# Speech 1NC Harrison rd 2 vs Claudia 4-2 10AM

## 1 – Disclosure

#### Interpretation: At all TOC bid distributing tournaments, debaters must disclose all constructive speech docs.

#### Violation – Violation – missing all prelims of emory, elims of state, all of harvard, etc

Graphical user interface, table

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

Table

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### A. Debate resource inequities—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who don’t have access to big coaching squads.

#### B. Depth of clash – open source allows debaters to come up with more nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate

## 2 – T

#### Interp – the resolution should divide aff and neg ground.

#### Violation –

#### Appropriation” is “large-scale extraction of space resources.”

Leon 18 [Amanda, JD from UVA] “Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources” Vol. 104:497, Virginia Law Review, <https://www.capdale.com/files/24323_leon_final_note.pdf>, 2018 RE

Employing the treaty interpretation tools of ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, historical context, state practice, and state interpretation offers many possible understandings of the obligations imparted by Articles I and II of the OST. For example, while the ordinary meaning of “use” could reasonably include the exploitation of materials, the meeting summaries of the Fifth Session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Legal Sub-Committee make clear that no consensus was ever reached regarding whether “use” includes large-scale exploitation of space resources, let alone fee-simple ownership and the ability to sell commercially. State practice dealing with extraterrestrial samples also sheds little light on the confusion, as the examples cited all deal instead with scientific samples of limited quantity. The international community’s rejection of the Moon Agreement also fails to bring clarity. While on the one hand the rejection could be read as a rejection of the idea that the OST prohibits private property rights, it could also be read as a rejection of the common heritage of mankind doctrine. Finally, the prospect of private venture space mining and extraterrestrial resource extraction remained far off and futuristic at the time of the Treaty’s negotiation, making drawing legal conclusions about the legality of these revolutionary activities extremely difficult.

Overall, however, the Treaty’s structure and its purposes (preserving peace and avoiding international conflict in outer space) ultimately indicate that private property rights in space resources are prohibited by Article II’s non-appropriation principle, at least until future international delegation determines otherwise (like in the Antarctic). The Treaty’s structure confirms this interpretation. Article I lays down a general rule for activity in space. Subsequent articles of the Treaty then lay out more specific requirements of and qualifications to this general rule. Much like Article IV restricts the use of nuclear weapons in space, Article II restricts the use of space in ways that might result in potentially controversial property claims. Historically, claims to mineral rights have resulted in just as contentious conflict as those over sovereign lands. Treaty efforts to avoid conflicts in Antarctica and the high seas reflect similar sentiments. The Soviet Union’s representative even hinted at this structural relationship between Articles I and II during Treaty negotiations.232 In light of the imminent need to ease Cold War tensions, the potential for conflict over property, and the final structure of the Treaty, this Note concludes that the large-scale extraction of space resources is incompatible with the non-appropriation principle of Article II of the OST.233 As a result, the United States’ provision of property rights to its citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space and asteroid resources extracted through the SREU Act contravenes its international obligations established by the OST.

#### “Is unjust” can require positive action to rectify the injustice

Pomerleau [Wayne, PhD, Professor of Philosophy at Gonzaga] “Western Theories of Justice”, IEP, <https://iep.utm.edu/justwest/>, last date cited is 2010, RE

Nozick (a departmental colleague of Rawls at Harvard) was one of the first and remains one of the most famous critics of Rawls’s liberal theory of justice. Both are fundamentally committed to individual liberty. But as a libertarian, Nozick is opposed to compromising individual liberty in order to promote socio-economic equality and advocates a “minimal state” as the only sort that can be socially just. In Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974), especially in its famous chapter on “Distributive Justice,” while praising Rawls’s first book as the most important “work in political and moral philosophy” since that of Mill, Nozick argues for what he calls an “entitlement conception of justice” in terms of three principles of just holdings. First, anyone who justly acquires any holding is rightly entitled to keep and use it. Second, anyone who acquires any holding by means of a just transfer of property is rightly entitled to keep and use it. It is only through some combination of these two approaches that anyone is rightly entitled to any holding. But some people acquire holdings unjustly—e.g., by theft or fraud or force—so that there are illegitimate holdings. So, third, justice can require the rectification of unjust past acquisitions. These three principles of just holdings—“the principle of acquisition of holdings, the principle of transfer of holdings, and the principle of rectification of the violations of the first two principles”—constitute the core of Nozick’s libertarian entitlement theory of justice. People should be entitled to use their own property as they see fit, so long as they are entitled to it. On this view, any pattern of distribution, such as Rawls’s difference principle, that would force people to give up any holdings to which they are entitled in order to give it to someone else (i.e., a redistribution of wealth) is unjust. Thus, for Nozick, any state, such as ours or one Rawls would favor, that is “more extensive” than a minimal state and redistributes wealth by taxing those who are relatively well off to benefit the disadvantaged necessarily “violates people’s rights” (State, pp. 149, 183, 230, 150-153, 230-231, 149).

#### a] they specify “**the heterotopic imagination” and b] citizens of Hubmarine and Neimoida.**

#### Vote for predictable limits – 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. At worst its extra t –

#### Fair engagement is good and prior –

#### A] debate’s a game that requires effective competition and negation, which makes their offense inevitable

#### B] Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters.

#### C] Can’t weigh the aff—it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### D] An absence of constant refinement dooms revolutionary potential by disregarding iterative testing and effective engagement

#### TVA – analyze the Eugenic genealogy of space exploration[[1]](#footnote-1)… The history of biotechnological intervention on the human body has always been tied to conceptual frameworks of disability and mental health, but certain biases and assumptions have forcibly altered and erased the public awareness of that understanding. As humans move into a future of climate catastrophe, space travel, and constantly shifting understandings of our place in the world, we will be increasingly confronted with concerns over who will be used as research subjects, concerns over whose stakeholder positions will be acknowledged and preferenced, and concerns over the kinds of changes that human bodies will necessarily undergo as they adapt to their changing environments, be they terrestrial or interstellar. Who will be tested, and how, so that we can better understand what kinds of bodyminds will be “suitable” for our future modes of existence?[1] How will we test the effects of conditions like pregnancy and hormone replacement therapy (HRT) in space, and what will happen to our bodies and minds after extended exposure to low light, zero gravity, high-radiation environments, or the increasing warmth and wetness of our home planet?

#### Check Viks wiki for the whole aff – its actually so fire - <https://hsld.debatecoaches.org/Lexington/Maan%20Aff>

#### any response to the substance of the TVA is offense for us because it proves our model allows for clear contestation

#### SSD – reading their advocacy on the neg solves – self-scrutinization breeds argument refinement and a constantly evolving methodology, but sidestepping testing ingrains ideological dogmatism by refusing intellectual experimentation.

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

#### 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.

#### Reject 1AR Independent Voting Issues

#### A] Time skew- They can blow up any 3 second argument into a 3-minute collapse no matter how long the 2nr spends on it making it a lose-lose situation for the negative

#### B] Clash- Incentivizes lazy debating where debaters don’t interact with the actual sheets but instead chose to up-layer

#### C] Psychology- they get a 2ar collapse which means the judge will always err towards what they say

#### D] No Risk- They become no risk issues and they can read tons of them in the 1ar which splits the 2nr several ways

#### E] The definition of an “independent voter” is one that doesn’t link to a framing mechanism – they just appeal to an intuition without a warrant for why their impact matters or even a justification for why intuitions matter.

