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#### Modern governance sustains itself through the necropolitical logic of the sacrifice zone. Progress demands drafting bodies into zones of non-being to preserve violent order.

Adebisi ’19 [Foluke Ifejola; December 17; Associate Professor at the Law School, University of Bristol whose scholarship focuses on decolonial thought in legal education; Foluke Africa, “Why I Say ‘Decolonisation is Impossible,’” https://folukeafrica.com/why-i-say-decolonisation-is-impossible/]

The epistemic world is predicated on two major lies. The first lie is that a majority of the people of the world and thus their knowledges and histories are inferior to the rest of the world. The second lie, allied to the first, is that humanity and specifically the supposedly superior portion of humanity is more important than everything else on this planet. The earth we walk on, the air we breathe, the seas, oceans, mountains, birds, animals, fishes, insects. And so I suggest again, maybe a little more strongly, that post-truth is not a recent arrival, but it is exceeding its original territory. Nevertheless, the disappearance of shared objective standards of truth, did not begin with the last shower of rain, but has always been washed away in bodies of water with forgotten names and forgotten histories and a million bodies hidden under them.

Decolonisation and Truth

Decolonisation is often perceived as a means to uncover these histories, but one of the pitfalls of its praxis in higher education is a fundamental misconception of what it requires, both in theory and in practice. It is often confused with any social justice endeavour, or as someone said to me recently, with ‘just being nice to people.’ The four main things decolonisation is confused with are, representation, inclusion, diversity and equality. If you have practiced and/or theorised in these areas, it quickly becomes clear that without critical thought, representation can become toxic and tokenistic, people could be included into spaces that are not safe for them, spaces historically and repeatedly designed to harm and exclude them. Diversity is a fact of life that cannot be promoted without explaining why it has been demoted. General statements of equality often ignore the process of othering and set an unequal normative standard of equality. In all of these schemes we focus on what we are fighting for, rather than what we are fighting against. All our lofty sounding words and good intentions pave the way to hell for groups who are almost routinely left out of our institutions. Notwithstanding that this hell we have paved the way for may be inside or outside of said institutions. The way is paved. The hell exists.

Decolonisation, I suggest, is something conceptually different. Tshepo Madlingozi, says decolonisation is always a disruptive phenomenon, Frantz Fanon calls it a violent process. Tuck and Yang describe decolonisation as nothing else but an undoing of colonisation. Joel Modiri in the video below defines it thus, ‘Decolonisation is an insatiable reparatory demand, an insurrectionary utterance, that always exceeds the temporality and scene of its enunciation. It entails nothing less than an endless fracturing of the world colonialism created.’

 ‘…an endless fracturing of the world colonialism created.’ What then is this world that colonialism created? And was this world not done away with at the end of empire? This is where people confuse the passing away of political colonial structures with the permanence of the colonial logics that drove the process and continue to drive and structure our institutions and our world. There are two overarching logics that I refer to here. One is the commodification of space and nature, the other is the commodification of humanity and variably valued labour. Built on these overarching logics is the mostly racial and gendered categorisation and hierarchization of peoples into those who labour and those who benefit from that labour. This system is given legitimisation by drafting people (the wretched/damned of the earth) into what Fanon calls the zone of non-being, according to Grosfoguel, this is below the line of the human. Hickel calls this zone the sacrifice zone. As Achille Mbembe’s work on the practice of necropolitics explains, political power is deployed globally to decide ‘who may live and who must die…’ in service of maintaining the world colonisation created.

Or as George Sefa Dei and Chizoba Imoka describe ‘To colonize … One has to equate the purpose of life to material acquisitions, affirm their personhood only through their ability to dominate/bully others, shrink their mental capacity so as not to respect/understand human diversity and rationalize a wide range of unfettered violence.’

Thus we must never forget that this categorisation of humanity always, always, always serves the purpose of marking for death and marking for life. Marking for visibility and marking for erasure and silence. Dispossession always serves the purpose of accumulation. ‘who may live and who must die…’

Therefore, and I reiterate very strongly, we cannot decolonise while relying on colonial logics of commodification of labour and space. This commodification is everywhere in UK HE. We have REF, TEF, KEF and the NSS. We have a varied assortment of university rankings… they all rely on logics of linking value to productivity, while also ignoring institutional racism, sexism, ableism, homophobia etc. These refusals to see, refusals to change, mean that we have strapped ourselves to a machine designed to destroy us. But we live in hope that before it does, at least it feeds us, sustains us for a while, unlike the poor benighted souls in the sacrifice zone, the wretched and damned of the earth, trampled under the wheels of the machine and then cast into the river with its forgotten names, its waters closing over their heads as they drift off into the silence. We do not remember their names. For most of them we never knew they names, never bothered to say those names. Too difficult to pronounce. Their bodies and their realities were too dissonant and distant, too foreign to fit into the normative frames of disciplines that did not consider the wretched and damned human at the dawn of the discipline’s inception. Now the discipline is complete, the canon closed and all it can do is fire out at a dying world.

#### **Nuclear energy is a eugenic fantasy of control---a system that glorifies productivity, creates the sustainability crisis, and renders disabled bodies disposable in service of economic efficiency. It doesn’t preserve life; it selects who is worth preserving.**

Wolbring ’11 [Gregor Wolbring; Associate Professor, University of Calgary’s Cumming School of Medicine, Program in Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, expert in ableism and disability ethics. 2011, " Ableism and Energy Security and Insecurity ", Hein Online, https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/selt5&div=4&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=ZVZ2k34VRAwAAAAA:dpmBG2o3Dvaw32oXCMpbpf\_OhA388yBmxIM3kSaXvmGIRvIHJfS-c6r-zWFkmcrECyqoxFtL7xc&collection=journals] mac

Introduction:

"Energy is fundamental to the quality of our lives. Nowadays, we are very dependent on an abundant and uninterrupted supply of energy for living and working. It is a key ingredient in all sectors of modern economies"(European Commission 2009). Energy security based on access, affordability, and quality is an essential driver for development (Pandey 2009). The European Commission Directorate-General for Energy and Transport highlighted in 2006 two ways to deal with energy insecurity: "reducing energy demand by changing consumption patterns or using energy in a "greener", more diverse and more efficient manner" (European Commission Directorate-General for Research Directorate Energy 2006). The European Community is not alone in feeling that their energy security is threatened (The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2006;Cohen 2006;Institute for the Analysis of Global Security 2004;Glenn, Gordon, and Florescu Elizabeth 2009). The fear of energy insecurity is also exploited. In a recent financial times article with the title "Total warns of Energy insecurity" one reads that: "Total, the French oil group, has warned politicians that they risk accelerating an oil supply crunch if they enact environmental policies that deter investment in oil and gas before enough viable alternatives are available"(Hoyos 2009). In developed countries, most of the discourses are around how to keep one's level of energy security and one's level of consumption and way of living. However, for many individuals energy insecurity is part of their daily life. According to the World Energy Outlook report by the International Energy Agency, some 1.6 billion people - one-quarter of the world population - have no access to electricity. In the absence of vigorous new policies, 1.4 billion people will still lack electricity in 2030 (World Bank 2005).

So what to do? The Ethics of Energy report by the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology states, "It is calculated that an amount of energy roughly equivalent to 7 per cent of the world's current electricity production could cover basic human needs. In an age of apparently advanced technological and management skills, we have failed in this relatively modest challenge" (Kimmins 2001). "How do we balance short-term social costs, borne largely by the poor, the disadvantaged and the developing nations (costs that may in the immediate future increase the disparities between rich and poor) against the long-term benefits of moving to a more sustainable society and protecting the global environment?" (Kimmins 2001). An ethical matrix is employed by various people (Beauchamp and Childress 1979;Mepham 2000) to visualize different angles and competing interests in a given discourse. This paper submits an ethical matrix for energy as a tool to visualize the different angles and competing interests in the energy discourse.

Furthermore, the author introduces the angle of favouritism for abilities and ableism as a new analytical lens through which one can analyse the energy discourse and look for governance options and solutions. One aspect that shapes behaviors in the energy discourse is that individuals, households, communities, groups, sectors, regions, countries and cultures cherish and promote certain abilities while viewing other abilities as non-essential or even undesirable (favoritism of abilities)(Wolbring 2008a). A step beyond the dynamic of favoring certain abilities is the dynamic of ableism where one not only cherishes certain abilities but where one sees certain abilities in oneself or others as essential. The list of abilities one can cherish is endless, with abilities added to the list all the time. Ableism leads to an ability-based and ability-justified understanding of oneself, one's body and one's relationship with others of one's species, other species and one's environment.

The purpose of this paper is to a) highlight how ableisms and local and global favoritism for certain abilities affect energy security and insecurity discourses and b) investigate the impact of existing ableisms on the development of ethical frameworks for the energy issue and vice versa. , This paper suggests the fields of abilities and ableism ethics, governance, foresight and studies as new fields of academic and non-academic inquiry as additional analysis and governance tools to deal with existing and to come energy challenges.

The Energy Security Situation:

Energy security concerns are not viewed merely in terms of ensuring a sustained supply but in the wider context of energy being an essential driver for development-based on access, affordability, and quality. (European Commission 2009) Many countries from Europe to the USA, China, India, as well as lowincome countries feel energy insecure. (European Commission 2009;European Commission Directorate-General for Energy and Transport 2006;Cohen 2006;The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2006) Most of the energy security and insecurity discourses in developed countries are around oil, gas and coal and about becoming independent of oil without having to give up the energy consumption level one is accustomed to and jeopardizing energy security. For 1.6 billion people, especially in low income countries, energy insecurity and lack of energy is part of their daily life (International Energy Agency 2009). On average, the poorest 2.5 billion people in the world use only 0.2 TOE (tonnes of oil equivalent) per capita annually while the billion richest people use five TOE per capita per year, which is 25 times more. In terms of electricity consumption, the richest 20 per cent uses 75 per cent of all electricity while the poorest 20 per cent uses less than 3 per cent (World Energy Council, 2000 cited in Rosario 2002)"(Gaye 2007) For Africa, the State of the Future 2008 states "the region will need to spend $563 billion over the next 25 years to increase generation capacity by 270 gigawatts and avoid a power crisis." According to the International Energy Agency (IEA) Energy Technology Perspectives 2008, in order to avoid catastrophic consequences of climate change urgent technology development and deployment at unprecedented rates are needed: from renewables to carbon capture and storage (CCS), **nuclear power**, low carbon fuels, and end-use efficiency. (International Energy Agency 2008) De-carbonizing the global energy system will require additional investment of US$3.6 trillion in power plants and US$5.7 trillion in energy efficiency over the period 2010-2030. These additional investments correspond to 0.6% of GDP per year, but bring fuel cost savings to consumers of the order of US$ 6 trillion. (International Energy Agency 2008)

The State of the future 2008 (Glenn, Gordon, and Florescu Elizabeth 2008) and 2009 (Glenn, Gordon, and Florescu Elizabeth 2009) highlight many examples of energy solutions from among others Africa, the USA and China. Achieving energy security varies between countries and within countries, usually depending upon the state of development and the availability of indigenous energy supplies. (World Bank 2005)

The industrialized, net-energy importing countries' priorities to generate energy security are

\* Avoid disruption of energy supplies;

\* Diversification of energy supply sources;

\* Security concerns for energy infrastructure;

\* Technological solutions to reduce dependence on imported supplies. (World Bank 2005)

For mid- to low-income net energy importers the ability to meet growing demand for energy from imported sources may occur by

\*Securing capital and financing for investment in resource development and infrastructure;

\* Meeting people's basic energy needs and creating effective demand for energy services. (World Bank 2005) For major hydrocarbon exporting countries, market strategies include

\* Long term markets at reasonable prices

\* Diversification of export markets for energy resources;

\* Securing capital and financing for investment in resource development and infrastructure. (World Bank 2005)

\*With so many different views on energy security and insecurity, so many players with divergent agenda's and needs, how do we solve energy security and insecurity issues and deal with competing interests? Can ethic theories and discourses give some guidance to the energy discourses?

What is Ableism

The term ableism evolved from the civil rights movements in the United States and Britain during the 1960s and 1970s (Encyclopedia of Disability 2006) to question and highlight the expectations towards certain body abilities and the prejudice and discrimination persons experienced whose body structure and ability functioning was labelled as 'impaired'. The disabled people rights discourse and scholars of the academic field of disability studies question the assumption of deficiency intrinsic to non-normative body abilities and the favoritism for normative species-typical body abilities (Carlson 2001;Finkelstein 1996;Mitchell and Snyder 1997;Olyan 2009;Rose 2003;Schipper 2006;Fiona A.K.Campbell 2001;Carlson 2001;Overboe 2007).

However, the favoritism for abilities and ableism is a much broader phenomenon. Every person cherishes certain abilities and finds others nonessential. The list of abilities one can cherish is endless with abilities added to the list all the time. The capability approach, the ability-to-do approach was developed by Amartya Sen, Martha Nussbaum and Sudhir Anand (for many articles on this topic see (Human Development and Capability Association 2010). Nussbaum generated a list of 10 essential capabilities (Nussbaum 2000) whereby capability in the end is the ability to act, to have access to and to have the opportunity. A social policy frame identifies certain abilities as essential that people should have the right to act on, and so exhibits certain forms of ableisms. The cherishing of abilities happens on the level of individuals as well as on the level of households, communities, groups, sectors, regions, countries and cultures (Wolbring 2008a) and has changed over time and will continue to change. Favoring certain abilities often morphs into ableism where one not only cherishes certain abilities but where one sees certain abilities in oneself or others as essential. Ableism leads to an ability-based and ability-justified understanding of oneself, one's body and one's relationship with others of one's species, other species and one's environment (Wolbring 2008a). Ableism as such is not negative it just highlights that one favours certain abilities and sees them as essential. One could choose to cherish the ability to maintain equity for one's members and members of a society could see this as positive. However, certain ableisms have historically been used and still are used by various social groups to justify their elevated level of rights and status in relation to other social groups, other species, and the environment (Wolbring 2008a;Wolbring 2008b;Wolbring 2008c). Certain ableisms are used to justify racism, sexism, cast-ism, ageism and speciesism(Wolbring 2008a;Wolbring 2008b;Wolbring 2008c). Ableism used in a negative way often leads to disablism, (Miller, Parker, and Gillinson 2004) the lack of accommodation for the needs of people and other biological structures who are seen to not have certain abilities; the unwillingness to adapt to the needs of others.

