in the maintenance of sentimental public spheres lubricates the wheels of liberalism, mobilizing fantasies of collective desires that undergird neoliberal regimes of governance

**Berlant 8** [Lauren Berlant, Professor of English at the University of Chicago, Introduction of *THE FEMALE COMPLAINT: The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*, Duke University Press: Durham and London, 2008]

Sentimentality: Love, Then Repeat As the preface suggested, the intimate public of femininity has always conjoined the very act of consumption to a powerful hunger to know and adapt the ways other people survive being oppressed by life. The therapeutic intensity of this drive is so conventional to sentimentality it comprises a story that barely needs to be told, a promise of aesthetic recognition and redemption whose consumption is its own reward. Such an economy is an important part of the sense of belonging an intimate public provides: the cliché and the convention represent “insider knowledge.” It would be easy to dismiss the social productivity of this kind of reward, as it associates subjective confirmation with fundamental changes of the sort the privileged rarely want to risk. But the mechanism of sentimental saturation of the intimate sphere with materials and signs of consumer citizenship has been crucial to what Mark Seltzer has called the “pathological public sphere” of the contemporary United States, which Karen Halttunen locates in the sensationalism of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century.43 The Uncle Tom genealogy is notable precisely because its sensationalism was a politically powerful suturing device of a bourgeois revolutionary aesthetic. The contradictions evoked by that phrase will be played out variously throughout each chapter: what links them is the centrality of affective intensity and emotional bargaining amid structural inequity, and the elaboration and management of ambivalent attachments to the world as such, the as-suchness of the world.44 I have been speaking of conventions, of stereotypes, and forms, the diacritics of congealed feeling that characterize the cultural scene of sentimentality: behind this is a desire to see the sentimental itself as a form—a dynamic pattern—not just a content with scenic themes, like that of weeping, sacrifice, and sanctified death. As when a refrigerator is opened by a person hungry for something other than food, the turn to sentimental rhetoric at moments of social anxiety constitutes a generic wish for an unconflicted world, one wherein structural inequities, not emotions and intimacies, are epiphenomenal.45 In this imaginary world the sentimental subject is connected to others who share the same sense that the world is out of joint, without necessarily having the same view of the reasons or solutions: historically, the sentimental intervention has tended to involve mobilizing a fantasy scene of collective desire, instruction, and identification that endures within the contingencies of the everyday. The politico-sentimental therefore exists paradoxically: it seeks out the monumental time of emotional recognition, a sphere of dreaming and memory, and translates that sense into an imaginary realm of possible acting, where agency is somehow unconstrained by the normative conventions of the real as it presents itself; and it holds the real accountable to what affective justice fantasy has constructed. This is to say that where sentimental ideology is, so will there be a will to separate and compartmentalize fundamental psychically felt social ambivalences, so that a sense of potentiality can be experienced enduringly, motivatingly, and even utopianly. The downside is that, often, all of the forces in play can seem formally equivalent. For example, the critique of patriarchal familialism that sentimental texts constantly put forth can be used to argue against the normativity of the family; at the same time, the sacred discourse of family values also sustained within this domain works to preserve the fantasy of the family as a space of sociability in which flow, intimacy, and identification across difference can bridge life across generations and model intimate sociability for the social generally. Likewise, at the same time that bourgeois nationalism promotes a sentimental attachment among strangers that is routed through the form of the nation, it also abjures the sentimental when the idiom of certain claims is inconvenient. (Sentimentalists talk about the emotional costs of injustice, not the material ones; the personal impacts of not changing, not the structural benefits of continuity.) Arguments for rationality and individual affective and appetitive self-management in the everyday have also been used to build and to critique identity discourses associated with historically subordinated U.S. populations;46 at the same time sentimental rhetoric is mobilized to describe everything from the timeless psychic unity of citizens possessing a national identity to the fragility of normal culture itself when faced with challenges to it.47 Meanwhile, social progressives have for over a century represented the ordinary effects of structural suffering in tactically sentimental ways—modes of testimony, witnessing, visual documentation about the personal impact of structural subordination—to critique the racist/patriarchal/capitalist world; now that same world has assimilated those genres to describe the psychic effects of feminism/multiculturalism on those who once felt truly free, nationally speaking. What conclusions can we reach from this jumble of ambitions to use and refuse sentimentality in the political sphere? That politics, mediated by publics, demands expressive assurance, while political subjectivity is, nonetheless, incoherent; that ideological incoherence or attachment to contradictory ethics and ways of life is not a failure but a condition of mass belonging; that ambivalent critique produces domains (such as intimate publics) to one side of politics that flourish insofar as they can allow the circulation of the open secrets of insecurity and instability without those revelations and spectacles engendering transformative or strongly resistant action in the idiom of political agency as it is usually regarded. Tracking mass-mediated norms of belonging in the affective register and conventions of engendering emotional solidarities helps us to understand the reproduction of normative life amid serious doubts about the probability that anyone, except the lucky, will be able to forge durable relations of reciprocity among intimates or strangers; such fractures produce the complaint as a register not merely of a stuckness but of the conditions of bargaining that allow people to maintain both their critical knowledge and their attachments to what disappoints.