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#### Abled subjectivity is tied up in a two-tiered affective response that explains disabled life – primary pity which reflects disability upon the ego threatening its ability status, which invokes secondary pity to overcorrect for the shattered-ego necessitating disabled death.

Mollow 15 The Disability Drive by Anna Mollow A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English in the Graduate Division of the University of California, Berkeley Committee in charge: Professor Kent Puckett, Chair Professor Celeste G. Langan Professor Melinda Y. Chen Spring 2015 //ACCS JM

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 primary- secondary 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?

#### The 1AC’s belief of a better future becomes complicit in the logic of rehabilitative futurism, which is threatened by the Disabled Child.
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“Let us begin our reexamination of Tiny Tim with a discussion of No Future, a text in which Tiny Tim takes a prominent position. No Future is a text with a target: the book takes aim at “the Child whose innocence solicits our defense,” a trope that Edelman names as the emblem of an ideology that he terms “reproductive futurism” (2). According to Edelman, commonplace cultural invocations of the figure of the Child (“not to be confused with the lived experiences of any historical children”) uphold “the absolute privilege of heteronormativity” (11, 2). Defying pronatalist social imperatives, Edelman names queerness as “the side of those not fighting for the children‟” (3) and urges queers to accept the culture’s projection of the death drive onto us by saying explicitly what Law and the Pope and the whole of the Symbolic order for which they stand hear anyway in each and every expression or manifestation of queer sexuality: Fuck the social order and the Child in whose name we’re collectively terrorized; fuck Annie; fuck the waif from Les Mis; fuck the poor, innocent kid on the Net; fuck Laws both with capital ls and with small; fuck the whole network of Symbolic relations and the future that serves as its prop. (No Future 29) Elsewhere, I have argued that No Future’s impassioned polemic is one that disability studies might take to heart. 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.” (68-69)

#### [Link Wall]

#### [1] Their attempt to construct a universal guide to action ignores the ways in which the disability drive determines us, which recreate external ableism.

**Mollow 15** The Disability Drive by Anna Mollow 2015 // UTDD

“How, then, might we begin to acknowledge our own determination by the drive? Any knowing of the drive that we might hope to achieve must, on account of the structural barriers that render the drive unthinkable, be an effort characterized by failure and incompletion—that is, we might say, by epistemological disablement. The term “epistemological disablement” will appear frequently in this dissertation, as I will argue that coming into close proximity with the disability drive produces states of cognitive and affective uncertainty, confusion, and incapacity that are akin to disability. In the works that I shall analyze, epistemological disablement will often be performed on a textual level, as theorists and narrators seem to lose control of what they want to say about disability. These moments of epistemological disablement are often disavowed by theorists and narrators and are instead projected onto disabled people. When this happens, disabled people’s impairments are depicted as the result of an insufficiency of self-knowledge that is assumed not to determine nondisabled subjects. I will challenge these characterizations of disabled people not only by arguing for the value of “cripistemologies” (that is, ways of knowing that arise from disabled people‟s lived experiences) but also by using drive theory to undermine belief in the possibility of a transparent and wholly knowable self, whether disabled or nondisabled.18 My two-pronged approach to the issue of epistemological disablement may seem to present a paradox: on the one hand, I am asserting that disabled people’s lived experiences generate important knowledge about disability; yet at the same time I am seeking to destabilize the very notion of self-knowledge. Let me be clear, then, that in undertaking this double endeavor I do not forward all-or-nothing claims either “for” or “against” the possibilities of self- knowledge. I will not assert that people cannot ever know anything reliable about themselves, but I will also not suggest that truth claims derived from personal knowledge about disability are infallible. Instead, this dissertation highlights the limits of complete self-knowledge for nondisabled and disabled subjects alike, while at the same time interrogating the social dynamics that give rise to imbalances in the distribution of epistemological authority to particular subjects on the basis of their perceived status as disabled or nondisabled.” (4)

#### [2] Ideal theory lacks accountability, forgets the value to know the unknown, and contains generalizations that exclude material suffering – prefer an ethic of care which brings humility and provides the necessary empirical realities that stipulate the definitions of your idealized world.