Ethics of Energy Security

The Ethics of Energy report by the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology covered the reality of energy poverty and energy inequity that often does not allow for the fulfilment of basic needs such as nutrition, warmth and light (Kimmins 2001). However, how do we deal with this energy inequity? How do we deal with competing interests? According to the Ethics and Climate Change in Asia and the Pacific research program of UNESCO Bangkok WGI: Universalism and Environmental Values, "when we think about energy choices and environmental challenges, and the ethics on science and engineering, we have to ask three important questions for convenience and global action:

Is there a set of universal ethics agreeable to the entire human race?

Can a set of universal ethics work across the many communities?

If not, what is an alternative to ethical universalism that can be applied when dealing with global challenges such as environmental degradation and climate change?" (Jasdev Singh Rai\* and Members of EETAP Working Group I (\*chair) 2009)

The ethical matrix is one methodology used to visualize key stakeholders in a given discourse and to link the discourse and its stakeholders to some basic ethical values. It was first employed in medical ethics by Beauchamp and Childress (Beauchamp and Childress 1979) and since then used for various topics (Mepham 1996;Mepham 2003;Mepham 2000;Beekman et al. 2006;Cotton 2009;Food Ethics Council 2009;Kaiser and Forsberg 200l;Whiting 2004;Brom et al. 2006). The matrix has normally three columns: Well Being, Autonomy, and Fairness.

Taking the basic three aspects of existing ethical matrices the author submits in Table I an ethical matrix for energy

<<TABLE OMITTED>>

This ethical matrix introduced here is not a result of any consultative process but a thought product of the author. This matrix uses three main values evident in Western ethics discourses, which are the ethics categories of the original matrix. However, different cultures and societies differ in their values and weigh the needs of stakeholders differently. The UNESCO Bangkok energy ethics-working group I highlights the difficulty if not impossibility of a universal ethics and strategy. (Jasdev Singh Rai\* and Members of EETAP Working Group I (\*chair) 2009) One might have to generate different ethical matrices for different cultures and societies. The above ethical matrix highlights further that many different groups have a stake in the direction and outcome of the energy security discourse. Many of these stakeholders have competing ability interests in today's world and the different ability interests have to be reconciled to a certain extend. One could make an argument that different values and irreconcilable, competing ability interests were two main reasons why the 2009 Copenhagen summit (COP15) in the eyes of many failed and did not deliver a global breakthrough. The adherence to different ableisms by different groups led to competing ability interests in Copenhagen that could not be resolved. The author submits that this arena of unresolved competing ability interests is one reason why there continues to be so little progress on the international level in the area of climate change and energy security.

Energy Security, Energy Ethics and Ableism:

The UNESCO Working group one states:

"Environmental values in the different regions of the world are ideally drawn from a diversity of rich philosophical and religious heritages. However, to what extent can common ground be found among the various traditions within a United Nations (UN) system that promotes the principle of universal values through dialogue among different civilisations? Is it important or appropriate to seek universal values, or should there be more focus on establishing a framework for pluralist environmental values? Are there common values across cultures that can constitute the foundation for building and promoting a more sustainable economic growth, preserving biodiversity and preventing the environment from deteriorating further?"

"If we can agree upon international values such as principles of environmental ethics, then we can include these principles into economic models in order to develop policy that may better protect these values." (Jasdev Singh Rai\* and Members of EETAP Working Group I (\*chair) 2009)

Whether we can agree on universal values depends partly on who favours what abilities and what forms of ableism different stakeholder' s exhibit.

What abilities one favours and what ableisms one exhibits defines the human-nature relationship which in turn has an impact on which strategies and priorities are envisioned and employed for gaining energy security and avoiding energy insecurity. There are two main schools of thought on the relationship of humans with nature (anthropocentrism and bio/ecocentrism) each favouring different abilities.

Anthropocentrism and Ableism

Anthropocentrism sees humans at the center of the Earth and even the Universe. Consequently, nature is considered disposable to whatever degree humans require, no matter what their needs. In contrast, the needs of nature are never considered. "The political theories that organized Western societies since the birth of the nation-state in the 17th century are centered on the well-being of the human species with the well-nigh exclusion of the well-being of other life forms and of the Earth's life-support systems" (Verhagen 2008). This anthropocentric view of the human-nature relationship is a form of ableism. One could say that the biosphere, the ecosystem and Nature experience disablism intrinsic to this form of ableism, which sees nature as being at the disposal of human needs. Anthropocentric environmental protection fights pollution, resource depletion and now climate change with the goal of preserving a particular human way of living, which today is often driven by favouring the ability to consume, the ability to outperform others, and the ability to generate a high Gross Domestic Product. To be wrapped up in GDP-ism, consumerism and competitiveness-ism leads to a perception of needs and required actions. For today's energy and climate discourse these three -isms precondition people to look for more 'eco-friendly' energy sources so long as these sources fulfill the isms of GDP-ism, consumerism and competitiveness-ism. While sources of eco-friendly energy may reduce the deleterious impact on nature, the motivation for doing so has little to do in most cases with providing for nature's needs but with the realization that the 'old' ways of treating nature threaten GDP-ism, consumerism and competitiveness-ism. At the same time one searches for techno-tools such as geoengineering that can help to alleviate the impact of GDP-ism, consumerism and competitiveness-ism on nature without having to abandon GDP-ism, consumerism and competitiveness- 1sm.

Biocentric/ecocentric and Ableism

The biocentric/ecocentric position is another form of ableism that places the biosphere--the whole ecosystem--at the center of a person's way of life, thought and feeling. It represents a partnership model between humans and nature. It cherishes a form of ableism that favours the ability of humans and nature to live in harmony. Biocentric/ecocentric driven environmental protection focuses on sustainability of lifestyle exhibited by humans using sustainability indicators such as the Human Development Index (HDI), the Weighted Index of Social Progress (WISP), the Happy Planet Index (HPI), the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), the Economic Living Standard Index (ELSI), and the National Wellbeing Index (NWI), which is published in a variety of countries. Korea publishes a comprehensive statistical yearbook, which includes 492 social indicators in 13 areas highlighting sustainability instead of consumability, and competitiveness. China initiated the Green GDP which includes the cost of neglecting nature as part of the GDP but regrettably, when the numbers showed high costs associated with the bad treatment of nature China discontinued this measure (Nature 2007). However, India has stated an interest in developing a Green GDP by 2015 (Reuters India 2009).

The biocentric/ecocentric school of thought promotes a political orientation known as, biocracylecocracy. Essentially, biocracy is a political system in which not only humans vote, but so do other living beings or Earth systems (Berry 1990). An ecocentric perspective would include in this vote the whole of the ecosystem. According to Verhagen: "evidence of an emerging biocracy in the modem Western world is legislation about endangered species and the representation of other life forms during political assemblies when persons or organizations become spokespersons and keepers of rivers, forests etc" (Verhagen 2008). Ecuador could be construed as the first country that is a legal biocracy and ecocracy. Articles 71-74 of its new constitution describe the relationship of humans to nature. Articles 71-74 can be interpreted as giving rights to the 'entity' nature. Provided below is a translation. The numbering and order of Articles has been edited to make the translation adhere to the Spanish original] (Revkin 2008)

"Art. 71. Nature or Pachamama [a goddess revered by the indigenous people of the Andes -- "Mother Earth"], where life is reproduced and exists, has the right to exist, persist, maintain and regenerate its vital cycles, structure, functions and its processes in evolution. Every person, people, community or nationality, will be able to demand the recognitions of rights for nature before public authorities. The application and interpretation of these rights will comply with the principles established in the Constitution. The State will provide incentive for natural and juridical persons, as well as collectives, to protect nature; it will promote respect towards all the elements that form an ecosystem.

Art. 72. Nature has the right to an integral restoration. This integral restoration is independent of the obligation on natural and juridical persons or the State to indemnify the people and the collectives that depend on the natural systems. In the cases of severe or permanent environmental impact, including the ones caused by the exploitation on non-renewable natural resources, the State will establish the most efficient mechanisms for the restoration, and will adopt adequate measures to eliminate or mitigate the harmful environmental consequences.

Art. 73. The State will apply measures of precaution and restriction in all the activities that can lead to the extinction of species, the destruction of the ecosystems or the permanent alteration of the natural cycles. The introduction of organisms and organic and inorganic material that can alter in a definitive way the national genetic patrimony is prohibited.

Art. 74. Persons, people, communities and nationalities will have the right to benefit from the environment and form natural wealth that will allow wellbeing. Environmental services will not be subject to appropriation; its production, provision, use and exploitation, will be regulated by the State."

It furthermore sets a hierarchy between different needs whereby the ability for food and water security is given higher priorities than energy security:

Art. 15 - The State shall promote, in the public and private sector, the use of environmentally clean technologies and clean alternative energy. Energy sovereignty will not be achieved at the expense of food sovereignty, or affect the right to water (Environmental law alliance worldwide 2010)

Conclusion

Energy security is a critical global issue. Energy Security is essential for many other goals. Reaching global energy security depends on global strategy and vision, which should especially take into account the people who already experience energy insecurity. The Bangkok office of UNESCO is coordinating a broad research program into the ethics of climate change in Asia and the Pacific (up to October 2009 the title was ethics of energy in Asia and the Pacific). UNESCO recently looked at the advisability of preparing a draft Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles in Relation to Climate Change which would also cover energy issues (UNESCO 2009a;UNESCO 2009b).

"The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) - which range from halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education, all by the target date of 2015 - form a blueprint agreed to by all the world's countries and all the world's leading development institutions" (United Nations 2005). All 189 United Nations Member States have pledged to meet the goals by the year 2015. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon is quoted on the MDG website as saying: "Time is short. We must seize this historic moment to act responsibly and decisively for the common good" (United Nations 2005). In a recent UN document one finds the acknowledgment that energy security is essential for all MDG goals (UNDP et al. 2007).

In 2001-02 the Millennium Project in collaboration with the Foresight and Governance Project of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Study conducted a survey to generate an international outlook on what goals might be desirable to achieve and what is seen as politically achievable by 2050 (Glenn, Gordon, and Florescu Elizabeth 2008). Most of the 44 identified goals (such as ending water shortages, water pollution and hunger) are directly affected by the existence of energy security or indirectly affected because whether energy security exists or not changes the political and societal culture in such a way that the list of goals would change as would the sentiment of which goals are achievable.

However, despite the pervasive importance of energy security so far, no global consensus has emerged as to how far and with which tools to address energy inequity. Techno solutions to energy security proposed are stalled or pushed forward in many places depending on how they impact consumerism and competitiveness. If a form of Ableism that favors productivity, consumerism and competitiveness is the main driver for envisioning and directing solutions for energy security one can expect product developments that further this form of Ableism.

Whether one follows an anthropocentric or biocentric view leads to different policies. Ableisms such as GDP-ism (the ability to produce), consumerism (the ability to consume whatever one wants), competitiveness-ism (the ability to out-compete others) very likely favour anthropocentric over biocentric views as long as they do not impede the very isms seen as essential. The ability to live in harmony with one's surroundings for example might favour the biocentric or ecocentric view. What ability one favours also has direct implications for energy security.

The author submits that the development of effective global policies related to energy that will meet local needs and increase global energy security might be furthered if one analyses the energy discourse through the lens of the fields of ableism ethics, ableism studies, ableism governance and ableism foresight (Wolbring 2008a).

#### Sustainability reform and the fascination with ‘tech progress’ reproduce ableist tropes and mask interdependence.

Fenney ’17 [Deborah; 2017; Ph.D. in sociology and social policy from the University of Leeds; Environmental Values, “Ableism and Disablism in the UK Environmental Movement,” vol. 26]

This research was informed by a social-relational approach to disability (Thomas 1999). Disability Ableism, meanwhile, provides a framework for considering why environments and activities have been constructed in particular ways, and which embodiments (and which abilities) are currently assumed and valued. Therefore a consideration of ableism, using Campbell's definition, can complement a social-relational approach to disability. The two are thus used alongside each other to enable wider theorising of disabled people's experiences in this research. A further key concept for this research is that of 'sustainable lifestyles'. This is a widely used concept in policy literature, but there is little consensus as to what, exactly, a sustainable lifestyle entails (Shirani et al. 2015). It can relate to a wide range of pro-environmental activities, from domestic to public (see e.g. Defra 2011), and this understanding is adopted in this paper. Similarly, wider understandings of sustainability are also highly contested. To briefly summarise one key debate, 'weak' sustainability approaches that focus on continued economic growth facilitated by technological progress are contrasted with 'strong' sustainability approaches that are less optimistic about the potential of technology and concern themselves with finite resources and the need to protect nature (see e.g. Neumayer 2010). The UK's policy approach implies the former, while a significant strand of the UK environmental movement may be characterised by the latter. Both approaches, however, risk obscuring social issues such as those relevant to disability. For example, 'weak' sustainability approaches, such as those in UK policy, are grounded in a wider neoliberal paradigm. This leads to overly focusing on the economy, which, along with other features of neoliberalism, has been implicated in maintaining disability as a form of oppression (Barnes 2005; Wilton and Schuer 2006). In the case of 'strong' sustainability, this is often associated with the more radical side of environmental activism that rejects current dominant economic (and sometimes political) system(s). It may also be characterised by an individualistic understanding of humanity and prizing of a traditional view of independence--that is, doing things without assistance - and self-sufficiency, as has been identified in some environmentally focused intentional communities (Fenney Salkeld 2015; Sargisson 2009). As will be shown, this kind of approach also has potentially negative implications for disabled people.

