# Speech 1NC Yale Doubles vs Valley 9-19 8AM

## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose frameworks and advocacy texts thirty minutes before round if they haven’t read the affirmative before

#### Violation: They didn’t

Graphical user interface, text

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates.

#### 2] Reciprocity – they have infinite time to frontline their aff to anything we could say against it while we get only four minutes which destroys generics

#### 3] Shiftiness- new affs bad incentivizes 1ar shiftiness about what the aff entails.

## 2

#### Interp – affs must specify medicine in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Medicine is flexible and has too many interps – normal means shows no consensus and makes the round irresolvable since the judge doesn’t know how to compare between types of offense and OW since it’s a side constraint on decision making.

**Hofmann 21:** Hofmann, Bjorn [Institute for the Health Sciences at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) at Gjøvik, PO Box 1, 2802, Gjøvik, Norway] “Vagueness in Medicine: On Disciplinary Indistinctness, Fuzzy Phenomena, Vague Concepts, Uncertain Knowledge, and Fact-Value-Interaction” *Springer Link,* July 05, 2021 AA <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10516-021-09573-4>

This article investigates five kinds of vagueness in medicine: disciplinary, ontological, conceptual, epistemic, and vagueness with respect to descriptive-prescriptive connections. **First, medicine is a discipline with unclear borders, as it builds on a wide range of other disciplines and subjects. Second, medicine deals with many indistinct phenomena resulting in borderline cases. Third, medicine uses a variety of vague concepts, making it unclear which situations, conditions, and processes that fall under them. Fourth, medicine is based on and produces uncertain knowledge and evidence. Fifth, vagueness emerges in medicine as a result of a wide range of fact-value-interactions. The various kinds of vagueness in medicine can explain many of the basic challenges of modern medicine, such as overdiagnosis, underdiagnosis, and medicalization.** Even more, it illustrates how complex and challenging the field of medicine is, but also how important contributions from the philosophy can be for the practice of medicine. **By clarifying** and, where possible, **reducing or limiting vagueness, philosophy can help improving care. Reducing the various types of vagueness can improve clinical decision-making, informing individuals, and health policy making.**

#### Violation – you don’t.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high-quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night – triggers presumption since the aff wasn’t subject to well researched scrutiny. We lose access to Insulin DA’s, Innovation DA’s, basic case turns, and core process counter plans that have different definitions and 1NC pre-round prep.

#### 2] Real World – policy makers will always define the entity that they are prohibiting. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, actors circumvent since there’s no specific object of the plan and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### Medicine spec isn’t regressive or arbitrary – its core topic lit for what happens when the aff is implemented and cannot be discounted from prohibition policies that require enforcement to function.

#### Fairness – a] its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation b] sequencing question to engagement

#### Education – it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – aff’s infinite prep means they can frontline every shell marginally enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough to deflate theory and win b) 1AR Flex – It’s key to check 1ar flexibility since you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments that were abusive.

#### No RVI’s- a) logic – you shouldn’t win for being fair b) clash – people go all in on theory which decks substance engagement c) chilling effect – people will be too scared to read theory because RVI’s encourage baiting theory d] 1ar flex

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

## 3

#### Interp – Debaters must disclose round reports on the NDCA wiki for every round they have debated this season.

#### Violation – screenshots – it doetsn say anyting

Graphical user interface, application, Teams

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1~ Level Playing Field – In the squo big schools know everyone's 2NRs and 2ARs by collecting flows and scouting, while small school debaters are left guessing. That's key knowledge because it tells you what layers debaters actually go for.

#### 2~ Strategy Education – Round reports help young debaters understand what the best debaters go for in the 2NR and 2AR in the context of the round.

