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### 1AC---Hauntology

#### 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).

#### The countermethod is 👻 hauntology 👻 vote us to endorse hauntology 👻

Freccero 06(Carla Freccero is Chair of the Department of Literature and Professor of Literature, History of Consciousness, and Women’s Studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz. January 16 2006, “Queer/Early/Modern,” accessed 7/8/2022, pg. 75-80, <https://drive.google.com/drive/u/1/search?q=%22queer/early/modern%22> // recut akang

Yet this intertwining of multiple brutal logics of erasure reappears again and again. The historical and political appropriation of ‘‘Brandon Teena’’ as ‘‘known’’ cannot lay to rest the haunting that persistently destabilizes the anchors of identity and meaning. As Halberstam explains, if ‘‘haunting is an articulate discourse’’ and ‘‘a mode within which the ghost demands something like accountability,’’ then ‘‘to tell a ghost story means being willing to be haunted’’ (73). This willingness to be haunted is an ethical relation to the world, motivated by a concern not only for the past but also for the future, for those who live on in the borderlands without a home. If the queer appropriation of ‘‘Brandon Teena’’ has been melancholic—an attempt to deal with trauma, in a sense, by refusing it as such, turning it instead into knowledge, into productive organizing—it has also been colonizing. Both gestures, the melancholic and the colonizing, have worked to foreclose how ‘‘he,’’ as ghost, recurs in ways that are not so clear, and demands not a definition but the creation of a future where categorical definitions so dependent on gender and desire might prove affirmingly impossible and unnecessary. Using spectrality as a hypothesis, then, we might wonder what we would see and hear were we to remain open to ‘‘Brandon Teena’’ ’s ghostly returns. One such moment is the point at which one survivor, finding himself haunted, ‘‘listens’’ to the ghost and speaks its reminder. Matthew Shepard’s homophobically motivated murder occurred in 1998, four years after ‘‘Brandon Teena’’ was killed and the year a documentary of the events The Brandon Teena Story—was released; it also occurred four months after the torture and murder of James Byrd in Jasper, Texas, for being African American. In a statement bordering on the wishes thus express themselves from beyond the grave. Tellingly, the ghostly performative ventriloquized by Mr. Shepard, as reported in the Washington Post, interrupts the logic of revenge and retribution animating the force of the law: In a dramatic and surprising end to the Matthew Shepard murder case, convicted killer Aaron J. McKinney, 22, today was sentenced to two life sentences for beating the gay University of Wyoming student to death last year. McKinney accepted a deal brokered by Shepard’s parents just as a jury was about to begin hearing testimony about whether he should be put to death.... His son, Shepard said, believed in the death penalty for certain crimes, and had called it justified in the racially motivated murder in Texas of James Byrd Jr., who was dragged to death behind a pickup truck in another hate crime that shocked the nation’s conscience. ‘‘Little did we know that the same response would come about involving Matt,’’ Shepard said. ‘‘I too believe in the death penalty,’’ he added. ‘‘I would like nothing better than to see you die, Mr. McKinney. However, this is the time to begin the healing process. To show mercy to someone who refused to show any mercy. ‘‘Mr. McKinney, I’m going to grant you life, as hard as it is for me to do so, because of Matthew . . .’’18 Ghostly returns are thus a sign of trauma and its mourning.19 This trauma, Derrida argues, is a ‘‘politico-logic of trauma,’’ that ‘‘répond à l’injonction d’une justice qui, au-delà du droit, surgit dans le respect même de qui n’est pas, n’est plus ou n’est pas encore vivant, présentement vivant’’ (‘‘responds to the injunction of a justice which, beyond right or law, rises up in the very respect owed to whoever is not, no longer or not yet, living, presently living’’).20 This mourning is not a form of nostalgia, a longing for what is gone, but a kind of mourning that is ‘‘en fait et en droit interminable, sans normalité possible, sans limite fiable, dans la réalité ou dans le concept, entre l’introjection et l’incorporation’’ (160; ‘‘in fact and by right interminable, without possible normality, without reliable limit, in its reality or in its concept, between introjection and incorporation,’’ 97).21 Thinking historicity through haunting thus combines both the seeming objectivity of events and the subjectivity of their affective afterlife. As Wendy Brown remarks of spectrality’s modality—what Derrida calls a ‘‘being-with specters’’ that is also ‘‘une politique de la mémoire, de l’héritage et des générations’’ (15; ‘‘a politics of memory, of inheritance, and of generations’’ [xviii–xix])—‘‘We inherit not ‘what really happened’ to the dead but what lives on from that happening, what is conjured from it, how past generations and events occupy the force fields of the present, how they claim us, and how they haunt, plague, and inspirit our imaginations and visions for the future.’’22 Ghostliness and homosexuality have a long history of association, most frequently referenced in the clichéd and homophobic phrase ‘‘the specter of homosexuality.’’ In its most virulent deployment, that specter is always lurking in an alley or behind a bush, waiting to pounce upon some unsuspecting innocents. When invoked more sympathetically, it hovers secretively around the edges of an otherwise perfectly straight and open—albeit presumably anxious—scene. Indeed, Derrida defines the specter in terms strikingly reminiscent of homosexual panic, the sense of a not-quite-visible contaminating near-presence that is also an anxious, often paranoid projection, the material immateriality I tracked through the term queer in chapter 2: Le spectre, comme son nom l’indique, c’est la fréquence d’une certaine visibilité. Mais la visibilité de l’invisible. Et la visibilité, par essence, ne se voit pas, c’est pourquoi elle reste . . . au-delà du phénomène ou de l’étant. Le spectre, c’est aussi, entre autres choses, ce qu’on imagine, ce qu’on croit voir et qu’on projette: sur un écran imaginaire, là où il n’y a rien à voir. Pas même l’écran, parfois, et un écran a toujours, au fond, au fond qu’il est, une structure, une structure d’apparition disparaissante. Mais