#### The alternative is an orientation towards disability justice. Grassroots battles are efficacious in the face of perpetual war AND debility, which makes the NEG a prerequisite.

Pitters ’22 [Destiny Pitters; writer, scholar, and advocate for decolonization and abolition. 09-07-2022, "Disability and war", Briarpatch, https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/disability-and-war]

In the face of this, the disability justice movement in the Global North must work to oppose war, militarism, imperial violence, and debilitation. Puar gives the example of the Abolition and Disability Justice Collective which, she says, “recognizes the connected carceral infrastructures, that settler colonialism here supports settler colonialism there.” In 2021, as Israeli airstrikes landed in the Gaza Strip, the group released a statement of solidarity with Palestine, writing that “Israeli settler colonization is a disability justice issue that underscores the urgency of abolition and its internationalist dimensions.”

We have been taught to see war as a conflict that comes to a head through physical, chemical, or nuclear altercation in a country far away. In actuality, we are part of the constant cycle of war and militarism – be it police brutality, colonial occupation, or military expansion under the guise of “humanitarian intervention.” This is what some scholars have called “perpetual war”: the constant growth of military powers, meant to sustain endless fights against nebulous enemies such as “terrorism.”

“One of the things that the War on Terror has really shown us is that war doesn’t ever need to end – it’s actually something that’s sustainable, and it’s profitable,” Puar tells me. “War isn’t a simple relationship between one side and the other, but a multiplayer, proxied [event] that has numerous economic and ideological and political relations embedded in it. […] What it means to focus on maiming along with killing means actually to understand war differently, in some sense – because it’s a kind of ongoing bodily assault.”

Resisting war, militarism, imperial violence and debilitation must begin at the grassroots level. Here, many disability justice, anti-war, and penal abolitionist organizers are already fighting against the military-industrial complex and advocating for peace and community-based safety. Supporters of disability justice displace the need for police and military by practising unarmed civilian protection, from Minnesota to South Sudan; campaigning to defund, demilitarize, and abolish the police; protesting against weapons deals and manufacturers; calling for reinvestments in social services and health care; and advocating for returns to Indigenous models of justice, among other things.

In Puar’s words, it is a fantasy “that resistance can be located, stripped, and emptied,” whether from the land or the body. The world that disability justice advocates aim to create centers co-operation, community, and the dignity of those most marginalized – a world that cannot be achieved through the endlessly violent cycle of war.

#### The role of the judge is to interrupt debates disabling environment. Prioritize epistemic orientations that refuse debate as a space of militarized education and productivity---that’s key to challenge ableism and eugenic violence.

Castrodale ’15 [Mark; 2015; Ph.D., professor of social sciences at the University of Sheffield; Gendered Militarism in Canada, “A Critical Discussion on Disabled Subjects Examining Ableist and Militarist Discourses in Education,” Ch. 5 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289253007\_A\_critical\_discussion\_on\_disabled\_subjects\_Examining\_ableist\_and\_militarist\_discourses\_in\_education]

Drawing on the works of Foucault (1984, 1994, 1995, 2003), one sees that gendered and disabled bodies are constituted discursively through webs of knowledge-power relations, and subjects may also work to constitute themselves. Examination of the intersection of gender and disability may shed new light on the ways in which bodies are constituted in various educational sites in potentially disempowering and empowering ways. In Discipline and Punish Foucault (1995) discusses disciplinary tactics and the “ vast science of war ” (p. 168) that applies to “ the general foundation of all military practice, from the control and exercise of individual bodies to the use of forces specific to the most complex multiplicities ” (p. 167).. Military knowledges represent a body of knowledge of how to know, move, coerce, discipline, and govern people (Foucault, 1995). Foucault demonstrates military knowledge as a foundation of tactics, procedures, manoeuvres, exercises , and functions, which may be used to regulate and shape entire societies, thereby extending into educational realms.

According to Foucault (1995), discipline entails a series of calculated measures, methods , and techniques aimed at observing, knowing, ranking, and rendering bodies useful and docile. For Foucault , a disciplined docile body may be corrected, controlled, and regulated as an “ object and target of power, ” where in every society individuals are subjected to “constraints, prohibitions, or obligations” (p. 136). Discipline increases the forces of the body in terms of socio-economic utility and decreases forces of resistance to encourage obedience (Foucault, 1995). All bodies may be enhanced. The perfect body, in military terms, is mouldable, moveable, and trainable (Foucault, 1995).

Militarization entails seeking advantages, advancing a position, finding tactical opportunities, and developing new technologies. Coordinating bodies that are unpredictable and unruly becomes troublesome. Militaries have been interested and invested in bodies, in making bodies perform certain spatio-temporally coordinated tasks (Foucault, 1995). For militaristic purposes bodies are trained, observed, organized, located, fixed, coordinated together or independently, and moved in rhythmic timings and particular places. Foucault describes this ideal soldier as a male

who could be recognized from afar; he bore certain signs: the natural signs of his strength and his courage, the marks, too, of his pride; his body was the blazon of his strength and valour...the soldier has become something that can be made; out of a formless clay, an inapt body, the machine required can be constructed; posture is gradually corrected; a calculated constraint runs slowly through each part of the body, mastering it, making it pliable, ready at all times, turning silently into the automatism of habit. (p. 135)

Soldiers’ bodies thus represent mouldable bodies that can be trained in the service of their country; they are oxymoronically disposable and indispensable citizens (see Taber, Chapter 4 of this volume, for a discussion of the latter).

Disabled bodies are often characterized as deviant, labelled and sorted according to biomedical , psychological disciplinary fields of knowledges (Murray, 2007), understood as imperfect, faulty, fat, weak, penetrable, and leaky (Shildrick, 1997). The disabled body is seen as deficient, abnormal, and in need of fixing. Disability is associated with dependence, and the disabled body often represents an “entity to be conquered” (Batts & Andrews, 2011, p. 558). Urla and Terry (1995) assert that “scientific and popular modes of representing bodies are never innocent but always tie bodies to larger systems of knowledge production and, indeed, to social and material inequality ” (p. 3).

Unpacking the constitution of all bodies entails critically thinking about the biomedical gaze (Foucault, 2003), dividing practices, hierarchical rankings, and normalizing judgments (Foucault, 1995), the materiality of bodies (Butler, 1993), the carnal politics of embodiment, and theorizing relating to the intersection of disability, gender, sexuality, race, and class. According to Goodley (2011), “a body or mind that is disabled is also one that is raced, gendered, trans/nationally sited, aged, sexualised and classed” (p. 33). Seeking to improve bodies deemed to be weak and fragile, military operations have developed bio-robotic, technological inventions such as the exoskeleton , which may enhance balance, speed , agility, and efficiency of movement and increase load -carrying capacity (Bogue, 2009). Not only do these technologies support direct military objectives, but they extend into the civilian arena, improving and rehabilitating disabled bodies often to move further and function faster in accordance with able-bodied norms. All bodies may be blended with bio- medical , militarized technologies to render them more useful and productive.

CDS offers avenues to critically examine military technologies in relation to how they shape the mattering of bodies. Technologies relating to augmentation and enhancement are of particular military interest. The ways in which bodies are moulded to fit and function with new technologies create hybrid bodies and perhaps new cyborg-body identities (Harraway, 1991). As an example, the prosthetic limbs of the model and athlete Aimee Mullins are imbued with aesthetic form and function. Thompson (2004) comments on how she “counters the insistent narrative that one must overcome impairment rather than incorporating it into one’s life and self, even perhaps as a benefit.…Mullins uses her conformity with beauty standards to assert her disability’s violation of those very standards. As legless and beautiful, she is an embodied paradox, asserting an inherently disruptive potential” (p. 97).

Thus, socio-cultural standards of beauty and ability are tied to norms of gendered performativity, connected in a nexus of function and form, aesthetic norms and norms surrounding movement, and ability in various spaces and contexts. To transgress these norms is to violate the “ideal” of “able-bodied” and the “ways of being, or moving, that…approximate more closely to the bodily actions and practices of ‘able-bodied’ people” (Price & Shildrick, 2002, p. 67).

As militarized technologies, ideals, standards, and values enter educational realms and inform pedagogical practices, it is essential to critically evaluate new educational technologies, examining how they relate to the ways in which teachers and learners are constituted. Such technologies may reflect normalized, gendered, and able-bodied ideals and reinforce dominant ways of thinking and being in the world. For Falk (2008), all pedagogies may represent military pedagogies because education is a strategic weapon that shapes individuals’ subjectivities as nation-states vie for power. As such, “education doesn’t win hearts and minds. Education makes them” (p. 2).

#### Our advocacy is a prior question to conceptions of procedural fairness

Castrodale ’18 [Mark Anthony; 2018; Ph.D., professor of social sciences at the University of Sheffield; Manifestor for the Future of Critical Disability Studies, “Disabling militarism: Theorising anti-militarism, dis/ability and dis/placement,” p. 66-68 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781351053341-7/disabling-militarism-mark-anthony-castrodale]

Disability represents a discursive-matter of interest well situated in the military-industrial-academia nexus. Critical disability and Mad studies scholars often examine disability as the social oppression of impaired persons where there is no single way of knowing or understanding disability (Taylor, 2004) nor madness (see LeFrançois, Menzies, and Reaume, 2013). These fields represent areas that root disablement not in individuals but in disabling environments and socio-political-economic structures (Castrodale, 2015). Similarly, Mad studies centres its discussions on the examination of psy-violence, the oppression of consumers, survivors, ex-patients (c/s/x), and how sanism negatively impacts the lives of Mad/crazy people (Beresford and Russo, 2016; Costa, 2014; LeFrançois, Menzies, and Reaume, 2013; Reville and Church, 2012; Russo and Beresford, 2015). Mad studies and self-identifying Mad subjects are reclaiming the term mad from its pejorative roots (Costa, 2014).

Dis/abled subjectivities are mediated by socio-spatialities (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 2010) and alienated through unequal geographies (Soja, 2010). As Soja (ibid., p. 105) states, ‘space is filled with politics and privileges … justice and injustice, oppressive power and the possibility for emancipation’. A radical rethinking of socio-spatial-temporal norms requires an intersectional focus, a sustained look at power-knowledge embodiment-materiality and space (Foucault, 1984). Within the military–industrial–academic nexus, how do Mad and dis/abled subjects matter, that is, how do they materialise and have meaning (see Butler, 1993)?

Fitting is contingent and contextual – people fit in accordance with socio-spatial-temporal norms. We are enmeshed in our geographies. For Garland-Thomson (2011, p. 592), therefore:

The concept of misfit emphasizes the particularity of varying lived embodiments and avoids a theoretical generic disabled body that can dematerialize if social and architectural barriers no longer disabled it … the concept of misfitting as a shifting spatial and perpetually temporal relationship confers agency and value on disabled subjects at risk of social devaluation by highlighting adapt-ability, resourcefulness, and subjugated knowledge as potential effects of misfitting.

Mis/fitting attends to ‘how the particularities of embodiment interact with the environment in its broadest sense, to include both its spatial and temporal aspects’ (Garland-Thomson, 2011, p. 591). Mad and dis/abled subjects are thereby intelligibly–materially understood as mis/fitting subjects in relation to ableist/sanist socio-spatial-temporal ideals.

Fit is relevant when unpacking able-sane socio-spatial privilege. ‘Finding one’s fit entails negotiating spatial-temporal norms, rethinking the material-embodiment-space nexus, and unpacking institutional power-knowledge webs enabling and constraining different spaces, embodiments, and fits’ (Castrodale, 2015, p. 374). This troubles how our contingent fleshiness becomes measured in relation to the Western dominant normate aesthetics of a man who is white, able-bodied, athletic, thin, and proportioned (Garland-Thomson, 1997). ‘Environmental fit makes nondisabled people less aware of their own embodied privilege’ (Hamraie, 2013, np). Able-bodied sane normative privilege is thus a reduction/absence of mis/fitting socio-spatial violent friction that wears on bodies and minds. Ableist/sanist friction productively works to grind misfitting people into a conformist sane, abled-bodied shape.

As an example of new fitting military–civilian technologies, a prosthetics limb may have a range of motion beyond that of congenital limbs. As Cohen (2012) attests, ‘prosthetic incorporations call attention to the limits and boundaries of our bodies and the broader contexts to which they are connected’. Prosthetic advances expose our human parts as lacking, as less capable and hardy than our potential cyborg futurities (Haraway, 1991). As technologies of fit, prosthetics have socio-cultural significance, lubricating the body-function-spatiality-context mismatch, easing the body–space fit (see also Garland-Thomson, 2011). Prosthetics may also be transgressive.

Militarised spatio-temporal regimes materially shape dis/abled subjects’ embodied materiality and play a constitutive role in discursively mediating who fits, and who is deemed to embody all that is unfit (ibid.). Fitness relates to a biomedical gaze, regimes of truths, observations, calculations and exercises (Foucault, 2006). As Goodley and Runswick-Cole (2016, p. 6) attest, ‘Dis/ability usefully disarms, disrupts and disturbs normative, taken-for-granted, deeply societally engrained assumptions about what it means to be human …’. Our conceptions of a hyper-masculine, able-bodied, strong, fit, autonomous soldier rest on the uber-able soldier subject. Discourses of fitness pervade militaristic ideology. Those devalued and deemed unfit are in need of exercise regimes and training to adjust their deficient selves. ‘Not all bodies are granted the status of persons (let alone of human)’ (Goodley and Runswick-Cole, 2016, p. 7). Ideals of hyper-masculine able-bodied soldiers are cast as brave warriors, as opposed to frail feminised disabled subjects (Castrodale, 2015). Constitutions of devalued humans are evoked as a rationale as to why they rightfully may be harmed or perish.