## 4

#### **The world relies on the fundamental opposition to disability to exist – disabled bodies are modeled as the inverse reflection to the normate which drives the internal ableism and desire to eliminate disabled bodies.**

**Hughes 12** [Bill Hughes (professor of Sociology at Glasgow Caledonian University, BA in sociology from the University of Stirling, PhD in political philosophy from the University of Aberdeen). 2012. Accessed 8/9/20. “Civilising Modernity and the Ontological Invalidation of Disabled People.” <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137023001_2> //Xu]

The stratifying binary of disability/non-disability and the antagonism of the latter towards the former is mediated and maintained, principally, by the emotion of disgust. Disgust is the bile carried in a discursive complex that Campbell (2008: 153) calls ‘ableism’: ‘a network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the corporeal standard) that is projected as perfect, species-typical and therefore essential and fully human’. The body produced by ableism is equivalent to what Kristeva (1982: 71) calls the ‘clean and proper body’. It is the body of the ‘normate’, the name that Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (1997) gives to the body that thinks of itself as invulnerable and definitive. It is the hygienic, aspirational body of civilising modernity. It is cast from the increasingly stringent norms and rules about emotional behaviour and bodily display that mark mundane social relations in the lebenswelt (lifeworld). This curious non-disabled body/self has no empirical existence per se. On the contrary, the body of ableism is a normative construct, an invulnerable ideal of being manifest in the imaginary of ‘modernist ontology, epistemology and ethics’ as something ‘secure, distinct, closed and autonomous’ (Shildrick, 2002: 51). It embraces ‘human perfectibility as a normative physical or psychological standard’ and involves ‘a curious disavowal of variation and mortality’ (Kaplan, 2000: 303). It is what we are supposed to aspire to, to learn to be but can never become. It has no grounding in the material world. It is a ‘body schema, a psychic construction of wholeness that … belies its own precariousness and vulnerability’ (Shildrick, 2002: 79). It is a ‘body divorced from time and space; a thoroughly artificial affair’ (Mitchell and Snyder, 2000: 7), the epitome of civilisation, closed off from any connection with the animal side of humanity and from the ways in which our bodily nature wallows in its carnal improprieties. It is a body aghast at the messiness of existence. Disability is the opposite of this ideal body, its ‘inverse reflection’ (Deutsch and Nussbaum, 2000: 13). The disabled body is or has the propensity to be unruly. In the kingdom of the ‘clean and proper body’, disability is the epitome of ‘what not to be’. As a consequence the disabled body can be easily excluded from the mainstream ‘psychic habitus’ (Elias, 2000: 167). The ‘clean and proper’ – a normative body of delicacy, refinement and selfdiscipline – has powerful social consequences most manifest in its normalising dynamics. It is the standard of judgement against which disabled bodies are invalidated and transformed into repellent objects. It is the emblem of purity that by comparison creates existential unease. It apportions the shame and repugnance that underwrite the civilising process (Elias, 2000: 114–19, 414–21). Through ableism, modernity has been able to structure disability as uncivilised, outside or on the margins of humanity. One of the great books of the science of natural history published under the title Systema Naturae by Linnaeus in 1735 distinguishes between homo sapiens and homo monstrosus. In this classification impairment – at its extreme and highly visible end – is excluded from the human family. The distinction is, in itself, an act of violence and invalidation, an object lesson in transforming difference and ‘defect’ into the abominable. The distinction mobilises the aversive emotions of fear and disgust. Ableism is a cruel teacher. It embodies violence at many levels: ‘epistemic, psychic, ontological and physical’ (Campbell, 2008: 159). It is at its most bellicose when it is mediated by disgust: a mediation invoked mostly in the social fabrication of taboo and most compellingly in a context when the human/animal boundary is under threat. Ableism rests on the effort to eliminate from awareness, chaos, abjection, animality and death: all that civilisation seeks to repress. It encourages us to live in the false hope that we will not suffer and die, to adopt a perspective of invulnerability, to confuse morality with beauty and to see death, pain and disability as the repulsive woes of mortality rather than as the existen- tial basis for community and communication. Kolnai (2004: 74) reminds us that, ‘in its full intention, it is death ... that announces itself to us in the phenomenon of disgust’. Disability, in modernity, has been produced in the ontological household of the abject, as the antithesis of communica- tion and community, in a place that we might on occasion peer into only to ‘choke’ on the unsavoury sights that greet us. Disability is put out, put away, hidden, segregated or transformed into its opposite, covered up by whatever medical or aesthetic techniques are available to achieve this end. Any opportunity that disability might have to take its place at the heart of communication and community is thwarted by the ablest sensibilities that push it back down among the disgusting, the sick, the dead and the dying. In fact, as Elias (2000) suggested, the making of ‘civilised’ community and communication in modernity proceeds by exclusion and interdiction, by cutting out and hiding away whatever causes or might come to inspire angar (choking) or anguista (tightness).