voilà qu’on ne peut plus fermer l’oeil à guetter le retour. (Spectres de Marx, 165) The specter, as its name indicates, is the frequency of a certain visibility. But the visibility of the invisible. And visibility, by its essence, is not seen, which is why it remains . . . beyond the phenomenon, or beyond being. The specter is also, among other things, what one thinks one sees, and which one projects—on an imaginary screen where there is nothing to see. Not even the screen sometimes, and a screen always has, at bottom, in the bottom or background that is, a structure of disappearing apparition. But now one can no longer get any shut-eye, being so intent to watch out for the return. (Specters of Marx, 101) Like the closet, whose very existence suggests the opening onto what is concealed, Derrida likens the specter to the screen whose structure is always already that of a disappearing appearance. The ghost is thus also structural. Terry Castle observes this phenomenon in relation to the ‘‘apparitional’’ history of the lesbian: ‘‘When it comes to lesbians . . . many people have trouble seeing what’s in front of them. The lesbian remains a kind of ‘ghost effect’ in the cinema world of modern life: elusive, vaporous, difficult to spot—even when she is there, in plain view, mortal and magnificent, at the center of the screen. Some may even deny that she exists at all.’’23 For those who live ‘‘on the other side’’ of the expression, ‘‘the specter of homosexuality,’’ those who might be said to be named, ‘‘ghosted’’ by that phrase, ghosts are neither scary nor menacing, however terrifying the prospect of being turned into one might be. For one may also reverse the perspective and understand the specter as that which sees without being seen, as what produces the sense of being seen, observed, surveilled.24 Hélène Cixous declared, concerning one famous gynephobic patriarchal figure of woman, ‘‘You only have to look at the Medusa straight on to see her. And she’s not deadly. She’s beautiful and she’s laughing.’’25 To be a ghost among ghosts is to ‘‘see’’ the ghost not as a feared and fearful projection—the way Medusa cannot be directly seen by men—but perhaps as beautiful, though rarely laughing, for the specter is the form a certain unfinished mourning takes. Thus part of what it might mean to live with ghosts would be to understand oneself as ‘‘ghosted,’’ and to understand ‘‘learning to live’’ as something that takes place ‘‘between life and death’’ as the ‘‘non contemporaneity with itself of the living present.’’26 This would then be an approach to history—and to justice—that would neither ‘‘forget the dead’’ nor ‘‘successfully’’ mourn them.27 Exploring further the notion of haunting as the way history registers as affect in the social and psychic lives of beings, and the reciprocity of haunting and being haunted, Avery Gordon follows the figure of the ghost and the poetics of haunting in other contexts to understand the specificity of this way of coming to terms with historical trauma.28 Ghostly Matters looks to Toni Morrison’s Beloved to see how haunting conveys the traumatic effect and affect of the historical event on the subject and the social responsibility that is thereby entailed.29 Thus what Derrida analyzes in the work of Marx and philosophy, Gordon studies in a kind of embodied poetics, tracking how the ghost’s figurative ‘‘materialization’’ elicits, even as it emblematizes, traumatic repetition and working through.30 In that process of materialization, or poetic embodiment, Hamlet’s father undergoes a morphological transformation, from Danish king to African slave and from father to daughter; the ghostly exchange takes place not between a father and his son but between a daughter and her mother; and the ‘‘allegory’’ of haunting moves from Europe to America.31 Like Gordon, in what follows I track a transatlantic passage from an earlier moment and an earlier historical trauma as they haunt both within and outside of their own time. In Premodern Sexualities, Louise Fradenburg and I raised questions concerning the fantasmatic relationship that we, as scholars of the past and scholars working ‘‘queerly’’ in the history of sexuality, might affirm in relation to the past, ‘‘ours’’ or that of others, in the name of pleasure.32 It was an effort, in part, to honor the complex pleasure positivity of queer theory in its resistance to the heteronormatively disciplining discourses that came self-righteously to the fore when aids in the United States became associated with ‘‘homosexuals’’ and ‘‘promiscuity.’’ It was also a way of examining how desires and identifications—queer theory’s psychoanalytically inflected terminological legacies—are at work in historical scholars’ investments in the differences and similarities between the past and the present. Finally, it was a way of noting historiography’s own (self-)disciplining force, its ‘‘repudiations of pleasure and fantasy’’ in spite—or because—of its queer wishes (xvii); thus we argued for a queer historiography that would devote itself to a critical revalorization of the places and possibilities of pleasure within the serious and ‘‘ascetic’’ work of history. Insofar as queer historicism registers the affective investments of the present in the past, however, it harbors within itself not only pleasure, but also pain, a traumatic pain whose ethical insistence is to ‘‘live to tell’’ through complex and circuitous processes of working through. Thus we concluded the introduction with an ethically impelled wish: The past may not be the present, but it is sometimes in the present, haunting, even if only through our uncertain knowledges of it, our hopes of surviving and living well. The questions we are raising about the practice of history may help us understand better the living and dying of twentieth-century bodies and pleasures. And we hope that consideration of the ways in which historicisms are currently questioning sexuality, and sex studies questioning historicism, will work to affirm the pleasures of mortal creatures. (xxi) The past is in the present in the form of a haunting. This is what, among other things, doing a queer kind of history means, since it involves an openness to the possibility of being haunted, even inhabited, by ghosts. What is transmitted in the cohabitation of ghostly past and present is related to survival, to ‘‘living well,’’ and to the ‘‘pleasures of mortal creatures,’’ survivals and pleasures that have little to do with normative understandings of biological reproduction.

