#### The aff’s expansion of the medical complex is not an expansion of care, but rather, an expansion of an industry that labors to eradicate all diseases, which results in lethal eradication of difference, conceptualizing of bodies into medical objects, and accepts death if a cure is possible.
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I play out an imaginary future in my head: disability has been cured. The medical-industrial complex has worked toward this moment for many decades. The visceral experiences named by thousands of diagnostic labels will soon cease to exist both in individual body-minds and collectively in the world. I think about myself and all the disabled people around me- acquaintances, friends, coworkers, neighbors, family members, lovers, activists, cultural workers. I think about what we offer the world--comedy, poetry, performance art, passionate activism, sexy films, important thinking, good conversation, fun. I think about who we are and the ways in which our particular body-minds have shaped us. Who would we be without disability? Disability activist Harriet McBryde Johnson writes, "Are [disabled people] 'worse off'? I don't think so. Not in any meaningful sense. There are too many variables. For those of us with congenital conditions, disability shapes all we are. Those disabled later in life adapt. We take constraints that no one would choose and build rich and satisfying lives within them. We enjoy pleasures other people enjoy, and pleasures pe-culiarly our own. We have something the world needs."3 In my imaginary future, we, or future generations like us, wouldn't exist. I feel neither triumph nor progress but loss. At the center of cure lies eradication and the many kinds of violence that accompany it. On the surface, this claim appears hyperbolic. Many lives, including my own, depend on or have been made possible by cure and its technologies. As it supports and extends life, the restoration of health seems to be the opposite of eradication. But cure arrives in many different guises, connected to elimination and erasure in a variety of configurations. In one permutation, the same medical-industrial complex that saved my mother and me would, if it could, eliminate cerebral palsy from both my individual body-mind and the world at large. In this guise, a multitude of visceral differences would cease to exist. They include both life- threatening conditions (AIDS, malaria, smallpox, and many kinds of cancer, to name a few) and conditions deemed defects but that aren't necessarily lethal (autism, cerebral palsy, hearing voices, and the lasting impacts of spinal cord injuries, for example). The list of body-mind differences, illnesses, and so-called defects that the medical-industrial complex wants to eradicate goes on and on. This kind of elimination benefits some of us in significant ways-saving our lives or increasing our comfort. At the same time, it also commits damage, routinely turning body-minds into medical objects and creating lies about normal and natural. In a second permutation, the medical-industrial complex focuses not specific diseases and disorders but rather on the people who have these conditions. This kind of eradication is often intent on changing the future by manipulating the present. I think about disability-selective abortion. In today's world, the ideology of cure doesn't suggest that we round up everyone who has Down Syndrome and eliminate them. Instead, genetic testing and counseling are paired with abortion, setting the scene for eradicating the future possibility of people with Down. Every day doctors pressure pregnant people to undergo genetic testing, and counselors release the results and guide the course of the conversations that follow. As a result, prospective parents in the United States decide to abort about two-thirds of fetuses predicted to have Down. This termination of pregnancy for the specific reason of not wanting a disabled child clearly manipulates the present. Eradication happens in this moment, but it also extends into a future that is no more than nine months away. In that future, one less person with Down syndrome exists. The choice of each individual parent stacks up until thousands of fetuses predicted to have Down are aborted every year. I'm less interested in the rightness or wrongness of these choices by themselves than in the distinct pattern they create when placed side by side, exposing the systemic desire to erase a whole group of people. This future-focused eradication is easy to shrug past, because many of us have been seduced into believing the need to eliminate disability and "defectiveness" is intuitively obvious. In a third permutation, the resolve to eradicate particular body-mind conditions stops for nothing, including the possibility of death in the present. I think about the separation of conjoined twins. These surgeries are intensely risky and not always necessary for survival and well-being. Often the high-tech, hours-long medical procedures become media spectacles, with cameras following the families and filming the operations. In an ABC News story from 2015 about the separation of the infants Connor and Carter Mirabal, a nurse says, "Now they are truly boys, individuals," suggesting that a non-conjoined body-mind is a requirement for individuality, possibly even for personhood. Moments later one of the surgeons echoes her sentiments: "It felt good to see them in separate rooms. They seem like individuals now." This emphasis on individuality underlines their belief in the superiority of one kind of body-mind over another. We never learn how Connor and Carter were actually doing before. Was this surgery essential for their survival? Or was it an exercise in eliminating what is deemed abnormal and defective, reshaping it to be normal? In some separation surgeries, doctors intentionally sacrifice one of the twins in order to save the other, most often when neither will survive if they remain conjoined. This exact situation landed in the court system in the United Kingdom in 2000. Doctors at St. Mary's hospital in Manchester, England, wanted to pursue the separation of Gracie and Rosie Attard, a surgery that they knew would lead to Rosie's death. Their parents, Michaelangelo and Rina Attard, refused to give consent. The surgeons sued the Attards and won. In the legal decision, the judges' logic is revealing. One declared, "The operation would give [Rosie], even in death, bodily integrity as a human being." Without apology, he justified the eradication of this disabled girl through an argument about personhood. In his logic, literal elimination of life becomes cure. In all three configurations, elimination of some kind-of a disease, of future existence, of present-day embodiments, of life itself- is essential to the work of cure. Sometimes these eradications result in benefit, but they can also cause individual death and the diminishment of whole groups of people. The violence that shadows these erasures could be framed as a mere side effect, or the unavoidable cost, of saving lives and normalizing body-minds. But let me suggest a different framing: that this violence is something more inherent-a consequence, an impact, even an intent. I don't mean that each individual instance of cure is violent. Remember, the restoration of health arrives in many slippery guises. Rather I mean that as a widespread ideology centered on eradication, cure always operates in relationship to violence

#### Inclusnism in society only forces disabled people to desire normalcy leading to re-injuring ourselves

**Campbell 08**. Dr Fiona Kumari Campbellis a Senior Lecturer in the School of Health and Wellbeing at the University of South Queensland <http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/21024/50540_1.pdf> “Exploring Internalized Ableism using Critical Race Theory” Disability and Society, Vol. 23 (2), p. 151-162 NT 16