Kittay 09 Eva Feder Kittay is an American philosopher. She is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy (Emerita) at Stony Brook University [Kittay, Eva Feder. “The Ethics of Philosophizing: Ideal Theory and the Exclusion of People with Severe Cognitive Disabilities.” Feminist Ethics and Social and Political Philosophy: Theorizing the Non-Ideal, 2009, pp. 141–143.] BRACKETED FOR ABLEISM //Found by ACCS JM & Cut by Lex AKo + Lex VM

Consider the first maxim, epistemic responsibility. Philosophy, by many accounts, is concerned with ‘truth’. The truth cannot be served if philosophers do not acquaint themselves with the basic facts about the subject under consider. As I have indicated, both Singer and McMahan fail to do so in their discussions of individuals with mental retardation. One might ask, ‘Why is such a clear violation of a philosophical value tolerated?’ Here a pernicious effect of idealization displays itself. Empirical realities give way to idealized descriptions and ‘stipulative definitions,’ in order to construct a theory which then can be ‘applied’ to the real world. But these idealizations and stipulative definitions may well construct a theory that is not applicable, or not applicable to that part of the real world that it purports to cover. Consider, in contrast, the way in which a naturalized care ethics is theorized. The practice of caring requires attention to the actual condition of the individuals who need care. Broad generalizations and presumptions—such as ‘the severely mentally retarded [disabled] cannot have aesthetic experiences’—cannot be the basis of good care for the severely mentally retarded [disabled], since the principal source of joy for many people with cognitive impairments derives from aesthetic experiences. A carer intent on giving good care must reject stereotypes and be attentive to what and how the 142 E.F. Kittay person in front of her responds. (Certainly this no less true of health care situations, although practical pressures result in a considerable relaxation of this demand of care.) A care ethic thus expresses the central values of attentiveness and responsiveness to actual conditions, and with that the responsibility to make oneself knowledgeable about the facts on the ground. That is to say, it values epistemic responsibility of the sort that I discuss above. Not only do we need to be responsible and insure that our philosophizing does not ignore salient empirical realities that are known, we have to be humble in the face of that which is as yet unknown (the third maxim). It seems hardly necessary to remind philosophers of what Socrates taught, that the greatest wisdom is to know what one does not know. Yet idealized theorizing, with its tendency to prefer clear lines of definition and opposition, makes it easy to forget to keep a focus on knowing what we do not know. Humility in the face of ignorance also reflects a value, one might say a necessary virtue, in the practice of caring. When we presume to know what we don’t know we are likely to fail in truly meeting the needs of the one for whom we care. In the practice of medical care, such hubris can easily cost lives. With respect to the third maxim, we can point out a dominant philosophical position is that of liberalism. Central to liberalism is the recognition of a plurality of goods. This elevates the avoidance of an arrogance of imposing one’s own values as the true and sole values to a central precept of contemporary philosophy. Reasonable value pluralism (as distinguished from value relativism, where anything goes) is, if you will, the received view. But philosophers frequently neglect this very maxim by presuming the overriding value of reason. An antidote for such presumption is found in the very practice of care. Many who need care are not in a position to exercise their rational functioning (to whatever degree they possess it). Yet for the carer who does good care the value of, and respect owed, the person is never in doubt. The very act of care (when it is good care and not a merely perfunctory carrying out of assigned duties) attests to the value we place on the person’s life and well-being whether or not they are capable of rational deliberation. Caring for one who is seriously dependent on our ministrations can, however, tempt one to presume to know what is good for another and what is of value. It can tempt us to think that we can (or even should) impose our own view on the other. However, such caring, I maintain, is not respectful caring, caring that respects another’s agency. Thus, I believe, best practices of care equally demand that we do not presume that what we value is the only thing that is valuable.21 Finally, there is the issue of accountability, the final maxim. Most practices require some accountability. The need for accountability is inherent in any practice, for without it, one cannot guarantee a consistency of standards. This is evident in practices of care. Parents are held accountable for their children’s actions when harmful actions were foreseeable and preventable. In medical practice, physicians similarly must be held accountable for foreseeable consequences. Any ethic of care must include the importance of being accountable for what we do. Yet, philosophical practice has been strangely inattentive to the importance of accountability. In this philosophers appear to take their cue from theoretical science, 8 The Ethics of Philosophizing 143 in which practitioners claim that they are only after the truth, and if others use their discoveries in a harmful fashion, that is not the pure scientist’s concern.