**The AFF reframes the dead such that they become rallying points for political change and broadens the scope of which bodies do or don’t count.**

Jessica **Auchter 16**, professor in the Social Science department at University of Tennessee, “Paying Attention to Dead Bodies: The Future of Security Studies?”, *Journal of Global Security Studies*, Volume 1(1), pp 37-39, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogv005>, lenox

Security studies has, up until now, not taken **dead bodies** seriously. This is perhaps because security studies scholarship has privileged the idea of survival and has focused on generating knowledge and scholarship that **ensured survival** at multiple levels. National interest has often been intertwined with **survival of the state**; similarly, focuses on human rights and responsibilities are tied to the survival of **humanity**. Environmental degradation, for example, is deemed a threat to **human security** because degradation can threaten survival by changing weather patterns, exacerbating desertification, and affecting the supply of water and food. As Priya Dixit (2015, 113) has noted, “it is presumed that life—and a live body—is the main goal of security. Thus, dead bodies and death in general become ‘**out of place**.’” It is worth mentioning here that there is a difference between dead bodies and death. While we know that death is **inevitable**, we cannot **know it ourselves**. Dead bodies, on the other hand, are something we can **see** and choose to ignore, or they can become **rallying points** around specific issues.

This focus on survival and human life in security studies means that the dead are often represented as simply a **failure of the system**: the dead citizen means that the state is not **secure**, while the dead famine victim indicates a lack of attention to adequate standards of health. The hyper-visible dead body thrust onto the scene of global politics is often represented as a crisis of **responsibility**. The **Syrian child** who drowned and whose dead body washed up on a Turkish beach in early September 2015 became an iconic **representation** of the failure of the international community to deal with the violence in Syria and of the insecurity of the global refugee crisis. **This one image raised more outcry in Europe than any report** of the thousands of people drowning making similar crossings. In terms of representation, some deaths come to matter more than others, because some lives are deemed **more worthy** of securing than others. Taking dead bodies seriously in security studies, then, is about both corpses as **signifiers of insecurity** and the politics of how the dead are identified, classified, measured, represented, and managed. It is directly linked to questions of their agency.

Dead bodies have been under-theorized in security studies, but this is not for a lack of representation in global politics. Indeed, bodies are both measured and managed, as will be explored more thoroughly in later sections. Dead bodies appear in numerous ways, from soldier dead to health management to religious and cultural traditions to famous individual bodies that are hyper-visible such as Lenin and Ho Chi Minh. Dead bodies and body parts have been addressed in terms of their management by **international organizations** (MarlinBennett, Wilson, and Walton 2010; Auchter 2015), but their political implications have not been thoroughly explored. Similarly, studies within sociology and anthropology have addressed dead bodies, particularly the corpses of leaders in a communist and post-communist context (Verdery 1999; Giroux 2006; Casper and Moore 2009), and recent media attention has focused on controversy over the bodies of figures such as Osama bin Laden. But these studies have not focused on the question of how dead bodies matter for security: how we view our own material and physical security and insecurity, and how we deal with a world where conflict and disaster produce dead bodies as a matter of fact. At the same time, we are told by global human **security paradigms** that **policy** changes should be inaugurated to **minimize** these kinds of deaths, and by many foreign policy paradigms that specific deaths, like those of terrorists, **render the world more secure**. That is, when looking at dead bodies, the idea of security is often invoked in a variety of ways and toward varying ends.