#### Freedom is a tool of liberalism to “civilize” populations in order to “advance” – that limits the category of human and excludes those rendered as lacking debility.

Fiona Kumari Campbell, 2005

Campbell is a Senior Lecturer in Disability Studies at the School of Human Services & Social Work Griffith University (Brisbane) and Adjunct Professor in Disability Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. “Legislating Disability: Negative Ontologies and the Government of Legal Identities” in “Foucault and Government of Disability” edited by Shelley Termain, University of Michigan Press, Pg 110-114

Within contemporary Western, neoliberal societies, freedom is held to be an inalienable and inherent right of the atomistic individual citizen. Indeed, the ethosof freedom is a foundation of the politics of our present, a mark and effect of justice and the other virtues of practiced democracy—that is, a measure of a society’s true worth, of the degree to which it is “civilized,” and the extent to which it is “advanced.” People who live in Western neoliberal democracies are seduced into freedom, the utopic dream that holds within itself a promise, that is, the vision of an alternative way of living. For disability activists, in particular, and for many of the other folk who live on the underside of liberalism, the ethosof freedom has performed as a source of emancipation that contains a promise to address “social injury.” As Wendy Brown (1995, 7) **reminds us, however, there is a paradox inherent to freedom: the incitement of freedom requires the very structures of oppression that freedom emerges to oppose**. In recent times, **the practices of freedom have been molded and codi‹ed into the apparatus of the welfare state, citizenship, and legal personality. In the terms of this apparatus, freedom is represented as autonomy,where this ideal encompasses the drive toward potential maximization, which invokes the performance of a choosing, desiring, and consuming subject** (cf. Foucault 1997). Furthermore, **the subject of the neoliberal welfare state is assumed to be an independent center of self-consciousness, who holds autonomy to be intrinsically valuable**. In the words of C. B. Macpherson (1964), **neoliberalism’s normative citizen is a nominal “possessive individual.” The nominal individual is free in as much as he [sic] is proprietor of his person and capacities. The human essenceis freedom from dependence on the will of others, and freedom is a function of possession. . . . Society consists of relations of exchangebetween proprietors**.(Macpherson 1964, 3; emphasis added)

#### Campbell Link wall –

#### 1] Functional capacity – 1AC Jaeggi frames ethical value through mental capacity which excludes people with neurodivergent cognititive subjectivities – independent voter regardless of ontology for violent rhetoric. DTD to deter the practice and reject violence.

#### 2] Medicine – their rhetoric and discourse of the lack of medicine as “morbidity” pathologizes disabled subjectivities and also turns case because it alienates them

#### 3] Body link – 1AC Krawisz valorizes the access to the physical body which demarcates disabled bodies as deviant

#### The impact is internalized ableism and psychological violence.

Campbell 08 (Fiona Kumari Campbell, disability author and professor at Griffith University, “Exploring internalized ableism using critical race theory” Disability and Society, Vol. 23, No. 2, March 2008, 151–162 some words are edited within []) DR 16

* Prefiat offense first
* Challenge all forms of ableism ie epistemological, material
* Weigh with probability and magnitude

