## 1

#### Behold the image of the disgusting disabled child, which causes one to wince in the face of egoistic empathy. This is self-reflection, a process constitutive of the psyche that results in the disability drive, the culmination of primary pity where the non-disabled subject embodies itself in the position of the disabled object, and secondary pity, which portrays the ego’s overcompensation to regain its position and pushes a desire from lack for the eradication of disability.
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A Tale of Two Pities “Piss on pity,” declares a well-known disability activist bumper sticker. A more polite companion to this tag, the slogan “No pity” is a rallying cry of the disability rights movement.119 For disability studies, a field that since its inception has vigorously resisted the imposition of pity upon disabled people, Tiny Tim is anathema. Understandably so: every year, the image of Tiny Tim is used to drum up pity for disabled people; the widespread circulation of this affect, disability scholars have compellingly argued, does not alleviate the social barriers that we face but instead reinforces our oppression. Indispensable as this disability studies analysis is, it leaves some important questions about pity unanswered. For example: if, as is commonly said, “No one wants to be pitied,” then why is this so? And also, if nobody wants to be pitied, who, if anyone, wants to feel pity? At first glance, the answer to the latter question might seem to be “everyone.” Certainly, multitudes of moviegoers appear to enjoy our culture’s annual recitations of Tiny Tim’s pity inducing tale. If it can be fun to perform pity, perhaps this is because pity gives a boost to the ego of the pitying person. “You are broken, and I am whole,” the pitier says to the one who is pitied. “I look down on you because you suffer.” Naturally, disabled people resist performing this service for the nondisabled. “Spare us your pity,” we say, because pity is felt to be demeaning. 73 Yet an incoherence structures this familiar account of pity: if pity fortifies the ego of the subject who feels it, then why do people so often resist feeling pity? Some folks get pissed when they are prodded to pity. “Your appeals to pity won’t work,” they say. “I have no pity for you.” This is the attitude that Scrooge takes toward Tiny Tim. It’s also the stance that Edelman invites queers to take in relation to the Child—and not only to the Child per se, but also to anyone who calls for a performance of pity. Edelman argues that compassion (which, of course, is a close relative of pity) is fundamentally narcissistic (73). When we call ourselves compassionate, we think we’re feeling for the other; but, Edelman contends, we’re really only feeling for ourselves (83). That is, compassion involves projecting one’s own ego onto the object of one’s compassion. In this schema, the pitied person is used as a vehicle for the pitier to feel sorry for his or her own self. But in calling compassion a cover for narcissism, Edelman may inadvertently point to a connection between compassion and the drive. Freud’s theorization of narcissism, which is a precursor to his idea of the death drive, suggests that although some forms of narcissism can bolster the ego, other forms can do just the opposite. “On Narcissism” posits a distinction between what Freud calls “primary” and “secondary” narcissism; this distinction provides the basis for a contrast that I wish to draw between what could be called primary and secondary pity. To elucidate these two pities, let us look at the tale that Freud tells about two narcissisms. The story begins, as many Freudian narratives do, with the image of a child at its mother’s breast. Freud gives the name “primary narcissism” to the perfect autoerotic pleasure in which the child luxuriates. This pleasure takes place in the absence of a stable self, as the child does not yet conceive of itself as a distinct entity, undifferentiated from its external environment (87-88). It’s the best of times, but it can’t last: the child’s primary narcissism, Freud recounts, is exposed to numerous “disturbances,” ranging from the castration complex (in which boys fear losing the penis and girls, Freud assumes, wish that they had one) to parental discipline and criticism.120 But still, we keep seeking that lost, best time: because humans are “incapable of giving up a satisfaction” that we have “once enjoyed,” we continually try to return to the primary narcissism of childhood. We do this by engaging in secondary narcissism. All the familiar attitudes and behaviors that one tends to think of when one disparages someone as “narcissistic” fall into the category of what Freud defined as secondary narcissism: the puffed up ego, the feeling of superiority over others. But even secondary narcissism, with its many patent problems, does not only aim to aggrandize the ego. The impetus of secondary narcissism, after all, is to return to a state in which the ego as such does not exist. The child’s autoerotic enjoyment at its mother’s breast is pleasurable in part because the child is not yet a subject. As with the death drive’s impulsion to return to “an earlier state of things,” secondary narcissism draws the subject back toward a prior time when the ego did not exist (Beyond 45). Yet if primary narcissism is looked back upon as the best of times, it must, from the vantage point of a fully constituted ego, appear as the worst of times, too. To be drawn back to primary narcissism would be to imagine the abolition of one’s self. For this reason, even though secondary narcissism may threaten to break down the ego, it also entails a defense against the threat/pleasure of that breaking down. Much as the differentiation between the inseparable processes of primary and secondary narcissism rests on a distinction between building up and breaking down the ego, a similar heuristic distinction gives structure to my concepts of primary and secondary pity. To be clear, pity and narcissism are not the same thing: if narcissism can be understood as love of the self, pity involves a complex affective reaction to the suffering of someone else. Primary pity entails a response to the image of another person succumbing to what I have termed the “tragedy of disability.”121 Primary pity arises when one witnesses a fall of the self, a collapse of the ego; such falling is at once painful and pleasurable to observe. In other words, primary pity could be described as a vicarious experience of the tragedy of disability. A great deal of the pain and pleasure of primary pity center on questions about what, or who, this fallen self is. When most people think about pity, we refer to an affect in which, to adopt Edelman’s phrase, we purport to “feel for the other.” But as with primary narcissism, in which the self has not yet been constituted, and therefore cannot be said to enter into intersubjective relations with an “other,” primary pity entails a mixing up of self and other such that the ego, in becoming permeable to pain that may properly belong to “someone else,” is profoundly threatened in its integrity. Primary pity is that intense pain-pleasure complex that is provoked by the image of a suffering other who, it seems momentarily, both is and is not one’s self. This affective response can feel unbearable, as seen in Siebers’s formulation: one “cannot bear to look…but also cannot bear not to look.” Primary pity is difficult to bear because it involves a drive toward disability (one cannot bear not to look), which menaces the ego’s investments in health, pleasure, and control—because to contemplate another person’s suffering is to confront the question, “Could this happen to me?” Such a prospect, although frightening, may also be compelling; in this way, primary pity replicates the self-rupturing aspects of sexuality. Indeed, the unbearability of primary pity reflects its coextensiveness with sexuality. Sex, or the Unbearable, a book coauthored by Edelman and by Lauren Berlant, argues that sex “unleashes unbearable contradictions that we nonetheless struggle to bear” (back cover). This claim accords with Freud’s account of sexuality as a “pleasurable” “unpleasure” that the ego can never fully master or control (Three 49,75). As Leo Bersani puts it in his reading of Freud, “the pleasurable unpleasurable tension of sexual enjoyment occurs when the body’s „normal‟ range of sensation is exceeded, and when the organization of the self is momentarily disturbed”; thus, “sexuality would be that which is intolerable to the structured self” (Freudian 38). Primary pity is also intolerable to the structured self, because it entails a fascination with the fantasy of a self in a state of disintegration or disablement. Secondary pity is something else, although it cannot wholly be differentiated from primary pity. Secondary pity attempts to heal primary pity’s self-rupturing effects by converting primary pity into a feeling that is bearable. As with secondary narcissism, secondary pity involves both an attempt to get back to that ego-shattering state of painfully pleasurable primary pity, and at the same time to defend against that threat to the ego by aggrandizing oneself at someone else’s expense. Secondary pity refers to all those ego-bolstering behaviors that most people think of when they talk about pity. Disabled people are all too familiar with these behaviors: the saccharin sympathy, the telethon rituals of “conspicuous contribution,” the insistence that “they” (i.e., nondisabled people) could never endure such suffering. More commonly known in our culture simply as “pity,” secondary pity encompasses our culture’s most clichéd reactions to disability: charity, tears, and calls for a cure. Correlatives of these