**1**

**Utilitarianism devalues disabled people and sees them as “unproductive”, “sufferers”.**

**Jarman**, Michelle. "Disability Studies Ethics: Theoretical Approaches for the Undergraduate Classroom." *University of Hawaii*, U of Hawaii, scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/58368/750.pdf. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020.

**Utilitarianism takes as its guiding principle that everyone should act according to the greatest good for all concerned**. In other words, moral action is determined by evaluating potential ramifications, and moral agents are obligated to choose the optimal act, or the one determined to provide the best consequences (Thiroux, 1998; Kagan, 1998). In practice, however, it is extremely difficult to predict the outcomes an action will have upon everyone involved. More important to disability studies, **the ideal of the greatest good for greatest number often devolves into cost-benefit debates where majority interests are pursued at minority groups’ expense. The legacies of utilitarianism are evident in resource allocation debates** in modern industrialized societies, **in which providing civic access, medical support, and other resources to people with disabilities center around cost-benefit analyses. Such models** inevitably **position those most in need of supports as least beneficial to the social fabric**—assumptions built upon medical authority, which correlates increased impairment levels with decreased quality of life—a euphemism for lesser human worth. **These arbitrary judgments portray people with disabilities as tragic sufferers who should be pitied, not as potential contributors** to cultural life—or the bottom line. As Wendell (1996) has argued, this limiting mindset continues to make it very difficult to allocate disability resources, “because most people still think of disability as a personal or family responsibility, and…**because public aid to people with disabilities has long been characterized as pure charity, rather than as a social investment in ability and productivity”** (p. 51). In effect, **utilitarian** and medical model **assumptions inhere within social thought and political structures and function invisibly as natural practices.**

**People with Anhedonia have an inability to feel pleasure, which means your framework excludes and devalues them.**

**Brody**, Barbara. "What Is Anhedonia?" *WebMD*, 20 Oct. 20**20**, www.webmd.com/depression/what-is-anhedonia#:~:text=Anhedonia%20is%20the%20inability%20to,life%20to%20make%20them%20happy. Accessed 1 Feb. 2022.

**Anhedonia is the inability to feel pleasure. It's a common symptom of** [**depression**](https://www.webmd.com/depression/default.htm) **as well as other** [**mental health**](https://www.webmd.com/mental-health/default.htm) **disorders.** Most people understand what pleasure feels like. They expect certain things in life to make them happy. Maybe you enjoy riding your bike, listening to the sounds of the ocean, or holding someone's [hand](https://www.webmd.com/osteoarthritis/rm-quiz-handfacts). But **some people lose the ability to feel joy.** The things that once made them content are no longer fun or enjoyable. That's anhedonia.

**Even if you win that people with Anhedonia can feel some pleasure, there are still people with a reduced ability to feel pleasure which means your framework devalues them. E.g. if someone felt half as much pleasure your framework would deem them as half as valuable.**

**The impact is ableism devalues life.**

**Peña-Guzmán**, David M., and Joel Michael Reynolds. "The harm of ableism: Medical error and epistemic injustice." *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 29.3 (20**19**): 205-242. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/736764/pdf?casa_token=fjDQmr0TsakAAAAA:R2nSHLphSxHWymMPUcTadnt2I3csRIR2xepqDdK-k2LGaarCQBUe5rQT4TzjYH_iAm7JbHD69Z8e>

As Cassam (2017) formulates it, epistemic overconfidence can affect all patients independently of disability status. But we argue that ableism amplifies it in particular ways. **Consider the so-called “disability paradox.”** This term refers to the fact that **non-disabled people rate the quality of life of people with disabilities significantly lower than people with disabilities do**. Albrecht and Devlieger formulate the paradox this way: **“Why do many people with serious and persistent disabilities report that they experience a good or excellent quality of life when to most external observers these individuals seem to live an undesirable daily existence?”** (1999, 977). One would expect that among non-disabled people, health care providers would buck this trend since presumably their expert knowledge of medicine translates to a better understanding of impairment than the average person. But the exact opposite turns out to be true. **Medical experts have an inaccurate perception of the quality of life of disabled people, and they systematically rate the quality of life lower than the average non-disabled person does** (Basnett 2001).16 What is more, because of their expert status, **medical practitioners are unlikely to call into question their own assumptions, which are continuously reinforced by the medical model of disability** in which they have been reared and to which in most cases they remain committed. Research concerning the disability paradox suggests that **doctors often walk into a consultation with fixed and fundamentally flawed assumptions about disability.**