#### F] Just drop my speaks which solves for all of your offense

## 3 – Opacity

#### CP Text – ????

#### The 1AC’s semiotic coherence within the world is sutured through a western model of scriptocentrism that is exclusionary and violent towards racialized bodies

Conquergood, Dwight. Cultural struggles: Performance, ethnography, praxis. University of Michigan Press, 2013. (a professor of anthropology and performance studies at Northwestern University)//Elmer

According to de Certeau, this scriptocentrism is a **hallmark of Western imperialism**. Posted above the gates of modernity, this sign: “‘Here only what is written is understood.’ Such is the internal law of that which has constituted itself as ‘Western’ [and ‘white’]” Only middle-class academics could blithely assume that all the world is a text because reading and writing are central to their everyday lives and occupational security. For many people throughout the world, however, particularly subaltern groups, texts are often inaccessible, or threatening, charged with the regulator)' powers of the state. More often than not, subordinate people experience texts and the bureaucracy of literacy as instruments of control and displacement, e.g., **green cards, passports, arrest warrants, deportation orders**—what de Certeau calls "intextuation": "Ever)' power, including **the power of law, is written first of all on the backs of its subjects"** (1984:140). Among the most oppressed people in the United States today are the "undocumented" immigrants, the so-called "il- legal aliens," known in the vernacular as the people "sin papeles," the people without papers, indocitmentado/as. They are illegal because they are not legible, they trouble "the writing machine of the law" (de Certeau 1984:141). **The hegemony of textualism needs to be exposed and undermined.** Transcrip- tion is not a **transparent or politically innocent model for** conceptualizing or **engaging the world**. The root metaphor of the text underpins the **supremacy of Western knowledge systems** by **erasing** the vast realm of human **knowledge and meaningful action that is unlettered,** "a history of the tacit and the habitual" (Jackson 2000:29). In their multivolume historical ethnography of colonialism/ evangelism in South Africa, John and Jean ComarofFpay careful attention to the way Tswana people argued with their white interlocutors "both verbally and nonverbally" (1997:47; see also 1991). They excavate spaces of agency and strug- gle from everyday performance practices—clothing, gardening, healing, trading, worshipping, architecture, and homemaking—to reveal an impressive repertoire of conscious, creative, critical, contrapuntal responses to the imperialist project that exceeded the verbal. The Comarofis intervene in an academically fashionable textual fundamentalism and fetish of the (verbal) archive where "text—a sad proxy for life—becomes all" (1992:26). "In this day and age," they ask, "do we still have to remind ourselves that many of the players on any historical stage **cannot speak at all? Or**, under greater or lesser duress, **opt not to** do so" (1997:48; see also Scott 1990)?

#### Ableism is created through the piercing gaze of pathologization, but the K’s method of opacity resolves this calculative lens.

**Campbell** [Brackets Original. Fiona Kumari Campbell (Adjunct Professor in the Department of Disability Studies at Griffith University). “Problematizing Vulnerability: Engaging Studies in Ableism and Disability Jurisprudence.” Legal Intersections Research Centre, Disability at the Margins: Vulnerability, Empowerment and the Criminal Law, University of Wollongong. 11/23/13. Accessed 11/30/20. <https://documents.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@law/@lirc/documents/doc/uow166211.pdf> //Houston Memorial DX]

Ableism is married to a sense of permanency of the idealized human form and competencies. With the development of enhancement technologies (cosmetic neurology and surgery for instance) the notion of the norm is constantly sliding, maybe creating a larger pool of ‘abnormal’ persons who because of ‘choice’ or limited resources cannot improve themselves and hence lapse into deficiency and are characterised as ‘risk populations’.. A counter-ableist version of impairment might explore what the experience of impairment produces and ask how does disability productively colour our lives? The second feature is a constitutional divide between the normal and pathological. Constitutions are related to the structure or attributes of an entity which shapes a characterisation. Constitutions are concerned with jurisdiction and boundaries between persons, things and actions and the ways that each of these elements assemble and interpenetrate (Mussawir, 2011). As such constitutionality is linked to cosmography and order the terms of relations. Constitutions (rule matrices) establish the terrain, the ground rules for governance, processes for clearance and right relation and how things are or how they are meant to be. Divisions of constitutionality requires people to identify with a category – ‘are you disabled or not?’ ‘Oh, no I am not disabled, I am ill or depressed!’, or ‘I am able-bodied’, or “Are you fit or unfit to plead’? For the ease of conversation we often feel the need to minimise any confusion. Many of this audience will know of that such a clear divide is blatant propaganda even if they have not up until now had a name for it or find the language of constitutions a bit bristly. Bruno Latour (1993, 10 - 11) states “…these two independent practices of normalising and pathologizing] … must remain distinct in order for them to work/function.” If the definitions of abled-bodied and disabled become unclear or slippery the business of legal and governmental administration would have problems functioning.8 Alarm would arise due to uncertainty as to how to classify certain people and in which category; the distribution of resources would unravel. Social differentiation produces difference: the abled and disabled which in turn are products of our ways of looking and sensing. People are made different by a process of being seen and treated as disabled, as outlawed disability or abled9 (Lawson, 2008, 517). Clarification of this perceived ‘uncertainty’ is achieved through a division called Purification, the marking of distinct archetypes. Ableism assists in the government of disability ensuring that populations that appear dis-ordered (maybe even causing social disorder) become ordered, mapped and distinct. The notion of inclusion is not all that it seems, for normative inclusion to be enacted one must have a permanent under-cohort of the excluded. Purification is essential to be able to count populations even if this counting and classifying does not reflect and in fact distorts reality, in any event demeanours and lives are judged according to constitutional arrangements (Altman, 2001; Mussawir, 2011). Purification has difficulty negotiating intersectional marginality and interdependent forms of impairment.

#### No perms in a method debate – a] It assumes fiat which doesn’t make sense. Their ROB forefronts the performance and method which a perm steals away b] non-T affs can defend anything – the burden is on them to prove their advocacy is the best solution to their problem c] you should hold them to the method they defended in the 1AC since anything else is severance which endorses bad scholarship as it’s a debate of methods.

## 4 – Star Wars

#### Their utilization of Star Wars as a method of embracing disability is an ideological doubleturn and justifies ableism – vote neg endorse the subtraction of Star Wars from their performance.

Emma Louise Backe, 1-14-2021, "Twisted and Evil: Ableism in Star Wars," Geek Anthropologist, <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Skippy_the_Jedi_Droid> //Cho