commonplace manifestations of secondary pity are the obligatory claims that disabled people’s suffering is “inspiring.” Indeed, the speed with which conventional cultural representations of disability segue from overt expressions of pity to celebrations of “the triumph of the human spirit” highlights the ways in which secondary pity, as a defense against primary pity’s incursions, reinforces the ego’s fantasy of sovereignty. Secondary pity, in other words, can be seen as a variation of secondary narcissism: these affects enlarge the ego of the pitier or the narcissist at the expense of someone else. But primary pity is not the same as either primary narcissism, secondary narcissism, or secondary pity. Unlike primary narcissism, a feeling that emerges out of a relation to the world in which notions of “self” and “other” do not obtain, primary pity does depend upon the constructs of self and other, although these constructions are unstable and are continually threatening to come undone. Primary pity can thus be envisioned as a threshold category occupying a liminal position between the total denial of the other that is inherent to primary narcissism and the rigid structure of (superior) self and (inferior) other that constitutes secondary narcissism and secondary pity. My concept of primary versus secondary pity also differs from Freud’s primarysecondary narcissism distinction at the level of genealogy. Like Freud’s account of primary and secondary narcissisms, my model of primary and secondary pities involves a temporal transition; but whereas Freud imagines the movement from primary to secondary narcissism as a passage from an earlier to a later stage of an individual’s development, the temporal shift from primary to secondary pity happens much more quickly than this. It happens in an instant: that moment in which we feel primary pity and then, almost before we can blink, deny that we feel or have felt it. The denial is understandable: who wants to admit that one gets pleasure from the sight of another person’s suffering—or, to make matters worse, that this pleasure derives in part from the specter of disability’s transferability, the possibility that this suffering could be—and, fantasmatically, perhaps already is—an image of one‟s own self undone? Indeed, the model of primary pity that I have been constructing may sound a bit too close to sadism for some people’s liking. Pity does come close to sadism, and at the same time, to masochism, which Freud theorizes as sadism’s obverse. In “Mourning and Melancholia,” an essay that can be read as a sequel to “On Narcissism,” Freud approaches a distinction between primary and secondary masochism, which accords with my primary-secondary pity heuristic.122 If the story that I traced in “On Narcissism” could be summarized as “child gets breast; child loses breast; child gets breast back, albeit in a secondary, adulterated form,” the tale that Freud tells about masochism takes much the same form. In this story, subject loves object; subject loses object; and subject tries to get object back by becoming object, that is, by identifying with the object in such a way that object starts to seem—and perhaps in some ways is—part of subject’s self. This last phase is a dysfunctional and disabling form of identification, Freud makes clear. Subject is still angry at object for having left it, and it takes out that anger on the object that is now part of itself. This is the reason that people suffering from melancholia are so hard on themselves, Freud says; the “diminution in…self-regard” that typically accompanies melancholia results from the subject’s attacks on the loved-and-lost object that the subject has incorporated into its ego (“Mourning” 246). Freud had not wanted there to be such a thing as primary masochism; for a long time, he had insisted that sadism, or “aggression,” was the primary instinct, and that masochism was only a turning-inward of this originary aggression. But in “Mourning and Melancholia,” although Freud does not yet use the term “primary masochism,” he nonetheless gets at this concept. The problem of suicide, Freud notes in this essay, raises the possibility that the ego “can treat itself as an object” that it wants to destroy (252). When it comes to such an extreme act as suicide, the possibility of carrying “such a purpose through to execution” must, Freud surmises, involve more than a sadistic wish to punish others. Perhaps, then, there is an innate desire to destroy one’s own self, Freud hypothesizes. If so, this self would not be a single thing: it would be “me” and at the same time, the lost object whose image “I” have internalized. Freud’s notion of a primary masochism is tied very closely to his conceptualization of the drive. Beyond the Pleasure Principle, the text in which Freud first used the term “death drive,” was published three years after “Mourning and Melancholia.” In the later text, Freud’s speculations about the death drive lead him to acknowledge that “there might be such a thing as primary masochism” (66). After all, Freud points out, the idea that either sadism or masochism definitively takes precedence over the other does not ultimately make much sense, as “there is no difference in principle between an instinct turning from the object to the ego and its turning from the ego to an object” (66). If sadism and masochism are ultimately indistinguishable obverses of each other, then pity, in both its primary and its secondary forms, would have to be both sadistic and masochistic. This is a deeply troubling possibility, but I suggest that trying to overcome pity will only make matters worse. There are many ways of trying to overcome primary pity, and each one ultimately aggravates the violence of primary pity. One way is the “pitiless” refusal of compassion that Edelman advocates (70). Another is the disability activist “No pity” injunction. A third example is secondary pity, as in the query, commonly addressed to disabled people, “Have you ever thought of killing yourself?”123 In this question, disabled people correctly hear the wish, “I’d like to kill you.” Indeed, primary pity is so unsettling that our culture has been driven to “mercifully” kill people in the name of secondary pity. We have also been driven to lock people in institutions, to let them languish on the streets, to stare, to punish, and to sentimentalize—all, I would suggest, in the interest of not owning, not naming, not acknowledging that self-shattering, ego-dissolving, instantaneous and intolerable moment of primary pity. Because primary pity is tied up with the disability drive, it must, like the drive itself, be regarded as unrepresentable. However, I will quote at length from a passage of writing that comes close not only to representing primary pity but also perhaps to producing it. In his memoir, One More Theory About Happiness, Paul Guest describes an experience that he had in the hospital after sustaining a spinal cord injury when he was twelve years old: My stomach still roiled and it was hard to keep anything down. Late one night, a doctor came to my bedside, leaning over me, his hands knotted together. He seemed vexed, not quite ready to say anything. Used to the look, I waited. And then he began. “The acids in your stomach, Paul, because of everything you’re going through, it’s like your body, everything about it, is upset. That’s why you feel so nauseous all the time. We’re going to treat that by putting a tube into your nose and down into your stomach, so we can give you medicine, OK?” When he walked away, I felt something begin to give way inside me. Up until then, I’d faced more misery and indignity than I would have thought possible. I lay there, numb and sick in a diaper, helpless. It was too much to bear, too frightening, a last invasion I could experience and not break, utterly. When he returned with nurses, I was already sobbing. Anyone so limited could hardly fight, but I tried. I tried. The neck collar prevented much movement, and any was dangerous, but I turned my head side to side, just slightly, a pitiful, unacceptable range. Fat tears rolled down my face like marbles. I begged them all, no, no, no, please no. “Hold him, hold him still,” the doctor said. Nurses gripped my head on either side. From a sterile pack, the doctor fished out a long transparent tube and dabbed its head in a clear lubricant. He paused almost as if to warn me but then said nothing. 77 Then the tube entered one nostril, its gauge slight enough to pass through, down my throat and into my stomach. I couldn’t thrash or resist. I could only relent. To the pain, the discomfort, but most distressingly the feeling of powerlessness, of violation. It was in that moment, I think, that the weight of everything which had happened fell upon me, undeniably, and the knowledge of it crushed me. (23-24) “Too much to bear,” Guest writes. The word “unbearable” would indeed be an accurate descriptor of this passage: both the experience of violence that it narrates and also the retelling of that experience produce sensations that, as in Berlant and Edelman’s account of sexuality, one cannot bear but must nonetheless “struggle to bear” (back cover). Guest’s account of a nonconsensual administration of an unwanted medical treatment is especially difficult to bear because it gives the reader no recourse to secondary pity: the passage offers no “lesson” to be learned, no invitation to feel “inspired,” nothing to make one feel in any way okay about what has happened. The medical violence that Guest recounts seems particularly devastating because it is readable as sexual: it takes the form of forced penetration, and it results in a “feeling of powerlessness, of violation” that resonates with experiences recounted by survivors of sexual assault.

