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#### The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Debater who Better Challenges the Exclusion of Educational Spaces. Interrogating ableism is key to understanding education itself.

**Dolmage 2017:** Dolmage, Jay Timothy. [Associate Chair, Undergraduate Communication Outcome Initiative at University of Waterloo, Miami University] “Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education” *University of Michigan Press*, Chpt. 1, 2017. AZ **Brackets in original text**

Disavowing disability is in no body’s best interest. Teachers recognize the diversity of the students they teach. But teachers must also recognize their roles within institutions, disciplines, and perhaps even personal pedagogical agendas, in which they may seek to avoid and disavow the very idea of disability—­to give it no place. This avoidance and disavowal brings with it its own spatial metaphors—­I use the steep steps to express this negative force. That these steps are real in the lives of people with disabilities adds to the power of the metaphor. The steps have a strong connotation in the disability community, and not just for people who use wheelchairs and crutches. When I say that the academy builds steep steps, I hope that this verb entails many things—­most of all, I want to show that the steep steps are constructed for a reason. As I have already shown, not only did eugenics actually reshape the North American population through things like immigration restriction, not only did it reshape families through its campaigns for “better breeding,” not only did it reshape bodies through medical reinvention, but it reshaped how North Americans thought about bodies and minds. Here, for example, is a diagram of the steps that were created to distinguish between different grades of the “feeble-­minded” in the United States in the heyday of the eugenics movement before the Second World War. The definitions were used to classify a group of humans according to mental age, suggesting that development had been arrested and would proceed no further past the step at which the individual was placed. The mental age was determined based upon variations of a standard test, the Binet test, which asked literally hundreds of standard common-­knowledge questions, of increasing difficulty. The test was also designed to stop the subject once they had reached the stage or step of difficulty at which they could proceed no further. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. This image shows five people, each stationed on one of five very steep steps. The bottom person, slouched on the ground, is labeled an “idiot, mentally 3 yrs. old.” On the next step up, an individual is hunched over, looking downwards, labeled “low-­grade imbecile, 4 to 5 yrs. old.” Next step up, a “medium imbecile, mentally 6 to 8 yrs. old.” Then a “high grade imbecile, mentally 8 to 10 yrs. Old” is pictured on the next step up, now gazing upwards. Finally, we view a person, described in the caption as a “moron, mentally 10 to 12 years old,” attempting to climb above the final and topmost step but only getting halfway up. As the image reveals, the steps were also closely associated with forms of work, and thus classed citizens and linked their value to this labor-­output, but also placed almost all of the feebleminded below reason and judgment, not only in a space of rational vacuity, but deficit. You’ll also notice that the bodily bearing of these individuals conveys a message: the different levels of animation suggest physical and cognitive correlation. These people look tired. The disabled mind equates with the disabled body. These states correspond with affects: the slumped shoulders and downcast eyes suggest or physicalize depression. If these steps in the image on the next page represent the very bottom of the steep set we climb to the ivory tower, they nonetheless cannot be disconnected from the history of North American higher education. In fact, “morons,” “imbeciles,” and “idiots” were both rhetorically (and eugenically) constructed by the “fathers” of higher education, and those individuals who were given these labels were also studied and researched.[10] At the top of the steps were those who taught and studied at premier universities, and these people studied and experimented upon the bodies of those on the bottom steps. We may like to believe that, today, practices of eugenics have not only been rejected but that they’ve also been corrected. Yet the selectivity of this environment must be continually interrogated or questioned. We must all evaluate the ways in which we ourselves continue to decide which bodies and which minds will have access to the considerable resources, privileges, and advantages we have and we bestow—and as we ask this question, we must wonder whether what we have to offer is truly worthwhile if it translates into policies of exclusion, programs of incarceration, and reductive definitions of human worth. Interrogating the steep steps metaphor works to highlight not just how space and spatialization are exclusionary but also the ways that the distance between a hypothetical “us” and a “them,” perhaps the able and the disabled, has a particular structure. Yet we must look at the steps from other angles, along other axes. What are the attitudes, requirements, and practices that might represent boundaries, jumps on the graph, risers on the steps? Are there chutes, or are there ladders, set up to speed movement from top to bottom or bottom to top? What forces move up and down, affecting students’ progress? Should we even want to get to the top? How do students go back down the steps or out of the university gates and back to home communities? What makes this journey possible or impossible? What does it mean to skip the steps? Where do the steps actually start?

#### The aff’s appeals to change, progress, and revolution equate the political with action – that requires the oppressed to position themselves in the public sphere and “do something.”

Here are specific links to the aff

1 -- “The cyborgian performativity of the 1AC ruptures the molar representations that overdetermine status quo ontologies”

2 -- “the 1AC interpellates the discourses of power, becoming aware of the relationship to the other”

3 -- “the 1AC’s cyborg embraces an ethic of staying with the world that necessitates kinship and a fundamental understanding of our relationalities”

4 -- a focus on form and performance is necessary

5 – the aff’s advocacy is built on a focus on the body, which can be re-traumatizing for PWD who have physical disabilities that impact their bodily movement

6 – the aff garners performative offense in the debate sspace – this is inaccessible for people who don’t have the ability to continuously perfom

hedva 2016: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

1. In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on.

#### Further, their framing of the aff as a 6-minute revolution is a performative link – the aff is only revolutionary because they got up and read it in a public sphere.

#### They adopt a “view from nowhere” – a myth of neutrality that frames the public as an open space for anyone willing to do the work to fight. These reps are rooted in Whiteness – what about people who CAN’T join the public sphere, or those who’ve tried and failed? And assuming progress is possible and things get better is ableist