Garland-Thomson’s (2011) concept of mis/fitting is useful as an explanatory theory of how Mad and disabled subjects experience socio-spatial alienation, violence and injustice. Spaces may be purposefully designed to exclude misfitting persons, whose conducts are misaligned with dominant socio-spatial norms, from actively participating in certain environments (Hamraie, 2013). Within such a socio-spatial dialectic (Lefebvre, 1991), our subjectivities are mediated by space and we (re)act back to agentically craft spaces.

#### Framing debate as a game inflicts ableist violence, by normalizing extremism in the pursuit of a mere ballot, an independent reason to reject.

McVey ’23 [Alex and Matthew Gerber; 2023; Assistant Professor in critical-cultural communication at Kansas State University; Associate Professor in argumentation at Baylor University; Speaker & Gavel, “At the Intersection of Ableism, Entelechy, and Policy Debate,” vol. 59 https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1281&context=speaker-gavel]

Western culture's broader obsession with entelechy, the drive to perfection, is deeply interwoven with the rhetorical norms of ableism, or the privileging of the perspectives and needs of able-bodied subjects over and against those of disabled people. Normalization is a rhetorical practice that defines human bodies through a telos of accomplishment, achievement, and success, with disabled bodies situated as the perverse underside of human capacity and ability. In this section, we read Burkean theory through the lens of disability studies to theorize entelechy as a rhetorical vehicle for the normalization of ableist practices under the ideological guise of the natural and inevitable force of competition and perfection. We show how entelechialism defines the ideological territory of debate, even as current practitioners may seek to redefine debate beyond its entelechial ends.

According to Burke, entelechy is a uniquely human tendency. Burke characterized humans as not only “separated from his natural condition by instruments of his own making” (symbol systems), but also as being “rotten with perfection” (Burke, 1963-1964, p.507). Burke argued that “there is a principal of perfection implicit in the nature of symbol systems; and in keeping with his nature as a symbol-using animal, man is moved by this principle” (Burke, 1963- 1964, p.508). The continual striving for perfection, the pursuit of the continued clarification and elevation of our terministic screens and symbols into final fruition, thus informs the definition of entelechy. Rowland and Jones (2001) refer to this as “terministic compulsion” or the tendency to “take one’s terminology to the end of the symbolic line” (p.57). Burke, drawing on Aristotle, posited that anything which comes into existence tends to symbolically move toward its entelechial end, and that “this state of completion is its full actuality” (Burke, 1969, p.261). For Burke, the “finishedness” of a thing, helps to classify and create symbolic order according to the states of perfection or final form that make up the essence of that thing (Burke, 1950, p.14). Jan Hovden (2006) argued that for Burke, “entelechy is the force of symbol systems to compel their adherents to see them to completion, and he believes that this compulsion contains within it numerous dangers” (p.507). The authors are in solidarity with Hovden’s characterization of Burke’s concept of entelechy. We also agree with Rowland and Jones, who argued that entelechy is a slippery rhetorical construct, and one that is often difficult to apply because humans do not always engage in extreme entelechy (2001, p.57). Indeed, entelechial compulsion undergirds the normalization of extremism in the name of human perfection. In a case study about the discursive structure of video games, Soukup (2007) deployed Burke’s concept of perfection to describe the “entelechial motivational system” which appeared in most popular video games with “remarkable uniformity” (p.159). This motivational system, which encourages the “finishing” of the game, and the pursuit of one’s personal competitive objectives to completion is not unlike the entelechial nature of policy debate. Using entelechy as a critical tool helps us to name discourses which promote a “dangerous mix of competition, conquest, hierarchy, and aggressive domination” (Soukup, 2007, p.159).

Humans often stretch their symbol systems to extremist ends that go beyond mere fulfillment and completion. Indeed, entelechy “results from our ability to use symbols to envision the extreme ends of behavior” (Hubbard, 1998, p.360). In his essay on entelechy and the rhetoric of religious cults, Stan Lindsay argued that Burke “implicitly recognizes the possibility of this extremist type of entelechy- what might be called psychotic entelechy” (Burke, 1968, p.180; Lindsay, 1999, p.270). For Lindsay, the characteristics of “psychotic entelechy” entail a proclivity by some to be “so desirous of fulfilling or bringing to perfection the implications of their terminologies that they engage in very hazardous or damaging actions” (1999, p.272). In tracing the rhetoric of cult leader David Koresh, Lindsay found that the dangerous part of his discourse was not that he was necessarily irrational, but rather that his symbol system was “super rational” (at least as it appeared to the members of his community) and that he had carried his “meaning to the extreme” (p.279). By advocating for the ultimate finishedness of the biblical prophecies which were foretold in his preaching, Koresh “laid out his own telos” and was thus compelled to “literally live out the entelechy” (Lindsay, 1999, p.277). Another potentially minacious aspect of extreme entelechialism is its potential to obfuscate alternative outcomes and the discursive means by which to reach them. As Bryan Hubbard (1998) postulated in his study of the entelechial aspects of the deliberation surrounding the development and ultimate detonation of the nuclear bomb in the 1940s, “entelechy prevents the exploration of alternatives and informed discussion by maintaining a steady course for the decision.” (p.360). The relentless pursuit of entelechial perfection produces narrowed, constrained futures and potentialities.

The normalization of perfection and competition functions as a pervasive constraint against the agency and positionality of disabled persons in policy debate. As Timothy Dolmage argues, ableism is a rhetorical phenomenon, operating on the level of deeply inscribed, everyday discourse and vernacular, and predicated on the “mythical able-bodied norm” (2014, p.22). For Dolmage, the rhetorical construction of normalcy, and the ways in which it controls and inscribes bodies, is coupled with the cultural valorization of able-bodiedness; making disability “abject, invisible, disposable, less than human, while able-bodiedness is at once ideal, normal, and the mean or default” (2014, p.22). Communities reproduce ableism in subtle and insidious ways. Norms are transmitted to subsequent generations not as intentional modes of exclusion but as solidified expectations regarding bodily competence and ability. As James Cherney argues, “the ways of interpreting disability and assumptions about bodies that produce ableism are learned” and are handed down by “the previous generation” (2011, para. 2). We argue that the inherited ideologies and taken-for-granted assumptions of debate may perpetuate harmful assumptions about disability, even as programs actively fight to pursue new motivations and justifications for debate. Likewise, toward the end of identifying rhetorical practices that undergird these tendencies, especially in the case of extreme examples, Cherney’s approach to ableism aids in understanding the historical origins of long-ingrained assumptions about disability in an argument community.

Fortunately, the negative outcomes associated with entelechial extremism are not inevitable. Burke’s notions of the tragic and comic frames provide guidance here. For Burke, “the tragic frame is marked by individuals committed to pushing their ideas to a rotten end” and by “the tragic tendency to push toward perfection regardless of the consequences” (Renegar & Dionisopoulos, 2011, p.325). On the other hand, the comic perspective proceeds from the assumption of human fallibility, inherent imperfection, and flaw. The purpose of the comic frame is to generate self-reflection and the creation of “argumentative space in the middle ground between opposites, recognizing that an absolutist frame is too rigid to allow for cooperative societal action” (Madsen, 1993, np). The comic perspective allows for humans to see through the narrow confines of their own terministic screens and to ostensibly help “those who possess these screens from being compelled to take them to their entelechial ends” (Hovden, 2006, p.507). Burke’s comic frame is also useful as a method by which critics and members of a community might offer “minor repairs” to the current system without throwing out an entire institution (Toker, 2002). As Hovden put it, the comic frame “allows for the challenging of pieties without causing the destruction of the order itself” (2006, p.507). Along similar lines, Travis Cram argued that the comic perspective functions to “rein in the dangers of tragic thinking by correcting rather than banishing antagonists and emphasizing inclusion within a community” (2017, p.80). Cram’s postulation is helpful here, in that the authors do not seek to “exile” those coaches and debaters who exhibit extreme entelechialism in debate; but nor do we seek to gloss over the glaring problem of ableism in the name of community harmony. Rather, we view our arguments here as part of an ongoing, long-term project designed to amend the activity in ways that render it more accessible to all. In the conclusion, we point to nascent practices and discursive interventions that seek to subvert the ingrained entelechial norms of policy debate, diverting the compulsion towards perfection into the comic possibilities of imperfection.

The Entelechial Tendencies of Policy Debate

This section examines the entelechial tendencies of policy debate, and how these tendencies reproduce ableist norms and practices within the activity. In particular, we name three rhetorical norms of entelechy that have, over time, come to define modern policy debate: Competition, Speed, and Rhetorical Ability. Our argument in this section is not that all policy debaters, programs, or coaches actively participate in the construction and maintenance of these ideologies. We name these forces entelechial tendencies to emphasize the way that these ideological norms have influenced the history of policy debate, not to state that these drives function as universal or unquestioned commands mindlessly repeated by policy debate automatons. We recognize that policy debate has created space for divergent voices and motivations that challenge many of the taken-for-granted assumptions of policy debate. We will revisit some of the challenges that have emerged to the entelechial forces of policy debate in the next section of the essay. Nevertheless, we hope the examples gathered here, collected from both published and public records of policy debate, as well as decades of personal experience from the authors as policy debate coaches, point towards pervasive norms that continue to shape how debaters perceive themselves and their communities. This critique emerges out of a practice of self-reflexivity, seeking to understand the way our own coaching and debating experiences reflect, are shaped by, and participate in norms of ableist exclusion. Our argument is not that the whole of the debate community is engaged in win-at-all-costs extreme entelechy; or that every debater strives with fury to cram as many words-per-minute into every speech in a debate. Instead, we argue that under entelechial systems, the extreme becomes normalized, so even extreme examples of entelechial ideology become regularized guideposts for judging the performances of bodies in debate, with devastating effects for those whose bodies cannot meet the ideals of exceptional debate performance.

Entelechy of Competition

Policy debate has always been competitive in nature. As William Keith argued in his Keynote Address to the National Developmental Debate Conference at Wake Forest in 2009, “NDT-style debate is intensely focused on competition, almost, one might say, in a warlike way” (2010). Debaters compete in front of trained judges who render a win or loss at the conclusion of the round. The competitive nature of policy debate creates a rhetorical situation in which winning functions as the ultimate entelechial end of participation. This all-in commitment to competitive success and victory is evidence, in and of itself, of the ways in which entelechy discursively operates. This argument is not novel; significant existing scholarship in debate laments the rise of competition as the overarching telos of debate competition (Mitchell et al 2010). Much of the focus in existing critique of debate’s competitive drive focuses on the ways that competition functions to insulate debate from public audiences, blunting the impact of debate as an activity aimed at civic participation and diminishing the possible value of debate for watchful institutional audiences. As Mitchell et al argue, “Once an enterprise born from the difficulties of engagement with public audiences, academic debate became estranged from its audience-centered origins during the mid-twentieth century. The rise of tournament competition as an organizing telos augured debate’s ascetic turn, characterized by heightened specialization, intensified insularity, and fetishization of technique” (2010, 107). While we agree generally that the competitive telos of debate makes it inaccessible for broader public audiences, we believe that these criticisms themselves ignore the differential inaccessibility of debate’s competitive practices. Centering disability in our examination of policy debate’s exclusionary practices allows us to see how debate’s competitive drive does not just isolate the activity from broader, dominant publics, but also how it performs a doubled exclusion of those disabled bodies and voices who are always/already excluded from the public itself.

The institutional practices and symbol systems that point participants toward “winning ways” are at the root of ableism in policy debate, and the exclusion of disabled students and coaches from the activity. While there are many examples which support our argument, we will focus primarily on two: first, the entelechial commitment to attaining victory at all costs, and to accumulating wins in debate; and second, the rapid rate of delivery (or “spreading”) which has emerged as an extreme entelechial speech code that has become both a requirement for success and a tool of exclusion, particularly for students and coaches with intellectual disabilities. Policy debate is a competitive game, and the game model of debate has pervaded the judging and coaching culture of the activity since its inception. The late Tuna Snider (1984) argued that the game approach to judging a debate (and ultimately rendering either a win or a loss) was the “silent”/default decision-making paradigm for most judges (p.19). The competitive gaming model of judging continues to be the overwhelming prevailing approach (Gerber & Nagel, 2017, p.45). Even critiques of the gaming model of debate concede that at root, “debaters are in fact, contestants involved in a competition and not agents of a government agency in an effort to simulate plan adoption” (Warner, 2003, p.65). According to Maxwell Schnurer, “in the 1980s debaters used gaming to defend speaking quickly in debates” (2003, p.46). While an examination of the notion of debate as a game is not the focus of the present essay, it is worth noting that that the game metaphor “crowds out other ways of viewing debate”, and this fact may warrant separate interrogation into its effects and impacts on the activity (Kaylor, 2015, p.33).