#### The affirmative’s politics are tied to a rehabilitative futurism where the signifier of the fantasmatic child is placed forward to eradicate and cure disability – this deems the disabled child a threat and excludes disability from the political. They don’t get to weigh case – if we win their starting point is violent, they don’t get to weigh their end point since we indict the process of how they got there.
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Elsewhere, I have argued that No Future’s impassioned polemic is one that disability studies might take to heart.109 Indeed, the figure that Edelman calls “the disciplinary image of the “innocent” Child” is inextricable not only from queerness but also from disability (19). For example, the Child is the centerpiece of the telethon, a ritual display of pity that demeans disabled people. When Jerry Lewis counters disability activists’ objections to his assertion that a disabled person is “half a person,” he insists that he is only fighting for the Children: “Please, I’m begging for survival. I want my kids alive,” he implores (in Johnson, Too Late 53, 58). If the Child makes an excellent alibi for ableism, perhaps this is because, as Edelman points out, the idea of not fighting for this figure is unthinkable. Thus, when Harriet McBryde Johnson hands out leaflets protesting the Muscular Dystrophy Association, a confused passerby cannot make sense of what her protest is about. “You’re against Jerry Lewis!” he exclaims (61). The passerby’s surprise is likely informed by a logic similar to that which, in Edelman’s analysis, undergirds the use of the word “choice” by advocates of legal abortion: “Who would, after all, come out for abortion or stand against reproduction, against futurity, and so against life?” (16). Similarly, why would anyone come out for disability, and so against the Child who, without a cure, might never walk, might never lead a normal life, might not even have a future at all? The logic of the telethon, in other words, relies on an ideology that might be defined as “rehabilitative futurism,” a term that I coin to overlap and intersect with Edelman’s notion of “reproductive futurism.” If, as Edelman maintains, the future is envisaged in terms of a fantasmatic “Child,” then the survival of this future-figured-as-Child is threatened by both queerness and disability. Futurity is habitually imagined in terms that fantasize the eradication of disability: a recovery of a “crippled” or “hobbled” economy, a cure for society’s ills, an end to suffering and disease. Eugenic ideologies are also grounded in both reproductive and rehabilitative futurism: procreation by the fit and elimination of the disabled, eugenicists promised, would bring forth a better future.110