“Seriously, Star Wars? Again?” was the exact phrase that ran through my mind the first time Dryden Vos appeared on screen during my first viewing of the movie Solo: A Star Wars Story (2018). By now, I am sick of the pattern that Vos so predictably followed: a character with a disability in a villainous role. The Star Wars franchise frequently uses physical disability as a signal of evil. The films, however, also use disability as a way to signal a character with a special connection to the Light Side of the Force. The Star Wars franchise uses certain disabilities to signal evil: those disabilities that make strong appeals to our visual and auditory senses. Simultaneously, the films use other disabilities to signal a connection to the Light Side. This is no accident. The United States has a long history of adverse reactions to people with highly visible disabilities (Thomson, 1983). Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, many cities enacted so-called “ugly laws.” For example, Chicago passed an 1881 law that forbade people who were “diseased, maimed, mutilated, or in any way deformed, so as to be an unsightly or disgusting object” (Schweik, 2010, 1) from being in public places. These laws singled out certain people with disabilities: those whose “alternative” physical appearance disturbed the senses. To look different, according to the norms of the time, triggered disgust or horror, as well as an assumption of moral corruption—cities therefore felt justified banning individuals with visible disabilities from public spaces. The disabilities that the films single out as signs of evil in Star Wars are similar: they are “ugly” in contrast to the less visually obvious disabilities that characters associated with the Light Side might have. I argue that this is a part of a larger cultural pattern where the disabled body is “never simply itself, the exceptional body betokens something else” (Thomson 1996, 1). In short, the films’ creators rarely allow characters with disabilities to be characters with traits beyond their disabilities. Rather, the films exploit their disabilities for the sake of the narrative. Like many public discourses about equity, people with disabilities are largely absent from public conversations about representation. The discrimination that people with disabilities face means that nondisabled people limit people with disabilities’ access to everything from housing to employment. Through the consolidation of power with the implicit bias of ableism, people with disabilities are summarily isolated—nondisabled people subsequently create a situation where there is no public place for people with disabilities to challenge stereotypes. That is why it is vital that we think critically about how people with disabilities are represented in films like Star Wars: for many nondisabled people, the media is often their only exposure to people with disabilities. Disabled Body, Disabled Soul As Jorain Ng argues, the phenomenon of the disabled body as a cue for a disabled soul is nothing new. Pop culture examples of villains like Wonder Woman’s Dr. Poison (2017), with her missing hand, and The Lion King’s (1994) Scar, employ visible “defects” to signal inner evil. While Ng points out that this trope of using disability as a cue for evil is becoming less popular in recent years, it remains alive and well in the Star Wars franchise, as evidenced by Vos. Vos is a one-dimensional crime lord whose only traits seem to be that he loves antiques, hates betrayal, and is a ruthless murderer. Vos’ face was deliberately and inexplicably disfigured to serve one role: to signal to the audience that he is evil. The film gives no explanation of his disfigurement. If you’ve seen Solo, you might be questioning whether or not Vos is truly disabled. After all, while his face is significantly maimed, it does not seem to cause any functional problems. You might also wonder if the other characters I argue are a part of this pattern of “evil” characters with disabilities. Emperor Palpatine of the original trilogy and the prequels, and Supreme Leader Snoke of the new trilogy, for example, have no functional impairments. Thomson (1996), however, has argued that in many ways disability has more to do with appearance than function in the United States. The Americans with Disabilities Act acknowledges this question of function when it states that the ADA’s protections extend to those who are “regarded” to have a functional impairment. This is with good reason: a person with a disability’s main problem isn’t their[1] body, it’s an ableist society. In an ableist society, everything, from institutions to actual physical structures, is structured with the presumption that everyone is “normal.” Although what is “normal” shifts from place to place and time to time (see for example Groce, 1985), by an ableist society’s standards people with disabilities are not “normal” despite their prevalence. An ableist society assumes that those who are not “normal” should overcome their differences, rather than society make itself more accessible. Although style guides generally consider using “their” for the third person singular grammatically “incorrect,” I choose to use it for singular people of unknown gender to acknowledge the broad range of gender diversity. Characters like Vos remind me of progressive writer and anti-war activist Randolph Bourne (1886-1918). Bourne’s disability “involved little functional impairment” (Longmore 2002, 35). Despite his lack of functional impairment, Bourne found himself extremely socially impaired. Bourne was socially disabled by those around him because of his curved spine and a twisted facial structure that resulted from spinal tuberculosis as a child, traits which Longmore describes as “highly visible” (Longmore 2002, 35). Bourne experienced difficulties in accessing schooling, work, and social capital. It should be noted that Bourne’s disability was entirely socially constructed: his physical differences hindered him only because of how people reacted to him, not because he was physically unable to accomplish tasks. Bourne’s story highlights the fact that, like so many other social identities, disability is socially constructed: it is created and defined by society, not some objective physical reality. Like other social categories, “society establishes the means felt to be ordinary and natural” (Goffman 1963, 2). There are also Star Wars villains with functional disabilities. There is, for example, the villain General Grievous, who has some striking similarities to Darth Vader. In Attack of the Clones (2002), we are introduced to Grievous, who is part biological and part machine. Like Darth Vader, he has problems with breathing. While Grievous is not himself connected to the Dark Side, he is working with the Sith, who are closely connected to the Dark Side. Grievous is “ugly” in appearance. What is perhaps “uglier” is his hacking cough. Darth Vader is the ultimate example of a narrative using disability to signify a connection to the Dark Side. When Vader first makes his appearance in A New Hope (1977), his unusual breathing becomes a signal for his menacing presence. In the words of his old mentor, Obi Wan Kenobi, in The Empire Strikes Back, “he’s more machine than man now: twisted and evil” (Kurtz 1980). What makes the use of Vader’s disability as a sign of evil so telling is the timing of it. In Revenge of the Sith (2005), Vader’s disability starts at the exact same time as his final fall from grace as a promising Jedi and defender of the Light Side of the Force. The films even use disability to show that non-villains are morally ambiguous.

#### The 1AC’s call for ongoing flight through fabulation assumes a universal mobility both metaphorically and literally. Their search for an escape within infrastructure designed to deny movement encourages individual capacitation as a resourse to antiblack violence.

Franks 19 (Matt Franks – Professor in the [Department of English and Philosophy](https://www.westga.edu/academics/coah/english/index.php), [College of Arts and Humanities](https://www.westga.edu/academics/coah/index.php) at the University of West Georgia. “Breeding Aliens, Breeding AIDS Male Pregnancy, Disability, and Viral Materialism in ‘Bloodchild’” Chapter in *The Matter of Disability: Materiality, Biopolitics, and Crip Affect* pgs. 194-197. DOA: 11/15/19, kbb)