**The alternative is to vote negative to endorse an “ethics of disability” instead of utilitarianism. A system of ethics that starts from the experiences and values of disabled people instead of traditional exclusionary ethics. To clarify it is a plan inclusive kritik, I endorse the entirety of the aff absent their use of utilitarianism.**

**Jarman 2**, Michelle. "Disability Studies Ethics: Theoretical Approaches for the Undergraduate Classroom." *University of Hawaii*, U of Hawaii, scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/58368/750.pdf. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020.

Disability studies scholars and rights activists, in their shared commitment to challenge stigmas around physical and cognitive impairments and advocate for full integration, self determination, and maximum civic participation of disabled people, often find themselves engaged in reconfiguring ethical theory, debate, and action. **At the heart of disability studies lies an ideal of social participation for all people**, to the fullest extent possible, regardless of impairment diagnosis. **This ideal positions disabled and nondisabled people as moral and legal equals, and does not formulate citizenship or personhood standards around rationality, independence, or self-sufficiency,** as many ethical and social justice theories have done traditionally. In challenging physical and cognitive norms—as these have been defined and enforced—as well as historical exclusions of people with disabilities, **an ethics of disability demands an expansion of long-standing conceptualizations of human embodiment and conscious engagement. Discussing ethics from a disability perspective becomes all the more urgent and complex as we look at some of the most polarizing debates about human life,** such as selective abortion, euthanasia, and the potential eugenic outcomes of prenatal testing and genetic technological advances. As many scholars in the field have pointed out, **much of the medical and popular media representations of these debates have privileged cure and eradication of disability over attitudinal change and greater efforts to integrate and support the access needs of disabled people** (Wendell, 1996; Parens & Asch, 2000; Glover, 2006). At the University of Wyoming, as faculty members in the newly established undergraduate minor in disability studies1 considered the layered ethical conversations that would inevitably arise within undergraduate courses, we decided to integrate ethical components across the core courses and popular electives of the curriculum2 . This essay introduces some of the pedagogical and theoretical approaches we are implementing by looking closely at some of the disability ethics content in three distinct courses. The first, Introduction to Disability Studies, is a required survey course, where students are encouraged to extrapolate the driving ethical commitments of disability studies within a social justice context. The second elective course, Women with Disabilities, focuses on feminist approaches and multiple perspectives of disabled women. This course provides a unique location to explore care ethics and to introduce a few of the productive complications disability studies has introduced to feminist theories. The final required course, Supports and Services, provides students with opportunities to meet service professionals, disabled clients and activists, and policy experts who provide first-hand accounts of how local and national support systems operate. In addition, students are exposed to broader theories of human rights, social justice, and vulnerability, and are encouraged to use these critical lenses to analyze the ethical guidelines within their own fields or professions. The ultimate goal is to provide students in the minor with a comprehensive understanding of the principles animating disability studies, and with the tools for articulating and integrating these values into an active ethical practice in their professional lives—within and beyond academia. Articulating an Ethics of Disability As an interdisciplinary field of inquiry, disability studies draws upon many areas of scholarship to inform its ethical commitments. The introductory survey class reflects this diversity by encouraging students to identify and cull out from our course readings some of the foundational ethical principals informing disability studies. Drawing upon leading scholars and activists in the field, students investigate critiques of the medical and moral models, and explore the political salience of the British social model and the minority/civil rights model that has emerged in the United States. As the perspectives of disabled people are moved to the center, students come to realize how marginalized these voices are