Some of the increased attention to the dead body has come through the emergence of the human security paradigm. Human security has drawn attention to human rights violations, global health, economic inequality, human mobility, and environmental degradation as security concerns affecting the global community. As Caroline Thomas (2001, 161) has explained, “human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realised.” The dead body itself poses important questions for how we conceptualize human dignity. If the very idea of human security implies the existence of a political community that privileges the security of the human at its heart, it must define which lives and deaths count as **politically qualified ones**, as lives worth protecting and as deaths worth **memorializing**. Life and security go **hand-in-hand**, as scholars of biopolitics have noted (de Larrinaga and Doucet 2008; Grayson 2008). Nikolas Rose, for example, has argued that “the biological existence of human beings has become **political** in novel ways. The object, target and stake of this new ‘vital’ politics are human life itself” (Rose 2001, 1). However, these approaches to the politics of life have not fully addressed the politics of death, or the role dead bodies play in our understandings of security. Similarly, as Edward Newman (2010, 77) has noted, approaches to human security rarely examine **ontological or epistemological questions**: “human security arguments are generally ‘problem-solving.’ They do not generally engage in epistemological, ontological, or methodological debates.”

To address this lacuna, I focus on corpses as an analytical concept that can open up conversations among various approaches to security studies. Both human security and critical security studies have brought the question of agency to the fore, while in traditional security studies, dead bodies remain subjects of the key agents of global politics: states. Human security scholars have argued for paying increased attention to the individual human and to human beings more generally, to broaden the agent of security. Within critical security studies, scholars have argued that the agent of security should be defined even more broadly, and new materialist approaches have extended this beyond the human being (Salter 2015). The dead body offers a useful way of thinking about security because it raises questions for all of these approaches.

Indeed, bodies often serve as **symbols** of political order, where political transformation is symbolized by what is done to bodies, as in the expression “cutting off the head of the king,” pomp and circumstance regarding burial and reburial of political leaders, and even the idiom “body politic” (Verdery 1999). This focus on political leaders raises an important question: what are the basic contours of what makes a body fair game for security studies? Though the responses to this question can be varied, with some focusing on the corpses of political leaders, others dead soldiers, and yet others civilian dead, the point of the question is that how we define which bodies have security implications matters. How one answers this question can also gesture to one’s approach to security: conventional security studies focuses on war deaths almost exclusively and is less likely to consider deaths from other causes to be important. Human security studies is much more likely to draw attention to civilian deaths, and to deaths from causes such as hunger. Critical security studies draws attention to **everyday practices**, thus **broadening** which dead bodies matter. Why and how certain dead bodies become national symbols and others objects of private mourning tells us something about how political communities are defined by the dead they **determine memorializable** and grievable. These deaths are deemed political because these lives and bodies were considered to be the **purview of the state**. From the original Hobbesian notion that individuals give over their sovereignty to the state in exchange for protection, the body that is killed by violence or bad governance is a representation of the abrogation of the essential social and political contract that motivates the formation and existence of political community itself; these are the corpses addressed in this article.

More must be said on how we give meaning to the dead within these political communities: the corpse is important precisely because it is a component within cultural understandings and **identity constructions**. Dead bodies are personally and culturally significant to survivors: they are “**socially alive** but biologically dead” (Sledge 2007, 21). Tiffany Jenkins (2011, 107) similarly describes human remains as holding “a social category as a ‘person’ (human, body), but are also a ‘thing’ (remains, corpse, cadaver, skeleton).” Even in museums “human remains, irrespective of age, provenance, or kind, occupy a unique category distinct from all other museum objects. There is a qualitative distinction between human remains and artefacts” (DCMS 2003, 166).

It is the fact that the corpse once possessed the self-actualization we associate with qualified participation in a political community—agency—that gives it such a special status. That is, dead bodies are still “human” in many ways, and they have important **effects on the living**. Norman Cantor has traced what he refers to as “postmortem human dignity,” the social and legal protections for the corpse, and how it is not considered as property in terms of corpse management and disposal, precisely because of the “intimate association between a cadaver and its predecessor” (Cantor 2010, 4). He argues that the relationship between the living and the **cadaver** is both emotional and material: the corpse “represents the continuing **embodiment** of a particular human being,” is someone’s loved one, is the “vessel that held a unique person and is still the most tangible manifestation of its human predecessor,” and is also structurally identical to a living human being (Cantor 2010, 29–30). As a result of this, the dead body **blurs our traditional conceptions** of who may **count** as the agent of human security, because the corpse is considered **worthy of securing**: we tend to anthropomorphize the corpse by attributing feelings to it, and the corpse has rights in various legal systems to dignity and privacy and undisturbed rest (Cantor 2010, 43–64). Additionally, the idea that heroic soldiers do not leave the bodies of comrades behind, or the movement to repatriate the remains of those who have died in a foreign country, both speak to the idea that the corpse has legal and political status as well as affective status. Because the corpse is not a living person, but bears many of the political assignations a living person does, it **broadens the notion** of who **counts** as a qualified member of the political community, with access to the rights it entails.