“Bloodchild” showcases how HIV/AIDS is fundamentally racialized, as the humans in the story are described as having “brown flesh” (14). The story mirrors Alexander Weheliye’s argument that “the politicization of the biological always already represents a racializing assemblage” (12). More specifically, Julie Minich stresses that disability is “highly racialized— both in the sense that disability is disproportionately concentrated within communities of color, which receive unequal health care and experience elevated risk of experiencing workplace injuries, environmental contamination, and state violence, and in the sense that disability is often used rhetorically to reinforce white supremacy” (para. 7). HIV/AIDS is a prominent manifestation of how disability is racialized in material ways: as Nirmala Erevelles demonstrates, just as black women’s bodies were used in the reproduction of slaves, the “construction of African American women’s sexuality and reproductive capacity continues to manifest itself in policies representing African American women with HIV/AIDS as both dependent and diseased and, thus, ineligible for resources needed for survival” (“Color of Violence” 122). The state allows the virus to disproportionately infect and kill people of color, who are excluded from treatment and prevention efforts that rely on racist notions of black bodies as already diseased and disabled. To read “Bloodchild” as an HIV/AIDS narrative entails seeing virality as a metaphoric and material mode of bodily difference that is interwoven with historical practices of racism. Neel Ahuja argues that, in the expansion of the US empire over the long twentieth century, “the purported universality of imperial public health was betrayed by its circulation of racial fears of disease. This made the microscopic bodies of viruses and bacteria into the very matter of racial differentiation, the lively conduits of debility and death that threatened a dangerous intimacy between species and social groups in a globalizing world of empire” (5). Such dangers called for biomedical management techniques that would insulate against the risk of racial and species mixing on a material level, to ensure prolonged life in a racially stratified order. “Bloodchild” repre- sents this order in an enslaved human population who are trained to participate in their own enslavement, as Elys Weinbaum argues. Gan and his family are forcefully “implanted” with alien DNA and then subject to the imperatives of “care” and disposability dictated by their alien overlords. In terms of HIV/AIDS, the story illuminates that, as Shahani argues, “the attempts to manage ‘risk’ only place queer communities of color in greater proximity to death and disposability” (26). In other words, Butler demonstrates how the modes of biological control over black bodies that were developed in slavery have adapted to the racialized micropowers of HIV/AIDS biopolitics. As an allegory about slavery coded in terms of male pregnancy, “Bloodchild” makes apparent how disability is materially produced on the flesh to institute racial control. As Pickens argues about the protagonist Dana in Butler’s novel Kindred, “Her disability remains tethered to historical black experiences of enslavement in America. So, disability moves beyond metaphor or narrative prosthesis to foreground Dana’s embodiment as testimony about the reality of having social and political ideology emblazoned on one’s flesh” (170). In other words, slave owners mutilated black bodies, producing physical and social disabilities as a technique of controlled dependence. And, like the Tlic, slave owners forcibly impregnated female slaves, raping them in order to ensure a steady supply of future slave generations. Erevelles argues that “slave women were utilized not only to meet the Master’s sexual needs, but also in a very concrete way to reproduce the labor force in the slave economy” (Disability and Difference 57). Erevelles and Pickens demonstrate the materiality of disability as it was inscribed on black flesh under slavery, tracing how6 masters enforced ownership over slaves by physical disabling them as a way of administering their dependence and obliterating black kinship structures. In “Bloodchild,” the Tlic similarly produce disability on and in the bodies of their human reproductive hosts. They implant material dependence into the “brown flesh” of their slaves, since the pregnant humans will die if unattended by Tlic care. As Elyce Helford argues, “T’Gatoi, like slavemasters of the antebellum South, attempts to win cooperation through coercion and contentment through narcotics” (267). “Bloodchild” makes apparent the thread that connects the narcotic, sexual, physical, and mental control over black slaves with the current exposure of black populations to HIV/AIDS. Butler highlights the sinister nature of this system of dependence by describing how the Tlic eggs are “anchored” into the human host’s blood vessels with “hooks,” suggesting not only the parasitic nature of the alien brood but also the fact that killing or removing them would also kill the host (18). While disability theorists insist that dependence is a common feature to all human life, disabled people and people of color are particularly vulnerable to the manipulation of dependence when the biopolitical state hooks them to its own institutional lifelines. As Mitchell and Snyder demonstrate, for example, “Contemporary bodies find themselves increasingly colonized by ‘big pharma’ through a process that segments body parts into insufficiencies, ailments, and shortcomings in need of chemical and surgical interventions” (40). Such economies of dependence are also part of the afterlife of slavery: as Christina Sharpe argues, slavery “simultaneously exhausted the lungs and bodies of the enslaved even as it was imagined and operationalized as that which kept breath in and vitalized the Black body,” and we are now “living in the wake” of such managed forms of “aspiration” (112–13). The state reduces the autonomy of people with disabilities and people of color by enforcing dependence on state institutions in ways that prevent alternate forms of community support. Within its context of slavery, “Bloodchild” demonstrates how the management of disability was, and continues to be, central to the management of black bodies—not only because slaves were literally disabled via amputation, torture, and forced physical and reproductive labor, but also because disability was inscribed on black flesh to ensure dependence on white masters and on the state.12 Resistance to such forms of enforced dependency has often tended to reassert black able-bodiedness. But, as “Bloodchild” crucially demonstrates, such recourse to rehabilitation is destined to fail. Resistance, Butler’s text insists, can only be achieved by forging new relations of dependence through crip/queer/black practices of taking ownership over one’s communal and individual risk, precarity, and dependence rather than attempting to purge disability from blackness. As Ellen Samuels argues, from the slave era to today, critics have been “deeply invested in the recuperation of the black body from a pathologizing and dehumanizing racism that often justified enslavement with arguments that people of African descent were inherently unable to take care of themselves—in other words, disabled” (30). The tight bind between disability and blackness in the time and afterlife of slavery means that in attempting to fight to regain bodily and symbolic freedom, resistance has often denigrated disability and attempted to assert the able-bodied, able-minded independence of black individuals, communities, and populations.13 In “Bloodchild” Gan’s brother, Qui, represents how such strategies of recuperating the debilitated black body to resist enslavement are destined to fail. Qui’s strategy is to run—an able-bodied activity that represents his determination to escape from being enslaved by using his individual, capable body to flee his Tlic masters. But in an enclosed, prison- and plantation-like compound on an alien planet, there is literally nowhere to run. The very ground and infrastructure is set up to deny him mobility: “He began running away— until he realized there was no ‘away’” (19). By attempting to recuperate his individual, able-bodied, masculine independence, Qui only further entrenches his enslavement. In contrast to Qui’s running, Butler insists that unofficial, non-statesponsored forms of crip community care, like Lien’s, are the only potentially empowering ones for crip/queer/black people, because individual rehabilitation and institutional state care are always disciplinary and many crip/queer/black subjects are barred access to them. “Bloodchild” is rife with imagery of cages that represent the enfolding protection offered by the state, but also the entrapment that they learn not to see, or to see as a comfort rather than an institutional structure of enslavement and incarceration. The insect-like limbs of the Tlic represent this comforting imprisonment. Gan, who was “first caged within T’Gatoi’s many limbs only three minutes after [his] birth,” finds it comfortable and secure to be enclosed in them (8). But the other members of his family, who did not experience this “embrace” until they were older, “said it made them feel caged” (6). The Tlic cage humans to foster passivity and make them adapt to and even grow to love their imprisonment.14 In the afterlife of slavery, moreover, this aspect of the story demonstrates how the mass incarceration of black people in prisons continues to materially segregate racialized populations.

## 5 – Cap

#### Capitalism causes massive violence and inevitable extinction – the fundamental task is developing tools for organization and tactics to bring about revolution.

Escalante ‘19

[Alyson, revolutionary Marxist (duh), philosophy at U of Oregon. 09/08/2019. “Truth and Practice: The Marxist Theory of Knowledge”. <https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge/>] Pat

The world we live in today is in a dire state. Climate destruction continues at a fast pace, and every with every passing day, capitalism proves itself to be incapable of addressing this. Capitalist production and its endless drive for resources to match artificial market demands has created a climate crisis that leaves us on the brink of potential extinction.

Governments around the world are turning to far right and fascist leaders to assuage their fears of an uncertain future, and the most marginalized and oppressed suffer because of it. Fascism is on the rise, and history tells us very clearly what that can result in without opposition.

The decaying US empire continues to lash out in violence across the globe in a desperate attempt to re-assert its power and hegemony. Whole countries are destroyed in its desperate bids for more fossil fuels. The world burns from America’s white phosphorus weaponry.

The need for a revolutionary movement capable of replacing capitalism with something better has never been so clear. The choice between socialism or barbarism has never been so stark. More and more people are starting to realize that reform cannot save us, that capitalism and imperialism themselves are the problem, and that we must unite and band together to fight for a better world.

The question then is: how will we know what strategies, what tactics, and what ideas to unite around? If the skeptics and postmodernists are correct that knowledge is always relative and localized, then we cannot built a global and universal strategy to unite around. If they are correct then we are doomed to small acts of localized or individual resistance in the face of apocalypse. To embrace such a vision of the world (with its accompanying epistemological skepticism) is to embrace defeat.

The masses do not want to embrace defeat, they want to know how to fight back. Marxism can provide the tools necessary to engage in that fight.

Marxism, with its self criticism and its insistence on incorporating the valuable ideas of its critics has created a means for unifying workers across the globe with anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. The Marxist belief in the possibility of true ideas, tested and verified in practice, creates the possibility for unity on a global scale. The scientific status of Marxism means that as our climate changes, as our world looks more and more grim, Marxism will adapt through struggle and practice; it will provide us with the ideas and tools we need to fight and win.

There will be no victory for the workers of the world without the ability to wield a revolutionary science. What is at stake in questions of Marxist epistemology is the very possibility of creating a philosophical and scientific basis for revolution. We must defend this possibility. We must defend the scientific status of Marxism, and must insist on the possibility of victory.