**Internalized oppression is not the cause of our mistreatment; it is the result of our mistreatment**. It would not exist without the real external oppression that forms the social climate in which we exist. Once oppression has been internalized, little force is needed to keep us submissive. **We harbour inside ourselves the pain and the memories, the fears and the confusions, the negative self-images and the low expectations, turning them into weapons with which to re-injure ourselves, every day of our lives. (Mason, as cited Marks, 1999, p.25). Internalised ableism means that to assimilate into the norm the referentially disabled individual is required to embrace, indeed to assume an ‘identity’ other than one’s own – and this subject is repeatedly reminded by epistemological formations and individuals with hegemonic subjectifications of their provisional and (real) identity**. I am not implying that subjects have a true or real essence. Indeed the subjects' formation is in a constant state of fluidity, multiplicity and (re)formation. However, disabled people often feel compelled to fabricate ‘who’ they are – to adopt postures and comportments that are additional to self. The formation of internalised ableism cannot be simply deduced by assessing the responses of individuals to Althusser’s famous interpolative hailing “Hey you, there” (Althusser & Balibar, 1979). Whilst a subject may respond to “Hey you there, crip!” – it is naïve to assume that an affirmative response to this hailing repressively inaugurates negative disabled subjectification. In fact the adoption of more positive or oppositional ontologies of disability by the subject in question may be unexpectedly enabling. As Susan Park (2000: 91) argues “what is at stake here is not so much the accuracy behind the hailing privilege, but the power of the hailing itself to instantly determine (or elide) that thing it is naming”. Nonetheless, censure and the cancellation of the legitimacy of oppositional subjectivities remains common place as Cherney reminds us with respect to Deaf culture: “If abnormal [sic] bodies must be fixed to fit within dominant cultural views of appropriateness then the Deaf celebration of their differences must be read as an illegitimate model of advocacy”. (Cherney, 1999, p. 33). 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 AfricanAmericans 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 detachment appears locked in**to 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 from her 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.**

#### \*T And The role of the ballot is to challenge ableism. Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question \*A Campbell 13\*C

**Campbell 13 (Fiona Kumari Campbell, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Disability Studies at Griffith University. Wednesday 27 November 2013. Problematizing Vulnerability: Engaging Studies in Ableism and Disability Jurisprudence. Keynote speech at Disability at the Margins: Vulnerability, Empowerment and the Criminal Law)**

What is meant by the concept of ableism? The literature suggests that the term is often used fluidly with limited definitional or conceptual specificity. The work of Carlson (2001)5 and Campbell (2001) represented a turning point in bringing attention to this new site of subordination not just in terms of disablement but also ableism’s application to other devalued groups. **Ableism is** deeply **seeded at the level of knowledge systems** of life, personhood and liveability. **Ableism is not just** a matter of ignorance or **negative attitudes** towards disabled people; **it is a schema of perfection**, **a** deep **way of thinking about bodies**, wholeness and permeability.6 As such integrating ableism into social research and advocacy strategies represents a significant challenge to practice as ableism moves beyond the more familiar territory of social inclusion and usual indices of exclusion to the very divisions of life. Bringing together the study of existence and knowledge systems, ableism is difficult to pin down. Ableism is a set of processes and practices that arise and decline through sequences of causal convergences influenced by the elements of time, space, bodily inflections and circumstance. Ability and the corresponding notion of ableism are intertwined. **Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the** very **foundations of social theory**, therapeutic jurisprudence, advocacy, medicine and law; or in the mappings of human anatomy. Summarised by Campbell (2001, 44) Ableism refers to; …A network of beliefs processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the bodily standard) that is projected as the perfect, speciestypical and therefore essential and fully human. Disability then is cast as a diminished state of being human. Writing today (2013) I add an addition to this definition: ‘The ableist bodily configuration is immutable, permanent and laden with qualities of perfectionism or the enhancement imperative orientated towards a self-contained improvability’. Sentiency applies to not just the human but the ‘animal’ world. As a category to differentiate the normal from the pathological, the concept of **abledness is predicated on** some **preexisting notion about the nature of typical** species **functioning** that is beyond culture and historical context. **Ableism** does not just stop at propagating what is typical for each species. An ableist imaginary **tells us what** a healthy body means – a normal mind, the pace, the tenor of **thinking and** the kinds of **emotions** and affect that **are suitable to express**. Of course these ‘fictional’ characteristics then are promoted as a natural ideal. This abled imaginary relies upon the existence of an unacknowledged imagined shared community of able-bodied/minded people held together by a common ableist world view that asserts the preferability and compulsoriness of the norms of ableism. Such ableist schemas erase differences in the ways humans express our emotions, use our thinking and bodies in different cultures and in different situations. This in turn enacts bodily Otherness rendered sometimes as the ‘disabled’, ‘perverted’ or ‘abnormal body’, clearly demarcating the boundaries of normal and pathological. A critical feature of an ableist orientation is a belief that impairment or disability is inherently negative and at its essence is a form of harm in need of improvement, cure or indeed eradication. Studies in Ableism (SiA) inverts traditional approaches, by shifting our concentration to what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism. In not looking solely at disability, we can focus on how the abled able-bodied, non-disabled identity is maintained and privileged. Disability does not even need to be in the picture. SiA’s interest in abledness means that the theoretical foundations are readily [is]applicable to the study of difference and the dividing practices of race, gender, location and sexual orientation. **Reframing our focus** from disability to ableism prompts different preoccupations: • What does the study of the politics of ‘vulnerability’ tells us about what it me ty ans to be ‘non-vulnerable’? • Indeed how is the very conceptualisation of ‘autonomy’ framed in the light of discourses of ‘vulnerability’? • In representing vulnerabilias universal does this detract from the specificity of disability experiences? SiA examines the ways that concepts of wellbeing, vulnerability and deficiency circulate throughout society and impact upon economic, social, legal and ethical choices. Principally SiA focuses on the limits of tolerance and possessive individualism. Extending the theorization of disability, studies in ableism **can enrich our understanding of the** production of vulnerability and the **terms of engagement in** civic **life** and the possibilities of social inclusion. I now turn to unpacking the nuances and structure of a theory of ableism.