hedva 2: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and we must contend with the fact that many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists. There was a Tumblr post that came across my dash during these weeks of protest, that said something to the effect of: “shout out to all the disabled people, sick people, people with PTSD, anxiety, etc., who can’t protest in the streets with us tonight. Your voices are heard and valued, and with us.” Heart. Reblog. So, as I lay there, unable to march, hold up a sign, shout a slogan that would be heard, or be visible in any traditional capacity as a political being, the central question of Sick Woman Theory formed: How do you throw a brick through the window of a bank if you can’t get out of bed? 2. I have chronic illness. For those who don’t know what chronic illness means, let me help: the word “chronic” comes from the Latin chronos, which means “of time” (think of “chronology”), and it specifically means “a lifetime.” So, a chronic illness is an illness that lasts a lifetime. In other words, it does not get better. There is no cure. And think about the weight of time: yes, that means you feel it every day. On very rare occasions, I get caught in a moment, as if something’s plucked me out of the world, where I realize that I haven’t thought about my illnesses for a few minutes, maybe a few precious hours. These blissful moments of oblivion are the closest thing to a miracle that I know. When you have chronic illness, life is reduced to a relentless rationing of energy. It costs you to do anything: to get out of bed, to cook for yourself, to get dressed, to answer an email. For those without chronic illness, you can spend and spend without consequence: the cost is not a problem. For those of us with limited funds, we have to ration, we have a limited supply: we often run out before lunch. I’ve come to think about chronic illness in other ways. Ann Cvetkovich writes: “What if depression, in the Americas, at least, could be traced to histories of colonialism, genocide, slavery, legal exclusion, and everyday segregation and isolation that haunt all of our lives, rather than to be biochemical imbalances?” I’d like to change the word “depression” here to be all mental illnesses. Cvetkovich continues: “Most medical literature tends to presume a white and middle-class subject for whom feeling bad is frequently a mystery because it doesn’t fit a life in which privilege and comfort make things seem fine on the surface.” In other words, wellness as it is talked about in America today, is a white and wealthy idea. Let me quote Starhawk, in the preface to the new edition of her 1982 book Dreaming the Dark: “Psychologists have constructed a myth – that somewhere there exists some state of health which is the norm, meaning that most people presumably are in that state, and those who are anxious, depressed, neurotic, distressed, or generally unhappy are deviant.” I’d here supplant the word “psychologists” with “white supremacy,” “doctors,” “your boss,” “neoliberalism,” “heteronormativity,” and “America.” There has been a slew of writing in recent years about how “female” pain is treated – or rather, not treated as seriously as men’s in emergency rooms and clinics, by doctors, specialists, insurance companies, families, husbands, friends, the culture at large. In a recent article in The Atlantic, called “How Doctors Take Women’s Pain Less Seriously,” a husband writes about the experience of his wife Rachel’s long wait in the ER before receiving the medical attention her condition warranted (which was an ovarian torsion, where an ovarian cyst grows so large it falls, twisting the fallopian tube). “Nationwide, men wait an average of 49 minutes before receiving an analgesic for acute abdominal pain. Women wait an average of 65 minutes for the same thing. Rachel waited somewhere between 90 minutes and two hours,” he writes. At the end of the ordeal, Rachel had waited nearly fifteen hours before going into the surgery she should have received upon arrival. The article concludes with her physical scars healing, but that “she’s still grappling with the psychic toll – what she calls ‘the trauma of not being seen.’” What the article does not mention is race – which leads me to believe that the writer and his wife are white. Whiteness is what allows for such oblivious neutrality: it is the premise of blankness, the presumption of the universal. (Studies have shown that white people will listen to other white people when talking about race, far more openly than they will to a person of color. As someone who is white-passing, let me address white people directly: look at my white face and listen up.) The trauma of not being seen. Again – who is allowed in to the public sphere? Who is allowed to be visible? I don’t mean to diminish Rachel’s horrible experience – I myself once had to wait ten hours in an ER to be diagnosed with a burst ovarian cyst – I only wish to point out the presumptions upon which her horror relies: that our vulnerability should be seen and honored, and that we should all receive care, quickly and in a way that “respects the autonomy of the patient,” as the Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics puts it. Of course, these presumptions are what we all should have. But we must ask the question of who is allowed to have them. In whom does society substantiate such beliefs? And in whom does society enforce the opposite? Compare Rachel’s experience at the hands of the medical establishment with that of Kam Brock’s. In September 2014, Brock, a 32-year-old black woman, born in Jamaica and living in New York City, was driving a BMW when she was pulled over by the police. They accused her of driving under the influence of marijuana, and though her behavior and their search of her car yielded nothing to support this, they nevertheless impounded her car. According to a lawsuit brought against the City of New York and Harlem Hospital by Brock, when Brock appeared the next day to retrieve her car she was arrested by the police for behaving in a way that she calls “emotional,” and involuntarily hospitalized in the Harlem Hospital psych ward. (As someone who has also been involuntarily hospitalized for behaving “too” emotionally, this story feels like a rip of recognition through my brain.) The doctors thought she was “delusional” and suffering from bipolar disorder, because she claimed that Obama followed her on twitter – which was true, but which the medical staff failed to confirm. She was then held for eight days, forcibly injected with sedatives, made to ingest psychiatric medication, attend group therapy, and stripped. The medical records of the hospital – obtained by her lawyers – bear this out: the “master treatment plan” for Brock’s stay reads, “Objective: Patient