in mainstream public discourse, and how meanings of disability have been shaped by limiting cultural narratives built around individual tragedy, charity, and heroic overcoming. From the outset, students are introduced to the ideals driving disability studies and disability rights, such as claims to full personhood and respect, maximum integration, and appreciation of dependencies and interdependencies. The importance of putting these ideals into practice are most salient as students are exposed to historical and contemporary exclusions of people with disabilities, the potentially oppressive power of medical authority, and the pervasive stereotypes that continue to cast disability as individual medical tragedy, moral punishment, or villainous attribute. As students begin to unpack the medical model, they are often struck by the power of the concept of normal to stigmatize and exclude people with disabilities. Linton (1998) has explained this process in the following way: “The medicalization of disability casts human variation as deviance from the norm, as pathological condition, as deficit, and significantly, as an individual burden and personal tragedy” (p. 11). Davis (1999) has elaborated further, pointing out that the very idea of normal, codified during the eugenics period, is relatively new. With the institutionalization of the bell curve in the early twentieth century, Davis has suggested, “The concept of normality…created an imperative to be normal” (p. 504) by drawing stark lines between so-called normal and abnormal bodies. Readings from such scholars push students to reevaluate their own assumptions about normalcy, and many uncover conceptual exclusions within their own thinking that become illuminating. The perspective shift from the medical to the social model, as well, is quite noticeable in the classroom. Wendell (1996) has captured the nature of this shift in The Rejected Body: "One of the most crucial factors in the deconstruction of disability is the change of perspective that causes us to look in the environment for both the source of the problem and the solutions” (p. 46). The invitation to look at specific environments allows students with and without disabilities to actively participate in locating barriers and suggesting ideas for more inclusive practices. As we explore the nature of disability oppression and prejudice, students are also encouraged to approach the insights of disability studies as generative, and applicable to human experience more broadly. In this vein, we begin to focus on the ways that **values produced by disability perspectives might enhance social theories, philosophical ideals, and cultural practices.** In his classic essay on disability culture, Longmore (1995) has delineated the provocative nature of disability values: “**[P]eople with disabilities have been affirming the validity of values drawn from their own experience. Those values are markedly different from, and even opposed to, nondisabled majority values.** They declare that **they prize not self-sufficiency but selfdetermination, not independence but interdependence, not functional separateness but personal connection, not physical autonomy but human community** (p. 36). In this formulation, **Longmore has rightly drawn upon the experience of disabled people as an alternative “source of values and norms”** (p. 36), and this provides an excellent starting point to discuss some of the major ethical traditions in philosophy, especially to investigate where the dominant assumptions critiqued above have originated, and how these theories continue to influence contemporary ideas and practices around disability. While our foray into philosophy is admittedly superficial, students are introduced to key ethical theories and encouraged to think about concepts and exclusions that might affect people with disabilities. Initially, the class considers the differences between consequentialist (teleological) and nonconsequentialist (deontological) theories (Thiroux, 1998). Consequentialist theories such as egoism, and act and rule utilitarianism, share a focus upon consequences of actions, and determining rules or personal actions in order to bring about beneficial consequences. Nonconsequentialist theories, such as intuitionism, Kant’s duty ethics, and virtue ethics, differ in many ways but broadly share the assumption that human beings have an internal moral guide, or that they have the capability, through reason, to develop moral rules and abide by them. Such theories see ethics as a process of internal intuition or reflective learning. For the purposes of this paper, I’ll outline a few of the questions disability studies brings to the discussions of a representational theory in each category: utilitarianism and Kant’s duty ethics.