#### Attempting to stage a semiotic break is a form of semiotic recapitulation that mystifies materialism.

McLaren 10 [Peter, UC-Los Angeles and Nathalia E. Jaramillo, Purdue University, “Not Neo-Marxist, Not Post-Marxist, Not Marxian, Not Autonomist Marxism: Reflections on a Revolutionary (Marxist) Critical Pedagogy” Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies 2010 10: 251]

Ebert (2009; Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008) makes an important distinction between corporeality/materiality and matter/materialism. Materiality is related to objective idealism and refers to the acceptance of an idea in the mind as something real, something that escapes class interests. In this way, avant-garde scholars will deconstruct materialism as merely the effects of tropes and representations. It attempts to create a prefigurative origin for what is essentially an ontology. However, Ebert (2009) argues that this constitutes transforming materialism into materiality, into a contemplative corporeality of difference, purging materialism of its conceptuality and determinate meanings. Matter is turned into signs or the effect of signs or sign power. This has led to the recent interest in the politics of performativity—performing identities, performing pedagogy, performing class, and so on. However, Ebert argues that matter is not synonymous with physical objects; matter exists outside the consciousness of the subject, and it cannot be separated from its production and contradictions in history. Matter is objective reality in history. Ebert and Zavarzadeh (2008) characterize materialism as the objective (transformative) productive activities of humans involving them in social relations; these social relations occur under definite historical conditions that are independent of their will and are shaped by class struggle over the surplus produced by social labor. A materialism that excludes historical processes and operates as a medium of cultural practices is not materialism; it is materiality or what Ebert (2009) refers to as “matterism.” Avant-garde critics who would replace materialism with materiality (through the tropes of supplementarity, spectrality, undecidability, and difference) severely undercut the claim for the objectivity of class interests and ultimately replace class struggle with the struggle over the sign. Like Ebert, David McNally (2001) in his classic Marxist text, Bodies of Meaning, describes the deconstructive efforts of post-structuralists such as Jacques Derrida as a form of linguistic idealism. In his critique of anti-fetishistic thought (like that of Marx), that palpates the farthest reach of linguistic meaning, Derrida devalues dialectical critique as useless by disavowing embodied human activity, by ignoring laboring human bodies and rejecting them as metaphysical illusions. When Derrida deals with issues of the economy, he is interested only in capital that begets capital—that is, in credit or fictitious capital. Likewise, in his critique of Saussure, he critiques the notion of a transcendental signified, a universal equivalent or what McNally refers to as meaning’s gold standard (something positive that can exist outside of an endless reference of commodities to other commodities). There is nothing extralinguistic for Derrida, since language suspends all reference to something outside of it. Similarly, for Derrida, money lacks a referent. It is driven by credit and speculation and lacks any material foundations. Derrida deals with fictitious or dematerialized money, money that can be produced without labor, that is, money as an expression of hyperreality. Capital in this view is nothing more than a self-engendering dance on a solipsistic path of self-fecundation. The real is folded into the representation. Derrida (and Baudrillard and others) assimilate the economy (the same one that is throwing people out of their homes and into the streets at present) into their poststructuralist model of language. Contrary to Derrida, Ebert and McNally maintain that value is not a sign freed from its referent; rather, value expresses itself in material form. It must pass through laboring bodies and their history of struggle, through toiling subjects and practical human activity that takes place in an organic social universe of skin, hair, blood, and bone. And capitalism abstracts from these bodies, and commodifies them. The work of McNally and Ebert implodes the limitations of post-structuralist thought in dealing with capitalist exploitation. According to Ebert (2009), revolutionary agents of social transformation act ethically when they attempt to resolve the contradictions of their objective location in relations of exploitation. Capitalist violence often doubles as cultural discourses, and Ebert views popular culture, especially, as a narcosis of violence, predicated on distracting subjects from the central antagonism of capitalist society—the struggles over the surplus labor of the other––thereby producing subjects who cannot grasp the totality of the system. In Ebert’s view, the pedagogical practices developed by the poststructuralist avant-garde theorize experience in relation to trauma, desire, and affective relations in general as if these relations were antiseptically cleaved from relations of class, thereby replacing a conceptual analysis of the social totality with liberating pedagogical narratives grounded in local affective strategies—strategies that serve unwittingly as epistemological covers for economic conditions that help the subject cope with the objective material conditions of capitalist exploitation. This leads ultimately to a de-historicization of social life and draws attention away from the way in which all human beings who populate capitalist societies are implicated in some manner in international class struggles and the social division of labor (see also Zavarzadeh, 2003). Ebert and Zavarzadeh describe this process as a “pedagogy of affect.” They write that The pedagogy of affect piles up details and warns students against attempting to relate them structurally because any structural analysis will be a causal explanation, and all causal explanations, students are told, are reductive. Teaching thus becomes a pursuit of floating details—a version of games in popular culture. Students seem to know but have no knowledge. This is exactly the kind of education capital requires for its new workforce: workers who are educated but nonthinking; skilled at detailed jobs but unable to grasp the totality of the system—energetic localists, ignorant globalists. This pedagogy provides instruction not in knowledge but in savviness—a knowing that knows what it knows is an illusion but is undeluded about that illusion; it integrates the illusion, thereby making itself immune to critique. Savviness is enlightened false consciousness: a consciousness that knows it is false, but its “falseness is already reflexively buffered.” (2008, pp. 107-108)

#### Fantasies of disabled bodies as inherently resistant to capitalism mystifies how disability becomes a site of value extraction and papers over Western privilege.

Puar ‘17

Jasbir Puar is an Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies at Rutgers University and has a Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies from UC Berkeley. “Crip Nationalism: From Narrative Prosthesis to Disaster Capitalism,” Chapter 2 in “The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability” Language edited NT 18 rc/pat

Neoliberal investments in the body as portfolio, as site of entrepreneurship, entail transition of some disabled bodies from the disciplinary institutions of containment, quarantine, and expulsion into forms of incorporative biopolitical control. David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder argue that “disabled people have shifted from modernity’s exception (a line of defect to be isolated and eradicated) to postmodernist [neoliberal] exceptionality (failing bodies resuscitated by an increasingly medicalized state). In this latter state, the ontology of disability retrieves a formerly fallen object and makes it newly available for cultural rehabilitation,” a euphemism for producing cultural docility.45 Mitchell and Snyder track this shift of people with disabilities located from “a former era of economic burden” of paternalistic, institutional, and welfare regimes when disabled people were “social pariahs,” to what they term “objects of care” that impel the investment of service economies and neoliberal strategies of intervention and rehabilitation—“a ‘hot’ ticket item for potential research and funding schemes.”

Mitchell and Snyder’s claim situates the disabled body as the site of extreme productivity— and thus, profitability— precisely through its lack of conventional productive laboring value. Once excluded from the labor system because of their “unproductivity,” disabled bodies have become the “sites for the exercise of the primitive accumulation that fuels capitalism.” This productivity is thus not “measured by his or her ability to produce goods and ser vices that satisfy social/human needs,” as Erevelles points out, but rather “based solely on capitalist exploitative demands for increasing profit.”48

And yet, despite this profitability, Mitchell and Snyder argue that the disabled non/laborer is also a resistant non-capacitated body, implicitly challenging the incomplete liberal proj ect of docility by refusing to assimilate into a laboring capacity. In echoing Russell and Malhotra’s conviction that disability reveals a central contradiction, a paradox even, of capitalism, Mitchell and Snyder laud Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s rerouting from the worker as the paradigmatic resistant subject in Marxist theory to “living labor” or “non- productive bodies,” as the nascent site of dissent. No longer able to locate a single site of re sis tance to capitalism in a “ simple, agonistic division of labor,” Mitchell and Snyder ask, “Where does re sistance manifest itself once a concept of the workers’ revolution no longer seems tenable and how will this re sis tance govern itself without the institution of new hierarchies of in equality?”49 In other words, the undermining of capitalism will come from those who cannot or will not work, from those whose “capacities make them ‘unfit’ for labor.”50 This unfitness, they argue, proves “imminently productive” because these bodies inhabit and generate alternative biopo liti cal scripts of consumption, family, and nation.51 They evidence this assertion by averring that “the disabled people that we know are some of the worst consumers on the planet because they have neither the means, the interest, nor the gullibility of mistaking meaning with market . . . disabled artists in the U.S. live some of the most sparingly non- consumptive lives and, yet, this is what we admire about them the most.”52