#### Thus, vote neg to delve into madness – refuse rationalist frames of enlightened humanism in favor of recognizing disability as the ground state of life.
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If politics suggests a move towards self-possession within the predetermined terms of normative democratic struggle, then what might an alternative look, sound, feel or move like? Not an alternative politics, but rather an alternative modality of moving, listening, feeling, dancing, laughing, loving, and studying with and within, against and beyond the political, the struggle for representation and recourse, even, the inherited notion of the subject, of the individual, of the human? Having recognised as illusory the recognition offered by these inherited grammars of colonial subjectivity, the state’s recognition in turn appears unrecognizable, betraying an absolute inability to ever really recognise (us, itself, or anything).100 We therefore refuse recognition and in doing so refuse the regulative (il)logics that made possible such an arrogant assertion of authority at all. Indeed, the imperative to make oneself intelligible holds (at least the trace of) a colonial and colonising move, the imposed order assuming itself as an origin predicated on a disavowal of what was already and always there—as if any person or thing did not matter until presented as (a) matter that matters. We lean into and away from, moving through and around, bending and breaking these inherited grammars, whether found in the classroom or the prison, the boardroom or the bathroom, in an academic conference on radical Marxist utopias or a panel of experts on the latest innovations in extractive economics, whether it’s the borders drawn on the soil or the soul, those that define money or marriage, care from work, law from lore, prescribing and proscribing what is considered appropriate and intelligible and passable for the housewife and the sex worker, the trans hacker and the military man, the artist and the audience, the doctor and the junkie, the cyborg and the human, the professor and the student, the cop and the crim. What would it mean, for us and ours, to refuse such calls? What would it mean to accept instead the call to disorder, which quickly reveals itself to have always already been there, circling and shadowing every scant statute of order, every arrogant assumption of authority? What would it mean to recognise that we are always already in the wild and unsettling, imaginative and improvisatory and irreducibly collective call (and response) of undercommon (dis)order, that the call (and response) is always already within us? Attendance to these non-spaces of transitivity and fugitivity that surround and unsettle the frame, these wild and prophetic movements that produce the conditions of possibility for the or any frame, is given not only in celebration and reclamation of ourselves and all of that which was deemed excessive, disordered, or dissonant, but also in the timeless truth of that most mundane but nonetheless vital cliché: “We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.” Put simply, whatever ‘the future’ means or looks like, it’s not something we can ever picture or describe, and even if our utopian visions have somehow covered all bases and can guarantee a good life for all, we’re certainly not going to ‘get there’ using the same tools, languages, stories, theories, or whatever else that got us ‘here’. And so we must fall into this madness, these disordered and disordering, unsettling and unsettled movements of the fugitive public, to trace and follow those movements and join them, knowing that to do so is simply to believe in the world and to want to be in it, to want to be in it all the way to the end of it because we believe in another world in this world and we want to be in that.101 The world we believe in is maybe not ‘a world’ at all, but it might have something to do with the Earth, with life, with love and imagination and togetherness, and in any case it takes it cue from something quite old-new. This is the decolonial horizon that we stay facing, that we stay running from and for, guided and humbled by what we sometimes can’t remember but can never forget, which keeps us from slipping into the meaninglessness of an anarchism with no regard for life or a liberalism with no regard for history. Struggling against and beyond normativity has never not involved a kind of madness, a madness that has never not had something to do with the irrepressibility of the imagination, its insurgent inventiveness, which has never been and can never be contained. The unsettlement given in and as refusal and fugitivity was and continues to be the condition of possibility for modernity, for the world order, for resistance and preservation and so much more that we don’t or can’t (yet) know, so let’s stay there, which is here, which is everywhere and nowhere, in the hold, in the break, as if entering this broken world again and again and again.102 But the weary watchmen of the unreal, never too far behind, (mis)hearing our wild and weird, unsettled and unsettling dream(ing)s from and for the Earth, call us back into line to remind us of the world, this unreal world that forgets the Earth and all of us in order to (re)call itself, again and again and again, as and into a violent yet illusory whole, populated by and assuming itself to be sovereign over numerous but never innumerable individuals with interests. And of course, despite failing to see what's really (un)real, when they tell us to get real, to get a real job and to get on with it, we know what they might be trying to say. As Smith tells it, we must “proceed through” the unreality of the colonised present. We must, however and whenever and wherever we can, live and love anyway, finding and forging ways to survive and navigate this world that (de)values life differently and prioritises the primacy of production over the preservation of the planet, of plurality and play—the risk of death never far in a world afraid of itself. We cannot be naïve about the hard materiality of (the) settlement and the violences it does to us, to ours, to all, nor can we delude ourselves into believing exodus was ever viable, “as if there was a space you could carve out of the terrorizing state apparatus in order to exist outside its clutches and forge some autonomy”.103 We can’t help being with(in) capitalism or (the) settlement, the university or the hospital or the city—we can’t avoid the hold(s) of language and subject, of nation and skin and class and gender. Escape in this absolute sense, for now, remains impossible, and so to live anyway, not naïve to the brutality of the normative while refusing to acquiesce to it, refusing the snare of recognition while noting its inevitability, is to live appositionally and impossibly, as if from and as a kind of internal outside, the irreducible fugitivity of flux and flight as it gives and takes refuge in the under and around and beyond of the unreal of the here and now. Fugitivity is therefore always a movement, in movement, this impossible yet constant “movement of escape, the stealth of the stolen that can be said, since it inheres in every closed circle, to break every enclosure”.104 Accepting this and insisting on that “fugitive impulse to rely on the undercommons for protection, to rely on the honor, and to insist on the honor of the fugitive community”105 is to hope against and beyond hope, where the latter is that which is offered in the hold of state recognition, in the hold of an adequately intelligible colonial subjecthood, in the hold, that is, of (the) settlement. Our refusal of that hope is self-preservation, in so far as we understand that the ultimate hope of that hope is total assimilation and integration, which is not but nothing other than the final notes of genocidal conquest. We refuse to leave however also in self-preservation, where what is being preserved is not just us and ours in the here and now but also that fugitive public, the “general inheritance of the shipped, the impossible tradition of those without tradition.”106 We hope only to find and follow that fugitive public, moving through and around these holds, reaching for and from that sublime otherwise that cuts through “the public and the private, the state and the economy.”107 The refusal at stake here is therefore also a refusal of the thinking that frames such wild and wide-eyed disavowal as unthinking or unserious, a refusal of that which frames such refusal as inaction or exodus. When what is being refused so often relies on, finds coherence around, is made possible by the fugitivity that is generated in and as that refusal, and when that refusal is given and taken in and as