# 1NC

## 1

### OFF

#### Interpretation – debaters must disclose the affirmative 30 minutes before the round. If it is new they should disclose the plan text + framing + advantage area 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation – they didn’t ss in the doc – hold the line on I meets they will try to make a tricky I meet but they obviously don’t

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### [1] DTD on 1nc theory and disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence

#### [2] Reject all responses to disclosure – they selectively comply with our norm because they disclose some docs that meet our criteria which proves we can’t verify what norms they actually agree with.

#### [3] No RVI on ac theory – chilling infinite abuse, substance ed, illogical

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] bites judge intervention cuz they have to gut check what they think is good 3] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL 4] norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

#### [5] Disclosure outweighs – it’s key to assessing the honesty of the form of your argumentation and how you presented arguments which means it precludes 1nc claims also lexically prior forced down strat

#### [5] Fairness is an impact –

#### A] Fairness is good and prior – debate’s a game that requires effective competition and negation, which makes their offense inevitable, it internal link turns clash and engagement.

#### 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] Inescapable – the AC conforms to every norm of debate – speed, speech times, ballots – proves they value playing the game and isolating T as the one bad rule is arbitrary.

#### E] Probability – ballots can’t shape our subjectivity or create broad political change but can rectify in-round skews.

#### F] Students with autism need rules to engage in the space – means theory is good because it establishes rules

**Nebraska Autism Spectrum Disorders Network 16** (Nebraska Autism Spectrum Disorders Network, 8-29-2016, "Rules and Routines," University Of Nebraska–Lincoln, https://www.unl.edu/asdnetwork/virtual-strategies/rules-and-routines )

Many **students with autism rely on rules** and routines to **keep their environment predictable and, therefore, feel safer.** Educational professionals and parents must understand the importance of rules and routines for individuals with autism and apply them in various settings and situations. **Application of rules** and routines in school and home **helps students with autism engage more successfully in activities** and prevents problem behavior. Routines help create an efficient environment – they save time. When students know routines, they can perform daily activities more quickly.

#### G] Predictability is an impact.

#### Alexsander, http://myautismexplained.wordpress.com/2013/05/15/77/NJW

A Stable Environment **A stable and preferable unchanging environment is another important contributing factor to an autistic person’s wellbeing**. We need to have one or several places, to which we can retreat when things get rough. In these sanctuaries, we can relax and just be ourselves because we feel (almost) completely safe. For me, these sanctuaries are physical rather than mental places. I can retreat to my home, switch off the doorbell, switch on the answer phone and have a quiet lie-down. Unfortunately, this does not work as well when I am up and about. There are few retreats on the road. I can imagine that some of you would say that avoidance tactics are the wrong way to deal with problems; that we have to confront stressful situations face to face! But **please bear in mind that people with autism do not avoid stressful situations because they are afraid of the event as such – they avoid them because they would be confronted with an unanticipated barrage of sensory impressions that they simply don’t feel they can cope with!** Also please note that I am here referring to the “autistic elements” of this kind of behaviour. Of course, insecurity and/or phobias can come into this equation – for autistic as well as for neurotypical persons. Here is an example: A person with autism often avoids large groups of people. This is usually because he fears the sensory overload that may go with this situation and not necessarily because he is afraid of people. Yet regardless of whether they have autism or not, people may have sociophobic tendencies, which means that they do fear people. That, a priori, has nothing to do with autism. The above-mentioned “safe place” or “sanctuary” may take different shapes depending on the individual. One type of person may need a specific place in order to relax. For me, the appearance of the room may change as long as it is still in the same apartment or building. For others, the slightest change in appearance may jeopardize its perceived safety. This may be the order in which things are arranged in a closet, the order of books or CDs in a shelf, the position of the pens on the desk or any number of minute changes that a neurotypical person will probably not even pick up on. I for my part tend to fret when the screw head of the kitchen scissors in our knife block is pointing outwards. On the scissor’s other side, a small red dot covers the spot and that for me makes all the difference. **Neurotypical people may not even notice this, but it has a big impact on my overall well-being. When all is not as it should be in my personal environment, I no longer feel safe and relaxed.** The extreme sensitivity to the smallest detail, visual or otherwise, explains the autistic person’s need to retreat from the sheer barrage of input from time to time!

#### No impact turns:

#### 1] T is just an argument for why the aff is a bad idea, which is what every single negative position says—there’s nothing unique about T that causes violence but the cap k or case turns don’t

#### 2] T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether.

**Use competing interps—reasonability collapses to offense defense paradigm.**

**No RVIs — Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect**

## 2

### OFF

#### **A. Interpretation: If the affirmative reads arguments related to ableist violence they must give a content warning before their speech. These conversations are empirically trauma inducing and warnings are a good idea. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Similarly, in their original petition, Oberlin students suggested trigger warnings when "issues of privilege and oppression" arise in the classroom (AAUP). Such suggestions also conflate potential discomfort, or personal injury, with the disabling affects of trauma and being triggered. However, an opportunity arises when students make these conflations. As educators, rather than dismissing trigger warnings outright, we could engage students about how systems of oppression work and explain the difference between pedagogically productive discomfort and trigger-induced re-traumatization. As educators, we could use this conversation as an opportunity to discuss the use of trigger warnings before the Internet. Historically, trigger warnings, Andrea Smith reminds us, began as "a part of a complex of practices" within the anti-violence movement working to recognize "that we are not unaffected by the political and intellectual work that we do" and that "the labor of healing has to be shared by all" (Smith).