#### The ROTB is to vote for the team who creates the best educational model for debate to solve for disableism in debate. Debaters will eventually become policymakers, voters, petitioners and people who can create change in the real world; by creating the best education in round you create people best equipped to create real world change and by creating empathy you ensure debaters will go on to make that change

#### Story the 2nd

Shelby **Roller**, she worked as a communications specialist for Georgetown College at Georgetown University, where she excelled at storytelling and content creation. Shelby also worked as a program manager for the School of Foreign Service where she planned large- and small-scale events., 7-26-2021, "Junior Creates Organization to Advocate for More Accessible Practices in High School Debates," College of Arts & Sciences, Georgetown University, <https://college.georgetown.edu/news-story/junior-creates-organization-to-advocate-for-more-accessible-practices-in-high-school-debates/>

“I **never had enough** in-round **prep**aration **time or space to take care of** my mental **health needs** and that **resulted in dozens of panic attacks**,” Cronk explains. “**Had there been** a system for **accommodations** that allowed a time and a half for in-round preparation, **I might have** been able to **continue debating**…I ended up quitting my junior year because of the lack of support and stress that caused.” After coming to Georgetown, Cronk began to become more involved with the Program in Disability Studies, taking a one-credit class with Lydia X. Brown. Cronk was so impacted by the course that she also took Professor Brown’s Capstone course. The skills she gained from these classes gave her the education “to be able to identify unfair and inequitable practices and the confidence to point them out.” During the pandemic, she was asked to join virtual debate tournaments as a judge over Zoom. Re-entering the world of debate with a more informed perspective made Cronk realize how many ableist policies existed in this arena. “I began to reflect on my past experiences, and I could see **how much disability and ableism played into me quitting something I really loved and excelled at**,” Cronk explains. “I could not stop thinking about the possibility that I might be able to make even a small change so no one else has to experience something similar to what I or other alumni have gone through. Speech and debate might seem niche, and it is, but to the people in the activity it is everything and so deeply beloved, and I want to do my part to work toward equality for the disabled folks in the activity who have largely been unaccounted for.” Through 1AC, Cronk hopes to change policies in high school debates so that everyone can participate equitably. Current rules, such as requiring that all debaters stand during their speeches, eliminate many potential students from participating. photo of adorable yellow dog curled on bed Cronk’s emotional support animal Twinkie Other policies such as speed reading, timekeeping or even the food that is served during debates create inaccessible environments to many. **Those who have mobility access needs face challenges navigating** unknown college **campuses where** the **majority of high school debates are held and** these **individuals are often fined for arriving late** after these needs have not been met. Nuisance fees also fine entries for leaving tournaments including emergent medical needs, which not only presents difficulties for those with disabilities but for those with economic hardships as well. “This **constellation of inconsideration provides considerable barriers that disabled children may not** be able to **overcome** and ultimately may be the cause for them leaving the activity, which is a real shame,” Cronk says. “**Disabled people deserve to participate by virtue of being people**, obviously. But also, I think the **speech and debate** community really **loses out on the enrichment of disabled thought and expression**.”

#### Story the 3rd

Scantlin '25 [Dani Scantlin, 1-8-2025, "Breaking Barriers: How Speech and Debate Can Uplift Autistic Voices", https://www.equalityinforensics.org/blog/breaking-barriers-how-speech-and-debate-can-uplift-autistic-voices, doa 4-5-2025] //ALuo

Picture this scenario: You’re a coach at a state tournament, a highly anticipated event for anyone involved in Speech and Debate. On the last night of your team’s overnight trip to one of these tournaments, an **autistic competitor** in Congress tells you that he is being "**picked on" by his fellow teammates**. When you probe him for details, he reveals that over the course of what was supposed to be a fun state tournament, **his underwear (yes, his underwear)** had been **thrown in the toilet, he was forced to sleep on the floor, a senior ate all of his snacks, and,** finally**, all of his roommates** were **calling him the r-word**.