the appositional movements of “that internal outside, that unassimilated underground”108 then the question of disengagement falls apart. As Aria Dean puts it, “the black is always already mutually co-constituting capital and subjecthood simultaneously.”109 It follows then that the state that deems itself an authority to grant us recognition in the form of “an illusory right to what we do not have”110 is itself illusory and permeable, finding coherence only ever when called to regulate away the black plans and fugitive labour of the undercommons. The dichotomous proscription to either reform the state or overthrow it, to restore the university or flee, to save the institutions or burn them down, dissolves into a distraction as we come to see that revolutionary thought and action, which would better be described, if at all, as decolonial thought and action, or as fugitivity in and as decolonial futurity, is always already possible in every place that has been touched by coloniality, which is seemingly almost every place, including and perhaps especially ourselves, our own beings and becomings, our own epistemological, ontological, political and other assumptions, the language(s) by which we are able to say or know any of this and the grammar(s) by which such enunciations are able to make any sense at all. Refusing the world and not the Earth, refusing to acquiesce and refusing to leave— surely this is (im)possible, just the absurd sermons of the pathologically optimistic? To be sure, at stake are certain (im)possibilities at the heart of (the) settlement, the untold and uncontainable, always already existing reality of “fugitive movement in and out of the frame, bar, or whatever externally imposed social logic.”111 We feel and follow this fugitive poetics through the undercommons of the here-and-now, its constant and unmediated escape from and unsettling of every imposed order to appear for a moment as something called “social life”, whose “relation to law is reducible neither to simple interdiction nor bare transgression”.112 What is that “fugitive art of social life” that is “practiced on and over the edge of politics” and “beneath its ground” —how does it feel, how does it move? Of course, the point is we already know, that we have always already known, that we practise this every day that we can find and be with each other, every moment that we can remember that there is nothing wrong with us or ours, every night we rest in the embrace of our dreams that are as real as anything. Returning to face the machine, which shifts and spreads ceaselessly across the globe, accumulating and disposing (the disposables, which increasingly seems as a category to increase), refusal seems a certain (im)possibility.113 Not naïve to the enemy, knowing its illusory incoherence, reminded all too often of the hard materiality of its unreal impositions, the decolonial insurgent refuses capitalism in service of a memory of something else, refusing to forget the (im)possibility of autonomous and shared living—refusing to forget, that is, what remains evident everywhere around them, the irrepressible interconnectivity and cooperation that remains both before and beyond (always under and around) enclosure (eternally as its condition of possibility, as that which enclosure follows to (fail to) enclose). Illusive though the enemy might be, it persists with force and fabrications of fatalism, false desires and fake stories that for some reason won’t fade away, foreclosing the future for those who thought they saw it first, frozen forever in the hold(s) of the here-andnow, the flat and frenzied fever-dream of neoliberal techno-capital. Refusing capitalism and the coerced and cursed containment it carries over all, the dominance it assumes over seemingly every facet of life and living, the commodification and territorialisation of all things it brings relentlessly—seems indeed to require more or less a step away (and towards) the world as we (un)know it. No wonder (for) the West, as the critical histories articulated at the outset assert irrefutably: no wonder. Denying before all else (the all but lost wonders of) his own insurgent and imaginative interiority, Modernity’s weary Man wandered out (from itself), emerging from Europe’s Dark Ages on an awakening predicated primarily upon consumptive constructions of whiteness and purity, on virulent ideologies of fungibility and flesh—that is, on anti-blackness—that came before and variously found their ways into Marx’s early and magisterial but nonetheless narrowly-conceived theorisations of capital, accumulation, labour and exploitation. Put differently: if decolonisation remains our horizon, it is insufficient to refuse capitalism only to affirm communism, leaving untouched and unthought the hold(s) by which Marx was held, those by which our inherited Marxisms continue to hold even the idea of communal or shared living at all. Marx got a lot right, but he didn’t discover the idea of collectivism. Held by modernity, historical materialism, the universalist assumptions of bourgeois Europe, and the dream for better, Marx remains one of the most incisive observers of capital. His ideas have found widespread articulation, inspiring and overlapping with the freedom struggles of ‘colonised’ and ‘oppressed’ peoples around the world. However, his theories remain incomplete—worse, the exclusions at the heart of Marxism remain invisible, the unthought spectre of the Black (slave), the primitive accumulation of slavery that had kicked off years before the first capitalist.114 Forged through decades of radical Black organising and class struggle in the Deep South, the Jackson-Kush Plan follows innumerable forerunners and forebears “from the New Afrikan Independence Movement (NAIM) in particular and the BLM [Black Liberation Movement] in general”.115 The self-determined and collective efforts of the Malcolm X Grassroots Movement (MXGM) were central in instigating the People’s Hurricane Relief Fund in the face of total government neglect and indifference to the (predominantly Black) death and loss following Hurricane Katrina.116 The insurgent invention of the Jackson Human Rights Coalition in the 1980s117 was similarly pivotal in organising against police terror, white segregationist politics, and the other violent signs of the “the plantation bloc's restoration" in the contemporary South.118 Reflecting on Cooperation Jackson, the solidarity economy component of the plan, co-founder and co-director Kali Akuno references "eclectic sources of inspiration—Mondragon worker cooperatives in Spain, Zapatistas, cooperatives in the South going back 200 years in the Black community, projects in the early days of Tanzania, Algeria, Guyana.”119 The People’s Assembly, the model of democratic social organization at the heart of the plan, follows its roots “from the spiritual or prayer circles” of “enslaved Afrikans”, who (dis)organised in stealth to sustain and find each other and themselves, (de)forming community and resistance from the brutal (im)possibilities of the hold, an irruptive and eruptive refusal that evidently resonates today in the dreams and designs of Jackson’s Black, working, and poor communities.120 The deep and dark cuts of such broad (an)origins—which to be clear, even staying within the Black South, predates the birth of Karl Marx—gives the Jackson-Kush Plan not only its vision, but the vision also to recognise that in order to achieve that dream of selfdetermining, radically democratic, autonomous living that moved Marx and Malcolm alike, a “critical break with capitalism” would be essential but insufficient without “the dismantling of the American settler colonial project”.121 This is not simply to reorient our political and ethical focus, although indeed this is often necessary; rather, it is the Jackson-Kush Plan’s explicit (ap)position with(in) and against the “American settler colonial project” that is of most significance (to their organising, to this thesis, to all of us). The plan’s historical (and ecological and spiritual) scope and all the struggles and memories and traditions that it holds and is held by is key to its visionary, unsettled and unsettling demands as it affords to the communities and individuals working from or towards the plan the fugitive standpoint (of no and every standpoint).122 In other words, in recognising the illegitimacy and illusion of (the) settlement, the Jackson-Kush Plan discloses the (im)possibilities that eternally remain internal, under and around the hold(s) of (the) settlement, gesturing from and towards the ruptures in (the past that fracture) the here-and-now, suppressed socialities and runaway dreams of communal living that continue to pierce the present with splinters of hope