I will leave aside for a moment the geopolitical inflections fueling certitude regarding the passé potential of organized resistance at the point of production. The claim about the inherent resistant capacity of the non-productive disabled laborer bears a complex relation to Mitchell and Snyder’s earlier conviction that disabled bodies have now transitioned into objects of care that represent a unique site for the capture of every element for capitalist profit. Do the individual consumption practices of disabled people (artists) mitigate, even remotely, the profitability of the sites of primitive accumulation that objects of care generate? Further, the resistance of non-consumptive lives pales in a global economic context where, as Gayatri Spivak reminds us, humanistic training in consumerism is foreclosed for populations whose labor creates consumer opportunities for others. The (individual) capacity to consume—or to refuse to consume—is already predicated on the privileged position of the consumer-citizen. Mitchell and Snyder lionize the non-laboring debilitated body as the new threshold of resistance — a crypto- capacity — via their positions as improper producers as well as consumers. But this formulation, as much as it would seem empowering to embrace, actually relies on the occlusion of the centrality of debilitation to the workings of capitalism. It effaces the unflinching need for “social pariahs” available for injury, excluded from the economies that hail certain bodies worthy of being objects of care, however compromised this inclusion may be. There are surely individuals with disabilities [disabled people] who perhaps neither labor nor consume “properly,” but any resistance this may signal is not an a priori feature of being disabled. Further, populations that are not roped into an economy of rehabilitative objects of care are sites of profit precisely for their availability for injury, their inability to labor, their exclusion from adequate health care, and their ideological production as lazy, criminal, and burdensome. While these populations may well enact various forms of resistance to capitalism, they do not escape the violent pro cesses of primitive accumulation that extract profit from the disposability that threatens these exact populations.

Mitchell and Snyder further vacillate between the figures of the resistant non- productive unfit non/worker and that very same worker as incorporated into capitalist sites of profit. They argue that “we are increasingly approaching a time when all that formerly passed as the undesirability of life in a disabled body proves increasingly ‘advantageous’ from the standpoint of an immaterial labor market.” The immaterial labor market is a reference to technologies that allow for productivity to be redefined against the grain of the “laboring body”— for example, fostering virtual participation in workplaces for mobility- impaired individuals. However, these very same technologies, driven by the conventional laboring body, produce vastly debilitated populations across the globe, from Chinese laborers in Apple factories who commit suicide, to wheelchair technology that enhances mobility developed in Israel 48 on the backs of Palestinian oppression and immobility, to the mountains of e-waste hand-sanded by the working poor in India, to the neo colonial extraction of minerals and natural substances from resource- rich areas for the purposes of manufacturing hardware.

Is it possible that the figure of the non-productive disabled body becomes something of a fetish in Mitchell and Snyder’s text, recoding resistance as a form of automatic capacitation, an onto-crypto-capacity? This body occludes, to some extent, populations that are neither positioned as resistant to capitalism nor promoted as objects of care. Rather these populations are constructed as objects of imminent disposability, continually subjected to paternalistic austerity regimes, violent institutionalization, and debilitation that is not in any way redeemable through cultural rehabilitation. (Cultural rehabilitation as an ave nue to normalization can be eschewed only if in fact it is an available possibility to turn away from.) Their debilitation functions as a form of value extraction for otherwise disposable bodies. Lauding the inherent resistance to capitalism of disabled bodies as well as the advantages of the immaterial labor market for people with disabilities both depend on three factors: first, the assumption or invocation of the identity or grouping of disabled people as an a priori given; which then, secondly, entails the substantial occlusion of the manufacturing of disability, that is, capitalist exploitation as an ongoing process of debilitation; which then, thirdly, submerges the supplemental relation between objects of care and social pariahs or objects of disposability — disability as a potential site of cultural incorporation and debilitation of populations made available and/or targeted for injury—in a neoliberal economy that profits from both. The burden-to-care periodization is one that therefore racializes as well as temporospatializes: between eugenics as it has been and the biopolitics of inclusion of the now (described as “post- imperialist”), a split that largely speaks to liberal spaces of privilege; and between the pro gress of the West/developed nations and the disarray of the rest/developing nations. ///

#### Deleuze link – 1AC Goodley 3 – “adapting to neoliberal pedagogy”

#### The alternative and ROB is to reject the aff in favor of a material analysis toward revolution - Our form of study builds the Party based on the scientific formulation of Maoist principles to catalyze a mass base against capitalism

<http://www.hamptoninstitution.org/why-black-people-need-maoism.html#.XWwv7ZNKh0s> // KZaidi]

When they hear Maoism, many people think of China, Peru, and the Philippines. They picture peasants "surrounding the cities from the countryside." This is, of course, understandable, but a mistake. Maoism is not simply "everything that Mao did," or "everything that happened in China between 1949 and now." I have spent a great deal of my time writing working to dispel these sorts of myths, some peddled in an unprincipled fashion by anti-Maoists. Maoism is a living, breathing science. By science we mean something with universal principles that can be taken and applied by all who have a material interest in making revolution. In the United States, this is Black people, or the New Afrikan nation. It was not by accident that the original Black Panther Party (BPP) developed close relations with the revolutionary leadership of the People's Republic of China. Huey didn't go to China to play; he went to study and learn things that could be applied back home. Of course, he eventually degenerated in political line and practice, taking a right opportunist course along with Bobby Seale (always a centrist) and Elaine Brown (who guided the party, in his absence, into a mainstream political force that led into the arms of the Democratic Party). This opportunism in the highest expression of revolutionary sentiment, practice, and force in this country to date needs to be studied and ruthlessly criticized, yet we should be careful. We must place things in their historical context and ensure that we are able to divide one into two, meaning see the beneficial as well as the negative aspects of a thing but also realize that one aspect must be primary. The BPP was destroyed by a combination of factors: lack of a really scientific method of analysis and cohesive program of political education, failure to promote and apply the Marxist-Leninist principle of Democratic Centralism (debate inside the party, formation of a political line through this debate, and the upholding of this decision by all party members and organs), and a culture of liberalism that ended with comrades fighting comrades, thus opening the door for external factors (the FBI and other LE agencies) to play havoc and get cadre railroaded into prison and killed. We must study and learn all of these lessons, because when we develop another organization with the prestige, mass base, and power that the Panthers had, and we will, they will come for us all again. So, why do we need Maoism? Because we are against the most brutal, bloody, and vicious empire known to humankind. This country is looting and enslaving our class siblings all over the world. To overturn this order of things, to smash it and rebuild it in the interests of the revolutionary proletariat of the entire world, we must apply the synthesis of 200 years of systematic, organized class struggle, which is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: the continuity of the revolutionary project that was Marxism-Leninism, with a rupture from the dogmatism and revisionism. Maoists do not uphold "Actually Existing Socialism" because a scientific analysis rooted in the principles laid down by the revolutionary movements and projects that gave us Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao would demonstrate that stealing food from Filipino fisherfolk, like the People's Republic of China (PRC) has been doing, is 100% non-Marxist. This is in disagreement with many Marxist-Leninist organizations today, which uphold these things and other imperialist depredations carried out under the faded red banner of China. The Maoist argument is that Marxist-Leninist terrain has been spent, and the 21st century must learn from Maoism. "You haven't seized state power yet!" others cry. Indeed, and there has never been a truly Maoist party that has initiated armed struggle in the imperialist metro poles. This doesn't mean that Maoist principles cannot be applied to these countries, this means that we must be ever more creative in our application and ever more disciplined in our party-building efforts. Party building in the USA requires the careful and thorough cultivation of a mass base. Tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of people must depend on and follow this party and participate in mass organizations before it can even begin to call itself a vanguard. This is what many who came out of the New Communist Movement of the mid-late 1970s failed to realize. The days of endless squabbling sects that fight over "mass bases" of a handful of other activists must be put to an end, and we must have a truly mass perspective. There is optimism in the spread of For the People (FTP) organizations and the development of the Organizing Committee for a Maoist Communist Party (MCP-OC) which has a more mass orientation and places primacy on the development of a class analysis and political line in the USA that is based in painstaking investigation and rooted in the aspirations and struggles of the most oppressed, along with a record of seeking to develop international solidarity and prison work. This, I believe, is the best hope for New Afrikan Maoists in the United States and I wholeheartedly encourage Black comrades to develop FTP-type organizations in their own communities under OC guidance. Even if this isn't done, at the very least studies in Maoism, studies in Maoist revolutions, and studies in Maoist theory are beneficial. After and during these studies, think about how it can be applied on your block and in your community. Learn about and be like Fred Hampton. Time is up for spinning our wheels; we must get together, unite on a principled and unshakeable basis, and mount a formidable resistance against decades and centuries-old oppression based in capitalism and white supremacy. I also encourage support and donation to the Hampton Institute as an invaluable resource in promoting revolutionary ideology and practice in the finest Marxist tradition.