#### 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

#### Opioid industry and it’s relationship to curing is inherently tied together causes psychological violence’s
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Consider the prominent role of profits for the pharmaceutical industry in “The Right (and Wrong) Way to Treat Pain.” This article highlights the personal narrative of Penny Rickhoff, who experienced a terrible back injury, and elegizes all the activities in which she once participated. The text box below the story reads, “WHAT SHE DOES FOR IT: A cocktail of narcotics and, until it was pulled off the market last fall, Vioxx. Now she takes Mobic; practices Tai Chi and abdominal breathing, which seems to help” (Wallis 50). This narrative includes the “devastating” effects of chronic pain as exhibited by the loss of beloved activities and the new regimen of drugs that replace them, but it simultaneously reassures the reader that help exists. Indeed, Wallis’s article reads like an obituary for Vioxx and Celebrex that laments the drugs’ (temporary) demise due to FDA regulations, suggesting that overregulation of pharmaceutical companies is the real barrier to chronic pain relief. This Time cover includes the subtitle, “PLUS: What’s behind the new FDA advice on VIOXX and Celebrex,” suggesting that the debate about whether these drugs should have been taken off the market frames the entire article. In case any ambiguity remains, the article title implies that removing Vioxx and Celebrex from the market was the wrong way to treat pain. The commodification of pain—leading to a boom in highly profitable pain treatment centers and multi-billion dollar pharmaceutical sales—surely facilitated the acceptance 210 Alyson Patsavas of chronic pain as a legitimate medical complaint, redirecting the historical dismissal of chronic pain complaints as malingering behavior. This commodification may seem at odds with the more familiar discourse of opioid abuse that suggests narcotic painkillers are too easily accessible and should therefore be more heavily regulated. These narratives, however, work together to bind the chronic pain “sufferer” within a discursive system that offers a cure through consumption, condemns the individual for using that cure, and holds the individual responsible when the cure does not work. Living a life without pain amounts to an imperative that captures the person in pain within a system of individual responsibility and “compulsory able-bodiedness” (McRuer 2–3). By highlighting the availability of relief, Time reduces those still living with chronic pain to an aberration, the result of individual failure to seek out and follow through on proper treatment—a narrative that disabled people of various impairments know too well. When I speak about pain, especially with someone that does not know me well, I am often called upon to account for my attempts to relieve myself of that pain. “Have you tried acupuncture?” “Have you tried yoga?” “How about swimming?” Statements like these, though well intentioned, are all part of a dismissive discourse that frames pain as a bodily experience that can be transcended with enough desire and motivation. A cripistemology of pain highlights these discourses of health, individuality, and personal responsibility—inseparable from an ideology of ability—as key influences on how we understand pain. For instance, a 1984 Time article, “Unlocking Pain’s Secrets,” explicitly individualizes responsibility by constructing chronic pain as the result of pain-prone personalities. It states, Some physicians are convinced that there are distinct characteristics that make some people more susceptible to chronic pain. Drs David Richlin and Leonard Brand of Presbyterian Hospital in New York City list the following traits: low motivation, poor self-image, lack of pride in accomplishments, dependency on others. (Wallis, Thompson, and Galvin 64) As the article presents them, these “risk factors” read more like character flaws than biological markers. While few physicians explicitly make such an argument today, the belief that chronic pain reflects a personality trait persists. Along similar lines, my journal speaks specifically about the indictment I felt, as my pain’s persistence seemed to reveal something about my character: “I am lazy. I am ungrateful. I am greedy. I am hypocritical. I am ignorant. I am short tempered. I am mean. I am evil.” My personal failure to get rid of the pain felt very much like moral failure. Such personalizing further dislocates Recovering a Cripistemology of Pain 211 the experience of pain from surrounding cultural and structural contexts. A cripistemology of pain restores those connections

#### The starting point of the 1AC is epistemically flawed and an independent link – fiat is illusory and anything that doesn’t begin from the question of disability allows for ableism to infiltrate modes of thought which means we’re an epistemic prerequisite. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best methodologically challenges ableism.
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Studies in Ableism 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.

#### Vote negative to endorse an unwavering pessimism and radical failure – we reject the political and notions of futurism in exchange for an affirmation of disability’s abjection as something beautiful.

**Selck 16** Michael (2016): Crip Pessimism: The Language of Dis/ability and the Culture that Isn't, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, SJCP//JG