#### **B. Violation: They didn’t give a content warning.**

#### **C. Standard:**

#### **1. Access – Content warnings for those who suffer from trauma or anxiety are excluded from the conversation without content warnings. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Given these findings, it is imperative that the debate on trigger warnings focus on the inherent questions of access. However, because of the misuse of "triggered" to reference anything that makes someone uncomfortable, disagreements about the classroom as a "safe space" often divert the conversation away from any real discussion of pedagogy and access in higher education. In his 2012 research, Mark Salzer found that students with mental illness were more likely to withdraw because of the impact of "perceived sigma and discrimination" than because of personal struggles with the symptoms or stresses related to their disability (Salzer 1). Because such students are "often viewed as disruptive, lacking academic skill, prone to violence" they are often socially isolated and left alone to question "how welcome they are on campus" (2). These findings suggest that simply providing information about mental illness and "chiding the audience to treat individuals with mental illness" by noting the available resources, is not an effective approach to decreasing the rate of withdraw for disabled students (6). The false conflations of access with "safety" allow accommodations to be dismissed, and only serve to further marginalize mentally disabled students by telling them they are in fact not welcome because their needs disrupt the processes of learning their peers deserve. In the most basic sense, accommodations are not about "safety," but about access to opportunity for a more livable life. When disability is denied because it is not understood or seen, or when access is denied because it is inconvenient or complicated, humanity is denied. While it is certainly possible to recognize trauma as a mental disability and still be hesitant toward trigger warnings as an accommodation practice,14 the content and tenor of that conversation would be far removed from the outright hostility and rejection that has reverberated most widely. When presented as an access measure, it becomes evident that trigger warnings do not provide a way to "opt out" of anything, nor do they offer protection from the realities of the world. Trigger warnings provide a way to "opt in" by lessening the power of the shock and the unexpectedness, and granting the traumatized individual agency to attend to the affect and effects of their trauma. Traumatized individuals know that trigger warnings will not save us. Such warnings simply allow us to do the work we need to do so that we can participate in the conversation or activity. They allow us to enter the conversation, just like automatic doors allow people who use wheelchairs to more easily enter a building.

#### Voters: Access is an independent voter – a) it’s a prior question to engaging in the space b) it’s a violation of the humanity of the opponent c) we are people before we’re debaters which makes it most intrinsic to the nature of the activity.

## 3

### OFF

Interp – debaters may not just evaluating the debate after the 1ac and not have it in the doc

Violation – you did

1] infinite abuse

2] ableism

3] able bodied shiftiness

## Case

### UV

New 2nr responses cards have different implications and can apply to different args which shifts – either way err on the side of more debating to test methods of liberation

### Top Level

Top level – the affirmative justifies semiocapitalism that signifiers structure capitalism and devalue humanity – ill concede that but that takes out the aff

### Case

#### Gender DA – Theorizing disability cannot occur outside the context of gender. The masculine domination of disability politics ensures that disabled women’s issues are written off as merely women’s issues. This reinforces the patriarchal structure of society while ensuring disability politics is woefully insufficient.

Kang, 2010 (Min Hui – Senior Researcher in Korea Disabled People's Development Institute, “Enabling Community: Disabled Women's Practice of Changing Disability Values”, *Asian Journal of Women’s Studies* 16.4, shae)