will verbalize the importance of education for employment and will state that Obama is not following her on Twitter.” It notes her “inability to test reality.” Upon her release, she was given a bill for $13,637.10. The question of why the hospital’s doctors thought Brock “delusional” because of her Obama-follow claim is easily answered: Because, according to this society, a young black woman can’t possibly be that important – and for her to insist that she is must mean she’s “sick.” 3. Before I can speak of the “sick woman” in all of her many guises, I must first speak as an individual, and address you from my particular location. I am antagonistic to the notion that the Western medical-insurance industrial complex understands me in my entirety, though they seem to think they do. They have attached many words to me over the years, and though some of these have provided articulation that was useful – after all, no matter how much we are working to change the world, we must still find ways of coping with the reality at hand – first I want to suggest some other ways of understanding my “illness.” Perhaps it can all be explained by the fact that my Moon’s in Cancer in the 8th House, the House of Death, or that my Mars is in the 12th House, the House of Illness, Secrets, Sorrow, and Self-Undoing. Or, that my father’s mother escaped from North Korea in her childhood and hid this fact from the family until a few years ago, when she accidentally let it slip out, and then swiftly, revealingly, denied it. Or, that my mother suffers from undiagnosed mental illness that was actively denied by her family, and was then exasperated by a 40-year-long drug addiction, sexual trauma, and hepatitis from a dirty needle, and to this day remains untreated, as she makes her way in and out of jails, squats, and homelessness. Or, that I was physically and emotionally abused as a child, raised in an environment of poverty, addiction, and violence, and have been estranged from my parents for 13 years. Perhaps it’s because I’m poor – according to the IRS, in 2014, my adjusted gross income was $5,730 (a result of not being well enough to work full-time) – which means that my health insurance is provided by the state of California (Medi-Cal), that my “primary care doctor” is a group of physician’s assistants and nurses in a clinic on the second floor of a strip mall, and that I rely on food stamps to eat. Perhaps it can be encapsulated in the word “trauma.” Perhaps I’ve just got thin skin, and have had some bad luck. It’s important that I also share the Western medical terminology that’s been attached to me – whether I like it or not, it can provide a common vocabulary: “This is the oppressor’s language,” Adrienne Rich wrote in 1971, “yet I need it to talk to you.” But let me offer another language, too. In the Native American Cree language, the possessive noun and verb of a sentence are structured differently than in English. In Cree, one does not say, “I am sick.” Instead, one says, “The sickness has come to me.” I love that and want to honor it. So, here is what has come to me: Endometriosis, which is a disease of the uterus where the uterine lining grows where it shouldn’t – in the pelvic area mostly, but also anywhere, the legs, abdomen, even the head. It causes chronic pain; gastrointestinal chaos; epic, monstrous bleeding; in some cases, cancer; and means that I have miscarried, can’t have children, and have several surgeries to look forward to. When I explained the disease to a friend who didn’t know about it, she exclaimed: “So your whole body is a uterus!” That’s one way of looking at it, yes. (Imagine what the Ancient Greek doctors – the fathers of the theory of the “wandering womb” – would say about that.) It means that every month, those rogue uterine cells that have implanted themselves throughout my body, “obey their nature and bleed,” to quote fellow endo warrior Hilary Mantel. This causes cysts, which eventually burst, leaving behind bundles of dead tissue like the debris of little bombs. Bipolar disorder, panic disorder, and depersonalization disorder have also come to me. This means that I live between this world and another one, one created by my own brain that has ceased to be contained by a discrete concept of “self.” Because of these “disorders,” I have access to incredibly vivid emotions, flights of thought, and dreamscapes, to the feeling that my mind has been obliterated into stars, to the sensation that I have become nothingness, as well as to intense ecstasies, raptures, sorrows, and nightmarish hallucinations. I have been hospitalized, voluntarily and involuntarily, because of it, and one of the medications I was prescribed once nearly killed me – it produces a rare side effect where one’s skin falls off. Another cost $800 a month – I only took it because my doctor slipped me free samples. If I want to be able to hold a job – which this world has decided I ought to be able to do – I must take an anti-psychotic medication daily that causes short-term memory loss and drooling, among other sexy side effects. These visitors have also brought their friends: nervous breakdowns, mental collapses, or whatever you want to call them, three times in my life. I’m certain they will be guests in my house again. They have motivated attempts at suicide (most of them while dissociated) more than a dozen times, the first one when I was nine years old. That first attempt didn’t work, only because after taking a mouthful of sleeping pills, I somehow woke up the next day and went to school, like nothing had happened. I told no one about it, until my first psychiatric evaluation in my mid 20s. Finally, an autoimmune disease that continues to baffle all the doctors I’ve seen, has come to me and refuses still to be named. As Carolyn Lazard has written about her experiences with autoimmune diseases: “Autoimmune disorders are difficult to diagnose. For ankylosing spondylitis, the average time between the onset of symptoms and diagnosis is eight to twelve years. I was lucky; I only had to wait one year.” Names like “MS,” “fibromyalgia,” and others that I can’t remember have fallen from the mouths of my doctors – but my insurance won’t cover the tests, nor is there a specialist in my insurance plan within one hundred miles of my home. I don’t have enough space here – will I ever? – to describe what living with an autoimmune disease is like. I can say it brings unimaginable fatigue, pain all over all the time, susceptibility to illnesses, a body that performs its “normal” functions monstrously abnormally. The worst symptom that mine brings is chronic shingles. For ten years I’ve gotten shingles in the same place on my back, so that I now have nerve damage there, which results in a ceaseless, searing pain on the skin and a dull, burning ache in the bones.