The disabled are dying and with them dis/abled culture is being eradicated. In the time between formulating this project and its completion already too many disabled souls have been taken from this world, including pivotal disability studies influences for this research. I barely had enough time to mourn the loss of disability advocate and inspiration porn critic Stella Young before grieving the loss of disability studies exemplar Tobin Siebers. Attached to the grief I feel as a result of the fading disability studies community is the perpetual grief I harbor since my disabled Father’s suicide and in turn the grief concomitant to the claiming of a disabled identity. I choose to start out this project with grief because it communicates the tenor of this research; this is not the disability studies project of inspiration or utopia. My entry point to the disability studies dialogue is riddled with grief, anger, and pain and it is as such that this project plots a course of disability research that attempts to make a space free from the ideological constraints of optimism. The language surrounding dis/ability is highly political. Entire words, phrases, and identities are stretched between, in, and out of the nexus of dis/ability. The choice, for instance, to include a backslash in the word dis/ability represents for Goodley (2014) a desire to delineate and expand each of the categories in the face of global neoliberalism. My initial research inquired about the impact of dis/abled terms and phrases. I went to interrogate rhetoric like “special education”, “handicapable”, and one of the most glaringly overused insults in the American education system “retard”. The scholarship I was coming up with was plentiful but was for the most part located entirely outside of intercultural communication programs like the one I was attending. For the most part the few and far between intercultural communication projects about dis/ability I was able to locate were without modal complexity and didn’t bear semblance to so many of my own experiences. I was beginning to notice a layer of optimism that has been communicatively imprinted upon the negotiation of dis/abled identity. The angst started to manifest as I questioned if I was in the correct field or if dis/ability even was ‘cultural’. I felt a very real cultural erasure of dis/ability in academia and ultimately that glaring lack of consideration is what pushed me to performance studies. I first worked to close the apparent research gap by crafting a collaborative performance titled Under the Mantle (UTM), which put dis/ability, communication scholarship, and pessimist philosophy on stage. The larger purpose of this research report is to antagonize the erasure of dis/ability from communication studies by autoethnographically analyzing the crip-pessimist performance art project Under The Mantle. This research report will first detail the components of the theoretical work that was drawn on to create UTM. Next I offer a literature review to demonstrate the combination of optimism and neglect dis/ability has undergone in intercultural communication models. Following that section I mark my shift to performance methods as I explain how narrative autoethnography can illuminate cultural misconceptions regarding the dis/abled. In the last sections of this report I offer a textual analysis of the performance UTM and analyze three significant arguments of the instillation before concluding. Contextualizing Critical Dis/Ability Theory Often used interchangeably, critical disability theory (CDT) and critical disability studies (CDS) contest dis/ablism (Goodley, 2011, 2014; Devlin & Pothier, 2006; Hosking, 2008). There are several unique additions made to CDS with every new instantiation. Scholars in European countries and Canada attend to the theory, with United States academics often underrepresented. There are three concurrent themes of CDT that I will synthesize in this section with some dis/ability studies authors claiming there are as many as seven themes of CDT (Hosking, 2008). In the introduction to their edited collection of dis/ability essays, Richard Devlin and Dianne Pothier (2006) present three themes of CDT as, first, to highlight the unequal status to which persons with disabilities are confined; second, to destabilize necessitarian assumptions that reinforce the marginalization of persons with disabilities; and third, to help generate the individual and collective practical agency of persons with disabilities in the struggles for recognition and redistribution. (p. 18, emphasis mine) Already the connections between the CDT and the critical communication paradigm are visible as each respectively forefronts notions of power, privilege, identity, and agency. Outlined in more detail, the first theme of CDT argues that there is systemic micro and macro level discrimination against bodies with disabilities. To some critical communication scholars, this theme might be obvious, but it seldom is when “the resulting exclusion of those who do not fit able-bodied norms may not be noticeable or even intelligible” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). As the bumper sticker on my laptop proudly disclaims, “Not all disabilities are visible,” which necessarily adds a level of nuance and complexity to the way that dis/ability studies attend to the prospect of discrimination and violence. Often times, “social organization according to able-bodied norms is just taken as natural, normal, inevitable, necessary, even progress” (Delvin & Pothier, 2006, p. 7). It might be true that the lack of collaborative work between critical communication studies and dis/ability studies is because neoliberalism is supremely effective at rebranding marginalized oppression as a marker of its progress. The implications of this assertion are dire but essential to the basis of crip-pessimism. Theoretical approaches based in pessimism and skepticism are often necessary to distinguish the instruments of self destruction that have been mistaken for those of self betterment. Thus, a key question remains, what is regarded as progress and to whom does it count? The politics of progress call for the second tenet of CDT, which is a destabilization of neoliberal practices that strip power and agency from bodies with disabilities. Devlin and Pothier (2006) use the language of “anti-necessitarian” (p. 2), which refers to the efficacy of social organizations and an unflinching skepticism of liberalism. For Shildrick and Price (1999), “disabled bodies call into question the ‘giveness’ of the ‘natural body’ and, instead, posit a corporeality that is fluid in its investments and meanings” (p. 1). Anti-necessitarian logics ask questions that remain innocuous to the critical communication paradigm. Can the architectural proliferation of stairs and multiple levels on buildings be attributed to neoliberalism and active disablism? If stairs seem to focus too exclusively on physical impairments, then what about the sensitivity of the building’s lighting, acoustics, and spatiality? Finally, if neoliberalism fights to protect its grand narrative of progress then is the social exclusion of bodies with disabilities necessary for the day-to-day operation of our globalized world? As Donaldson (2002) posits: “theories of gendered, raced, sexed, classed, and disabled bodies offer us critical languages for ‘denaturalising’ impairment’” (p. 112) at the level of the subjective and inter-subjective. The third theme of CDT is to attend to the agency of bodies with disabilities in the struggle for recognition. One key element of extending agency to the disabled is the use of social experience. Experience is subjective “but experience remains intimately connected to political and social existence, and therefore individuals and societies are capable of learning from their experiences” (Siebers, 2008, p. 82). Though absolutely necessary, it is not enough to write treatises on the oppression of the disabled over time. Academics, theorists, intercultural trainers, and storytellers alike should be aware of the constant risks of representation. Representation and context are at the core of critical disability studies. The notion of agency is as unstable as the notions of dis/ability. There is no one-size-fits-all human rights based approach that will be suitable to address all disabled experiences, as the theoretical call for crip-pessimism will remind us. Instead of a universal abstract Rawlsian concept of social justice, CDS “attend(s) to the relational components of dis/ablism” (Goodley, 2011, p. 159). By a Rawlsian concept of social justice I mean a model that relies on distributive justice with utopist equality at its core. Where utopist equality projects highlight human sameness to the point of purity. CDT unavoidably invites a discussion about difference into the folds as postmodern and post-structural thinkers position the self as defined constantly in relation to others. Therein lies the difference between an equality model and a justice model of social identity. Often in the attempt to open up spaces for reconsidering self and other, CDS celebrates disability as a positive identity marker. This essay offers a strong argument of caution that the inclusion of CDS in critical communication studies might rely too heavily on celebrations of disabled identity. Nothing better demonstrates that reliance on celebrating identity than the myriad language choices used to describe a disabled identity including: differently-abled, special needs, person with disability, disabled person, temporarily able-bodied, and others. Often, able- bodied audiences have a tendency to sensationalize the presence of disability in a space that has not traditionally welcomed it. Examples of this are highlighted by the increasingly popular discussion of ‘inspiration porn’ (Young, 2014) and Hollywood’s representation of disability. The tendency is to inspirationalize the disabled for achieving tasks that would not be celebrated if they were accomplished by an unimpaired body. Crossing the street, showing up on time, entering a building by oneself are all tasks profoundly routine to the non-disabled and yet simultaneously cherished as markers of progress for the disabled. Philosophical pessimism is articulated next as a way to temper the risk of sensationalizing dis/ability. The theories ultimately fuse together like orchids and wasps to generate the larger theme of crip-pessimism. Philosophical Pessimism Throughout the 19th century pessimism was one of the most popular intellectual and philosophical strains, crossing countries and continents. Authors such as Rousseau, Leopardi, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche overwhelmingly created and lead the spirit of pessimism. Contemporarily however, the word ‘pessimism’ is pejorative and describes a body’s emotional discontent rather than intellectual engagement with the world. Dienstag (2009) writes, “Since pessimism is perceived more as a disposition than as a theory, pessimists are seen primarily as dissenters from whatever the prevailing consensus of their time happens to be, rather than as constituting a continuous alternative” (p. 3). Power is responsible for ontological shifts, and during shifts some populations benefit while others are harmed. The turn in thinking about pessimism from an intellectual position to an emotional state has been particularly gratuitous for bodies with disabilities. I come to pessimism because of my experience with disability. My anxiety disorder comes with an exteriority of anti-social behavior that has branded me pessimistic. The concern for my anxiety in public situations is often commented on as overly critical, negative, narcissistic, and most often pessimistic. I experience an anxious state of becoming different, and after years of failing to rehabilitate my sameness to able-bodied standards, I have come to a comfort with pessimism. I choose to include pessimism as a theoretical crutch to avoid communication studies’ sensationalism of disability. I imagine that when critical communication studies does bridge the dis/ability research gap that it might, at least initially, extend some neoliberal logics at the expense of CDS. This might manifest by scholars simply asserting disabled personhood where it does not institutionally, culturally, or individually exist. I find that CDT and philosophical pessimism combine in unique and valuable ways, particularly around tensions of personhood, abstract ideal humanism, and neoliberalism. Neoliberalism should be understood as “the superiority of individualized, market-based competition over other modes of organization. This basic principle is the hallmark of neo-liberal thought— one with old roots that lay partly in Anglo economics and partly in German schools of liberalism” (Mudge, 2008, p. 706-707). There are four components of pessimism outlined by Joshua Foa Dienstag (2006) in his book Pessimism: Philosophy, Ethic, Spirit that I wish to explore difference through. They are as following that: (1) time is a burden, (2) history is ironic, (3) human existence is absurd, and finally (4) resignation or affirmation. To write about pessimism necessarily involves questions of time, temporality, and history. The development of philosophical pessimism, specifically, the theories regarding the burden of time-consciousness, begins with difference. For the pessimist, the concept of time begets a differentiation between human and animal. Being a dog-owner myself, I have heard the colloquial aphorism that dogs, as all animals, have no concept of time. Pessimists understand time consciousness as a unique, but ultimately loathsome, trait of the human condition. Even in projects that appear to be geared toward sameness there are always unperceived and neglected populations. For example, even the U.S. constitution alleges persons of color were (and still are often) racially subjugated as property instead of considered to be fully human. The notion of difference is at the center of the pessimist’s position on time-consciousness because the philosophy accepts that the conditions of our existence are subject to relentless unpredictable change. “To the pessimists, however, the human condition is existentially unique— its uniqueness consisting precisely in the capacity for time-consciousness” (Dienstag, 2009, p. 20). For the pessimist nothing is ever the same, everything is always different, and to inhabit linear time means that everything in existence is always rushing off into the past. The advent of human time consciousness is also what leads the pessimist to find the course of history to be ironic. History is ironic for the pessimist because progress is always related to a greater set of unperceived consequences. As suggested above, philosophical pessimism acknowledges that change occurs; technologies develop and improve over time. Pessimists ask if those improvements are related to a greater set of costs that are not immediately recognizable. (Dienstag, 2006, p. 25) Similar to critical disability theory, pessimism interrogates power and privilege. Pessimists rely on the logic of difference to chart consequences. Consequences go unperceived because they occur across populations with disproportionate access to power, populations that are often culturally unintelligible. For instance, the massive boom in mobile technologies like cell phones and laptops has created vast pits of ‘e-waste’ in Africa, surges in child labor, and conflict over rare earth minerals (Vidal, 2013). Pessimists use difference to tease out the distinction between the instruments of suffering and those of betterment. The third philosophical pessimistic position is that human existence is absurd. The absurdity of existence “is illustrated by the persistent mismatch between human purposes and the means available to achieve them: or again, between our desire for happiness and our capacity to encounter or sustain it” (Dienstag, 2006, p. 32). Difference is built upon exanimations of power, which is both fluid and transferable but ultimately permanent. Classical western philosophy has an optimistic pragmatism built into it that posits there must be an answer to our questions. Alternatively, the pessimist embraces uncertainty, ambiguity, and intersubjectivity. Pessimism encourages a sense of comfort around the idea of multiple, coexistent, and perhaps competing histories. Neoliberal optimism is the logic of conflict as materially reconcilable, rather than antagonistically irreconcilable. The fourth and final tenet of pessimism that we are to examine asks what we are to do about our dire human condition. There are multiplicities of rationales that ultimately inform the pessimistic dualism to either resign from life or affirm it entirely. I defer to an existential or Nietzschean pessimism that recognizes suffering is inevitable for two reasons. First, human time-consciousness necessitates an awareness of our impending death. Second, mutually assured value systems will always intersubjectively exist. The choice to affirm life in its entirety is a pessimistic choice. Embracing life as both miserable and beautiful, fleeting and enduring, validates the perpetually fragmented subject seeking a world that exists beyond good and evil and instead just is.