Since the mid-1980s, "human rights" and "equality" for the marginalized have taken center stage in the social movement in Korean society and the issues concerning them have increasingly attracted attention. By virtue of this change in social milieu, disability has come to be recognized as a critical social issue, especially in the last decade. However, the attention paid to disability has not covered disabled women's issues adequately. Social interest has been mainly focused on several issues, wherein disabled men have dominated the disability movement. Even though considerable numbers of disabled women were deeply involved in and performed essential roles in the disability movement, they were merely considered assistants or supporters. The problems that disabled women faced in their lives and, therefore, intended to publicize as key agenda items for the disability movement, were completely ignored by the men activists simply because they were women's matters. This patriarchal mood within the movement led disabled women to organize their own movement groups. These women from within the conventional disability movement as well as other groups or organizations joined hands to form a nationwide disabled women's network The first official group of disabled women, Korean Differently Abled Women United (KDAWU), began its activity in 1994 and has grown notably in terms of both external scale and internal capability. The beginning of political activity by disabled women was, on the one hand, really an opportunity for the most marginalized group in Korean society to appeal with their message that the exclusion and the discrimination they experienced was more severe than any other group experienced. On the other hand, it was also a chance for disabled women to become empowered, in that they could break their silence and embark on a struggle against social injustice. Through their movement, they have developed alternative values in order to tackle the able-body-centered culture and, at the same time, to practice disability-inclusive politics. With these new values, disabled women have also developed the philosophical basis and practical tools to resist patriarchal disablism in Korea. In this paper I recognize the significance of the disabled women's movement, considering that its politics can be acknowledged as a counter-discourse to the dominant discourse, which is disability-exclusive. Also, this paper pays attention to the fact that, as a part of the counter-culture in a disablist society, disabled women's politics can provide a model for fighting discriminative values and resisting oppression. It analyzes the meanings and significance of disabled women's politics, focusing on what these women practice within their own movement groups, which can be considered their "safe community." I, therefore, begin with a theoretical review of disability and emancipatory politics, introduce the methods employed, and analyze disabled women's practices under the four sub-themes of "sharing experience," "tackling able-body-centered concepts," "building an emancipatory community," and "practicing disability-embodied gender politics."

#### No biopower impact---US democratic system prevents genocide

Dickinson 4 – Edward Ross Dickinson, Associate Professor, History Ph.D., U.C. Berkeley, Central European History, Vol. 37 No. 1, p. 34-36

And it is, of course, embedded in a broader discursive complex (institutions, professions, fields of social, medical, and psychological expertise) that pursues these same aims in often even more effective and inescapable ways.89 In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakable.

Both are instances of the “disciplinary society” and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different strategic and local dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes. Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism. Above all, again, it has nowhere developed the fateful, radicalizing dynamic that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic that leads from economistic population management to mass murder. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies.

In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce “health,” such a system can —and historically does— create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, there are political and policy potentials and constraints in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of self-direction and participation that is functionally incompatible with authoritarian or totalitarian structures. And this pursuit of biopolitical ends through a regime of democratic citizenship does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies, and to have generated a “logic” or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.90

Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of “liberty,” just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics, the only end point of the logic of social engineering.

This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not “opposites,” in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept “power” should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively “the same.” Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, “tactically polyvalent.” Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create “multiple modernities,” modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.91

#### No alt to biopolitics, it’s not the root cause, and it’s self-correcting

Parry 5 – John Parry (Visiting Professor, Lewis & Clark Law School; Associate Professor, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, lewis and clark law journal vol 9 ““SOCIETY MUST BE [REGULATED]”: BIOPOLITICS AND THE COMMERCE CLAUSE IN GONZALES V. RAICH” Lexis)

III. WHAT’S SO BAD ABOUT BIOPOLITICS?

My goal so far has not been to convince readers that biopolitics is good or bad, although the tone of the preceding section leans toward the negative. Instead, I have tried to argue not only that the idea of biopolitics reflects our current social arrangements, but also that constitutional doctrine accepts it, makes room for it, and sometimes endorses it. That said, I want to close by suggesting that biopolitics, while perhaps not necessarily good, is at least not wholly bad. Absent realistic alternatives, this claim is certainly worth considering. Foucault, for example, never charted a way out of biopolitics beyond developing an individual aesthetic of self discipline and regulation—the “care of the self.” 94 Other writers speak of achieving something like a “new politics,” which usually means some combination of personal freedom that includes the substance—but often not the legal baggage—of individual human rights, combined with an ideal of community that fits uneasily with the ideal of personal freedom (thus the “politics,” which are likely to be anything but new), as well as a more egalitarian economic arrangement and the social safety net of the modern welfare state, but without the modern state itself. Even assuming this vision is desirable, no one has any practical idea how to make it happen. 95 My basic assertions are that the ills laid at the feet of biopolitics are not entirely its fault and that they are in any event the costs of “progress.” Consider, first, the charges. Critics point out that in the modern, centralized, biopolitical state, our individuality is suppressed to the larger goal of managing the population. As a result, we become detached and alienated, even as we are disciplined and regulated. At best we can resort to coping strategies, but larger transformation of our social environment is impossible. 96 The flaw in this diagnosis is that it treats the alienated individual as problematic, as if there were an a contextual, dehistoricized thing known as “an individual” that is capable of being alienated or not, with the result that we should try to make it less, rather than more, alienated. Far more likely is that the idea of the individual developed in the modern period along with the modern state and that alienation is part of what defines an individual. To the extent the “problem” of the alienated individual has significance in the contemporary world, in other words, it is a direct consequence of the enlightenment and can only be solved through biopolitics. Indeed, biopolitics simply reflects the enlightenment project of promoting reason in place of “superstition” and arbitrary power. Social structures have become rationalized, so that governments are more likely to operate by articulated policy instead of fiat, the rule of law instead of whim, and democracy instead of hereditary rule or warlordism. The creation of the individual—a rational, rights-bearing but also alienated entity—is critical to all of these developments.