#### Reject their representations of liberation and endorse Sick Woman Theory as a survival strategy for oppressed people. This means re-centering the discussion to oppose incorporation into oppressive structures. It is NOT the burden of the oppressed to fix the world around them – instead, an ethic of care for self and others should replace the call for public protest.

hedva 3: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

Despite taking daily medication that is supposed to “suppress” the shingles virus, I still get them – they are my canaries in the coalmine, the harbingers of at least three weeks to be spent in bed. My acupuncturist described it as a little demon steaming black smoke, frothing around, nestling into my bones. 4. With all of these visitors, I started writing Sick Woman Theory as a way to survive in a reality that I find unbearable, and as a way to bear witness to a self that does not feel like it can possibly be “mine.” The early instigation for the project of “Sick Woman Theory,” and how it inherited its name, came from a few sources. One was in response to Audrey Wollen’s “Sad Girl Theory,” which proposes a way of redefining historically feminized pathologies into modes of political protest for girls: I was mainly concerned with the question of what happens to the sad girl when, if, she grows up. Another was incited by reading Kate Zambreno’s fantastic Heroines, and feeling an itch to fuck with the concept of “heroism” at all, and so I wanted to propose a figure with traditionally anti-heroic qualities – namely illness, idleness, and inaction – as capable of being the symbol of a grand Theory. Another was from the 1973 feminist book Complaints and Disorders, which differentiates between the “sick woman” of the white upper class, and the “sickening women” of the non-white working class. Sick Woman Theory is for those who are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, were never meant to survive: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to **resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution**, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing. I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. 5. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of our bodies and minds carry the historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick. To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way. But more than anything, I’m inspired to use the word “woman” because I saw this year how it can still be radical to be a woman in the 21st century. I use it to honor a dear friend of mine who came out as genderfluid last year. For her, what mattered the most was to be able to call herself a “woman,” to use the pronouns “she/her.” She didn’t want surgery or hormones; she loved her body and her big dick and didn’t want to change it – she only wanted the word. That the word itself can be an empowerment is the spirit in which Sick Woman Theory is named. The Sick Woman is an identity and body that can belong to anyone denied the privileged existence – or the cruelly optimistic promise of such an existence – of the white, straight, healthy, neurotypical, upper and middle-class, cis- and able-bodied man who makes his home in a wealthy country, has never not had health insurance, and whose importance to society is everywhere recognized and made explicit by that society; whose importance and care dominates that society, at the expense of everyone else. The Sick Woman is anyone who does not have this guarantee of care. The Sick Woman is told that, to this society, her care, even her survival, does not matter. The Sick Woman is all of the “dysfunctional,” “dangerous” and “in danger,” “badly behaved,” “crazy,” “incurable,” “traumatized,” “disordered,” “diseased,” “chronic,” “uninsurable,” “wretched,” “undesirable” and altogether “dysfunctional” bodies belonging to women, people of color, poor, ill, neuro-atypical, disabled, queer, trans, and genderfluid people, who have been historically pathologized, hospitalized, institutionalized, brutalized, rendered “unmanageable,” and therefore made culturally illegitimate and politically invisible. The Sick Woman is a black trans woman having panic attacks while using a public restroom, in fear of the violence awaiting her. The Sick Woman is the child of parents whose indigenous histories have been erased, who suffers from the trauma of generations of colonization and violence. The Sick Woman is a homeless person, especially one with any kind of disease and no access to treatment, and whose only access to mental-health care is a 72-hour hold in the county hospital. The Sick Woman is a mentally ill black woman whose family called the police for help because she was suffering an episode, and who was murdered in police custody, and whose story was denied by everyone operating under white supremacy. Her name is Tanesha Anderson. The Sick Woman is a 50-year-old gay man who was raped as a teenager and has remained silent and shamed, believing that men can’t be raped. The Sick Woman is a disabled person who couldn’t go to the lecture on disability rights because it was held in a venue without accessibility. The Sick Woman is a white woman with chronic illness rooted in sexual trauma who must take painkillers in order to get out of bed. The Sick Woman is a straight man with depression who’s been medicated (managed) since early adolescence and now struggles to work the 60 hours per week that his job demands. The Sick Woman is someone diagnosed with a chronic illness, whose family and friends continually tell them they should exercise more. The Sick Woman is a queer woman of color whose activism, intellect, rage, and depression are seen by white society as unlikeable attributes of her personality. The Sick Woman is a black man killed in police custody, and officially said to have severed his own spine. His name is Freddie Gray. The Sick Woman is a veteran suffering from PTSD on the months-long waiting list to see a doctor at the VA. The Sick Woman is a single mother, illegally emigrated to the “land of the free,” shuffling between three jobs in order to feed her family, and finding it harder and harder to breathe. The Sick Woman is the refugee. The Sick Woman is the abused child. The Sick Woman is the person with autism whom the world is trying to “cure.” The Sick Woman is the starving. The Sick Woman is the dying. And, crucially: The Sick Woman is who capitalism needs to perpetuate itself. Why? Because to stay alive, capitalism cannot be responsible for our care – its logic of exploitation requires that some of us die. “Sickness” as we speak of it today is a capitalist construct, as is its perceived binary opposite, “wellness.” The “well” person is the person well enough to go to work. The “sick” person is the one who can’t. What is so destructive about conceiving of wellness as the default, as the standard mode of existence, is that it invents illness as temporary. When being sick is an abhorrence to the norm, it allows us to conceive of care and support in the same way. Care, in this configuration, is only required sometimes. When sickness is temporary, care is not normal. Here’s an exercise: go to the mirror, look yourself in the face, and say out loud: “To take care of you is not normal. I can only do it temporarily.” Saying this to yourself will merely be an echo of what the world repeats all the time. 6. I used to think that the most anti-capitalist gestures left had to do with love, particularly love poetry: to write a love poem and give it to the one you desired, seemed to me a radical resistance. But now I see I was wrong. The most anti-capitalist protest is to care for another and to care for yourself. To take on the historically feminized and therefore invisible practice of nursing, nurturing, caring. To take seriously each other’s vulnerability and fragility and precarity, and to support it, honor it, empower it. To protect each other, to enact and practice community. A radical kinship, an interdependent sociality, a politics of care. Because, once we are all ill and confined to the bed, **sharing our stories** of therapies and comforts, forming support groups, bearing witness to each other’s tales of trauma, prioritizing the care and love of our sick, pained, expensive, sensitive, fantastic bodies, and there is no one left to go to work, perhaps then, finally, capitalism will screech to its much-needed, long-overdue, and motherfucking glorious halt.

#### 1 – no perms in a methods debate – it’s the burden of the aff to prove that your method is actively more desirable, not just that two things can happen at once

#### 2 – perms against disability oriented positions are a form of footnoting – you engage in ableist practices but then ask for the ballot without doing anything to solve for the harms

#### 3—any perm is a further link into the k—claims one more instance of exclusion is okay because of some net benefit which is more important that deconstructing ableism—this is diminishing of ableism and the exclusion people w disabilities face

## Hypermasculinity da

#### Their defense of the cyborg reifies the same structures of technomasculinity that are used to justify space colonization

**Don’t let them shift out of the link – here are quotes from the aff where they defend the cyborg:**

1 – “Focusing on how evolving conceptions of the positive and negative aspects of frontier cyborgs revise and resist the “John Wayne West” by questioning human power structures and morality,”

2 – the entirety of the banschbach 13 ev that the previous quote is from – I’m not gonna copypaste every single quote from the card

3 – “The cyborgian performativity of the 1AC ruptures the molar representations that overdetermine status quo ontologies”

4 – “the 1AC’s cyborg embraces an ethic of staying with the world”

**Ileri 2021** [Eren Ileri, PhD Candidate at Academy of Fine Arts – Vienna, “Disembodied Masculinity and the Imagination of Outer Space in Contemporary Video Games,” 2021, <https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/733292/733293>] //neth