and (im)possibility, (in)complete plans of productive fugitivity and fugitive productivity. Self-described as a “vehicle for sustainable community development, economic democracy, and community ownership”,123 Cooperation Jackson emerged in 2013 from the vision(s) of the Jackson-Kush Plan to develop a (re)generative solidarity network in Jackson, Mississippi (and everywhere else) across and through four interconnected and interdependent institutions: a federation of local green worker cooperatives and mutual aid networks, a cooperative incubator and sustainable development centre, a communal school and training facility, and a community-owned and controlled bank. The cooperative is maintained democratically through a People’s Assembly, a model of participatory selfgovernance and Black (and brown and poor) self-determination, organised without hierarchies via democratically determined agendas and working bodies.124 Linking with already existing regional and national solidarity economy networks (like the Southern Grassroots Economics Project and the US Solidarity Economy Network), and drawing on a wealth of theory and praxis elaborated in struggle through the 1980s and 90s in Latin America, Cooperation Jackson works for (and through and with) the multiplication of solidarity networks of mutually reinforcing cooperative initiatives. It seeks “a regenerative economy…. that not only restores and replenishes the resources it extracts from the earth, but aids in the actual restoration of our earth's ecosystems”.125 What it might (and indeed in places like Detroit, New York, and Atlanta is already beginning to126) look like is a regenerative network of mutually reinforcing yet interdependent and localised eco-villages self-sustaining via community production (of energy, food, life, and so on), enmeshed with urban and regional farms, farmers markets and community land trusts held by and holding communal financing and collective and ecologically-constrained enterprise, eventually evolving an autonomous public sector providing communal health care, transportation, education, housing, and whatever else the people themselves decide they want or need, according to (democratically determined and ecologically constrained) ability and need— elaborating and embodying an unsettling, dynamic, “all-embracing and class-oriented” model of community and worker unionism, centring the need to “build genuine worker power from the ground up… as the core transformative force to democratize the local economy and society”.127 Not afraid to push the vision to its (im)possible limits,128 Cooperation Jackson has already started towards what Akuno describes as “a critical initiative to own and control the means of industrial production”, which are increasingly represented by digital and automated—3D printing, quantum computing, procedural and artificially-intelligent— production technologies that are distributed and decentralised yet collectively and democratically owned and operated by “members of geographically and/or intentionally defined communities”.129 These ideas—described broadly as Community Production— serve as the foundation for Cooperation Jackson’s ultimate campaign to transform Jackson into “an innovative hub of sustainable manufacturing and fabrication”, a kind of model “city of the future”130 guided by “zero-emission and zero-waste”131 principles, a ‘Transition City’ anchored by not only cooperative 'fab(rication) labs'—able to produce "build-to-order, high quality, high volume 3D-printed products... from toys to medical aids and tools” as well as serving “essential production needs”132 of the community such as green housing or other services—but also an education division to train local workers and community members in distributed fabrication, open-source design and coding, and sustainable development. This is all guided by a commitment to democratising technology in general but particularly those technologies that increasingly constitute means of production, (pre)figuring such collective and visionary efforts as “a prelude towards the democratic transition to eco-socialism.”133 Indeed, this might sound like the communist dream, but it remains a dream, an impressive but nonetheless impotent economic plan of reform so long as we remain held “within a capitalist framework of social production governed by a bourgeois social order”.134 Cooperation Jackson therefore recognises the strategic necessity of what they call ‘dual power’, differentiating between autonomous power—the collective efforts of building solidarity power “outside of the state” primarily through People’s Assemblies and Solidarity Economies—but also strategic and fugitive engagements with “electoral politics on a limited scale” in refusal of its legitimacy and with the goal of subverting its logics and social relations, diluting its strength, and containing “the dictatorial power and ideological influence of monopoly capital”.135 In ‘dual power’ we see an unsettling and unsettled site of contradictory and compromising movements, a fracture in the walls and halls of the state, through and from which fugitivity flows, under and around the hold(s) of the here-and-now, moving to and for a different kind of beat altogether. Cooperation Jackson are certainly awake to not only the changes and challenges that characterise the contemporary moment—the dominance of the tech giants and their unholy union with the state and the police, their violent and impersonal imposition into every inch of our lives—but also the fugitive potentials that such technologies disclose, revealing contradictions that appear on the surface like splinters to be exploited and exploded. In its unsettling embrace of what might be called ‘fugitive development’, given and taken in their wild and wide-eyed plans for a future city amid a regenerative network of productive and cooperative local enterprises, Cooperation Jackson refuses capitalism as it unsettles it from within, from underneath and around and beyond, strategically leaning in to the language and (il)logics of the enterprising ‘developer’, however for goals explicitly opposed (and apposed) to those of neoliberal extractive capitalism. By assuming this unsettling (ap)position of the fugitive entrepreneur, the forerunners of the Jackson Kush Plan recognised not only the productive potential of the working class population, but also the ‘untapped’ industries and interests in and through which they hoped to thrive. In the face of the economic, industrial, and infrastructural neglect that characterises many cities of the Deep South, Cooperation Jackson instead sees this as opportunity, the “relatively sparse concentration of capital in Mississippi” affording a degree of “breathing room on the margins and within the cracks of the capitalist system”, in which a radical and visionary project of self-determination for Black and working-class people might manoeuvre, experiment, and thrive, building upon “a tremendous degree of pent up social demand waiting to be fulfilled”.136 The potential of ‘green energy’ and sustainable development is similarly viewed, identified as an opportunity to “get ahead of the curve” amid an increasing awareness of the viability of renewables.137 The explosions of the Internet and the digital era more generally revealed certain (im)possibilities of connection and communication with(in) the hold(s) of the here-and-now, the contradiction of feeling so alienated in a world so connected, bringing fugitive communities together across distances previously unimaginable—but the progression of (capital and its) technology notably also reveals, as it did to Marx so many years ago, the very real possibility of working less, of working differently, of working not at all or for or with or as something else entirely, “making a dramatic new orientation to work and labor possible”.138 These are the contradictions identified by Cooperation Jackson that they work to exploit, unsettling the circuits of capital from within and against the hold(s) of (the) settlement, guided by a commitment first and foremost to “regenerating the bounty of life on our planet, in all its diversity” but yet nonetheless welcoming “non-extractive, patient capital to move on many fronts”,139 such as by investing in the future of cooperative, ecologically-constrained solidarity initiatives. This suggests the emergence of potentially unusual alliances and contradictory movements, navigated strategically and dynamically with a view towards the decolonial horizon, unsettling any coalitional interaction or exchange it moves with—the invocation of ‘patient capital’, for example, suggests an interesting refusal and reconfiguration of taken-forgranted ideas about the role, value, and meaning of capital.