#### Communist organizing is historically phenomenal at combatting ableism.

**Slorach 11** [Brackets original, glang. Roddy Slorach (key figure in the British disability rights movement, pioneered the development of what became known as the social model of disability, Senior Disability Advisor @ Imperial College London). “Marxism and disability.” International Socialism. [Issue 129](https://isj.org.uk/issue-129). Posted on [4th January 2011](https://isj.org.uk/marxism-and-disability/). Accessed 9/1/20. <https://isj.org.uk/marxism-and-disability/> //Houston Memorial DX]

The “festival of the oppressed” has been a feature of every major period of working class struggle, where previously demonised or marginalised groups have championed a common cause. Immigrant workers helped lead movements such as the Chartists and the Wobblies. At the peak of the struggle in Poland in 1980 one hospital doctor related how working class patients discharged themselves, suddenly well enough to join the Solidarno´s´c workers’ movement.75 The Russian Revolution of 1917, which saw women and Jews elected as its leaders, producing new ideas about disability many decades ahead of its time.76 Just as oppressed minorities rose to the forefront of these struggles, disabled people will be among those leading the revolutions of the 21st century. An end to disability? The horrors of the past are not simply abstract history lessons. The assumptions of eugenics are still present in claims that human society and behaviour are determined by our genes. Discussing online the death of David Cameron’s disabled son Ivan, senior British National Party activist Jeffrey Marshall complained about “an excess of sentimentality towards the weak and unproductive”, adding later that “there is not a great deal of point in keeping these people alive”.77 Although such ideas remain largely confined to the margins, this can change quickly.78 Cuts on a scale unseen since the 1930s are likely to rapidly polarise society, as the media and the government round on the latest scapegoats for the crisis. The coalition’s plans to privatise workplace safety inspections, increase its predecessor’s restrictions on disability benefits and promote the expansion of “special” (segregated) schools will create more impairment and more disability. But attacks on social services, pensions and benefits risk provoking generalised resistance. From Mumbai to Mexico City, slums similar to those Marx, Engels and Dickens exposed 150 years ago now house an estimated 1 billion people, with poverty creating more disease and opening pathways for epidemics like HIV/Aids. Much of modern capitalism, with its ageing population, service industries and technological advances, differs markedly from the Industrial Revolution. Today’s workforce is as likely to be affected by repetitive strain injury or depression as by other workplace injuries. But the remorseless global drive to accumulate continues to cause disabling accidents and conditions at an unprecedented rate. The essence of humanity, our capacity to reshape ourselves and our world through social labour, remains controlled by a small minority whose sole interest in production is profit. The removal of this exploitation—the most fundamental divide in society—is a prerequisite if humanity is to achieve its liberation. Marx provided a new definition of meaningful labour: In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour, from a mere means of life, has become the prime necessity of life…society [can] inscribe on its banner: from each according to [their] his abilities, to each according to [their] his needs.79 A socialist society will not liberate disabled people from their impairments. But eradicating competitive accumulation, the basis for capitalism’s wars, waste and pollution, will also eradicate the source of so much impairment. Simple measures implemented globally, for example, could prevent or cure the vast majority of all visual defects and blindness.80 In an economy planned and controlled by the majority, science, medicine and social care will be socialised and restructured by providers and users alike. Cooperation on a scale unprecedented in history will provide the basis for a real individualism celebrating diversity difference, and mutual interdependence. Only such a society can significantly reduce both the causes and the effects of impairment—as well as providing an end to disability.

# AC

## Presumption

#### 1] They have zero solvency – What parts of the 1AC were Heterotopic? The parts where they read established scholars, using standard citational practices? Or the parts where they organized cards into a conventional 1AC and used Zoom servers to broadcast?

#### 2] Systems-

#### 3] Spillover- they are missing an internal link as to why they need the ballot or why the reading of the aff forwards change. Empirically denied – judges vote on [x] all the time and nothing happens.

#### 4] Competition- debate is the wrong forum for change and competition moots any ethical value of the aff. Winning rounds just makes it seem like you want to win and a loss is internalized as a technical mistake.

## Disability

#### Reject ontoog

#### 1[ materiality first

#### 2] cnat determine

#### 3] diff definitions

#### 5] try or die

#### 6] empirically proven – ada

#### The 1AC relies on the management of affect as a precursor to communal inclusion

Goodley, Liddiard, and Runswick-Cole 18 (Dan Goodley - Professor of Disability Studies in the School of Education at the University of Sheffield. Kirsty Liddiard – Research Fellow in the School of Education at the University of Sheffield. Professor in the School of Education at the University of Sheffield. “Feeling disability: theories of affect and critical disability studies” *Disability & Society*, 33:2, 197-217. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09687599.2017.1402752>, DOA: 3/25/21, kbb)