In this perspective, outer space became white men’s playground, either in real life aspirations or in science fiction, where the language and images of colonialism can be reproduced. Renewed colonialist imagery in the realm of extra-terrestrial space and the manifestation of a new kind of relationship between human and machine, embodied by the cyborg, together constituted the image of the astronaut, that is defined by supposedly intrinsic qualities of masculinity, such as risk taking, pathfinding and having an insatiable curiosity to explore and to progress (Llinares, 2011). Yet, this image of the space explorer, whether as the spacefarer, the scientist or the economic visionary behind the technology (like scientists such as Wernher von Braun or today’s billionaire business men like Elon Musk or Jeff Bezos) is a complex one, incorporating issues of gender, race and class. What is relatively stable in this construction of representation is that space exploration has always been driven by an unquestioned, axiomatic curiosity or drive for exploration which was frequently ascribed as a masculine quality. For Llinares, “[i]n most evocations of space history ´man´ stands in for a supposedly genderless expression of humanity’s innate subjectivity. Think of Neil Armstrong’s now legendary phrase: ´That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind´, or Star Trek’s mantra, ´to boldly go where no man has gone before´. These phrases have become a naturalized parlance and defining rhetoric of space exploration. Far from being neutral semantics however, they are part of an underlying discourse within space history in which ´man´ implicitly means men” (Llinares, 2011: 5)[26]. (Dovey, 2018). Considering the access to outer space, human spaceflight has not been particularly diverse in terms of gender and race/ethnicity Out of approximately 600 people who traveled to outer space, only 62 of them were women, while 24 astronauts who traveled to the Moon were all white men[27]. Only recently, following efforts to increase diversity in the selection process of astronauts, NASA has achieved a 50% ratio of men and women with the 2013 astronauts class, where out of eight graduated astronauts, four were women and four men[28]. Historically, NASA’s criteria for astronaut selection required the candidates to be chosen from a pool of military test pilots, which was exclusively male, since it was not possible for women to enter this profession in the American army in the 1960’s and 70’s. The Soviet Union’s first female cosmonaut Valentina Tereshkova traveled to the earth orbit in 1964, much earlier than NASA’s first female astronaut Sally Ride, who flew to space in 1983. Despite the early date of Tereshkova’s flight, it was nearly 20 years until another woman flew to space. Towards the end of the Apollo program in the late 1970’s, there was a shift in the qualifications of astronauts and more were selected among scientists, instead of the ranks of military test pilots. Today, it became natural to conceive astronaut as a “scientist in the lab”, an identity that starkly contrasts with the 1960’s conception of the military-originated, risk-taking, masculinized adventurer astronaut. As space travel became gradually more inclusive to women and people of color, the traditional language of space travel was also challenged. For instance, since 2006 NASA’s guidelines for space travel language suggest the usage of gender neutral terms such as “human-piloted” or “crewed” instead of the much-used and almost standardized term “manned spaceflight”[29]. In science fiction, the diversification and democratization of space travel in recent years have also been represented and celebrated, as we increasingly see women and people of color characters in the forefront of fictional space exploration. Yet, considering the “techno-masculinized” subject of space travel, one could argue that the representation of masculinity was somewhat decoupled from the physical body, while tensions relating to the traditional binary understanding of gender were rearticulated on the level of the relationship between bodies and the technological. The traditional hierarchical dualism of masculinity and femininity, frequently positions femininity as masculinity’s inferior other. In the landscape of the cyborg, these traditional definitions of masculinity are being rearticulated, taken away from the biological body image and ascribed to hybrid technological subjects. The traditional model of muscular masculinity, characterized by strength, bravery, independence and virility as masculine qualities, has been destabilized with the advent of the cyborg, while being rearticulated through it at the same time. Human bodies have been “feminized”, rearticulated as needing protection, while technology has been “techno-masculinized” (Fernbach, 2000; Masters, 2005). When considering the cyborg’s potential for guarding the patriarchal lineage they emerged from, Cristina Masters crucially points out that “[…] the figure of the cyborg remains rather faithful to its origins. Thus, while the cyborg may provide new grounds upon which to reveal gender representations as contingent and historically grounded social constructs, we need also to attend to the ways in which the figure of the cyborg may continue to represent a desire for total masculinist control and domination” (Masters, 2010: 2)[30]. One of the most apparent examples for this kind of disembodied masculinity is incorporated by the cyborg soldier of the American military, where the body is the weakest link in the chain, as Masters argues, “[w]hat we are witnessing, and indeed participating in, with the constitution of the cyborg soldier is a radical rearticulation of subjectivity. Contemporary military techno-scientific discourses have profoundly altered the subject of discursive power productions, with the fleshy body of the soldier no longer standing in as the agent of politics by other means, or in this case, war by other means. With the discursive positioning of military technologies as superior to the human soldier, machines are now the subjects of the text. […] Technology, not the male body, becomes the subject capable of the discursive transcendence of embodiment” (Masters, 2010: 5)[31]. As discussed, masculinity serves as one of the main pillars for the construction of a dualistic, earth-centric understanding of outer space (Kilgore, 2003). But what does masculinity mean in the context of disembodiment and how is it represented in the posthuman condition? To accurately answer this question and to be able to investigate forms and representations of disembodied masculinities in the context of “space exploration”, it is necessary to employ a posthumanist approach, because it allows us to challenge predominantly anthropocentric perceptions of the cosmos. To emphasize a critical proposition towards the understanding of the extra-terrestrial, I will thus draw upon arguments from discourses of posthumanism, new materialism and – albeit with a strong critical distance – transhumanism. Based on this framework, my research investigates how disembodied masculinity manifests itself in the astronaut/spacefarer, in digital game narratives of outer space exploration as well as in the world building and experiencing of outer space through gameplay mechanics.

#### The endorsement of the cyborg in space is a continuation of hegemonic masculinity

**Ileri 2021** [Eren Ileri, PhD Candidate at Academy of Fine Arts – Vienna, “Disembodied Masculinity and the Imagination of Outer Space in Contemporary Video Games,” 2021, <https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/733292/733293>] //neth

As it becomes apparent in the example of the American soldier – there are organic and formal similarities between the American soldier and the astronaut – the cyborg can become a continuation of patriarchal capitalism and hegemonic masculinity. A similar proposal was also made by Braidotti regarding the condition of the posthuman, recognizing the ambiguity about the end of humanism and “man”: “[t]he Vitruvian Man rises over and over again from his ashes, continues to uphold universal standards and to exercise a fatal attraction” (Braidotti, 2013, 29[32]; Matthews, 2018, 91)[33]. Likewise, humanism’s capacity for resistance was also drawn to attention by Neil Badmington: “Apocalyptic accounts of the end of “Man”, it seems to me, ignore humanism’s capacity for regeneration and, quite literally, recapitulation. In the approach to posthumanism on which I want to insist, the glorious moment of Herculean victory cannot yet come, for humanism continues to raise its head(s)” (Badmington, 2003, 11)[34]. This capacity of “man’s” perpetual insurgency for its validation will form the basis of my thesis. My suggestion is that “man’s” crisis in the face of the posthuman condition and his attempts at reconfiguring the anthropocentric masculine identity in a disembodied subject are exemplified by various representations of the astronaut or outer space exploration narratives and gameplay mechanics across popular science fiction video games. In many popular video games (Metal Gear Solid, Mass Effect, Deus Ex series as few prominent examples for many) we witness a version of glorified transhumanism where the fetishization of human enhancement is expressed both in the game’s narrative and the gameplay itself. At the same time, the aforementioned games morally and ethically question the conditions of the cyborg and almost always posit a tension between the avatar/player and the posthuman condition that is seemingly imposed on the human, posthuman or non-human subject in their narrative. The representation of the “crisis of masculinity” arising from disembodiment in video games is complex and multifaceted, both exemplified by the narratives of conquest, exploitation, antagonistic relationships with non-human entities among others, while also encapsulated by the video games’ intrinsic qualities through gaming technologies which undermine the traditional humanist conception of the subject (Boulter, 2015).