No, this isn’t a satire post from Reddit, but an excerpt from one of the few articles on the National Speech and Debate Association’s website that mentions autism. The section of the aforementioned article details how coaches should approach accommodations for competitors with disabilities. While good-natured, it’s more than disappointing that, for a community that prides itself on calling out oppressions within society and giving everyone a voice, this is one of only four articles by the NSDA that even mentions the word "autism." This isn’t to say that the discrimination autistic competitors may face should go unrecognized. However, underwear in the toilet? Really, NSDA? You couldn’t think of anything more realistic?

If you couldn’t tell, **I have autism.** Autism is a neurological condition that can impair one’s social interactions, motor-related skills, and communication abilities, among other things. Despite these quirks, it might be surprising that I do Speech and Debate. In fact, I don’t just do Speech and Debate; I’ve been the captain of my school’s team for the last two years, and I’ve competed in several different events, ranging from Informative Speaking to Lincoln-Douglas Debate. I still struggle with public speaking, but Speech and Debate has improved my communication skills and given me a platform to discuss topics I care about.

I’m sure you’re wondering what any of this has to do with what I said about the excerpt from the NSDA. And that’s just it—the excerpt itself is a major part of the issue.

**Discrimination**, especially the kind directed toward those with disabilities like autism, **is nothing new**. For years, my community has struggled to be accepted; but, our challenges are more nuanced than being forced to sleep on the floor by our teammates. By no means am I trying to say that we should not talk about the harassment and discrimination directed toward autistic competitors, I’m sure scenarios similar to the one the NSDA mentioned have happened in the past. On the other hand, **understanding the challenges autistic competitors face** within forensics **extends beyond prohibiting** oppressive language, like the r-word, or **blatant discrimination.** If anything, **the greatest challenges competitors like me face originate from our disorder itself.**

I can go on and on about my own experiences as an autistic competitor. My **abnormally high levels of stress often caused me to talk at an absurdly fast pace,** my **lack of understanding social cues made it harder for me to tell when I should speak** in a conversation**, and I didn't even know if what I was saying was appropriate. I am not the only competitor facing these challenges.** In Dirigo High School sophomore Will Hines’ NSDA-qualifying Original Oratory speech, "The Struggles of Autism", he addresses many of the challenges those with autism face. Hines states "Oftentimes, I have trouble understanding when people are being sarcastic." He later talks about how those with autism have an "inability to understand social cues," which is one of the most common symptoms of our disorder.

These traits manifest in various ways within forensics. For me, my speaking patterns would get me ranked at the bottom of my speech rounds. Not understanding social cues or emotions can also mean misinterpreting what someone said in a speech or cross-examination.

As autistic competitors, **we face a tremendous number of challenges that** often **fly under the radar** of the Speech and Debate community. Not only does our disorder make competing harder, **but it can** also **cause competitors to mask their autistic traits and receive lower scores** in rounds. The University of Dayton tells us that one nationally ranked forensic student, who struggled to make eye contact with judges due to their autism, received lower scores on ballots and received feedback on rubrics that ignored natural human habits.

"**Some rubrics**, for example, **state ‘sustained eye contact** with entire audience’ and that eye contact **is needed** '90%; span the audience' and 'at least 70-80% of the time,' yet, in general, adults typically make eye contact 30-60% during a conversation," stated Dayton. The student in question further elaborated that speech taught them to mask their autism, and if they did not, then they were ranked lower at tournaments. This is not to say that ballots or judges themselves are harmful, as receiving feedback is an almost necessary part of competing in Speech and Debate. However, as a community, we need to unlearn obsessing over certain discriminatory criteria, such as eye contact. Dayton explains, that by doing this, we make an inherent assumption about what students can and cannot control, which inadvertently harms both autistic and non-autistic competitors as well.

While understanding why competitors with autism may struggle within forensics is important, there’s also a brighter side to our story. By competing **in speech and debate, autistic competitors are presented with a surplus of opportunities to speak uninterrupted**. For example, events like Lincoln-Douglas Debate or Congress provide autistic competitors not only a space to engage in lively arguments with other debaters but also encourage discussion through cross-examination. Additionally, these types of events provide each competitor a specific space where they can speak—meaning, as long as you understand the rules of the event, there’s no worry for autistic competitors that we spoke for too long or that we spoke when we weren’t supposed to. Because these events are timed or usually only allow one competitor to ask questions at a time, each competitor has a clear, uninterrupted, and specific time allotted to speak.

Speech events, such as Informative Speaking or Original Oratory, allow members of the autistic community to talk about the challenges we face in a unique way. For example, in their Informative Speaking performance, "Autism and Minecraft", 2022 National Finalist Kalen Sieja talks about how Minecraft provides people with autism ways to expand upon their social skills and problem-solving abilities in a fun, interactive way. Beyond the issues our community faces, speech events allow autistic competitors to talk about our special interests. Speaking from my experiences, I love Informative Speaking because it allows me to talk about niche parts of history while combining different means of rhetoric to engage an audience. In short, these types of public address events give the autistic community a space to talk about what really matters to us.