## Round reports

**Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2020-2021 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.**

**Violation: screenshot in the doc bronx and call positions just fw and disad**

**Standards:**

**1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for them to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it's an impact multiplier.**

**what you want to go for from the start.**

**Education- the reason we fund debate**

**Fairness- constitutive of a competitive activity**

**No RVI- Deter theory which is bad because is needed to check against abuse**

**Drop debater- to deter future abuse**

**Competing interps lead to judge intervention**

### Counter Plan

CP: Text we should launch nukes

#### Nuke war causes extinction – 3,000 scientists agree – ignore pseudoscientific ‘nuke war good’

Tegmark 17 Max Tegmark, 5-26-2017, "Why 3,000 Scientists Think Nuclear Arsenals Make Us Less Safe," Scientific American Blog Network, https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/why-3-000-scientists-think-nuclear-arsenals-make-us-less-safe/, SJBE Max Erik Tegmark is a Swedish-American physicist and cosmologist. He is a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the scientific director of the Foundational Questions Institute.

Delegates from most United Nations member states are gathering in New York next month to negotiate a nuclear weapons ban, and 30 Nobel Laureates, a former U.S. Secretary of Defense and over 3,000 other scientists from 84 countries have signed an [open letter](https://futureoflife.org/nuclear-open-letter/) in support. Why? We scientists like to geek out about probabilities, megatons and impact calculations, so we see the nuclear situation differently than many politicians and pundits. From the public debate, one might think that the cold war threat is over and that the most likely way to be killed by a nuke is by being attacked by Iran, North Korea or terrorists, but that’s not what nerdy number crunching reveals. Those media-dominating scenarios could potentially kill millions of people—except that Iran has no nukes and North Korea lacks missiles capable of reliably delivering their dozen or so Hiroshima-scale bombs. But scientific research has shown that a nuclear war between the superpowers might kill hundreds or potentially even thousands of times more people, and since it’s not a hundred times less likely to occur, the laws of statistics tell us that it’s the nuke scenario most likely to kill you. Why is superpower nuclear war so risky? First of all, massive firepower: there are more than [14,000 nuclear weapons](https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/) today, some of which are hundreds of times more powerful than North Korea’s and those dropped on Japan. Over 90 percent of these belong to Russia and the US, who keep thousands on hair-trigger alert, ready launch on minutes notice. A [1979 report by the US Government](https://www.princeton.edu/~ota/disk3/1979/7906/7906.PDF) estimated that all-out war would kill 28-88 percent of Americans and 22-50 percent of Soviets (150-450 million people with today’s populations). But this was before the risk of nuclear winter was discovered in the 1980’s.Researchers realized that regardless of whose cities burned, massive amounts of smoke could spread around the globe, blocking sunlight and transforming summers into winters, much like when asteroids or supervolcanoes caused mass extinctions in the past. A peer-reviewed analysis published by Robock et al (2007) showed cooling by about 20°C (36°F) in much of the core farming regions of the US, Europe, Russia and China (by 35°C in parts of Russia) for the first two summers, and about half that even a full decade later. Years of near-freezing summer temperatures would eliminate most of our food production. It is hard to predict exactly what would happen if thousands of Earth’s largest cities were reduced to rubble and global infrastructure collapsed, but whatever small fraction of all humans didn’t succumb to starvation, hypothermia or epidemics would probably need to cope with roving, armed gangs desperate for food. There are large uncertainties in Nuclear Winter predictions. For example, how much smoke is produced and how high up it rises would determine its severity and longevity. Given this uncertainty, there is no guarantee that most people would survive. It has therefore been argued that the traditional nuclear doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) be replaced by Self-Assured Destruction (SAD): even if one of the two superpowers were able to launch its full nuclear arsenal against the other without any retaliation whatsoever, nuclear winter might still assure the attacking country’s self-destruction. Recent research has suggested that even a limited nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan could cause enough cooling and agricultural disruption to endanger up to [2 billion people](https://hinwcampaignkit.org/section-4/section-4/), mostly outside the warring countries. The fact that nuclear powers are taking the liberty to endanger everyone else without asking their permission has led to growing consternation in the world’s non-nuclear nations. This has been exacerbated by a seemingly endless [series of near-misses](https://futureoflife.org/background/nuclear-close-calls-a-timeline/) in which nuclear war has come close to starting by accident, and leaders of many non-nuclear nations feel less than thrilled by the idea of being destroyed by something as banal as a malfunctioning early warning-system in a nation that they are not threatening. Such concerns prompted 185 non-nuclear nations to sign the 1970 Non-Proliferation-Treaty (NPT), promising to remain nuke-free in return for the nuclear nations phasing out theirs in accordance with NPT Article VI, whereby each party "undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”. Nearly 50 years later, many of these "have-nots” have concluded that they were tricked, and that the "haves” have no intention of ever keeping their end of the bargain. Rather than disarming, the U.S. and Russia have recently announced massive investments in novel nuclear weapons. Russia has recently touted a cobalt-encased doomsday bomb reminiscent of the dark comedy "Dr. Strangelove,” and the U.S. plans to spend a trillion dollars replacing most of its nuclear weapons with new ones that are more effective for a first strike. Adding insult to injury, India, Pakistan and Israel have been allowed to join the nuclear club without major repercussions. "The probability of a nuclear calamity is higher today, I believe, that it was during the cold war," said former U.S. Secretary of Defense William J. Perry, who signed the open letter. This disillusionment from the “have-nots” prompted 123 of them to launch an initiative in the United Nations General Assembly, where the nuclear nations lack veto power. In late 2016, they voted to launch the aforementioned UN negotiations that may produce a nuclear weapons ban treaty this summer. But a ban obviously wouldn’t persuade the nuclear ``haves” to eliminate their nukes the next morning, so what’s the point of it? The way I see it, most governments are frustrated that a small group of countries with a minority of the world's population insist on retaining the right to ruin life on Earth for everyone else with nuclear weapons. Such “might makes right” policy has precedent. In South Africa, for example, the minority in control of the unethical Apartheid system didn't give it up spontaneously, but because they were pressured into doing so by the majority. Similarly, the minority in control of unethical nuclear weapons won't give them up spontaneously on their own initiative, but only if they're pressured into doing so by the majority of the world's nations and citizens. The key point of the ban is to provide such pressure by stigmatizing nuclear weapons. Nuclear ban supporters draw inspiration from the 1997 Ottawa treaty banning landmines. Although the superpowers still refuse to sign it, it created enough stigma that many people now associate mines not with national security, but with images of children who have had limbs blown off while playing in peace-time. This stigma caused leading arms manufactures to half production in response to investor pressure and dwindling demand. In 2014, the Pentagon announced that it was halting landmine use outside of the Korean peninsula. Today, the global landmine market has nearly collapsed, with merely a single manufacturer (South Korean Hanwa) remaining. The "have-not” negotiators hope that a nuclear ban treaty will similarly stigmatize nuclear weapons, persuading us all that we’re less safe with more nukes—even if they are our own. If this happens, it will increase the likelihood that the ``haves” trim their nuclear arsenals down to the minimum size needed for effective deterrence, reverting from SAD back to MAD and making us all safer. Here is the text of the letter. A list of some of the notable signatories follows. AN OPEN LETTER FROM SCIENTISTS IN SUPPORT OF THE UN NUCLEAR WEAPONS NEGOTIATIONS Nuclear arms are the only weapons of mass destruction not yet prohibited by an international convention, even though they are the most destructive and indiscriminate weapons ever created. We scientists bear a special responsibility for nuclear weapons, since it was scientists who invented them and discovered that their effects are even more horrific than first thought. Individual explosions can obliterate cities, radioactive fallout can contaminate regions, and a high-altitude electromagnetic pulse may cause mayhem by frying electrical grids and electronics across a continent. The most horrible hazard is a nuclear-induced winter, in which the fires and smoke from as few as a thousand detonations might darken the atmosphere enough to trigger a global mini ice age with year-round winter-like conditions. This could cause a complete collapse of the global food system and apocalyptic unrest, potentially killing most people on Earth – even if the nuclear war involved only a small fraction of the roughly 14,000 nuclear weapons that today’s nine nuclear powers control. As Ronald Reagan said: “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.” Unfortunately, such a war is more likely than one may hope, because it can start by mistake, miscalculation or terrorist provocation. There is a steady stream of accidents and false alarms that could trigger all-out war, and relying on never-ending luck is not a sustainable strategy. Many nuclear powers have larger nuclear arsenals than needed for deterrence, yet prioritize making them more lethal over reducing them and the risk that they get used. But there is also cause for optimism. On March 27 2017, an unprecedented process begins at the United Nations: most of the world’s nations convene to negotiate a ban on nuclear arms, to stigmatize them like biological and chemical weapons, with the ultimate goal of a world free of these weapons of mass destruction. We support this, and urge our national governments to do the same, because nuclear weapons threaten not merely those who have them, but all people on Earth.