## Adv cp

#### CP Text: Virgin Galactic should halt the use of the VMS Eve aircraft for all purposes

#### Solves the aff – they criticize the representation of Galactic Girl – halting use of the aircraft on which Galactic Girl is painted means we solve for the objectification offense, and that’s the only offense their advocacy solves for

#### VMS Eve is currently being used for space missions – proves that getting rid of this aircraft does something & hinders Virgin Galactic

**Shrestha 2021** (Sajina Shrestha, “Virgin Galactic flight to the edge of space: your questions answered,” July 11, 2021, The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/11/virgin-galactic-flight-branson-q-and-a>) //neth

Branson’s Virgin Galactic, which is aiming to develop space tourism, will carry its founder on what will be the 22nd flight test for the company’s spaceplane VSS Unity. It will also be the first time the spaceplane will carry a full crew of two pilots and four mission specialists (one of whom is Branson). VSS Unity will take flight from Virgin Atlantic’s base at Spaceport America in New Mexico. Virgin Atlantic will stream the flight on YouTube, starting at 9am ET. What will Branson do on Sunday? He will fly to space for an up-and-down test flight on VSS Unity, Virgin Galactic’s sub-orbital rocket-powered space plane. He will fly with two pilots, Dave MacKay and Michael Masucci, and three other passengers, Virgin’s chief astronaut instructor, Beth Moses, operations engineer, Colin Bennett, and Sirisha Bandla, Virgin’s vice-president for government affairs and research operations. How will he fly? The VSS Unity will take off from Virgin Galactic’s facilities on a mothership plane called VMS Eve. The mothership will carry and then drop VSS Unity at about 10 miles above sea level. The space plane will then immediately fire its rocket engines, tilt upwards and accelerate to three times the speed of sound to reach the edge of space. There the spacecraft will drift in space as the pilots shut off the engine. The passengers will be able to see the Earth below through the plane’s windows. They will stay in this weightless state for a few minutes before the gravity of Earth begins to pull them down. The VSS Unity will then rotate its wings and tail booms upwards. The plane then will plunge back to the Earth. At 10 miles above sea level, the wings will rotate back in place and glide to a runway landing.

## Case line-by-line

#### ON MONTGOMERY 11 –

#### 1 – this ev is indicting pixar films and the way they represent technology – don’t let them garner offense from criticisms of Pixar – explodes the neg prep burden bc we now have to prep against criticisms of everything even remotely related to space

#### 2 – they don’t garner offense from this – their advocacy doesn’t do anything about Pixar – don’t let them reframe this in the 1ar bc it makes the 2nr impossible – we don’t have a 2nc to read new positions

#### ON DEERFIELD 16 –

#### 1 – gender binary disad – the card refers to subjects as “male” and “female’ – reinforces TERF ideals + implies that feminism is nly for feminine presenting people who are coded as “female” – normalizes and obscures violence against people who don’t fit into their view of feminism – independent reason to reject them on safety

#### 2 – the “master-subject” relation refers to enslaved people and their masters – proves that they (as a white presenting person) shouldn’t be allowed to engage in reclaiming that perspective – reason to presume neg bc they don’t garner any offense

#### ON DEERFIELD 2/ADVOCACY –

#### 1 – white feminism DA – centering your advocacy on a depiction of a white, thin, conventionally attractive woman excludes discussions about objectification of gender minorities who don’t fit that norm – at best, it’s a solvency deficit to your method bc it means you don’t solve for any significant harms and at worst it’s an independent reason to reject you for perpetuating exclusionary fem



#### 2 – you don’t solve – your advocacy just says that you think it’s unjust – that doesn’t get rid of the aircraft that this is painted on or stop virgin galactic from making more like this – reason to presume neg

#### ON BANSCHBACH 13 –

#### 1 – this card is about representations of cyborgs in media, not about galatic girl – no internal link from any of their other offense to this card – means they don’t get offense from it

#### 2 – their advocacy only talks about galactic girl – means that they don’t get to access offense from other cyborg reps – they haven’t proven that their aff solves for it

#### ON PUAR 12

#### 1 – the card just says discursive restructurings in general are good – no warrant for why your aff is the best

#### 2 – empirically denied -- they’ve read this aff before and gender minorities are still facing discrimination in debate – it’s a reason to negate on presumption because this proves that they don’t rupture ontologies

#### 3 – exclusion DA – privileging one form of communication over another excludes and oppresses those who can’t access their chosen method of communication – normalizes practices in debate that exclude but are framed as anti-oppressive – reject them to set a precedent

#### ON THE ROB –

#### 1 – the ROB is unusable – everyone experiences affect differently which means it’s impossible to determine what form of affect is the best bc that would require weighing between lived experiences and denying someone’s experience

#### 2 – orientations change based on situation – proves that your ROB is infinitely shifty – don’t evaluate shifty ROBs bc they allow infinite recontextualization of offense and don’t allow neg engagement

#### 3 – our rob o/w – having access to the space in which the aff is read is a prior question to discussing the aff – even if you win that your ROB is good, you need ours to access your offense

#### 4 – reps indicts come as a prior question to the ROB – if we win that your aff is representationally violent, that comes first bc stopping in-round violence comes before evaluating whether you get offense – reps have to come first bc anyth else justifies ignoring racism and sexism if a debater is good at weighing

#### ON HUSTON 11 –

#### 1 – this card says that understanding the oppressed other is good – if that’s true, it’s a reason to reject a white presenting debater as a method of uplifting the voices of POC gender minorities. AND uniquely solves the offense in this card bc it forces the aff to reimagine their understanding of themselves in relation to POC

#### 2 – no need for the ballot – the 1ac has already been read, which means we’ve already garnered the discursive offense that they claim – means you can negate on presumption

#### ON HARAWAY 16 –

#### 1 – the 1ac cannot claim to be a rejection of capitalism while simultaneously saying that the best model of debate is performativity – proves that they justify performing oppression for the ballot – their aff is capitalist AND this is a perfcon – perfcons are DTD bc they knew it was bad and they did it anyway

#### 2 – the aff doesn’t solve any of the cap impacts the card isolates (such as meaningless jobs) – make them isolate what they actually solve for; don’t let them weigh all of capitalism against us

### Case overview

#### 1 - The impacts of the affirmative are garnered from their performance in round – the aff has already happened. Negate on presumption – there’s no reason they need the ballot.