Other public address events, like Extemporaneous Speaking or Impromptu, help autistic competitors improve their problem-solving skills in a short period of time. While the University of Dayton states that those with autism may struggle with Extemporaneous Speaking because it is harder to remember certain facts or quotes within a limited period, understand that through practice or the use of notecards, one can overcome these obstacles in time.

Meanwhile, interpretation events allow autistic competitors to practice a wide range of emotions and play multiple characters. Where those with autism may struggle to process or display certain emotions, events like Humorous Interpretation specifically allow autistic competitors to practice these emotions through comedy and humor, which otherwise may have been difficult for that competitor to do.

Looking at the broader forensics community, we need to recognize that although competitors with autism have largely struggled with disability-based discrimination, the challenges we face within Speech and Debate also result from our disorder itself—and this isn’t necessarily a bad thing. Speech and Debate allows autistic competitors to talk not only about the issues our community faces but also about our special interests. Speech and Debate allows autistic competitors to improve upon their social cues, timed problem-solving abilities, and perception of emotions while receiving constructive criticism. These events offer something autistic competitors such as myself have longed for: a place to talk without fear of worrying about saying or doing something that violated some unknown social norm.

Furthermore, Speech and Debate can be a lifesaver for the autistic community. For me, Speech and Debate helped me find my voice and gain confidence in my words. However, the forensics community at large cannot continue to leave the struggles of the autistic community unrecognized. If the leading authorities in speech and debate, such as the NSDA, pledge that they "connect, support, and inspire a diverse community committed to empowering students through speech and debate," and "envision a world in which every school provides speech and debate programs to foster each student’s communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creative skills," then it is imperative that we also acknowledge the implications of forensics for the autistic community as well.

To that end, I urge you, whether you’re autistic or not, to foster conversations within forensics about autism. Don’t hesitate to ask questions or to confront discrimination when you see it. Speech and Debate exists to inspire discussion, promote learning, and challenge the oppressions we witness in society.

However, talking about preventing disability-**related discrimination is not enough. We must address the specific challenges faced by the autistic community and actively work to amplify their voices.** After all, if we fail to recognize the struggles and successes of the autistic community, can we truly claim to be empowering the voices of all?

## 2AC

### 2AC---Hauntology Works

#### The act of haunting leads to real change. See the 1980’s AIDs crisis.

Montalvo 21 [David Montalvo, “How AIDs Activists Used ‘Die-Ins’ to Demand Attention to the Growing Epidemic”, History, 07-02-21, <https://www.history.com/articles/aids-activism-protests-act-up-die-ins> //GZR - recut akang]  
As the AIDS crisis took hold in the 1980s, killing thousands of Americans and ravaging gay communities, the deadly epidemic went unaddressed by U.S. public health agencies—and unacknowledged by President Ronald Reagan—for years. In response, a political group called ACT UP emerged, deciding it needed to do something shocking to draw attention to the crisis and jolt government agencies, drug companies and the mainstream media into action. So it began organizing protest events where masses of people lay down in a public space, feigning death. “The strongest thing we can do is something in silence,” declared writer, filmmaker and AIDS activist Robert Hilferty at a November 1989 meeting of ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power). “A die-in. A massive die-in. Founded in 1987, ACT UP ultimately organized thousands of protests, with die-ins becoming a signature tactic. And while AIDS activists weren’t the first to simulate death to call attention to lethal threats, the action became a powerful tool to show that, because the epidemic was being stigmatized and ignored, bodies were piling up. In ACT UP’s case, “they forced social and cultural institutions to take responsibility for the AIDS deaths by having to physically move the protesters’ bodies,” says Matt Brim, professor of queer studies at City University of New York. The AIDS die-ins emerged from a longer history of activism that made bodies the focal point of protest, such as suffragettes chaining themselves to railings and civil rights activists staging sit-ins. One of earliest known references to the term “die-in” came nearly two decades prior to ACT UP, when environmentalists demonstrated on Earth Day, 1970, in Boston, to raise awareness about the deadly impact of air pollution. About a month later, protesters in Seattle fell to the ground at a busy downtown intersection to oppose dangerous nerve gas shipments. Since then, public die-in stunts have been used to decry everything from war and weapons testing to police violence and cycling deaths. To ratchet up the visual drama, some protesters have employed fake blood and bandages. Others brought coffins. When playwright and LGBTQ activist Larry Kramer took center stage at the New York Lesbian and Gay Community Services Center on March 10, 1987, and delivered the rousing speech that helped launch ACT UP, the epidemic had entered its sixth year. The U.S. government had yet to approve the prescription sale of a single drug to treat AIDS, and the deaths were largely being ignored by the media. “Unless we fight for our lives, we shall die,” Kramer wrote that month for the New York Native, a bi-weekly magazine aimed at the city’s gay community. As a result, ACT UP worked urgently to train as many individuals as possible in civil disobedience tactics. As an unidentified activist in the documentary United in Anger: A History of ACT UP put it, “you don’t always know when it’s going to happen or when you’ll want to do it.” Die-ins became important for ACT UP, Michael Bronski, author of A Queer History of the United States for Young People and professor of practice in media and activism at Harvard University, told HISTORY.com in an interview. That’s because “there’s a cultural hesitation to think about death—and the protest made it physical.”And AIDS activists knew their best chance to affect policies was by affecting public opinion—making the media, rather than politicians or chief executives, die-ins’ primary targets. In United in Anger, an activist remembered how ACT UP clearly viewed civil disobediences, like die-ins, as a “safe tactic for making a stronger statement and as a way of getting media attention.”