**Foucault’s (1976; 1980) theorisation of power as productive may provide some offerings from which to build a conversation about internalised ableism**. I am not so much interested in the ‘external’ effects of that power, but for the moment wish to concentrate on what Judith Butler aptly refers to as **the ‘psychic life’ of power.** She describes this dimension: … an account of subjection, it seems, must be traced in the turns of psychic life. More specifically, **it must be traced in the peculiar turning of a subject against itself that takes place in acts of self-reproach, conscience, and melancholia that work in tandem with processes of social regulation** (Butler, 1997b, p.19). In other words, **the processes of subject formation cannot be separated from the subject** him/**herself who is brought into being though those very subjectifying processes**. **The consequences of taking into oneself negative subjectivities not only regulate and continually form identity (the disabled citizen) but can transcend and surpass the strictures of ableist authorizations.** Judith **Butler describes this process of the “carrying of a mnemic trace**”: One need only consider the way in which **the history of having been called an injurious name is embodied, how the words enter the limbs, craft the gesture, bend the spine …how these slurs accumulate over time, dissimulating their history, taking on the semblance of the natural, configuring and restricting** the doxa that counts as “**reality**”. (Butler, 1997b, p. 159) The work of Williams and Williams-Morris (2000) links racism experienced by African Americans to the effects of hurtful words and negative cultural symbols on mental health, especially when **marginalized groups embrace negative societal beliefs about themselves.** They cite an international study by Fischer et al (1996) which inter alia links poor academic performance with poor social status. Although using different disciplinary language Wolfensberger (1972) in his seven core themes of SRV, identified role circularity as a significant obstacle to be overcome by disabled people wanting socially valued roles. **Philosopher** **Linda Purdy contends** it is important to resist conflating disability with the disabled person. She writes **My disability is not me**, no matter how much it may affect my choices. With this point firmly in mind, **it should be possible mentally to separate my existences from the existence of my disability**. (Purdy, 1996, p. 68). The problem with **Purdy’s conclusion** is that it is psychically untenable, not only because it **is posited around a type of Cartesian dualism that simply separates being-ness from embodiment**, **but also because this kind of reasoning disregards the dynamics of subjectivity formation** to which Butler (1997a; 1997b) has referred. **Whilst the ‘outputs’ of subjectivity are variable the experience of impairment within an ableist context can and does effect formation of self – in other words ‘disability is me’, but that ‘me’ does not need to be enfleshed with negative ontologies of subjectivity**. **Purdy’s ~~bodily~~ [fleshly] detachment appears locked into a loop that is filled with internalised ableism, a state with negative views of impairment, from which the only escape is ~~disembodiment~~; the penalty of denial is a flight** 12 **from her [flesh] ~~body~~.** **This finds agreement in the reasoning of** Jean **Baudrillard** (1983) **who posits that it is the simulation, the appearance (**representation) **that matters. The subject simulates what it is to be ‘disabled’ and by inference ‘abled’ and whilst morphing ableist imperatives, in effect performs a new hyper reality of be-ing disabled. By unwittingly performing ableism disabled people become complicit in their own demise – reinforcing impairment as an outlaw ontology.**

#### The alternative is unwavering pessimism – only a refusal of the world can disrupt the current notion of optimism – voting neg is a refusal of progress.

**Selck**[Michael L Selck(B.S., Southern Illinois University – Carbondale). “Crip Pessimism: The Language of Dis/ability and the Culture that Isn’t.” Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Jan 2016. Accessed 3/16/20. <https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1845&context=gs_rp> //Recut Houston Memorial DX]