**Hynek 13** et al; Dr. Nik Hynek is Associate Professor of International Relations and Theory of Politics at the Metropolitan University Prague and Charles University. He holds PhD degree in International Politics and Security Studies from the Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford - "No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies"- Critical Studies on Security - Volume 1, Issue 1, 2013. / MM

These ‘**post-emancipatory’ scholars** still frame Western and international intervention in potentially emancipatory terms, but the horizons and **aspirations have been substantially lowered from the** universalist **call to radical academic policy advocacy**, of the founders of emancipatory approaches within security studies. While the initial confident calls for emancipatory **alternatives** at least had an understanding of the need for emancipatory agency, **unfortunately found only in Western powers** and international institutions, the later **approaches lack** this **clarity and confidence**, merely suggesting that more ‘open’, ‘unscripted’, ‘locally sensitive’, ‘desecuritised’ and less ‘universalist’ and ‘liberal’ approaches can avoid the ‘resistances’ held to come from the local level. If these approaches are ‘emancipatory’ **they lack any clear project** or program **as to what these claims might mean or** how they might be **carried out in reality** and are little different to mainstream think tank proposals calling for more ‘local ownership’, ‘local capacity-building’, ‘empowerment’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘resilience’ (see Chandler 2012, Forthcoming). This article has argued that the appendage ‘critical’ should be removed to allow Security Studies to free itself of the baggage of its founding. It is clear that what little emancipatory content critical security theorizing had initially has been more than exhausted and, in fact, thoroughly critiqued. The boom in CSS in the 1990s and early 2000s was essentially parasitical on the shift in Western policy discourses, which emphasized the radical and emancipatory possibilities of power, rather than on the basis of giving theoretical clarity to counter-hegemonic forces. We would argue that the removal of the prefix ‘critical’ would also be useful to distinguish security study based on critique of the world as it exists from normative theorizing based on the world as we would like it to be. As long as we keep the ‘critical’ nomenclature, we are affirming that government and international policy-making can be understood and critiqued against the goal of emancipating the non-Western Other. Judging **policy-making** and policy outcomes, on the basis of this imputed goal, may **provide ‘critical’ theorists with endless possibilities** to demonstrate their normative standpoints but it does little to develop academic and political understandings of the world we live in. In fact, no greater straw man could have been imagined, than the ability to become ‘critical’ on the basis of debates around the claim that the West was now capable of undertaking emancipatory policy missions. Today, as we witness a narrowing of transformative aspirations on behalf of Western policy elites, in a reaction against the ‘hubris’ of the claims of the 1990s (Mayall and Soares de Oliveira 2012) and a slimmed down approach to sustainable, ‘hybrid’ peacebuilding, CSS has again renewed its relationship with the policy sphere. Some academics and policy-makers now have a united front that **rather than placing emancipation at the heart of** policy-making it should be ‘**local knowledge**’ and ‘local demands’.

#### 2 - This method requires investment in the debate space, but it’s been read by dozens of other people and done nothing - this is an investment in capitalistic technocracy posing as progressivism - voting for them does nothing but get them a TOC bid and a trophy; reject the reward-orientation of the aff

#### 3 - their narrative of “overcoming” PERPETUATES CYCLES OF OBJECTIFICATION, requiring a public performance for a spectator’s benefit.

James 2015: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] Resiliency and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism. Zero Books: Winchester, 2015. CH

 (d) “Look, I Overcame!” Resilience must be performed explicitly, legibly, and spectacularly. Overcoming is necessary, but insufficient; to count and function as resilience, this overcoming must be accomplished in a visible or otherwise legible and consumable manner. Overcoming is a type of “affective labor” which, as Steven Shaviro puts it, “is productive only to the extent that it is **a public performance.** It cannot unfold in the hidden depths; **it must be visible** and audible” (PCA 49n33). In order to tune into feminine resilience and feed it back into its power supply, MRWaSP has to perceive it as such. “Look, I Overcame!” is the resilient subject’s maxim or mantra. Gender and race have always been “visible identities,” to use philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff’s term, identities strongly tied to one’s outward physical appearance. However, gendered/ racialized resilience isn’t visible in the same way that conventional gender and racial identities are visible. To clarify these differences, it’s helpful to think of resilience in terms of a “Look, I Overcame!” imperative. “Look, I Overcame!” is easy to juxtapose to Frantz Fanon’s “Look, a Negro!”, which is the touchstone for his analysis of gendered racialization in “The Fact of Blackness.” In both cases, looking is a means of crafting race/gender identities and distributing white patriarchal privilege. But, in the same way that resilience discourse “upgrades” traditional methods for crafting identities and distributing privilege, the “looking” in “Look, I Overcame!” is an upgrade on the “looking” in “Look, a [black person!] Negro!” According to Fanon, the exclamation “Look, a Negro!” racializes him as a black man. To be “a Negro” [a black person] is to be objectified by the white supremacist gaze. This gaze fixes him as an object, rather than an ambiguous transcendence (which is a more nuanced way of describing the existentialist concept of subjectivity). “The black man,” as Fanon argues, “has no ontological resistance for the white man” (BSWM 110) because, as an object and not a mutually-recognized subject, he cannot return the white man’s gaze (“The Look” that is so important to Sartre’s theory of subjectivity in Being & Nothingness). The LIO narrative differs from Fanon’s account in the same way it differs from Iris Young’s account of feminine body comportment: in resilience discourse, objectification isn’t an end but a means. any impediment posed by the damage wrought by the white/male gaze is a **necessary prerequisite** for subjectivity, agency, and mutual recognition. In other words, being looked at isn’t an impediment, but a resource. Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectification (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer’s individual overcoming into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject’s hail, “Look, I Overcame!”. Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its “good girls” as proof that they’re the “good guys”—that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the “resilience” of “our” women is often contrasted with the supposed “fragility” of ThirdWorld women of color.

**4 - Their performance is rooted in the divide-and conquer identity politics of capitalism. Focus on one identity as fundamentally different legitimates the neoliberal ethic of atomized individualism.**

Taylor 2011: [Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, on the editorial board of the International Socialist Review and a doctoral student in African American Studies at Northwestern University; “Race, class and Marxism,” SocialistWorker.org,<http://socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism>]