#### No perms: (a) view it as artificially distinct since it’s key to fully flesh out the individual intricacies of both methods and create more concrete proposals (b) justifies infinite aff conditionality – allowings permutations allows infinite new 1AR advocacies which skews 1 mins of the 1NC and destroys neg ground (c) hold the 1AC method by itself since anything else endorses bad scholarship since it justifies severence – justifying both in the aff solves.

#### Accessible

## case

### Theory > Materiality

#### Theory comes before materiality –

#### [1] Error Replication – Focusing purely on materiality allows for structural forces that contribute to violence to go unquestioned and unnoticed – if every time someone is walking down a street, they get beat up material reforms can temporarily solve that but the forces that caused that violence will manifest themselves again.

#### [2] Fiat is Illusory – The ballot CANNOT solve their impacts, but the ballot can solve our impacts about violent epistemology. Even if they win that they can weigh the case our critique outweighs because our position is the only one that can be solved with the ballot.

#### 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

#### [1] [subpoint] and extinction – this is totally irrelevant because we read a fiat K which means you can’t weigh hypotheticals BUT even if you intervene and let them.

#### [2] VTL is non unique for disabled folk who are antagonism to civil society that produce able-bodiness. ONLY this leap in the name of preventing future eradication can risk clearing the grounds for future generations of disabled life their project is parasitic because it furthers the occupation of abled bodies at the expense of disabled folk – that’s Mollow.

#### [2] Justifying extinction first is an independent voter –

* It justifies atrocities since it allows us to harm some for the benefit of others
* Reject ethics based in preservation–it creates a survival-at-all-costs mentality that justifies violence and makes debate unsafe–comes first since safety is a prior question to people being in debate.