The disabled are dying and with them dis/abled culture is being eradicated. In the time between formulating this project and its completion already too many disabled souls have been taken from this world, including pivotal disability studies influences for this research. I barely had enough time to mourn the loss of disability advocate and inspiration porn critic Stella Young before grieving the loss of disability studies exemplar Tobin Siebers. Attached to the grief I feel as a result of the fading disability studies community is the perpetual grief I harbor since my disabled Father’s suicide and in turn the grief concomitant to the claiming of a disabled identity. I choose to start out this project with grief because it communicates the tenor of this research; this is not the disability studies project of inspiration or utopia. My entry point to the disability studies dialogue is riddled with grief, anger, and pain and it is as such that this project plots a course of disability research that attempts to make a space free from the ideological constraints of optimism. The language surrounding dis/ability is highly political. Entire words, phrases, and identities are stretched between, in, and out of the nexus of dis/ability. The choice, for instance, to include a backslash in the word dis/ability represents for Goodley (2014) a desire to delineate and expand each of the categories in the face of global neoliberalism. My initial research inquired about the impact of dis/abled terms and phrases. I went to interrogate rhetoric like “special education”, “handicapable”, and one of the most glaringly overused insults in the American education system “retard”. The scholarship I was coming up with was plentiful but was for the most part located entirely outside of intercultural communication programs like the one I was attending. For the most part the few and far between intercultural communication projects about dis/ability I was able to locate were without modal complexity and didn’t bear semblance to so many of my own experiences. I was beginning to notice a layer of optimism that has been communicatively imprinted upon the negotiation of dis/abled identity. The angst started to manifest as I questioned if I was in the correct field or if dis/ability even was ‘cultural’. I felt a very real cultural erasure of dis/ability in academia and ultimately that glaring lack of consideration is what pushed me to performance studies. I first worked to close the apparent research gap by crafting a collaborative performance titled Under the Mantle (UTM), which put dis/ability, communication scholarship, and pessimist philosophy on stage. The larger purpose of this research report is to antagonize the erasure of dis/ability from communication studies by autoethnographically analyzing the crip-pessimist performance art project Under The Mantle. This research report will first detail the components of the theoretical work that was drawn on to create UTM. Next I offer a literature review to demonstrate the combination of optimism and neglect dis/ability has undergone in intercultural communication models. Following that section I mark my shift to performance methods as I explain how narrative autoethnography can illuminate cultural misconceptions regarding the dis/abled. In the last sections of this report I offer a textual analysis of the performance UTM and analyze three significant arguments of the instillation before concluding. Contextualizing Critical Dis/Ability Theory Often used interchangeably, critical disability theory (CDT) and critical disability studies (CDS) contest dis/ablism (Goodley, 2011, 2014; Devlin & Pothier, 2006; Hosking, 2008). There are several unique additions made to CDS with every new instantiation. Scholars in European countries and Canada attend to the theory, with United States academics often underrepresented. There are three concurrent themes of CDT that I will synthesize in this section with some dis/ability studies authors claiming there are as many as seven themes of CDT (Hosking, 2008). In the introduction to their edited collection of dis/ability essays, Richard Devlin and Dianne Pothier (2006) present three themes of CDT as, first, to highlight the unequal status to which persons with disabilities are confined; second, to destabilize necessitarian assumptions that reinforce the marginalization of persons with disabilities; and third, to help generate the individual and collective practical agency of persons with disabilities in the struggles for recognition and redistribution. (p. 18, emphasis mine) Already the connections between the CDT and the critical communication paradigm are visible as each respectively forefronts notions of power, privilege, identity, and agency. Outlined in more detail, the first theme of CDT argues that there is systemic micro and macro level discrimination against bodies with disabilities. To some critical communication scholars, this theme might be obvious, but it seldom is when “the resulting exclusion of those who do not fit able-bodied norms may not be noticeable or even intelligible” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). As the bumper sticker on my laptop proudly disclaims, “Not all disabilities are visible,” which necessarily adds a level of nuance and complexity to the way that dis/ability studies attend to the prospect of discrimination and violence. Often times, “social organization according to able-bodied norms is just taken as natural, normal, inevitable, necessary, even progress” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). It might be true that the lack of collaborative work between critical communication studies and dis/ability studies is because neoliberalism is supremely effective at rebranding marginalized oppression as a marker of its progress. The implications of this assertion are dire but essential to the basis of crip-pessimism. Theoretical approaches based in pessimism and skepticism are often necessary to distinguish the instruments of self destruction that have been mistaken for those of self betterment.

#### The ROB is to vote for the method that disrupts notions of progress. Don’t let them weigh case- if we win the starting point is flawed, they shouldn’t leverage their impacts.