Disability can and should be an entry point into studies of affect. We might want to think about the ways in which affect economies draw disabled people and those close to them into particular ways of feeling and emoting. Like Ahmed (2004) and Pedwell and Whitehead (2012) we are wary of those affect theorists who claim that their work constitutes a brand-new field on inquiry in relation to emotion and feeling. Just as feminism can claim a long historical alignment with affect through ‘the personal is political’, so critical disability studies can also point to a body of literature that has been engaged with the affective experiences of disability (Goodley 2016). Critical disability studies is a nascent field of scholarship and activism that explicitly engages with transformative fields of inquiry including queer, postcolonial, indigenous and feminist studies. Theories of affect sit at the intersections of these different spaces of theorisation. In the following, we make some novel connections of theoretical orientations and trajectories from affect theory and critical disability studies. How come you are in a wheelchair? What happened to you then? I never think of you as disabled? You are so brave, you know. (Common comments and questions made by non-disabled people to disabled people; see Goodley 2016). It must be so difficult for you, having a disabled child, but it’s a good job it happened to you, I don’t think I could cope. (Personal comment made to one of the authors, no date) A lot of people [friends] will ask, ‘Does Shaun’s willy work?’ (Hannah, non-disabled wife of Shaun, a man with Spinal Cord Injury [SCI]; see Liddiard 2017) The British feminist disability scholars Thomas (1999, 2001, 2002, 2007) and Reeve (2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008) have created a theoretical space for thinking creatively about the psyche. As Goodley (2016) argues, both are sceptical about psychologisation but share an interest in what Reeve describes as the ‘barriers in here’ that are often ignored by radical structuralist sociologists who are more focused on the ‘barriers out there’ (2008, 1). The psycho-emotional register is progressive because it seeks to consider what ‘disabled people can be’ rather than what ‘disabled people can do’. But this approach is also sensitised to an exploration of indirect and direct forms of psycho-emotional disablism.4 Direct forms can be found in discriminatory interactions, acts of invalidation, patronising responses of others and hate crimes such as the destruction of group symbols and hate literature (Sherry 2000). Indirect forms of psycho-emotional disablism are less overt but just as damaging. They may emerge as side effects of structural disablism (a feeling of dislocation in a building that is largely inaccessible) or unintended actions, words or deeds (such as stares of curious others, patronising attitudes, need-freak requests for assistance) (see Liddiard 2014). How are disabled people, their partners, families and allies meant to respond emotionally to these questions? By accommodating non-disabled people, perhaps offering a smile, a short answer and a response that will not make the non-disabled person even more uncomfortable. Anger, violence or rejection on the part of the disabled person would no doubt be understood by the non-disabled inquisitor as a rude emotional response of someone with a ‘chip on their shoulder’. Ironically, it would at the same time serve to embody the stale ableist trope of the angry, bitter crip. Liddiard (2014, 124) recognises both the complex management of feeling and the relational politics inherent to responding in the right ways as forms of skilled emotional labour, as disabled people come to take on the diverse roles of teacher, negotiator, manager, mediator, performer and educator’ in negotiating their reactions and responses – enacting forms of skilled inter-personal labour desired by the very western labour markets from which they are largely excluded (see Exley and Letherby 2001). Hochschild (1983) is clear: there are appropriate affects to display in these moments of interaction. Families with disabled children and disabled children themselves have described the affective labour that they are forced to engage with to manage the emotions of others (Runswick-Cole 2013). Disabled people have articulated the emotional work and labour required within their loving and sexual relationships with close others, showing that such labour can reach the most intimate spaces of life and self (Liddiard 2014). In our respective work, each of us has previously drawn on Hochschild’s work to explain the ways in which disabled people engage in disabling forms of emotional labour (Goodley 2016; Liddiard 2014; Runswick-Cole 2010, 2013); as disabled people, their partners and their families find themselves caught up in interactions with non-disabled people that are governed by a number of well-known social scripts (Goodley 2016; Runswick-Cole 2013). These scripts invite non-disabled people to interact with disability that permits, for example, the asking of inappropriate, demeaning and highly personalised questions and commentaries we outlined at the start of this section. Affect is deeply embedded in cultural norms. Hughes (2009, 2012, 2015) points out that disabled people are associated with a cultural history of disgust, pity and fear. This renders disabled people as objects of ambivalent feelings from wider non-disabled society such as resentment and hatred. Disabled people risk being ontologically invalidated by the disabling worlds that they inhabit. Hughes (2009, 408) argues that: The role of fear … is hugely underplayed in personal tragedy theory. So to is the role of disgust, a mediating emotion in the relations between disabled and nondisabled people that is in need of considerable development. Hughes’ work builds sociologically on the psychological and psychoanalytic analysis of Marks (1999a, 1999b, 2002) that sought to probe unconscious responses to disability. Marks powerfully argued that being subjected to the damaging pathologising projections of others risked being internalised by disabled people: where the projections of societal norms of dependency and bodily imperfection are internalised, only to sit ambivalently, often shamefully, with one’s psychical position in a disabling world. (Marks 1999a; 21) Such feelings of emotional and ontological invalidation risk self-harm and self-hatred (Marks 1999b, 615, also see Hughes 2009). Goodley too has deployed social psychoanalytic concepts to explain further the generation of fear, disgust but also attraction in relation to disability displayed by non-disabled culture (Goodley 2011, 2014, 2016). This analysis was indebted to the writings of Marks (1999a, 1999b, 2002) and Watermeyer (2013) who as therapists trained in the psychoanalytic tradition are far more skilled in deploying this theoretical language. Both were keen to understand the ontological damage done to disabled people whilst living in a society that veers from not recognising disabled people as valued members of society to conceptualising disability solely in terms of deficit and lack. Marks and Watermeyer are keen to take seriously the emotional lives of disabled people and do so with a keen interest in the socio-cultural conditions in which one’s psycho-emotional life thrives or fails. Clearly, living in such a dismissive atmosphere risks causing feelings of invalidation. Also, we know that a precarious sense of self becomes heightened in times of austerity (Flynn 2017). Goodley’s (2011, 2016) interest in deploying psychoanalysis was less with disabled people and more with non-disabled people. In particular, he played around with the idea of the psychopathology of the normals, which considers the ways in which the precarious nature of living with being non-disabled (or able-bodied or able-minded) inevitably plunges individuals into emotional turmoil (Goodley 2014). One easy route out of any psychic trouble is projection: finding failings in others. We therefore might understand feelings of disgust or fear (or attraction for that matter) as symptoms of the underlying neurosis on the part of non-disabled people. Hence, disability becomes disavowed by normative culture: it is rejected (because it symbolises lack) and adored (because of its association with dependency which is the human condition desired by most of us caught in the terrors of adult autonomy). While some affect theorists consider the field to be in part a rejection of the psychoanalytic ownership of the affective register, psychoanalysis may be critically reappropriated to make sense of wider cultural formations of emotion. Indeed, Gorton (2008) and Duschinsky, Greco, and Solomon (2014) draw on related concepts of attachment and fantasy in their interrogation of affective culture. Duschinsky, Greco, and Solomon (2014, 232) note that the idea of attachment might well be the best way to engage with a vital question left behind by Foucault: why we emotionally invest in the cultures and institutions which discipline our identities and limit our potential to flourish. For Duschinsky, Greco, and Solomon (2014) this is the root of Berlant’s affective notion of cruel optimism: ‘an optimistic attachment is cruel when the object/scene of desire is itself an obstacle to fulfilling the very wants that bring people to it: but its life-organising status can trump interfering with the damage it provokes’ (Berlant 2011, 227). The consequence of such cruel optimism risks causing emotional distress, as one fails to match up to the labour and consumption demands of late capitalism. One route out of such distress is to unconsciously view and locate failure in others. This might help us explain the cultural disavowal of young people with LL/LTIs and their families. We might understand the broader cultural politics of emotion or affect economy (Ahmed 2004) – against which interactions such as those already described take place – as one being framed by ableism (Campbell 2009; Goodley 2014). Ableism is associated with the broader cultural logics of autonomy, self-sufficiency and independence. These logics are unquestionably and uncritically linked to psychological contentment and the affect of happiness. Ahmed ([2007] 2008) urges us to shake up our taken-for-granted ideas around happiness. Indeed, her critique of the pursuit of happiness, which is promulgated by psychological therapies and the self-help industry, fits well with a critical disability studies rejection of neoliberal-ableism. The latter discourse similarly propels the individual citizen towards an end of point of supposed contentment through the never-ending performances of labour and consumption. Happiness is to be bought, and so is able-bodied and able-mindedness. Here we can see further connections with Berlant’s (2007, 2010, 2011) cruel optimism: the mistaken desire and belief that we will reach personal fulfilment and happiness through working and shopping hard enough. Happiness, for Ahmed ([2007] 2008), can be understood as a promise or aspiration, a habit, a narrative, a memory, as well as an emotion, feeling or affect.5 We would want to consider ability (and the desire of autonomy tied up within ableism) in similar ways. Neoliberal-ableism is the elision of individual and national economic independence with an individual and cultural celebration of autonomy (Goodley 2014). This particular cultural economy ties individual and national progress to independence and, by virtue of this, associates happiness with self-sufficiency. Young people with LL/LTIs risk being threatened with what Flynn (2017, 155) describes as a ‘lived experience of shock and disappointment’ that can further devalue their identities as young disabled people. We would want to understand and contest the affective consequences of neoliberal-ableism.
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