Callahan 73 Daniel Callahan, Fellow at the Institute of Society and Ethics, 1973 The Tyranny of Survival, Pages 91-93) SJCP//JG

The value of survival could not be so readily abused were it not for its evocative power. But abused it has been. In the name of survival, all manner of social and political evils have been committed against the rights of individuals, including the right to life. The purported threat of Communist domination has for over two decades, fueled the drive of militarists for ever-larger defense budgets, no matter what the cost to other social needs. During World War II, native Japanese Americans were herded, without due process of law, into detention camps. This policy was later upheld by the Supreme Court in Korematsu v. United States (1944) in a general consensus that a threat to national security can justify acts otherwise blatantly unjustifiable. The survival of the Aryan race was one of the official legitimizations of Nazism. Under the banner of survival, the government of South Africa imposed a ruthless apartheid, heedless of the most elementary human rights. The Vietnamese war has been one of the greatest of the many absurdities tolerated in the name of survival, the destruction of villages in order to save them. But it is not only in a political setting that survival has been evokes as a final and unarguable value. The main rationale B.F. Skinner offers in Beyond Freedom and Dignity for the controlled and conditioned society is the need for survival. For Jaques Monod, in Chance and Necessity, survival requires that we overthrow almost all known religious, ethical, and political system.

#### Extinction outweighs sets the bar too low and relate to lenient attitudes toward moral transgressions

**Kahane et al 15** (Guy Kahane, Jim A.C. Everett, Brian D. Earp, Miguel Farias, and Julian Savulescu, \*Director of Studies at the Oxford Uehiro Centre, \*\*Assistant Professor at the University of Kent and Research Associate at the Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics at the University of Oxford, \*\*\*Associate Director of the Yale-Hastings Program in Ethics and Health Policy at Yale University and The Hastings Center, \*\*\*\*Joined Coventry University to lead the Brain Belief and Behaviour research group, \*\*\*\*\*Uehiro Professor of Practical Ethics at the University of Oxford, January 2015, accessed on 10-31-2020, Cognition, "‘Utilitarian’ judgments in sacrificial moral dilemmas do not reflect impartial concern for the greater good", <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4259516/>) \*I don’t endorse ableist rhetoric //Lex Dy

A great deal of recent research has focused on hypothetical moral dilemmas in which one person needs to be sacrificed in order to save the lives of a greater number. It is widely assumed that these far-fetched sacrificial scenarios can shed new light on the fundamental opposition between utilitarian and non-utilitarian approaches to ethics (Greene, 2008; Greene et al., 2004; Singer, 2005). However, such sacrificial dilemmas are merely one context in which utilitarian considerations happen to conflict with opposing moral views (Kahane & Shackel, 2010). To the extent that ‘utilitarian’ judgments in sacrificial dilemmas express concern for the greater good—that is, the utilitarian aim of impartially maximizing aggregate welfare—then we would expect such judgments to be associated with judgments and attitudes that clearly express such concern in other moral contexts. The set of studies presented here directly tested this prediction by investigating the relationship between so-called ‘utilitarian’ judgments in classical sacrificial dilemmas and a genuine impartial concern for the greater good. Across four experiments employing a wide range of measures and investigations of attitudes, behavior and moral judgments, we repeatedly found that this prediction was not borne out: a tendency to endorse the violent sacrifice of one person in order to save a greater number was not (or even negatively) associated with paradigmatic markers of utilitarian concern for the greater good. These included identification with humanity as a whole; donation to charities that help people in need in other countries; judgments about our moral obligations to help children in need in developing countries, and to prevent animal suffering and harm to future generations; and an impartial approach to morality that does not privilege the interests of oneself, one’s family, or one’s country over the greater good. This lack of association remained even when the utilitarian justification for such views was made explicit and unequivocal. By contrast, many (though not all) of these markers of concern for the greater good were inter-correlated. In fact, responses designated as ‘utilitarian’ in the current literature were strongly associated with traits, attitudes and moral judgments (primary psychopathy, rational egoism, and a lenient attitude toward clear moral transgressions) that are diametrically opposed to the impartial concern for the greater good that is at the heart of utilitarian ethics. While prior studies have already associated ‘utilitarian’ judgment with antisocial traits (Bartels & Pizarro, 2011; Glenn et al., 2010; Koenigs et al., 2012; Wiech et al., 2013), here we show that such judgments are also tied to explicit amoral and self-centered judgments. Moreover, while these further associations were largely driven by antisocial tendencies, some (such as the more lenient attitude toward clear moral transgressions) were present even when we controlled for these antisocial traits.

### AT: Zanotti

#### [1] When we learn more about the state, they learn more about us, killing revolutionary potential because they can stop movements

#### [2] The disabled object already know enough about the state - they experience its antagonistic relationship to themselves every day. Any sort of information wouldn’t change movements because the ultimate goal is still the same.

#### [3] Turn – Working within the state does not bolster resistance, it crushes movements for radical change. If you figure out the state is bad while working within it, it doesn’t give you a strategy to find it. All your doing is working within the same methods that gave the state its power and oppressive nature. Only working outside of it solves.

### AT: Dieses

#### [1] Produces Stigma of dieses because they are caused

### AT: barma

#### The Barma evidence - the closest they get to an impact based off scenario analysis in competitive spaces is we break out of biased thinking

#### [1] nonunique – your net benefits are breaking out of cognitive biases and stuff but the neg also does so by challenging the dominant mindset surrounding disability

#### [2] this justifies comparative worlds which the neg functions under – our alternative is a “scenario” that can be analyzed

#### [3] That doesn’t assume ableist rhetoric tied to their scenario planning that internalizes ableism and quote student activism.

#### [4] There’s just straight up zero internal link that presupposes any of our uniqueness claims which proves activism they create which invests in the status quo social order is problematic.

# Accessible formatting

#### Behold the image of the disgusting disabled child, which causes one to wince in the face of egoistic empathy. This is self-reflection, a process constitutive of the psyche that results in the disability drive, the culmination of primary pity where the non-disabled subject embodies itself in the position of the disabled object, and secondary pity, which portrays the ego’s overcompensation to regain its position and pushes a desire from lack for the eradication of disability.