From the moment they are introduced to the policy debate game, some novice students are subject to both the entelechial aspirations of their coaches, and to their own human desire to maximize personal potential (measured, of course, by the number of times they defeat their opponents). They are exhaustively trained in the strategic trappings of winning; out-smarting and out-talking one’s opponent and gaining a victory, one granted by an expertly trained judge who has been long-immersed in the arcane and recondite symbolic structures of the activity. The continued development of novice debaters (who inevitably flounder and stumble in their initial forays) into something approaching a competent competitor (one who wins regularly), requires even deeper immersion into the rules, speech techniques, and strategy of debate. Thus, through the machinations of entelechy, the novice debater can engage in “the process of changing from what something is into what something should become” (Lindsay, 1999, p.270). While entelechialism is a uniquely human tendency, and is thus endemic to most competitive games, it is particularly pronounced and obvious as it appears in some segments of policy debate, an activity that along with its university sponsors and private donors, has nurtured an “unacceptable preoccupation with competition” (Hlavacik, Lain, Ivanovic, & Ontiveros-Kersch, 2016, p.395). The implication of this entelechial obsession is that many debaters either self-select out of the activity when the true nature of what it means to succeed becomes apparent, or they continue to participate in a system in which perpetual disappointment ensues because of an inability to reach the idealized norms of bodily performance. This is particularly true of debaters with disabilities.

<<TEXT CONDESNED, NONE OMITTED>>

Other examples of the entelechial nature of winning in policy debate abound. Take for instance the narrative history of policy debate, which is saturated with legendary stories of students or coaches who engage in herculean feats of self-deprivation and sacrifice: coaches staying up all night to research, cut evidence, and strategize to outsmart and defeat one’s opponent in elimination rounds; students staying up all week before a big tournament to get a competitive edge and notch another win over a rival team; graduate assistant coaches who skip the readings for the Master’s seminar, but who instead spend their finite time researching esoteric topics with sometimes little bearing on their chosen course of study. In the experience of the authors, while that research may be enjoyable (because of the promise of the thrill of victory), it is often not particularly contributory to academic success, and often trades off with other projects or life priorities. These are the mythic heroes of contemporary intercollegiate policy debate, placed on a pedestal because they are/were willing to sacrifice their mental and physical well-being in order to get the “W.” Tragically, and throughout the history of policy debate, too many coaches and competitors have “died for the cause” from “too much stress over wins and losses, the bottom line” (Gerber, 2009, p.90). A renewed commitment to selfregulation, indeed self-preservation in policy debate could be actualized if extreme entelechial tendencies were held in check and generationally filtered out of debate pedagogy. After all, according to the “The Speech” by the late Scott Deatherage (the winningest coach in the history of NDT debate) preparing for debate competition must begin “when the topic is released [in July] until the final debate is concluded [in April] and continues at all points in between” (Snider, 2011, np). Later in “The Speech” Deatherage famously laid out his opinion on the proper way to conduct a winning cross-examination. “Don’t ask, argue!” he implored, and then he repeated that phrase several times. “Don’t ask, argue!”. For Deatherage (and for generations of his former students and coaches), the cross-examination was wasted if one simply asked questions for clarification, or for the organizational sake of one’s flowsheet, or for a deeper understanding of an opponent’s position, simply for the sake of understanding. Rather, the cross-examination period should optimally be used strategically to set up one’s own arguments and to expose and exploit weaknesses in the arguments of the adversaries. Like “spreading,” the “proper” way to conduct a winning cross-examination (by foregrounding one’s own arguments rather than by asking questions for true clarification or understanding) is a speech code, circulated through policy debate’s past and present. This speech code, this “best practice” of cross-examination, sacrifices understanding and clarity for a competitive advantage; it enshrines misunderstanding, opacity, and deception; it foregrounds winning over the edification of the parties involved; and it is entelechial insofar as it unreflexively carries out a dangerous symbolic practice to its extreme. This speech code is also ableist in that it complicates the in-round experience for students, coaches, or judges who have intellectual disabilities. This speech code encourages debaters with disabilities to actively avoid asking the very types of questions that might make their experience in policy debate more navigable. The drive for entelechial perfection comes to define how the policy debate community advocates for the value of debate to stakeholders within colleges and high schools that fund and resource policy debate programs. Many studies have pointed to the positive impact of policy debate competition on student academic achievement, the development of critical thinking skills, higher rates of civic engagement, and matriculation to college or higher education (Colbert, 1995; Kennedy, 2007; Breger, 1998; Lee, 1998). However, the measurement of those achievements is most often based on “win/loss records, speaker points, or placement in a given tournament” (Stone-Watt, 2012, p.81). While there should be multiple metrics by which universities assess and track student outcomes related to their participation in policy debate (Partlow-LeFevre, 2012), the reality is that most debate coaches feel that they are “rewarded more by their university for focusing on competitive success” rather than for foregrounding those aforementioned ancillary pedagogical advantages (Hlavacik, Lain, Ivanovic, & OntiverosKersch, 2016, p.394). Many universities that field debate programs expect wins, because those are measurable metrics, and because defeating opponents is a point of pride to be celebrated. Thus, it is notoriously hard for coaches to generate publicity for teams that don’t advance beyond the preliminary rounds. Coaches often struggle to explain the NDT first-round at large process to administrators who fail to see why being ranked 16th in the country is even noteworthy. Universities also find themselves caught up in entelechy as they assess and represent the quality of their institution to educational accrediting organizations. They must be able to portray the debate program, for example, as being successful (and blossoming toward perfection), and the easiest way to do that is to point to wins, particularly over peer institutions or ivy league schools who also support policy debate programs. Entelechy of Speed One of the most emblematic characteristics of policy debate is the discursive practice known as “spreading”: a speech code that is inculcated in college debaters (and also in high school and middle school students) who are taught that “speed kills” and that overwhelming one’s opponent with a blizzard of arguments, evidence, and debate theory is one of the keys to winning. Thinking and talking faster than one’s opponents opens new doors to the entelechial pinnacle of debate victory. University hosted summer debate camps, including the ones we have hosted and taught at, spend hours teaching debaters how to keep up with the norms of hightempo bodily debate performance that participants may expect to see at the highest echelons of debate competition. Even as many debaters have questioned what gets called the “flogo-centric” paradigm of debate practice, the normalized way of teaching policy debate holds that dropped arguments are assumed to be true arguments, thus creating added incentive to speak and deliver arguments quickly, in hopes that opponents will “drop” or concede arguments and lose the debate. Training one’s body to speak, think, and write at greater speeds than one’s opponent normalizes bodily perfection and a drive towards competition as the paradigm of what constitutes desirable debate practice. Even the so-called critical styles of debate (an ideological alternative to the expectation of strict fidelity to policy content in debate) often retain the same sound and rapid delivery mechanisms. Indeed, to the “uninitiated observer, this type of critical debate would not sound much different from traditional policy debate” (Solt, 2004, p.52). Often, even debaters who make the aforementioned in-round arguments about disability adhere to the discursive practice of spreading. One need not look far for an example of how these speech codes are weaponized against students with disabilities. In a recent article published in the Rostrum (the official publication of the National Speech and Debate Association, and one read by thousands of high school speech and debate instructors), the two authors (both attorneys specializing in the Americans with Disabilities Act) made it clear that any debate competitor with a fine-motor impairment who requests that their opponent slow down (not spread) so that they can “keep up while flowing” is not seeking a legitimate, protected accommodation, but is rather seeking a competitive advantage, which would be unfair to the debater who has mastered the art of speaking quickly and wants to overwhelm their opponent with speed (Mayes & Zirkel, 2018, p.42). This amounts to institutionally sanctioned discrimination against students with auditory processing disorders or fine-motor impairment who wish to compete in the policy debate activity. Those types of disabilities are common in people with dyslexia, autism spectrum disorders, Tourette’s Syndrome, or other learning disabilities, and in people who simply process information at a slower pace than their neuro-typical peers. A more recent article from the Rostrum focused on ways that the debate community could be more inclusive for people with visible/physical disabilities, but stopped short of offering solutions to the intractable problem of the ongoing exclusion of those with intellectual disabilities (Freeman & Pizzo, 2020, p.20). We argue that debaters with so-called “invisible” disabilities are more acutely impacted by extreme entelechialism in policy debate, and this article attempts to engage in the hard work needed to generate solutions to the dilemma. In the 1990s and 2000s, the practice of debaters simply saying “more evidence” during a speech, rather than labelling and briefly explaining what their evidence says by way of a “tagline”, became common. This practice, akin to simply “piling on” one’s opponent with an ever-growing mountain of evidence, is yet another example of entelechy in which the content of the argument or evidence is not as important as the creation of more ink on a judge’s flowsheet. Indeed, “policy debate has developed its own shorthand jargon and even a specialized method of notetaking (called “flowing”) to accommodate and account for the rapid delivery” employed in most policy debate rounds (Gerber, 2009, p.82). Thus, the mere suggestion of “more evidence” creates a corresponding visual marker on a judge’s flowsheet which denotes the symbolic presence of an argument which even without explanation, is often deemed to be true if not directly addressed. The extreme entelechial end of this speech code would envision a judge’s flow to be covered with these symbolic notations of evidence, preferably on both the front and back sides of the legal-size flow paper, thus “burying” the opposing team and “crushing them” under the weight of multiple unaddressed (thus True) arguments or pieces of evidence. Entelechy of Argumentative Ability The privileging of extreme bodily performance as the desired norm of argumentative ability functions as a pervasive mode of exclusion for those bodies that fail to meet these standards of normalization. Our argument is not that judges and coaches actively and consciously exclude those who cannot or will not participate in speed, but rather that the norm of bodily and cognitive competence comes to define our expectations regarding proper debate performance. In the opening sequence of her article about ableism in the field of communication studies, Vanessa Beasley (2021) argued that rhetoricians, and particularly former policy debaters who continue to populate the ranks of the communication discipline, not only “want to win” (p.291), but are also at least subconsciously excluding disabled voices from the realm of deliberation because “we do not expect them to win” (p.293). Students with intellectual disabilities are often not recruited into the activity or encouraged to try policy debate in the first place, because of the presumption that they might “not be able to follow (as in cognitively track) the logic of rules or arguments in a manner that would enable them to participate” (Beasley, 2021, p.300). The prevailing model of policy debate as a competitive game is exclusionary of students and coaches with disabilities because the members of the policy debate community have themselves “made a priori decisions that people with disabilities will almost always lose” (Beasley, 2021, p.294). While the sole focus of Beasley’s article is not policy debate, the authors are in solidarity with her extended opening examples about the activity, as they resonate deeply with our own personal experiences both in the academy and in debate. The entelechial drive toward winning is also self-perpetuating in that students who demonstrate the bodily and intellectual competencies of winning debaters often may receive more attention, more coaching, and more academic benefit from the activity because they are perceived, consciously or subconsciously, as winners. In this framework students with intellectual disabilities may face invisible or de facto external barriers, or may even not seek inclusion in the first place, given the tendency for norms of bodily and cognitive excellence to be highlighted as exemplars of proper policy debate performance. Similarly, the other trappings of winning and entelechialism discussed previously are equally ableist and exclusive. Many people disabled or not, are not capable of the super-human feats of mental and physical stamina required for success in policy debate. That said, the kind of sustained, up-all-night, prepping at all times, approach to policy debate will, by definition, be tougher (or impossible) for people with intellectual disabilities when compared with their neuro-typical peers. The benefits associated with participation are celebrated to justify funding for policy debate programs, but the purported academic, civic, and social profit of participation is often reserved for able-bodied students who can compete and win. Those with intellectual disabilities are confronted with structural obstacles to their very participation in the activity (not to mention the barriers they face with regard to actual competitive success or winning policy debates regularly). Policy debate describes itself as an activity committed to emancipation, equality, and the creation of an accessible, supportive discursive space for people with disabilities. Yet, speech codes like “spreading,” a discursive practice that is emblematic of the policy debate activity, have frequently been employed to deter participation or to “exclude traditionally disenfranchised voices” based on (dis)ability, race, and location (Nelson & Miller, 2016, p.5; Ryan & Sovacool, 2006, p.48-49; Pack-Jordan & Jordan, 2018). Simply put, “the speed and complex jargon in debate continues to become increasingly- dare I say- exclusive” (Ferguson, 2016, p.8). Comic Frame Correctives This article has attempted to draw readers attention toward damaging entelechial tendencies in the policy debate activity, proclivities which function to suppress meaningful participation for students and coaches with intellectual disabilities. Here, we utilize Burke’s theories of the comic frame to interrogate alternatives to the entelechial and ableist discourse patterns that undergird policy debate. As mentioned previously, Burke’s comic frame of acceptance allows for members of a discourse community to dig up, analyze, and reform their own harmful rhetorical practices. By proceeding from the assumption of human imperfection, inadequacy, and proneness to error, the comic frame “can serve as a vehicle for selfexamination” and create cognizance of “the possibility that unexamined routine habits and trends could lead to a disastrous future” (Renegar & Dionisopoulos, 2011, p.325). By examining the harmful and exclusionary discursive habits of the policy debate community, one can also begin to envision correctives to that behavior and alternatives to the ableist underpinnings of the activity. The comic perspective thus acts as a tempering check on human entelechial tendencies. Community Self-regulation Eliminating ableism in policy debate will not be a simple fix, but within a comic framework those repairs do not seem as daunting and unattainable. Toward that end, we offer a few suggestions as starting points for further deliberation. Initially, and simply put, policy debate and its constituents must make a determined effort to hold their own extreme entelechial tendencies in check. Instead of “pushing their ideas toward a rotten end” and striving to transform debaters who experience disability into perfect debating machines, the comic frame of acceptance allows us to accept those people for who they are, and to meet them where they are in terms of coaching and instruction (Renegar & Dionisopoulos, 2011, p.325). Not all students will be able to experience policy debate in the same way, and the one-size-fits-all approach to teaching, judging, and competing in policy debate must give way to a more diverse, hypersubjective, localized method by which each student can approach the activity on their own terms. There are several encouraging developments on this front, such as the Healthy Debater Initiative, as well as other self-regulatory movements in the community such as the move to six preliminary rounds at most major tournaments (instead of the standard eight). The majority of the community has decided that the loss of data points from those two missing prelim rounds did not outweigh the benefits of ending the day early, and building in more time to relax after rounds, or sleep just a little later in the morning. Thus, inroads can be cut into the entelechial tendencies of policy debate. While this may seem like an insignificant example, it proves that the humans who inhabit the debate space can mutually agree to dull the sharp edges that characterize the entelechial tendencies of the activity; the rottenness that co-mingles with the pursuit of competitive perfection. The authors also argue that the COVID-19 protocols instituted by the NDT and CEDA, and the high degree of community compliance with those rules, demonstrates the ability of the community to acknowledge and step back from, its own entelechial practices. In 2021, the national championship tournaments achieved nearly universal adherence to in-person masking mandates, no small feat given that wearing a facemask likely compelled debaters to slow down a little, enunciate more clearly, and breathe differently as compared to speaking without a mask. At once, this small change both protected people with compromised immune systems (people whose bodies were different than the discursively constructed able-bodied norm), but also helped to demonstrate that at least in some cases, the dominant speech code could be deviated from without catastrophic results. This is not to equate the dangers of spreading with the dangers of the pandemic, or to debate the scientific merits of masking; rather, we simply argue that when the policy debate community is in peril (and we believe it is, for a number of reasons that are beyond the scope of this essay), it has shown an ability to self-regulate in ways that are beneficial and healthy. These changes are helpful for students and coaches who do not, or cannot, meet the standard assumptions and expectations about bodily and cognitive performance that are baked into contemporary policy debate. Additionally, in order to cut into the entelechial ways in which debate is evaluated by administrators and decisionmakers who are in control of resource allocation, the community must change how it frames and represents the activity. Success in policy debate should be presented based on individual student development, and on the extra education that participation in debate affords competitors. Speaker awards and win-loss percentages are important, but they should be framed as a secondary metric when advocating for one’s program. Most colleges and universities are ostensibly deeply concerned with and committed to undergraduate research, and yet “debaters have been doing ‘undergraduate research’ for years, but our programs are rarely (if ever) mentioned when university administrators start talking about undergraduate research initiatives” (Morello, 1997, para.8). If participation in policy debate was more often lauded as a boon to undergraduate research and the enrichment of student knowledge, rather than being tied to success in tournament competition, it could undermine the forces of entelechy which coproduce both ableism in debate and in the evaluation of debate programs by administrators. Policy debate has grappled with “public relations” problems since its inception, but those issues become more acute when the problem is “in-house” at one’s own college or university. A shift in the metrics of evaluation and representation from one of quantitative success (accumulation of wins and awards) to one at least partially based on individual student edification is needed, although the authors recognize from our own experience that this may be a difficult task. That said, once again Burke’s notion of the comic frame provides critics with the “adventurous equipment” needed to upend standards of judgement which rest solely on “the somewhat empty accumulation of facts” (Burke, 1984, p.170-171). Changes in Policy Debate Adjudication We have argued that the dominant speech-code in policy debate, “spreading,” is ableist and exclusionary at multiple levels. A comic frame of acceptance helps us to envision ways to renew or at least revise those discursive speech practices as “entrenched conventions that might be redefined, reimagined, or transcended. (Renegar & Dionisopoulos, 2011, p.326)”. In other words, the comic frame provides argument communities with a tool for self-reflection; a path to admitting that the current approach, to judging, for example, is missing the mark. Specifically, a comic frame allows us to envision new modes of judging and evaluating policy debates which both captures and co-opts the tremendous influence judges hold over the symbolic structures and practices of the activity (Rowland & Deatherage, 1998). The delivery and speaking practices that judges choose to reward with higher speaker points is one area where it may be possible to harness the entelechial drive toward winning and mobilize it against itself. If judges began rewarding a style of delivery which was slower and less reliant on debate jargon, those students and coaches who were interested in winning would most certainly adapt their approach, creating new entry points for previously excluded students (Rowland & Deatherage, 1988, 248-249). Additionally, judges have the authority to enforce requested accommodations like asking for one’s opponent to slow down, or even requesting additional prep time. Judges should continue to use that enforcement power to make changes in the debate space that would improve the experience of debaters with disabilities. It is the judging community in policy debate which holds the power to effectuate changes in discursive practices that have been normalized in the name of competitive success. As Scott Harris argues, unsurprisingly “debaters utilize communication strategies which maximize their individual success” (entelechy), a tendency which foregrounds “information processing over delivery” (which can lead to extreme entelechy, as we have described it here) (1995, p.129). As Rowland confirmed, “we cannot expect debaters to take a long-term perspective on the activity in an environment that is inherently competitive”, meaning that change from within must come from the judges of the activity. This is a project that has been attempted before (and should be revisited and expanded) as a way to increase meaningful participation for black debaters in the activity. Shanara Reid-Brinkley argued that one aspect of the Louisville debate project in the early 1990s was to replace “expert judges with lay judges” as a method to destabilize “common research and speech delivery practices in policy debate”, practices which functioned to exclude black debaters from meaningful participation (2023, p.4-5). We argue that many of those same discursive practices and approaches to judging are also exclusionary to people with disabilities who seek meaningful participation in policy debate, and that changes in how debates are adjudicated may warrant additional scholarly and community investigation. Similarly, Steven Combs (1993) maintained that to square the purported pedagogical benefits of policy debate with the reality of how debate operates in practice, the community ought to reorient itself toward a more “public advocacy perspective” which envisions the use of lay judges instead of highly trained argumentation technocrats who reward and encourage the rapid delivery which pervades policy debate (p. 43). Finally, judges, students and coaches should consider a pause in order to self-examine their own ableist predispositions, and to determine the depth of their “own identities as the smartest people in the room when it comes to understanding how, when, and why some kinds of rhetoric win” (Beasley, 2021, p.297). As Gilbert noted, comic frames of judgement are needed in times of public and community krisis, particularly as they relate to questions regarding which course of action or trajectory that an argument community should pursue (2014, p.275). Changes in Competition
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In line with the comic frame of interpretation, we would be remiss if we did not close with at least a few descriptions of the types of radical new worlds of policy debate that could center disability justice and simultaneously destabilize the entelechy driving policy debate. While the most obvious solution, and the one which extends directly from the line of logic laid out in the article, is to simply remove the wins and losses from the activity, the authors believe that suggestion falls prey to the same critique of entelechialism that we have laid out herein. Totally removing the competitive aspect of the policy debate game would potentially undercut the reason many are attracted to the debate endeavor in the first place, and would risk further closing off the activity at a moment when it can ill afford such a thing. At the same time, a conscious tempering of the drive for competitive success, coupled with a shift toward a model of policy debate which focuses more on the fostering of publicly accessible communication and delivery styles, is not necessarily incommensurate with a drive to increase the number of people and programs who do what we do. Toward this end, Foote (2022) suggested that a shift toward a metric of program evaluation in which civic engagement, and debate as a vehicle for social change, was foregrounded as an alternative to the base accumulation of wins and trophies, might aid in increasing participation and by extension, accessibility. Indeed, within this framework, both neuro-typical and intellectually disabled debaters could find success by harnessing and developing their innate power as advocates.