#### Spec

#### Offense is

#### 1] Disrupting the rhetoric of rehabilitative actions in the context of violence to disability counts as offense

#### 2] Pre-fiat offense matters and theory flows on principle but voters probably don’t on principle

#### 3] Form outweighs content

**Selck**[Michael L Selck(B.S., Southern Illinois University – Carbondale). “Crip Pessimism: The Language of Dis/ability and the Culture that Isn’t.” Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Jan 2016. Accessed 3/16/20. <https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1845&context=gs_rp> //Recut Houston Memorial DX]

Despite the fact that a large basis of American culture is founded on ability, dis/ability rarely enters the dominant public communication sphere. The unpleasant and visceral questions that accompany communication about dis/ability have been strategically re-zoned and relocated like so many dis/abled patients, veterans, and transients. Yet, when conversation about dis/ability does seem to permeate the ideological walls of ability the messages are inspirationally distorted and optimistic. My time researching dis/ability in academia found that the conversation there mimicked the exploitive inspirational humaninterest trope found in cinema and journalism. To break the optimistic silence I set out with a performance art piece titled Under The Mantle to advance a theme of crip-pessimism, which intended to raise the stakes of contemporary dis/ability research. The beginning of this essay takes the time to detail the vast theoretical backgrounds of critical disability theory and philosophical pessimism. In the following section I reviewed intercultural communication literature for dis/ability because much of the theory literature I drew from existed outside the communication studies discipline. The evidenced lack of intercultural dis/ability artifacts up against a dis/ability centric performance art project necessitated an interdisciplinary multi-method framework. In that framework I demonstrate how autoethnography is significant to dis/ability studies because it illuminates even the most mundane able-bodied norms. In the final sections I offer a textual description of the performance and hone in on three explicit arguments that augment traditional thinking about dis/ability and communication. The trouble I encountered with dis/ability research in communication studies has to do with the way American culture understands offensive communication. Political correctness as a disciplining communication concept dictates what terms are socially acceptable at a given time. Political correctness underscores how many communication studies programs operate within the rubric of conflict (Wilderson, 2010). The thinking that suggests simply avoiding offensive terms will diminish oppression is within the rubric of conflict because it understands the oppression as materially reconcilable. What crippessimism does, and what UTM performed, is skepticism that speaking inspirationally and avoiding speaking offensively about dis/ability would end disablism. Instead I argued that what dis/ability represents is an antagonism, it is an oppression so much more foundational to the core of American values that linguistic reforms would not even scratch the surface. The significance of antagonism is that it raises the stakes of dis/ability research. The end goal of research should not be to service the meta-theoretical assumptions of the paradigm (Kuhn, 1962), because consequently the researcher never stops to ask if the assumptions of the paradigm are ethical, valid, or effective. Crippessimism is a call for some demolition and redistribution of communicative identity paradigms. If the radical promise of our theories is nothing more than a call for social stability then they are complicit in the neoliberal eugenic project. We need to theorize so that there is nothing already ‘given’ or taken for granted. Often in those moments, like the moments of so many textbooks, the underlying optimism goes completely unquestioned. Crip-pessimism as a theme is characterized by negotiating debates surrounding the efficacy of identity politics. Arguments that fit within the theme ask why the disabled should abandon their bodies in the political sphere. Social death has already occurred, the dis/abled are being rendered culturally unintelligible and physically fungible. So what we need when we are having discussions about how to progress is a theory that breaks down the notion of progress. The recognition and need for a theory like this comes about when we ask central dis/ability questions like: ‘when did eugenics end?’ and ‘where is disability in U.S. society before and after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act?’ and ‘globally has the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities reconciled the antagonism of disablism?’. These are the questions that I want to end on and encourage communication and dis/ability scholars alike to take up. As scholars and mass media engines continue to project dis/ability within the rubric of conflict our collective reliance on capitalism and neoliberalism grow deeper. It is my hope at the end of this project that my voice both in performing and in writing encourages more scholarship detailing the omnipresence of disablism in American culture. Under The Mantle is a reminder to me that all representations of dis/ability have consequences and in many cases all we need to witness those consequences is a slight perspectival shift.