Nuke war is Net Better under Dispo. Nuke war would stop all future pain. Since we can’t weigh pleasure this means extinction is net better.

### Case

#### [1] That’s a Link – their focus on pleasure is in reality a momentary investment into the jouissance of the drive to understand the real which translates itself into the disability drive as the subject rejects itself in asylum without being able to make any change

#### [2] Independently drop them for reading utilitarianism it is an unsafe philosophy that normalizes repugnant conclusions. Safety is prima facie because we concede to the validity of safety when not we are scared of our bodily security to debate in this round.

#### [A] Util dehumanizes disability and the curing of secondary pity to increase the disabled’s “welfare”

Stein 01 Mark is the author of Distributive Justice and Disability: Utilitarianism against Egalitarianism (Yale University Press, 2006) [Stein, Mark S. “Utilitarianism and the Disabled: Distribution of Life.” Social Theory and Practice, vol. 27, no. 4, 2001, pp. 561–578. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/23559190. Accessed 23 Nov. 2020](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23559190.%20Accessed%2023%20Nov.%202020).] //Lex AKo

**If the disabled have on average less welfare** than nondisabled people, it seems to follow that the disabled benefit less from continued life than do nondisabled people. **Utilitarianism would therefore place a lower value on disabled life** than on nondisabled life, and if a choice had to be made between saving the lives of disabled people and saving the lives of nondisabled people, utilitarianism would counsel us **to give less preference to the disabled**. So, for example, disabled people would receive less preference, in the distribution of life-saving organ transplants, than nondisabled people. Moreover, the utilitarian preference against disabled people in the distribution of life would appear to be exactly **proportional to the** utili tarian **preference in** favor of disabled people in the **distribution of resources**. However morally urgent it might be to cure a given disabled person, increasing her welfare, it would seem that the same moral ur gency must attach to a decision to preserve the life of a nondisabled person in preference to that disabled person, assuming that only one of them 13Mark Stein, "Utilitarianism and the Disabled: Distribution of Resources," Bioethics 16 (2002), forthcoming. 14See ibid.

#### [B] Util excludes people who can’t feel happiness, which results in their manipulation.

**Peter** 07 “Utilitarianism Is Unjust.” On Philosophy, N.P, 8 Sept. 2007, onphilosophy.wordpress.com/2007/09/08/utilitarianism-is-unjust/. //Massa

According to this principle utilitarianism is unjust because it treats people differently based on their capacity for happiness**;** although utilitarians can appeal to their principles to justify this different treatment, so can racists, and like the racist the utilitarian arguments are not based on objective facts. But before we get into the details allow me to give examples of some groups of people who would be treated unfairly in a purely utilitarian system. The first are those who have no capacity for happiness or unhappiness. There are rare people born without this ability, and we can easily imagine possible species (such as the Vulcans from Star Trek) or conscious computers (such as Data, also from Star Trek) who lack it as well. Utilitarianism cares only about maximizing happiness or pleasure, and so these people effectively wouldn’t count; their treatment would be invisible to the system. Since we can’t make the Vulcans unhappy we would be free to exploit them, turn them into slaves, or whatever else would make us happy. And since we can’t make them happy there is no reason for the system to give them any of the rights or privileges that make us happy. Since they aren’t made unhappy by this treatment the total amount of happiness may be increased, and hence utilitarianism as a system would endorse it. Also treated unfairly are people who are in a permanent state of unhappiness. It isn’t inconceivable that someone might have a condition that prevents them from being happy, and, although many such people might choose to end their lives, there would probably be some who would still choose life. A utilitarian system would take that choice away from them, and to execute them immediately, since they will always be unhappy (negative happiness) eliminating them would increase the total amount of happiness. If such actions could be considered just it would only be if we could somehow convince these people that abusing them on the basis of their capacity for happiness is reasonable, which means convincing them of the validity of utilitarianism.