#### Debates over an impossible future instill false hope AND encourage further imagination that expunges the disabled subject out of time.

Wälivaara ’18 [Josefine; 2018; Ph.D. in Culture and Media Studies and Staff Scientist at the Department of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies, Umea University; Culture Unbound, “Marginalized Bodies of Imagined Futurescapes: Ableism and Heteronormativity in Science Fiction,” p. 237-240 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328622729\_Marginalized\_Bodies\_of\_Imagined\_Futurescapes\_Ableism\_and\_Heteronormativity\_in\_Science\_Fiction\_Munch's\_Painting\_Painting\_Reproductions\_on\_Display]

Disability on the contrary has as of yet seldom been included in the notion of social equality as a way to emphasize progressive future societies. This notion of progression has an impact on the way disability has become related to the future. From the perspective of crip temporalities, Kafer writes, “disability is seen as the sign of no future, or at least of no good future” and adds that it is assumed, “that we all agree […] that we all desire the same futures” (Kafer 2013: 3). Kafer argues that the disabled body has come to signify not having a future or that the future has failed. Due to the prevalence of the medical model of disability, a future in which disability is not eradicated is inevitably a failed future:

Disability is cast as a problematic characteristic inherent in particular bodies and minds. Solving the problem of disability, then, means correcting, normalizing, or eliminating the pathological individual, rendering a medical approach to disability the only appropriate approach. The future of disability is understood more in terms of medical research, individual treatments, and familial assistance than increased social supports or widespread social change. (Kafer 2013: 5)

This prevalence of the medical paradigm in stories as well as in society offers insight into how the future of disability is viewed by contemporary society. Kafer’s assertion about the future discourse of disability based on medical and individual definitions is highly viable in science fiction narratives. Consider for example the prevalence of cure narratives in science fiction (cf. Allen 2013). Science fiction (and science) continues to explore technological possibilities based on this medical model of disability:

With the recent cracking of genetic coding, opening up the possibility of genetic manipulation, a future where medical technology and genetic engineering will have advanced to the point where bodies can be genetically manipulated before birth, or treated and cured so as to make ‘disability’ obsolete, it is not beyond the realm of possibility. In this ‘medical model’, disability becomes non-existent. (Cheu 2002: 198)

The future is extrapolated based on ableist assumptions about the connection between health, progression, and disability. Moreover, the ideal future from that perspective is undoubtedly a future where disability has been eradicated. For fiction narratives dealing with the future, this medical progression or regression has come to symbolize utopian/dystopian futures. As Fiona Kumari Campbell argues, “for disability, utopianism is a conflicted zone – there is no future existence, disability dreaming is expunged and the utopian drive is a device for promise (of curability), hence, extinction of the impairment state” (Campbell 2012: 223).

As a narrative mechanism, the inclusion of disability in imagined futures often aims to emphasize “bad” futures. For example, one of the most obvious inferences to disability in The Handmaid’s Tale is used to narratively underline decadence and corruption. In the scene in which Offered is taken to Jezebel’s, a brothel to which influential men travel for sex with women forced into prostitution, the setting is introduced to us through Offered’s gaze. She sees naked women, women dressed-up in various costumes and lingerie, men together with several women at the same time, people drinking and smoking, a sight in stark contrast to Offered’s present existence as a handmaid. Moreover, she sees a man and a woman in an elevator, as the man passionately sucks on the woman’s amputated arm. In this instance, disability is positioned to further symbolize the decadent space of Jezebel.

There are, however, examples in which the medical model of disability is in negotiation with ideas of progression in terms of social equality. Star Trek’s utopian vision of the future has been criticized for not including people with disabilities in any significant way (Kanar 2000). However, Star Trek: Discovery, has not only included a same-sex couple, but also characters with disabilities. While at the time of writing this only one season of Star Trek: Discovery is available, there are some indications that the creators want to problematize some previously taken-for-granted notions of the future of disability. So finally, one can say, disability is beginning to be included in the notion of the progressive future of Star Trek in which a variety of bodies, genders, and ethnicities are welcome. First of all, a crewmember of the Discovery is in passing shown in a wheelchair (“Magic to Make the Sanest Man Go Mad” 2017). The character is used to praise the sacrifices made by crewmembers in the ongoing war, i.e. the injuries acquired in battle are visualized by a crewmember in a wheelchair and partly adhere to a taken-for-granted ableist notion of loss and sacrifice. But, to see a character in Starfleet uniform who is not able-bodied is still an important step towards including a variety of bodies not as a sign of a failed future, but of a future of inclusiveness and equality. However, the character only appears briefly on screen.

In addition, the Captain of the U.S.S Discovery, Captain Lorca (Jason Isaacs), is introduced as having suffered an eye injury in battle, and, though he has the medical and technological possibility to simply “have it fixed,” he has refused to do so. This refusal to make surgical corrections to his eyes can first be interpreted as an unwillingness to be “cured” and thus, choosing to live with a visual impairment. However, it is revealed later on in season one that Lorca in fact originates from a mirror universe, a parallel universe in which every human has this condition, a sensitivity to light. Is Lorca then to be considered a character with a disability only due to disabling circumstances in the prime universe, or is the visual impairments of the entire evil Terran Empire of the mirror universe to be read as a metaphor for their inability to see and value non-human species? This only difference between the prime universe (aka. the good guys) and mirror universe (aka. the bad guys) can thus instead be understood as utilizing bodily differences and disabilities as signs of character flaws rather than as portrayals of experiences of disability (cf. Bérubé 2005).

In the light of the discussion about disability and futurity I argue that the lack of homo/bisexual characters in early science fiction narratives also can be ascribed to the pathologization of homosexuality in a time in which medical discourses surrounding non-heterosexual sexualities dominated. It would then make sense that many stories would have done away with both disability and homosexuality in their imagined futurescapes based on the notion of an evolved progressive society.

Moreover, the changes in how homosexuality has come to be understood and defined over the course of 50 years have definitely affected the types of stories that have been told, what types of futures have been imagined, and what value and meaning have been ascribed to the presence of homo/bisexuality in imaginary futures. Likewise for disability, changes in how disability is understood and defined will affect portrayals and ascribed meanings in future settings. The shift from a purely medical understanding of disability to social, relational, and political frameworks has taken place later in time for disability than for homosexuality, and these efforts have not yet come to bear much fruit in fiction.

I have also argued that the kind of futures we imagine is bound to the way we understand the present. In this context, imaginations of the future are also political. For example, questioning the political aspects of disability according to Kafer, “requires a recognition of the central role that ideas about disability and ability play in contemporary culture, particularly in imagined and projected futures” (Kafer 2013: 10). The same goes for sexuality. Allen, likewise, identifies ways contemporary society thinks about disability as the area to be scrutinized.