#### The only ethical alternative is to affirm crippessimism – only a refusal of the world can disrupt the current notion of optimism to validate the fragmented subject. If we win their starting point is ableist they cannot weigh the consequences of it. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best disrupts notions of progress within civil society.

Selck 16 [Selck, Michael L. "Crip Pessimism: The Language of Dis/ability and the Culture that Isn't." (Jan 2016) // WHSRS and Lex VM]

“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.” (1-2) 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.

## 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must always have their mask on unless eating or drinking.

#### Violation: They took it off

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Safety- Spreading without a mask is the most probable way of spreading COVID and germs – that leads to debaters getting sick and not being able to participate in debate tournaments – this also links into happiness/mental health since tournaments will continue online debate tournaments and close down in person ones when they see an influx incases. Happiness/mental health is an independent voter because it means debaters have no motivation to do debate/participate in they’re unhappy. Inclusion is a voter since its an impact filter to everything else

#### 2] Resolvability and Judge Intervention- masks force debaters to speak slower and more clearly. That guarantees judges catching everything on the flow in order to make the correct decision.

## Voter

#### Not wearing a mask is a voting issue – riskiest way of spreading COVID and compromising the safety of the debate space – comes first cuz it leads to debaters getting sick and not participating controls the i/l to inclusion and mental health.

## Case

**Democracy doesn’t exist; it’s just an illusion**

**Dans 14** | Dans, Enrique. “Democracy Doesn't Exist.” Medium, 24 Aug. 2014, - https://medium.com/enrique-dans/democracy-doesnt-exist-875c0fa25b81.

So now we know: the United States is not a democracy. That’s what two US academics, Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page, argue in a newly published study called “Testing theories of American politics: elites, interest groups, and average citizens”, which compiles the replies to polls carried out between 1981 and 2002 among the US electorate proposing more than 2,000 changes to the law, and whether those changes were implemented. The conclusion? That elite and interest groups make a substantial impact on US government policies, while popular initiatives from the wider electorate never get anywhere. An edited version of the piece can be read in this article posted on Talking Points Memo: “Princeton study: US no longer an actual democracy”, or in this great interview with one of the authors on the same site. The study has gone viral in some circles in the United States. The outcome of the research, in line with Gilens’ book, “Affluence and influence: economic inequality and political power in America”, backs up previous studies, and echoes Lawrence Lessig’s presentation on TED called “We the People, and the Republic we must reclaim”, which I would heartily recommend. It’s been seen by more than a million times, and has also been published in book format in Lesterland: the corruption of Congress and how to end it, or the recent funding initiative for a Super PAC to end all PACs (Political Action Committees raise money to lobby Congress or influence candidates). If you haven’t seen Lessig’s presentation, take the time: Gilens and Page’s research only confirms what many ordinary people have suspected for years: that the result of elections matters least. It doesn’t matter who you vote for, in reality democracy is simply a system designed to make sure that the same people’s interests are served. I have written about this many times, and it is something that I have seen close up on the occasions when I have come into close contact with the people who make the decisions in my own country, and that has led me to put as much distance between myself and them as possible. In recent years, as we have seen how the internet has come to play a bigger role in helping civic groups organize, governments everywhere have become worried at this new threat to their hegemony. There is no such thing as democracy: at best we are given the chance to elect a number of theoretical representatives, most of who have not been chosen by us to stand in our name, but on behalf of powerful minorities. The reality is that most countries that consider themselves advanced democracies are run by a small clique of corrupt politicians acting on behalf of an oligarchy. Technology offers us far better ways to organize society than our bankrupt democracies currently do. But technology on its own can’t do the job. We would first have to overcome resistance to change, to fear of doing things differently, and that despite what some would have us believe, people are capable of running their own affairs. The idea that a small group of experts is somehow better qualified to run things on our behalf is nonsense, and only shows just how rotten our political system has become. The really important thing about technological development is that it will end up being able to initiate the disruption in the industry that needs it most: politics.