What do Marxists actually say? Marxists argue that capitalism is a system that is based on the exploitation of the many by the few. Because it is a system based on gross inequality, it requires various tools to **divide the majority** – racism and all oppressions under capitalism serve this purpose. Moreover, oppression is used to justify and "explain" unequal relationships in society that enrich the minority that live off the majority's labor. Thus, racism developed initially to explain and justify the enslavement of Africans--because they were less than human and undeserving of liberty and freedom. Everyone accepts the idea that the oppression of slaves was rooted in the class relations of exploitation under that system. Fewer recognize that under capitalism, wage slavery is the pivot around which all other inequalities and oppressions turn. Capitalism used racism to justify plunder, conquest and slavery, but as Karl Marx pointed out, it also used racism to divide and rule--to pit one section of the working class against another and thereby blunt class consciousness. To claim, as Marxists do, that racism is a product of capitalism is not to deny or diminish its importance or impact in American society. It is simply to explain its origins and the reasons for its perpetuation. Many on the left today talk about class as if it is one of many oppressions, often describing it as "classism." What people are really referring to as "classism" is elitism or snobbery, and not the fundamental organization of society under capitalism. Moreover, it is popular today to talk about various oppressions, including class, as intersecting. While it is true that oppressions can reinforce and compound each other, they are born out of the material relations shaped by capitalism and the economic exploitation that is at the heart of capitalist society. In other words, it is the material and economic structure of society that gave rise to a range of ideas and ideologies to justify, explain and help perpetuate that order. In the United States, racism is the most important of those ideologies. Despite the widespread beliefs to the contrary of his critics, Karl Marx himself was well aware of the centrality of race under capitalism. While Marx did not write extensively on the question of slavery and its racial impact in societies specifically, he did write about the way in which European capitalism emerged because of its pilfering, rape and destruction, famously writing: The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of Black skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. He also recognized the extent to which slavery was central to the world economy. He wrote: Direct slavery is just as much the pivot of bourgeois industry as machinery, credits, etc. Without slavery you have no cotton; without cotton you have no modern industry. It is slavery that has given the colonies their value; it is the colonies that have created world trade, and it is world trade that is the pre-condition of large-scale industry. Thus slavery is an economic category of the greatest importance. Without slavery North America, the most progressive of countries, would be transformed into a patriarchal country. Wipe out North America from the map of the world, and you will have anarchy--the complete decay of modern commerce and civilization. Cause slavery to disappear and you will have wiped America off the map of nations. Thus slavery, because it is an economic category, has always existed among the institutions of the peoples. Modern nations have been able only to disguise slavery in their own countries, but they have imposed it without disguise upon the New World. Thus, there is a fundamental understanding of the centrality of slave labor in the national and international economy. But what about race? Despite the dearth of Marx's own writing on race in particular, one might look at Marx's correspondence and deliberations on the American Civil War to draw conclusions as to whether Marx was as dogmatically focused on purely economic issues as his critics make him out be. One must raise the question: If Marx was reductionist, how is his unabashed support and involvement in abolitionist struggles in England explained? If Marx was truly an economic reductionist, he might have surmised that slavery and capitalism were incompatible, and simply waited for slavery to whither away. W.E.B. Du Bois in his Marxist tome Black Reconstruction, quotes at length a letter penned by Marx as the head of the International Workingmen's Association, written to Abraham Lincoln in 1864 in the midst of the Civil War: The contest for the territories which opened the epoch, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labor of the immigrant or be prostituted by the tramp of the slaver driver? When an oligarchy of 300,000 slave holders dared to inscribe for the first time in the annals of the world "Slavery" on the banner of armed revolt, when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the rights of man was issued...when on the very spots counter-revolution...maintained "slavery to be a beneficial institution"...and cynically proclaimed property in man 'the cornerstone of the new edifice'...then the working classes of Europe understood at once...that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy war of property against labor... They consider it an earnest sign of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggles for the rescue of the enchained race and the Reconstruction of a social order. Not only was Marx personally opposed to slavery and actively organized against it, but he theorized that slavery and the resultant race discrimination that flowed from it were not just problems for the slaves themselves, but for white workers who were constantly under the threat of losing work to slave labor. This did not mean white workers were necessarily sympathetic to the cause of the slaves--most of them were not. But Marx was not addressing the issue of consciousness, but objective factors when he wrote in Capital, "In the United States of America, every independent movement of the workers was paralyzed as long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the Black it is branded." Moreover, Marx understood the dynamics of racism in a modern sense as well--as a means by which workers who had common, objective interests with each other could also become mortal enemies because of subjective, but nevertheless real, racist and nationalist ideas. Looking at the tensions between Irish and English workers, with a nod toward the American situation between Black and white workers, Marx wrote: Every industrial and commercial center in England possesses a working class divided into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the ruling nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists of his country against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself. He cherishes religious, social and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude is much the same as that of the "poor whites" to the "niggers" in the former slave states of the USA. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker at once the accomplice and stupid tool of the English rule in Ireland. This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. This antagonism is the secret of the impotence of the English working class, despite its organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist maintains its power. And that class is fully aware of it. Out of this quote, one can see a Marxist theory of how racism operated in contemporary society, after slavery was ended. Marx was highlighting three things: first, that capitalism promotes economic competition between workers; second, that the ruling class use racist ideology to divide workers against each other; and finally, that when one group of workers suffer oppression, it negatively impacts the entire class.

**5 - Next, “US”/“THEM” DICHOTOMY:** they take on the authority to speak for a whole class of people, which reflects the logic of colonial domination EVEN IF they identify with that group.

Alcoff 1: Alcoff, Linda Martin. [Department of Philosophy, Syracuse University] “The Problem of Speaking For Others.” Cultural Critique, Winter 1991-92. CH

Feminist discourse is not the only site in which the problem of speaking for others has been acknowledged and addressed. In anthropology there is similar discussion about whether it is possible to speak for others either adequately or justifiably. Trinh T. Minh-ha explains the grounds for skepticism when she says that anthropology is "mainly a conversation of `us' with `us' about `them,' of the white man with the white man about the primitive-nature man...in which `them' is silenced. `Them' always stands on the other side of the hill, naked and speechless...`them' is only admitted among `us', the discussing subjects, when accompanied or introduced by an `us'..."[*4*](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote4) Given this analysis, even ethnographies written by progressive anthropologists are a priori regressive because of the structural features of anthropological discursive practice. The recognition that there is a problem in speaking for others has followed from the widespread acceptance of two claims. First, there has been a growing awareness that where one speaks from affects both the meaning and truth of what one says, and thus that one cannot assume an ability to transcend her location. In other words, a speaker's location (which I take here to refer to her social location or social identity) has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker's claims, and can serve either to authorize or dis-authorize one's speech. The creation of Women's Studies and African American Studies departments were founded on this very belief: that both the study of and the advocacy for the oppressed must come to be done principally by the oppressed themselves, and that we must finally acknowledge that systematic divergences in social location between speakers and those spoken for will have a significant effect on the content of what is said. The unspoken premise here is simply that a speaker's location is epistemically salient. I shall explore this issue further in the next section. The second claim holds that not only is location epistemically salient, but certain privileged locations are discursively dangerous.[5](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote5) In particular, the practice of privileged persons speaking for or on behalf of less privileged persons has actually resulted (in many cases) in **increasing** or reenforcing the oppression of the group spoken for. This was part of the argument made against Anne Cameron's speaking for Native women: Cameron's intentions were never in question, but the effects of her writing were argued to be harmful to the needs of Native authors because it is Cameron rather than they who will be listened to and whose books will be bought by readers interested in Native women. Persons from dominant groups who speak for others are often treated as authenticating presences that confer legitimacy and credibility on the demands of subjugated speakers; such speaking for others does **nothing** to disrupt the discursive hierarchies that operate in public spaces. For this reason, the work of [the] privileged authors who speak on behalf of the oppressed is becoming increasingly criticized by members of those oppressed groups themselves.[6](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote6)