#### Plan focus creates an artificial binary between ‘genuine knowledge’ and ‘unproductive criticism,’ naturalizing epistemic oppression.

Yancy ’22 [George and Christine Wiesler; October 11; Samuel Candler Dobbs professor of philosophy at Emory University and a Montgomery fellow at Dartmouth College; Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy at the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Truthout, “The ‘Problem’ Isn’t Disabled Bodies — It’s the Violent Structure of Our Society,” https://truthout.org/articles/the-problem-isnt-disabled-bodies-its-the-violent-structure-of-our-society]

My sense is that people generally think about disability as consisting of a physical or cognitive “deficit.” This raises all sorts of questions related to, for example, “epistemic oppression” — a form of oppression that occurs when people in positions of power assert that those who are disabled will only benefit from the people they deem as having epistemological expertise and as possessing “genuine” knowledge (very often those who are deemed “able-bodied”). And while it is important not to conflate the dynamics of epistemic oppression within the context of anti-Black racism, I think that it is important that we challenge the differential ways in which knowledge possession is assumed to be devoid vis-à-vis those who are disabled. Could you elaborate on how you understand epistemological oppression within the context of disability studies, and discuss how you conceptualize disabled knowers and the richness and complexity of their knowledge, and how their knowledge can transform epistemic forms of arrogance and hegemony?

There is a long history of disabled people being denied epistemic authority in regard to our own bodyminds and experiences. (I use Margaret Price’s term “bodymind” to emphasize the inextricability of the body and mind and the fact that many impairments are not readily apparent.) The Disability Rights Movement’s slogan “Nothing About Us without Us” is, in part, a challenge to epistemic oppression — which entails the assumption that disabled people are unable to make contributions to shared knowledge, as well as ways in which the disabled people’s knowledge claims are actively undermined. In spite of good intentions, nondisabled “experts” on disability have sometimes made the lives of their patients or students worse by privileging normalization. In other words, health care professionals and educators attempted to get their patients/students to look and function as closely to a mythical “normal” bodymind as possible (e.g., prohibiting D/deaf children from using sign language or forcing children with polio to walk rather than using a wheelchair). There is still an overemphasis on cure rather than helping people to figure out how to live with impairments and chronic illnesses.

Disabled people and our allies continue to demand epistemic justice. I would suggest that a central assumption of disability studies is that disabled people are capable of living worthwhile lives and that we have important contributions to make — including epistemic ones. Unfortunately, these assumptions still seem to go against the grain, and this is readily apparent within philosophy.

When I first read philosophy containing false assertions about the lives of disabled people, I thought that this should be easy to fix. Philosophers are concerned with truth and engaging in just epistemic practices, right? I thought that this lack of knowledge could be corrected through engagement with empirical research and testimonies of disabled people. However, it turns out that the problem is much deeper and more difficult to address. Certain bioethicists, in particular, are so sure that they know about the lives of disabled people that they dismiss any claims that challenge the views they hold, sometimes paying lip service to the positions of disability theorists/activists, but then going on to contradict them. The epistemic arrogance is truly astounding. I now believe that epistemic humility is a necessary condition for the knowledge of disabled people to make any difference in the beliefs of nondisabled knowers such as these bioethicists. Encountering the richness and complexity of this knowledge is not enough; having an openness to being wrong (i.e., demonstrating epistemic humility) and valuing the knowledge of disabled people are both necessary.

#### Voting NEG is a sufficient win condition---it holds violent academics hostage and accountable.

Castrodale ’18 [Mark Anthony; 2018; Ph.D., professor of social sciences at the University of Sheffield; Manifestor for the Future of Critical Disability Studies, “Disabling militarism: Theorising anti-militarism, dis/ability and dis/placement,” p. 68-74 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781351053341-7/disabling-militarism-mark-anthony-castrodale]

There is a need to examine how (in)sane and dis/abled subjectivities are (re)crafted through academically disciplined scholarship. The military-industrial-academic complex is a profitable enterprise and universities have now come to exist as ‘hypermodern militarized knowledge factories’ (Armitage, 2005, p. 219), now resembling a military character, promoting military capability and preparedness. Moreover, universities are sites implicated in defence contracts, engineering weaponry, communication technologies, robotics, biotechnologies – all operationalised to support a perpetual war-ready military mentality (ibid.).

Within the military–industrial–academic complex all disciplinary knowledges are implicated. ‘What could once only be imagined in science fiction is now increasingly coming to fruition: drones can be flown by thought in human brains: pharmaceuticals can help you forget traumatic experience, or produce feelings of trust to encourage confession in interrogation’ (Howell, 2016, p. 1). Militarised knowledge–truth regimes are central to life–death struggles in the bio-political management of life itself and imaginings of (post)humanity (Braidotti, 2013) and posthuman ways of war (Cudworth and Hobden, 2015). Drawing on Howell (2016), we must ‘grapple with the complexity of ethical questions about the contemporary relationship between war and science … When war efforts shapes funding priorities, multiple disciplines including medicine, are shaped by these military priorities’ (Howell, 2016, p. 17).

Academic scholarship is mediated through a militarised ethic and funding regimes. Koopman (2016) cautions that the very nature of the knowledges we produce may become weaponised. Koopman (ibid.) attests that geographers need to contest militarised co-option and collusion of their scholarship. Similarly, anthropological research has been mobilised for military-oriented applications (Price, 2011). Research outcomes are influenced by the militarisation of university science (Johnson, 2015).

The psy-sciences are militarily instrumentalised with damaging (a/e)ffects (Howell, 2016; Jaffee, 2016). Direct linkages between psy-sciences and military–academic knowledge applications abound. Notable recent work by Efrat Gold (2016) titled By any other name: An exploration of academic development of torture and its links to the military and psychiatry details unethical academic military psy-science that recruited university students (who were offered payment) as research subjects exposed to torturous sensory deprivation, isolation, restraint and immobilisation. As Howell (2016, p. 3) attests, ‘war is not only a destructive force, but also a productive one’. Diagnostic labels such as soldier heart, nostalgia, shell-shock, PTSD, traumatic brain injuries and polytrauma share common war–biomedical improvisations of origin (ibid.). ‘Trauma is being radically reconfigured as a neurological problem, a brain problem, and more generally as an injury’ (Howell, 2016). PTSD is depoliticised through the championing of ‘medico-technological interventions’ (Jaffee, 2016, p. 2) which stifle and placate imagination for political activism and normalise ‘conditions of perpetual war’ (ibid). It therefore bears repeating that, due to the immense physical and psychological harms, ‘Critical disability studies scholars cannot be silent about the disabling effects of imperialist wars’ (ibid., p. 7).

War, science, technology and society coalesce. The knowledge we produce is not innocent. We must collectively refute militarised research which hijack free pacifist intellectual thought, narrowing what can be thought and said by constructively aligning scholarship and funding regimes in ways which hold academics hostage to state-corporate colluded militarised imperatives.

## 2NC

### OFF

#### A] Interpretation – Debaters must read a content warning before discussing or reading a case containing suicide with the anonymous option to opt out and have another case available to read in case those involved in the debate are not okay with the content.

#### B] They Violate: They discuss suicide without giving an anonymous opt out content warning.

#### C] Standards:

#### 1. Accessibility; Anonymous Content warnings are key to allowing others to prepare for or reject a triggering argument from triggering them without having to directly come forward about the issue. Without this anonymity, it forces some debaters to just allow the argument to trigger them. This ruins their access to debate because they are no longer comfortable in the space and fear another argument similar in nature may be ran, meaning the debater has no nor wants any access to the debate. This is key to education, the debater no longer wants to debate, leading to less research, potentially dropping out of debate, and less want to engage in education during debate rounds due to the fear of the argument. Key to fairness, the debater is now at an unfair advantage and is shut out of the debate, making the round unfair and debate as a space unfair.

#### 2. Cornering; Anonymity in Content Warnings allows the person to remain anonymous. Without anonymity, they must come forward with their trigger which forces them into a corner. Bullying, Blaming, or unwanted conversations with others may ensue as a result. Key to education and fairness as to escape such a situation, the debater will likely no longer want to debate, feel less inclined to research things as it may get worse, and have a disadvantage in the actual debate because they will be pressured and not want to debate due to the aforementioned issues.

#### D] Voters:

#### 1. Education; It’s intrinsic to debate. Debate helps us facilitate intelligible discourse on current issues, without education there is no point for debate.

#### 2. Safety; being in the space is a prerequisite to other impacts

#### Drop the Debater -

#### Creates a good norm for the rest of the community to follow in the wake of the loss; even if we lose all other offense this independently wins us the round because it changes the actual debate space.

#### Prefer Competing Interps. - holds debaters accountable, otherwise, it creates a race to the bottom, encouraging debaters to test how much abuse they can get away with.

It comes before ROB

#### No RVIs-

#### 1. Chilling effect- De-incentivizes debaters from checking abusive debaters.

#### Must respond in the next speech; -

#### 1. My time allocation has already shifted, ensure theirs does too, otherwise the shell gets dropped over 2 speeches.

#### Disability must be politicized---this is the only way to secure collective rights---the retreat from politics reifies ableist tropes of charity politics and naively tries to wish problems away

**Ruckelshaus 17**, (Jay Ruckelshaus is a Rhodes Scholar and graduate student in political theory at the University of Oxford, and the founder and president of Ramp Less Traveled, a nonprofit organization that helps students with spinal cord injuries pursue higher education, The Non-Politics of Disability, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/opinion/denouncing-trump-wont-help-disability-rights.html)

Disability rights enjoy a seemingly ironclad moral consensus, an ostensible unanimity that is striking given America’s entrenched polarization and the antagonism surrounding other identity movements. Many are wary of L.G.B.T. rights or the Black Lives Matter movement, but it seems beyond the pale — almost cruel — to oppose disability rights. Nobody wants to be anti-disability. Initially, this harmony would seem helpful. Free from partisan discord, advancements for the approximately 57 million Americans with disabilities should be easier to achieve, borne aloft by the wings of certain progress. Why, then, do **rampant unemployment and educational disparities endure**, and why does success remain the exception? I think part of the reason is the insulation of our pro-disabled political consensus. Its logic is rooted not in any deep belief in the equal worth of citizens with disabilities, but rather in a **general aversion to disability**. This is related to the **charity impulse** that has always surrounded disability — and has constrained liberation efforts by assuming that inequities are unfortunate but natural realities to be mitigated through compassion, **rather than politically structured injustices.** There is also a profound lack of disabled people in the public sphere, meaning any substantive discussion that does occur is extremely rare. I suspect many people I talk to about disability maintain an implicit hope that, if they nod as vigorously as possible, the issue will simply go away. In this way, support for disability rights is similar to the act of expressing perfunctory thanks to military veterans. It temporarily absolves us of the responsibility to address the heart of the matter. Moreover, the apparent moral consensus may be mostly superficial. In trying to enact accessibility, disability advocates encounter increasing resistance as the effort and costs involved in proposals come closer to being realized. (Consider the neighborhood store that decides it’s just too costly to install a ramp, or the community lecture that excludes deaf attendees by refusing to hire a sign-language interpreter.) Instead of facilitating change, false unity actually **restrains change.** It **stifles the more substantive conversations true progress requires.** And our inability to speak honestly — and contentiously — about disability shows how the politics of disability is in this sense non-political. We are the worse for it. In addition to greater participation in the public sphere, true progress for citizens with disabilities will require a willingness to confront the issues head-on, even when — especially when — citizens disagree on competing solutions. **We must politicize disability** — not in the cable-news, grandstanding kind of way, but in the term’s more formal sense. The work of the Belgian political theorist Chantal Mouffe can help illuminate what’s at stake. Mouffe begins with the premise that human relations are inherently antagonistic: Political change always requires controversial transfers in power or prestige, and it is an illusion to imagine politics without confrontation. Per this “agonistic” conception of democracy, a healthy political order is one that prefers vigorous, good-faith argumentation to complacent consensus. Until we publicly **recognize real disagreements** surrounding disability and accessibility, Mouffe would insist, we are **doomed to a vacuous, empty debate that is neither political nor productive.** Recall the Kovaleski incident. I’m not suggesting that the abhorrence of Mr. Trump’s actions is open to legitimate questioning. But in their forcefully reassuring comments and messages, my friends prevented any serious discussion of disability at the level where reasonable disagreement does exist. Where will the money come from to fund disability employment schemes? How do we even define “disability”? Despite — and, I would argue, partly because of — the broad condemnation of Mr. Trump for his insensitivity, there was no substantive public discussion of such issues. You may be thinking, haven’t we had enough politics lately? Maybe it’s a blessing that disability isn’t as political as it might be; it avoids the drama and messiness that now seem to define our common life. Avoiding politics might be possible if disability were an exclusively private affair. But it is fundamentally a public concern, affecting everyone directly or indirectly and revealing our obligations to one another as members of a democratic society. Issues of accessibility can be fully addressed only through public institutions and collective effort. **For the disability community, there is no answer but politics.**

#### Mapping Turn – Using disability studies to validate a sense of identity plays into Enlightenment reasoning that renders bodies productive for society – prefer impersonal life over identity politics

**Overboe 9** (James Overboe, professor of sociology at Wilfred Laurier University, “Affirming an Impersonal Life: A Different Register for Disability Studies,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 3, Number 3, 2009, pg. 241-2)