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the best method to reject ableism.**

**We need to deconstruct ableism in an educational setting.**

**Nocella**, Anthony. "Emergence of Disability Pedagogy." *University of Syracuse*, U of Syracuse, www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/6-2-05.pdf. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020.

It is without a doubt that **education is liberation and when individuals are marginalized**, segregated, and have no access to education, there exists, as Paulo Freire the founder of critical pedagogy would note, oppression (1997). People are of course oppressed for a diversity of reasons -- race, class, gender, age, nationality, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, and ability. Ability is the foundation of the justification of the term and philosophy of disability, while disability has been the justification to kill, test on, segregate, abort, and abandon. Oppression is a universal experience that is felt by everyone at one time or another. What must be stressed is that the cause and experience of oppression is not universal, it is personal, while social, political and economic. **The central task of** critical theorists and **critical pedagogues is to analyze and identify the cause, justification, and history of particular oppressions and to provide space for experiences of that oppression to be heard and understood.** We must challenge the systematic domination of all, which creates experiences of oppression, suppression, and repression. Sara Bareilles, the singer of ―Love Song‖ expresses a brilliant, poetic, simple and succinct, experience of oppression in the opening of her song: Head under water, And they tell me to breathe easy for a while. The breathing gets harder, even I know that. This is the essence of the experience of oppression, where the dominator similar to that of a doctor (i.e., expert) says, ―Relax, it‘s not too bad,‖ even though the dominator has never been dominated in such that manner, i.e., felt this experience before. Another classic case is when one individual emotionally hurts another and then says, ―I did not hurt you.‖ This statement, like the lyrics of the song, takes away the ownership of the experience, which is the central understanding and empowerment of knowing one is oppressed. **If one does not critically understand they are oppressed** and the state that they are in**, they can never** want or **wish to be liberated and become free. Therefore, to control others is to take away their experience, for their experience is what unites them to create a collective identity, which aids in developing a social movement.** Recently critical scholarship on disability has been undertaken by people that are ―disabled‖ and allies around the world, while still in its infancy disability studies is making an explosive appearance across college campuses on a global scale. Linton in the beginning of her book ―Claiming Disability. Knowledge and Identity, ‖ writes that disability studies is, a location and a means to think critically about disability, a juncture that can serve both academic discourse and social change. Disability studies provides the means to hold academics accountable for the veracity and the social consequences of their work, just as activism has served to hold the community, the education system, and the legislature accountable for disabled people compromised social position. (1998, pp.1-2) Anthony J. Nocella II P a g e | 78 She goes on to write, The field explores the critical divisions our society makes in creating the normal versus the pathological, the insider versus the outsider, or the competent citizen versus the ward of the state. It is an interdisciplinary field based on a sociopolitical analysis of disability and informed both by the knowledge base and methodologies used in traditional liberal arts. Disability studies have emerged as a logical base for examination of the construction and function of ‗disability.‘ (1998, p. 2) Therefore, as Linton notes,disability studies is not an approach or based on the classroom, but a dynamic philosophy looking at the macro socio-economically constructed relationships which create the dominator versus the dominated.Linton, Mello and O‘Neill state that, disability studies challenges the idea that the social and economic status and assigned roles of people with disabilities are inevitable outcomes of their condition, and idea similar to the argument that women‘s roles and status are biologically determined. But disability studies goes beyond cataloguing discrimination and arguing for social change. It challenges the adequacy of the content and structure of the current curriculum. As with women‘s studies, disability studies redresses omitted histories, ideas, or bodies of literature and also analyzed the construction of the category ‗disability,‘ the impact of that construction on society, and on the content and structure of knowledge. (Linton, Mello & O‘Neill, 1995) Disability studies is further defined by Linton (1993), Disability Studies reframes the study of disability by focusing on it as a social phenomenon, social construct, metaphor, and culture utilizing a minority group model. It examines ideas related to disability in all forms of cultural representations throughout history, and examines the policies and practices of all societies to understand the social, rather than the physical or psychological, determinants of the experience of disability. Disability Studies both emanates from and supports the Disability Rights Movement, which advocates for civil rights and self-determination. This focus shifts the emphasis from a prevention/treatment/remediation paradigm, to a social/cultural/political paradigm. This shift does not signify a denial of the presence of impairments, nor a rejection of the utility of intervention and treatment. Instead, Disability Studies has been developed to disentangle impairments from the myth, ideology, and stigma that influence social interaction and social policy. The **scholarship challenges the idea that the economic and social statuses and the assigned roles of people with disabilities are inevitable** outcomes of their condition. (1993) In what follows **[there] is a critical engagement of dissecting the history and definition of disability on how it is used to oppress, dominate, repress, and suppress others and an emergence of a new pedagogy for those identified as disabled.** Dissecting Disability

Fiat ignores social change that happens outside the state. Non-state politics are necessary and effect people in their day-to-day lives. Very few debaters become policy makers, but we can all engage in social change. **Traber**, Becca. “Fiat and radical Politics.” Nsdupdate. January 17, 2018. Web. <http://nsdupdate.com/2018/fiat-and-radical-politics-by-becca-traber/>