**Mollow 15**

pity gives a boost to the ego of the pitying person You are broken, and I am whole fortifies the ego of the subject compassion is fundamentally narcissistic Primary pity arises when one witnesses a fall of the self at once painful and pleasurable to observe we feel for the other entails a mixing up of self and other such that the ego may properly belong to “someone else threatened in integrity one cannot bear to look but also not to look Primary pity involves a drive toward disability menaces ego’s investments contemplate Could this happen to me Secondary pity attempts to heal primary pity’s effects by converting primary to bearable defend against that threat to the ego insistence nondisabled could never endure charity, tears, and calls for a cure primary pity is so unsettling our culture mercifully” kill people in secondary interest of ego-dissolving pity medical violence results in violation

#### The affirmative’s politics are tied to a rehabilitative futurism where the signifier of the fantasmatic child is placed forward to eradicate and cure disability – this deems the disabled child a threat and excludes disability from the political. They don’t get to weigh case – if we win their starting point is violent, they don’t get to weigh their end point since we indict the process of how they got there.

**Mollow 2**

the image of the Child is inextricable from from disability Lewis assert disabled person is “half a person he is only fighting for the Children begging for survival I want my kids alive rehabilitative futurism future envisaged in a fantasmatic “Child threatened by disability Futurity is habitually imagined fantasize eradication of disability recovery of a hobbled” economy cure for society’s ills

#### 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

#### Opioid industry and it’s relationship to curing is inherently tied together causes psychological violence’s

**Patsavas 2014**

the “devastating” effects of chronic pain as exhibited by the loss of beloved activities and the new regimen of drugs that replace them, but it simultaneously reassures the reader that help exists. highlighting the availability of relief, reduces those living with chronic pain to an aberration, the result of individual failure to seek out through on proper treatment—a narrative that disabled people well. When I speak about pain I am often called upon to account for my attempts to relieve myself of that pain. “ “risk factors” read more like character flaws than biological markers my pain’s persistence seemed to reveal something about my character: “I am lazy. I am ungrateful. I am evil.” My personal failure to get rid of the pain felt very much like moral failure

#### The starting point of the 1AC is epistemically flawed and an independent link – fiat is illusory and anything that doesn’t begin from the question of disability allows for ableism to infiltrate modes of thought which means we’re an epistemic prerequisite. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best methodologically challenges ableism.

**Campbell 13**

Ableism is seeded at the level of knowledge systems a schema of perfection deep way of thinking about bodies integrating ableism into advocacy represents challenge to practice as ableism moves ableist imaginary tells us what a healthy body means relies upon the existence of an unacknowledged community of people held together

#### Vote negative to endorse an unwavering pessimism and radical failure – we reject the political and notions of futurism in exchange for an affirmation of disability’s abjection as something beautiful.

**Selck 16**

disability free from ideological constraints of optimism Often times organization to able-bodied taken as inevitable after failing to rehabilitate able-bodied standards come to a comfort with pessimism The choice to affirm life in its entirety is a pessimistic choice Embracing life as miserable and beautiful

#### No perms: (a) view it as artificially distinct since it’s key to fully flesh out the individual intricacies of both methods and create more concrete proposals (b) justifies infinite aff conditionality – allowings permutations allows infinite new 1AR advocacies which skews 1 mins of the 1NC and destroys neg ground (c) hold the 1AC method by itself since anything else endorses bad scholarship since it justifies severence – justifying both in the aff solves.

## case

### Theory > Materiality

#### Theory comes before materiality –

#### [1] Error Replication – Focusing purely on materiality allows for structural forces that contribute to violence to go unquestioned and unnoticed – if every time someone is walking down a street, they get beat up material reforms can temporarily solve that but the forces that caused that violence will manifest themselves again.

#### [2] Fiat is Illusory – The ballot CANNOT solve their impacts, but the ballot can solve our impacts about violent epistemology. Even if they win that they can weigh the case our critique outweighs because our position is the only one that can be solved with the ballot.

#### [1] [subpoint] and extinction – this is totally irrelevant because we read a fiat K which means you can’t weigh hypotheticals BUT even if you intervene and let them.

#### [2] VTL is non unique for disabled folk who are antagonism to civil society that produce able-bodiness. ONLY this leap in the name of preventing future eradication can risk clearing the grounds for future generations of disabled life their project is parasitic because it furthers the occupation of abled bodies at the expense of disabled folk – that’s Mollow.

#### [2] Justifying extinction first is an independent voter –

Callahan 73

In name of survival evils have been committed including right to life. can justify acts unjustifiable survival of the Aryan race was Nazism South Africa imposed apartheid survival requires we overthrow ethical system

#### Extinction outweighs sets the bar too low and relate to lenient attitudes toward moral transgressions

**Kahane et al 15**

sacrificial dilemmas are merely one context in which util conflict with moral views studies tested this by investigating the relation between util and genuine concern for the greater good tendency to endorse the sacrifice of one to save a greater number was not (or negatively) associated concern responses designated as ‘utilitarian’ were strongly associated with egoism and lenient attitude toward moral transgressions opposed to the heart of util

### AT: Zanotti

#### [1] When we learn more about the state, they learn more about us, killing revolutionary potential because they can stop movements

#### [2] The disabled object already know enough about the state - they experience its antagonistic relationship to themselves every day. Any sort of information wouldn’t change movements because the ultimate goal is still the same.

#### [3] Turn – Working within the state does not bolster resistance, it crushes movements for radical change. If you figure out the state is bad while working within it, it doesn’t give you a strategy to find it. All your doing is working within the same methods that gave the state its power and oppressive nature. Only working outside of it solves.

### AT: Dieses

#### [1] Produces Stigma of dieses because they are caused

### AT: barma

#### The Barma evidence - the closest they get to an impact based off scenario analysis in competitive spaces is we break out of biased thinking

#### [1] nonunique – your net benefits are breaking out of cognitive biases and stuff but the neg also does so by challenging the dominant mindset surrounding disability

#### [2] this justifies comparative worlds which the neg functions under – our alternative is a “scenario” that can be analyzed

#### [3] That doesn’t assume ableist rhetoric tied to their scenario planning that internalizes ableism and quote student activism.

#### [4] There’s just straight up zero internal link that presupposes any of our uniqueness claims which proves activism they create which invests in the status quo social order is problematic.