Drawing from the template of feminism, queer politics, and other civil rights movements, a fundamental tenet of the Disability Studies movement continues to be the **validation of one’s** own **identity** and politics **based upon various disabilities**: sensory, psychiatric, developmental, environmental, and physical (or any combination of the aforementioned). Underlying this politics of identity, or even the politics of difference, is the self-reflexive individual. Michel Foucault has argued that, since the Enlightenment, society has **followed the ‘humanist**ic **register’** noted by the **conscious self**. This self through subjection **internalizes** the effects of **institutionalized discourses** and subsequent power circulates through the subject, being **reiterated** because it is **beneficial for the individual** and **productive for society** as a whole. In The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection, Judith Butler writes, “**Subjection** consists precisely in this **fundamental dependency** upon a discourse we never chose but that, paradoxically, initiates and **sustains our agency**” (2). Both Foucault and Butler reject the notion of the founding subject that constructs the social and material world. Fundamentally, they offer differing accounts of how the self is formulated, and in doing so retain both self-reflexivity and intent. In his analysis of “Immanence: A Life...” Giorgio Agamben argues that Deleuze moves this discussion to a different register, that of the impersonal life (without a self). In Potentialities: Collected Essays on Philosophy, Agamben contends that many of the categories of the philosophical tradition must be rethought or reconsidered, making room for “Life as contemplation without knowledge ... that has freed itself of all cognition and intentionality” (239). Agamben realizes this endeavour will not be easy as, in the philosophical community, self-reflexivity has given meaning to the world for many centuries. This article will assert that Disability Studies should **embrace the register of the impersonal life**. While this self-reflexive humanism gained prominence in modernity and often displaced other forms of governance and life, the article will contend that the registers of humanistic self-reflexivity and impersonal life co-exist and affect or may affect the social world. My purpose here is not to resurrect the sanctity of life versus quality of life debate, which I believe is framed within a discourse of humanistic self-reflexiv- ity. Within this discourse, on one hand, people with cognitive ability recognize the pitiful existence of the non-communicative, the comatose, or the non- cognitive subjects, but on moral grounds argue that the sanctity of life must be upheld. On the other hand, from a quality of life perspective, people considered non-communicative, comatose, or non-cognitive are suffering and to ease their torment must be allowed the right to die if they so choose by prior informed consent. Either argument remains steadfast in the realm of the humanistic reg- ister with its emphasis on agency and intent. Moreover, from the perspective of **the humanist**ic **register**, a **lack of self-reflexivity** and intentionality is taken for granted as **an inferior** and questionable **existence**. This article makes a case to affirm lives that are alive without intent or a greater meaning imposed upon them, by themselves or others, and are located on a different register-that of the impersonal life. …

#### Logics of identity are ablenormative – zeroes the capacity of the non-neurotypical to engage

**Overboe 9** (James Overboe, professor of sociology at Wilfred Laurier University, “Affirming an Impersonal Life: A Different Register for Disability Studies,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 3, Number 3, 2009, pg. 252-4)

Can Disability Studies risk cutting through the patchwork of rhetoric and cli- chés that continually privilege the self-reflexive narrative and equally recognize the palpating voice that eschews language and representation, that simply exists without needing to be understood? This voice is pure difference, a difference in itself without hierarchical comparison, or subordination of difference to identity. A voice that is “at once distant and intimate” (May 20), which needs to be affirmed within the discipline of Disability Studies. This may be difficult because disability scholars and activists have an affinity and commitment to language, communication, and community. Like rehabilitation, underscoring language and communication is the belief in a self with agency and intent. In A Thousand Plateaus, Deleuze and Guattari assert: No one is supposed to be ignorant of grammaticality; those who are belong in special institutions. The unity of language is fundamentally political. There is no mother tongue, only a power takeover by a dominant language that at times advances along a broad front, and at times swoops down on diverse centers simultaneously. We can conceive of several ways for a language to homogenize [and] centralize. (101) This dominant language or pattern of communication is in itself **a strategic site** of **normality**. It paints normality with broad strokes or, under **the guise of diversity**, it may **allow for difference within a range of normality**, but it nevertheless **rejects** any sense of communication (or non-communication) that is **deemed abnormal**. Thus, the vitalism of an impersonal life is often considered noise that will be filtered out, in the name of clarity, in order to facilitate the real business of social change and so-called emancipation. This re-establishes and **re-inscribes** the dominant language or communication style associated with being a person or individual with agency. Deleuze writes, “The ultimate aim of literature is to **set free**, in the **delirium**, this creation of a health or this invention of a people, that is, **a possibility of life**” (Essays Critical and Clinical, 4). If Deleuze is correct, and literature and life are intertwined, then we must find a way to write about impersonal possibilities of life in Disability Studies before (as Agamben suggests about philosophy) it becomes restricted by **cognition and intentionality**. I am not suggesting (nor do I think it possible) that we rid ourselves of the seductive allure and pragmat- ic force of the self with agency. But can I ask that people living an impersonal expression of life be acknowledged as existing on a differing plane of life, not considered an inferior expression of life that inhibits access to the ‘real person’ trapped in the recesses of our mind and/or body? Moreover, for those disabled people who **acquire a disability** through **brain injury, stroke, Locked-in Syndrome, ‘mind problems’** or those who experience **neurodiversity**, could Disability Studies realize, in a Deleuzian sense, **becoming impersonal**, opening up the possibility of different expressions of life in addition to a return to personhood? Even more radical, could those of us who have succeeded in grabbing the brass ring of personhood with agency risk embracing our impersonal existence, as well as later ‘expressions of life’ that are considered post-person, thereby realizing a potential not even imagined? The implications for Disability Studies and social change are vast and immense if the discipline embraces pure immanence: a life...

#### Liberalism isn’t monolithic – abandoning institutions is materially violent

**Badano 14** (Gabriele. PhD Candidate, Centre for Philosophy, Justice, and Health, University College London. “Political liberalism and the justice claims of the disabled: a reconciliation.” Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy 17(4): 401-22. Emory Libraries.)

I argue that any proposal abandoning the language of **political** justice would not seem to do enough for those individuals with disabilities who fall outside the basic idea of persons as depicted by Rawls. In fact, the intuitions supporting the idea that concepts like rights and opportunities are indispensable are very strong.11 Let us go back to the examples of individuals falling outside Rawls’s idea of persons because their disabilities prevent them from being a net beneﬁt to social cooperation. They are individuals who need multiple careers to work, or whose disabilities prevent them from providing a beneﬁt to social cooperation that is large enough. To put the point more sharply, it is worth noticing that the disabilities in question are compatible with being in full possession of one’s logical and moral powers. Now, should we accept that those individuals ought to be given **no** rights or opportunities? An afﬁrmative answer would strike us as implausible, and for a good reason. In a liberal society, having one’s rights, opportunities and basic distributive entitlements acknowledged is one and the same as being recognized as an equal. And what is missing from Rawls’s political liberalism is precisely the idea that falling below a threshold of full cooperation should not be enough to prevent the disabled from being regarded as persons on an equal footing with anyone else.

In sum, Rawls’s political liberalism is not amenable to any extension that, keeping the basic ideas of society and persons intact, is able to include a concern with the status of individuals with disabilities. In addition, the proposal that the interests of the disabled are not for public reason to protect is not satisfactory. Consequently, a substantial **revision** is the only way to reconcile political **liberalism** with our intuitions concerning what is due to the disabled.

5. Revising political liberalism I: beyond Hartley’s contractualism

The aim of this section and the next is to propose a substantial revision of Rawls’s theory that accommodates the justice claims of the disabled while upholding the project of political liberalism. A question that needs to be answered at this point is: why should we uphold the project of political liberalism, rather than endorsing a different model that more neatly ﬁts with our intuitions concerning what is due to the disabled? First, the general project of political liberalism is compelling. Rawls’s political liberalism aims to identify a common ground of political ideas that can work as the basis on which the most important political decisions should be made. This project is of the greatest importance because, if successful, it creates **legitimacy** by building **institutions** on the basis of concepts that are acceptable to each reasonable individual. Moreover, it promotes stability in societies that are characterized by deep pluralism.

Second, despite Rawls’s failure to take the interests of the disabled into consideration, political liberalism is well suited to support the justice claims of individuals with disabilities. This is because the idea that the disabled are citizens who deserve our respect is part of the common culture of our societies. In other words, there is an overlapping consensus on the idea that rights, opportunities and distributive shares must be granted to individuals who are not fully cooperating members of society, including those who fall below full moral powers. It is widely believed that those with physical disabilities should have the same rights as their fellow citizens, live in a **social** environment that does not excessively limit their **opportunities** and receive **beneﬁts** that help meet their special needs. Besides, although the state or third parties are given exceptional rights to interfere with the autonomy of individuals with severe cognitive disabilities, it is widely recognized that the mentally disabled are citizens whose basic interests must be protected by the law.12 In the public space, any proposal that individuals who are not fully cooperating members of society should have their basic interests neglected would be widely received with outrage. Such proposal would be said to ﬁt a fascist society, not a decent one. Among other legal documents, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN General Assembly, A/61/611) can be taken as the epitome of this widespread attitude. Adopted in 2006, the Convention requires that all individuals with disabilities should share in the enjoyment of equal fundamental rights.

#### Assuming that state politics can be abandoned is founded on an ableist vision of independence

**Nussbaum 0** (Martha. Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics, University of Chicago. “The Future of Feminist Liberalism.” Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association 74(2): 47-79. Emory Libraries. Problematic language modified in [brackets].)

My solution to these problems lies, then, squarely within the liberal tradition. But Kittay suggests that we should go further departing from that tradition altogether. She holds that Western political theory must be radically reconfigured to put the fact of dependency at its heart. The fact, she says, that we are all "some mother's child," existing in intertwined relations of dependency, should be the guiding image for political thought.39 Such a care-based theory, she thinks, will be likely to be very different from any liberal theory, since the liberal tradition is deeply committed to goals of independence and liberty. Although Kittay supplies few details to clarify the practical meaning of the difference, I think her idea is that the care-based theory would support a type of politics that provides comprehensive support for need throughout all citizens' lives, as in some familiar ideals of the welfare state-but a welfare state in which liberty is far less important than security and well-being.

Kittay is not altogether consistent on this point. At times she herself uses classic liberal arguments, saying that we need to remember that caregivers have their own lives to lead, and to support policies that give them more choices.40 But on the whole she rejects, in the abstract, solutions that emphasize freedom as a central political goal. The **concrete** measures she favors do not seem to have such sweeping **anti-liberal** implications. The restoration and expansion of Aid to Families with Dependent Children expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993; various educational measures promoting the dignity of the disabled, through a judicious combination of "mainstreaming" and separate education4"-all these are familiar **liberal** policies, which can be combined with an emphasis on choice and liberty as important social goals. Kittay's most controversial proposal, that of a direct non-means-tested payment to those who care for family dependents at home-clearly has, or could have, a liberal rationale: that of ensuring that these people are seen as active, dignified workers rather than passive non-contributors.

Indeed, if we adopt all the changes I have proposed, we will still have a theory that is basically liberal. For theories that take their start from an idea of human capability and functioning emphasize the importance of giving all citizens the chance to develop the full range of human powers, at whatever level their condition allows, and to enjoy the sort of liberty and independence their condition allows. Would we do better to reject this theory in favor of Kittay's idea, rejecting independence as a major social goal and conceiving of the state as a universal mother? To be sure, **nobody is ever self-sufficient**; the **independence** we enjoy **is** **always both temporary and partial**, and it is good to be reminded of that fact by a theory that also stresses the importance of care in times of dependency. But is being "some 57 mother's child" a sufficient image for the citizen in a just society? I think we need a lot more: liberty and opportunity, the chance to form a plan of life, the chance to learn and imagine on one's own. These goals are as important for [those with varying degrees of (dis)ability] the mentally handicapped as they are for others, though much more difficult to achieve. Although Kittay's daughter Sesha will never live on her own (and although Kittay is right to say that independence should not be seen as a necessary condition of dignity for all mentally disabled people)42, many others do aspire to hold a job, and vote, and tell their own story. Michael Berube ends his compelling account of his son's life with the hope that Jamie, too, will write a book about himself, as two adults with Down Syndrome recently have.43 One day Jamie's kindergarten class went round the room, asking the children what they wanted to be when they grew up. They said the usual things: basketball star, ballet dancer, fireman. The teacher wasn't sure Jamie would understand the question, so she asked it very clearly. Jamie just said, "Big." And his literal answer, said the teacher, taught them all something about the question. Berube too wants, simply, a society in which his son will be able to be "big” healthy, educated, loving, active, seen as a particular person with something distinctive to contribute, rather than as "a retarded child."

For that to happen, his **dependencies must be understood and supported**. But so too must his need to be distinct and an individual: and at this point Berube refers sympathetically to Rawls. He argues that the idea at the heart of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)-the idea that every child has the right to an "appropriate education" in the "least restrictive environment" possible, based on an "Individualized Education Plan"-is a profoundly liberal idea, an idea about individuality and freedom. One of the most important kinds of support mentally disabled children need is the support required to be free choosing adults, each in his or her own way. Insofar as Kittay suggests that we downplay or marginalize such liberal notions in favor of a conception of the state that makes it the parental supporter of its "children’s needs, I thinks he goes too far, misconceiving what justice would be for both the disabled and the elderly. Even for Sesha, who will never vote or write, doesn't a full human life involve a kind of freedom and individuality namely, a space in which to exchange love and enjoy light and sound, free from confinement and mockery?

So I believe that the problem we have investigated shows us that liberal theory needs to question some of its most traditional starting points-questioning, in the process, the Kantian notion of the person. But that does not disable liberalism: it just challenges us all to produce a **new** form of liberalism, more **attentive to need** and its material and **institutional** conditions. The liberal ideas of freedom and of the human need for various types of liberty of action are precious ideas that feminist philosophers, it seems to me, should cherish and further develop, creating theories that make it possible for all citizens to have the support they need for the full development of their human capabilities.