#### The effect of these hauntings:
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By early 1987, with the U.S. death toll topping 40,000 and worldwide HIV infections reaching 5 to 10 million, the threat was starting to feel apocalyptic. The gay community's mounting frustration finally boiled over in an explosive show of anger. Hundreds of gay men and their supporters took to New York City's streets to vent their fury — first with a demonstration on Wall Street. Then a protest at city hall. Then an even bigger showdown on Wall Street. Barr and Petrelis had been to gay rights demonstrations before — pride rallies, candlelight vigils for people who had died of AIDS. But this time, says Petrelis, "something felt different." People weren't just chanting or carrying signs. They were blocking traffic with their bodies. At the second Wall Street action, "over a hundred people got arrested," Barr says. Many of them were people who had never contemplated civil disobedience before. "It was such a terrific feeling to be arrested with my yoga teacher," Petrelis recalls with a chuckle. And it was profoundly affirming. "All those men and women screaming at the top of their lungs — I felt they were taking my anger and putting it out there to the world." For Barr, participating in the outpouring was galvanizing. "Rallying together and expressing our anger was a really good replacement for just feeling scared all the time," he says. "It felt powerful. And it gave us a way of saying, 'OK, we've got to do something more than just buy people groceries, and take them to the hospital, and plan memorial services.' The anger is what helped us fight of a sense of hopelessness." Soon the group — which the New York demonstrators named ACT UP at an early planning meeting — was going national, with thousands of people across the country staging similar actions. Getting strategic ACT UP quickly made its name with tactics that were unapologetically confrontational, says David France, the author of a history of AIDS activism called How to Survive a Plague, as well as a 2012 documentary by the same name. "ACT UP's ethos was that they had united in anger," he says. "They would storm people's offices with fake blood and cover people's computers with [it]," he says. "They locked themselves to politicians' desks. At one point, they barged into a meeting of a pharmaceutical company and turned over the shrimp cocktail tables." This made them extremely intimidating. "They were no longer invisible sufferers of a disease. They were terrifying sufferers of a disease," says France. But initially, says France, "the actions had the air of purposeless anger." That changed when ACT UP began to deploy its anger strategically. Barr says the demonstrations started off as a simple release: "We were angry and we needed to express ourselves." But in doing so, he says, "we began to realize, 'Oh, this is a tactic that we can put to good use.' " So they took it upon themselves to figure out the specific roadblocks in government policy and clinical trials that stood in the way of what ACT UP wanted most: a cure. Then they unleashed their rage to force the decision-makers to hear ACT UP's solutions. They kicked off the approach at a government building in suburban Maryland. "Our goal was to seize control of the FDA," says Barr. ACT UP wanted the Food and Drug Administration to give AIDS patients access to an experimental drug. The FDA wouldn't even discuss it. So hundreds of activists converged on the FDA's headquarters. "One group were wearing lab coats that were stained with bloody hands," recalls Barr. "Other people brought tombstones that they made and lied down in front of the building and held up the tombstones: 'Dead from FDA red tape.' " The activists advanced in rows, blocking the entrances. The demonstration made national news. Within days the FDA agreed to meet. In a couple months, officials opened up the policy on access to experimental drugs. France says the two prongs of ACT UP's strategy were equally important. The aggressive protests got them a foot in the door, but it wouldn't have made a difference if they hadn't done the homework needed to offer insightful and viable proposals once they did get a meeting. "What made this work was not just the anger. But the anger coupled with the intelligence," says France. Halting U.S. HIV Epidemic By 2030: Difficult But Doable SHOTS - HEALTH NEWS Halting U.S. HIV Epidemic By 2030: Difficult But Doable ACT UP came to call this approach its "inside-outside strategy." And they deployed it over and over again — with the National Institutes of Health, and then with pharmaceutical companies, eventually becoming full partners with key scientists. The upshot of all this: "What they were able to revolutionize was really the very way that drugs are identified and tested," says France. This included scrapping the prevailing practice of testing drugs on a small number of people over a long period of time in favor of testing a huge sample of people over a much shorter period — significantly speeding up the time it took to conduct drug trials.