**Insisting on fiat** in all cases functionally **means** that **we cannot run arguments about politics outside the state** without radically distorting the nature of that politics. Many debaters assume that the only “practical” or “pragmatic” politics occur through the state. However, this is not the case. Things like the feminist **movements** intervention **on norms** of sexual harassment **are examples of politics outside the state.** Collapsing the recent backlash to sexual harrasment precipitated by Harvey Weinstein and others to possible state action ignores that **the state could not** possibly **intervene** in an **adequate[ly]** way to change those norms. The norms about sexual behavior in the workplace must change, but they can only reasonably change through politics engaged outside the state. Thinking of it in terms of state **politics conceals the necessity of non-state politics.**This is uniquely bad because the reality of the situation is that the percentage of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the state is minuscule, but **all debaters could** plausibly **engage in non-state movement politics.** All the evidence that people read in favor of fiat and state-based implementation makes education claims that assume the necessary training one needs to engage in politics involves thinking about the state, but fiat is not the tool to do that. Fiat doesn’t ask us to think about how to engage in politics as citizens who live under a state, it asks us to pretend that we are the state. In a real way, it is also inadequate as a way of roleplaying a policy-maker, because the reality of politics as a legislature is significantly more complicated than being able to wave a magic wand and implement whatever policy is wanted. Fiat is a construction where we don’t even roleplaying as a human, much less as plausibly political actors.

**2**

**Interpretation: The affirmative must only garner offense from proving permanently claiming a part of space is bad, e.g. appropriating a planet, star etc.**

**Violation: Their plan and offense is about satellites, which don’t permanently claim a part of space since they move around and aren’t in the same spot for more than milliseconds.**

**Appropriation means:**

[**https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/appropriation**](https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/appropriation)

**The action of taking something for one's own use, typically without the owner's permission.**

**Thus, satellites aren’t appropriation because they don’t take a part of space.**

**Prefer for logic, sending a boat into the ocean isn’t appropriating the ocean because you’re not claiming property rights to the ocean. Satellites rotate around the earth, which means you’re not claiming property rights to any particular part of space.**

**Standards:**

1. **Limits: When “this thing uses space” counts as a topical aff it explodes the number and type of potential affs. You can garner offense from things like private entities shouldn’t use rockets, shouldn’t send up weather balloons, shouldn’t launch telescopes, etc. Which is an impossible prep burden on the negative because it means there are literally infinite different variety of topic literature I have to be prepared on.**
2. **Precision: When you can just start defending stuff that kind of has to do with space, that artificially inflates aff ground because you can just cherry pick trivially true policy proposals and skirt out of core neg disads.**

Fairness:

DTD:

No RVIs:

CI:
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**Interpretation:**

**Reject 1AR Theory:**

**1. It gives them a 7-6 time skew.**

**2. All of the responses to my counterinterp will be new which means the aff has a massive structural advantage, since they just get to make up random turns against the counterinterp and auto win.**

**3. You get two speeches on it and I only get one.**

**4. Worst case scenario use reasonability and drop the argument on 1AR shells, this is especially key since it prevents them from blitzing like 8 1AR shells and auto winning every round. This checks infinite abuse because you can beat abusive practices with theory.**

**5. On Infinite Abuse:**

**a) If they leverage this make them meet an infinite abuse brightline in the 1AR.**

**b)You have other metrics of uplayer which check without the setbacks.**

**c)Spikes solve, you can just preempt what would be infinitely abusive.**

**6. Reject AC paradigm issues, make them justify specific paradigm issues in the 1AR and let the 2N respond. This is key because I don’t know whether or not to respond to the paradigm issues without seeing the shell. Additionally, I shouldn’t have to answer them in the NC since I either respond to them and waste time, or drop them and you read like 10 shells.**

**7. Neg Shells Outweigh**

**a) Aff abuse justifies neg abuse, my strategy was designed in response to your aff which means the abuse is your fault.**

**b) It’s more tested, since we have more time and speeches on the shells to flush them out.**

**c) Cross apply how 1AR shells are massively aff skewed.**

**8. No 1AR weighing on 1AR shells because it means any weighing arg I drop is an auto loss since it gets blown up in the 2AR with no 3NR to reconcile.**