# Accessible formatting

#### The aff’s expansion of the medical complex is not an expansion of care, but rather, an expansion of an industry that labors to eradicate all diseases, which results in lethal eradication of difference, conceptualizing of bodies into medical objects, and accepts death if a cure is possible.

**Clare 17.**

At the center of cure lies eradication cure arrives in different guises, connected to the medical-industrial complex would eliminate cerebral palsy autism hearing voices, and spinal cord injuries This commits damage turning body-minds into medical objects and creating lies genetic testing are paired with abortion exposing the systemic desire to erase a whole group resolve to eradicate stops for nothing including death elimination of present-day life is essential to cure

#### Inclusnism in society only forces disabled people to desire normalcy leading to re-injuring ourselves

**Campbell 08**

#### Internalized oppression is the result of our mistreatment We harbour the pain and negative self-images turning them into weapons which re-injure ourselves Internalised ableism means to assume an ‘identity’ other than one’s own to separate my existences from my disability is psychically untenable bodily detachment appears locked in internalised ableism of it is the simulation that matters. The subject simulates what it is to be ‘disabled’ and morphing ableist imperatives, in effect performs a new hyper reality of be-ing disabled. By performing ableism disabled people become complicit in their demise

#### \*T And The role of the ballot is to challenge ableism. Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question \*A Campbell 13\*C

**Ableism is** **seeded at the level of knowledge systems** **Ableism is not just** **negative attitudes it is a schema of perfection** **a** **way of thinking about bodies** **Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the** **foundations of social theory** **abledness is predicated on** **preexisting notion about the nature of typical** **functioning** **Ableism** **tells us what** **thinking and** **emotions are suitable to express** **Reframing our focus** **can enrich our understanding of the terms of engagement in** **life**

#### Thus, vote neg to delve into madness – refuse rationalist frames of enlightened humanism in favor of recognizing disability as the ground state of life.

Khozoei 18

Not an alternative politics, but an alternative modality within, against and beyond the political the imperative to make oneself intelligible holds a colonising move, predicated on disavowal What would it mean to refuse such calls? to accept the call to disorder to recognise we are always already unsettling and irreducibly collective we must fall into madness, these disordered and disordering movements to believe in the world and to want to be in it all the way to the end of it because we believe in another world in this world and we want to be in that. Struggling has never not involved madness its insurgent inventiveness, which can never be contained

## Round reports

**Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2020-2021 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.**

**Violation: screenshot in the doc bronx and call positions just fw and disad**

**Standards:**

**1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for them to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it's an impact multiplier.**

**2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can't afford coaches to prep out affs.**

**3] Pre-round prep –1ARs gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could go for 1AR theory every round– otherwise I enter every round unknowing whereas you have an idea of**

**what you want to go for from the start.**

**what you want to go for from the start.**

**Education- the reason we fund debate**

**Fairness- constitutive of a competitive activity**

**No RVI- Deter theory which is bad because is needed to check against abuse**

**Drop debater- to deter future abuse**

**Competing interps lead to judge intervention**

### Counter Plan

CP: Text we should launch nukes simulatiously

#### Nuke war causes extinction – 3,000 scientists agree – ignore pseudoscientific ‘nuke war good’

Tegmark 17

a nuclear weapons ban over 3,000 scientists have signed a [open letter](https://futureoflife.org/nuclear-open-letter/) in support A peer-reviewed analysis showed cooling by about 20°C in core farming regions of the US, Europe, Russia and China for the first two summers near-freezing summer temperatures would eliminate most food whatever humans didn’t succumb to starvation, hypothermia or epidemics would cope with armed gangs desperate for food. even a limited nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan could cause enough cooling and agricultural disruption to endanger [2 billion people](https://hinwcampaignkit.org/section-4/section-4/), Individual explosions can obliterate cities, radioactive fallout can contaminate regions, and a high-altitude electromagnetic pulse may fry electrical grids across a continent nuclear weapons threaten all people on Earth.

Nuke war is Net Better under Dispo. Nuke war would stop all future pain. Since we can’t weigh pleasure this means extinction is net better.

### Case

#### [2] Independently drop them for reading utilitarianism it is an unsafe philosophy that normalizes repugnant conclusions. Safety is prima facie because we concede to the validity of safety when not we are scared of our bodily security to debate in this round.

#### [A] Util dehumanizes disability and the curing of secondary pity to increase the disabled’s “welfare”

Stein 01

**If** **disabled have** **less welfare** it seems the disabled benefit less from life **Utili** **would** **place** **lower value on disabled life** **proportional to the** **preference in** **distribution of resources** to cure a disabled person, increasing welfare

#### [B] Util excludes people who can’t feel happiness, which results in their manipulation.

**Peter** 07 “Utilitarianism Is Unjust.” On Philosophy, N.P, 8 Sept. 2007, onphilosophy.wordpress.com/2007/09/08/utilitarianism-is-unjust/. //Massa

According to this principle utilitarianism is unjust because it treats people differently based on their capacity for happiness**;** although utilitarians can appeal to their principles to justify this different treatment, so can racists, and like the racist the utilitarian arguments are not based on objective facts. But before we get into the details allow me to give examples of some groups of people who would be treated unfairly in a purely utilitarian system. The first are those who have no capacity for happiness or unhappiness. There are rare people born without this ability, and we can easily imagine possible species (such as the Vulcans from Star Trek) or conscious computers (such as Data, also from Star Trek) who lack it as well. Utilitarianism cares only about maximizing happiness or pleasure, and so these people effectively wouldn’t count; their treatment would be invisible to the system. Since we can’t make the Vulcans unhappy we would be free to exploit them, turn them into slaves, or whatever else would make us happy. And since we can’t make them happy there is no reason for the system to give them any of the rights or privileges that make us happy. Since they aren’t made unhappy by this treatment the total amount of happiness may be increased, and hence utilitarianism as a system would endorse it. Also treated unfairly are people who are in a permanent state of unhappiness. It isn’t inconceivable that someone might have a condition that prevents them from being happy, and, although many such people might choose to end their lives, there would probably be some who would still choose life. A utilitarian system would take that choice away from them, and to execute them immediately, since they will always be unhappy (negative happiness) eliminating them would increase the total amount of happiness. If such actions could be considered just it would only be if we could somehow convince these people that abusing them on the basis of their capacity for happiness is reasonable, which means convincing them of the validity of utilitarianism.