1. **Link. The Health care mindset normalizes the body, expanding social control and biopower.**

**Haunschild**, University of Hamburg, 20**01**

Axel Haunschild. Humanization Through Discipline? Foucault and the Goodness of Employee Health Programmes. 2nd International CMS Conference, Manchester, July 11-13, 2001

Human resources are more and more becoming the most valued asset of organizations. To keep and to improve this asset, employee health has to be a major focus of (human resource) management. By improving individual well-being, employee health programmes in the end serve both individual and organizational needs...STOP! Any feelings of uneasiness? Any objections? Why? Isn’t healthiness good and illness bad? Isn’t healthiness of employees good for organizations and the employees themselves? Are there any reasons for saying that organizational health management is not just good? In addition to external control over bodies in organizations, like certain ways of job design (e.g. assembly lines, call center work places**)** or the ‘optimization’ of body movements through time measurement studies, health manage**ment commonly addresses the individuals consciousness and internal control**. **The image of a healthy** and fit **body** or employee, respectively, **functions as a norm which results from processes of normalization and which leads to continuous self perception identifying deviations from these norms. While it can be said that health** management improves wellbeing of employees **and can have positive effects on the organization** (image, reduced absenteeism in the long run etc.), **the mere goodness of such programmes has to be questioned**. Two (connected) starting points for critique arise here and shall be developed in more detail in the paper.(2) **Health management** activities, especially when successful, can be described as additional building block of power mechanisms which Foucault subsumes under the notion of ‘disciplines’ (see his genealogical middle works as *Discipline and Punish*, 1977; *The History of Sexuality: Vol. I*, 1981; *Power/Knowledge*, 1980). These **disciplines increase control over human beings and produce them as subjects**. Health management activities can be interpreted as micro-practices in this respect: All systematic conceptions of health management support the formation of a coalition of different professions, e.g. work safety, company doctors, psychologists, medical insurances, trade associations etc., and include instruments and methods of gathering information on individuals and their bodies and therewith creating knowledge/power complexes. In analogy to Foucault’s societal macro-strategy of bio-power that concerns the management of the production and reproduction of life in modern society“ (Fraser 1981), employee **health strategies aim at or contribute to administering, cultivating and controlling** personnel/**the workforce as population of the organization** (see also Deetz 1992; Townley 1993, 1994; McKinlay and Taylor 1998),finally **to produce ‘docile and useful bodies’** (Foucault 1977). In this respect, **characterizing health promotion at work merely as a direct path to humanity seems to be quite naïve and neglects the underlying, to a wide extent not directly intended structures of control- and power-strategies in modern society.**

1. **Impact. Biopower Justifies Genocide, Mass Destruction, And war**

**Foucault 78**

Michel Foucault. The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1. 1978, p. 259

Since the classical age, **the West has undergone a very profound transformation of these mechanisms of power**. "Deduction" has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: **a power bent on generating forces**, making them grow, **and ordering them to submit or destroying them. There has been a parallel shift in the right of death**, or at least a tendency to align itself accordingly. **This death that was based on the right of the sovereign is now manifested as simply the reverse of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, or develop its life**. Yet wars were never as bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century. and **all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations.** But **this** formidable **power** of death and this is perhaps what accounts for part of its force and the cynicism with which it **has so greatly expanded its limits now presents itself as the** counterpart **of a power that exerts a positive influence on life. that endeavors to administer**, optimize and multiply it, subjecting it to **precise controls and** comprehensive **regulations. Wars are** no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are **waged on** behalf of **the existence of everyone**. **entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life** and survival, of bodies and the race, **that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars**, causing so many people to be killed. And through a turn that closes the circle, **as the technology of wars has caused them to tend increasingly toward all-out destruction**, the decision that initiates them and the one that termites them are in fact increasingly informed by the naked question of survival. The atomic situation is now at the end point of this process: **the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee and individual's continued existence.** The principle underlying the tactics of battle that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living has become the principle that defines the strategy of states. But the existence in question is no longer the juridical existence of sovereignty; at stake is the biological existence of a population. If **genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers** this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is **because power is situated** and exercised **at the level of life**, the species, the race, **and the large-scale phenomena of population.**

1. only a constant interrogation into the ways knowledge formation crafts biopolitical government policies can open avenues for subjects to resist control and cultivate an ethical existence

Trent H. Hamann. Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Ethics. Foucault Studies, No 6, pp. 37-59, February 2009)

**Foucault** explicitly **identified critique, not as a transcendental form of judgment** that would subsume particulars under a general rule, **but as a** specifically **modern ”atti-tude**” that can be traced historically as the constant companion of pastoral power and governmentality. As Judith Butler points out in her article “What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault’s Virtue”,39 critique is an attitude, distinct from judgment, pre-cisely because it expresses a skeptical or questioning approach to the rules and ra-tionalities **that serve as the basis for judgment within a particular form of gover-nance**. From its earliest formations, Foucault tells us, **the art of government has al-ways relied upon certain relations to truth**: truth **as** dogma, truth as an individualiz-ing knowledge of individuals, and truth as **a reflective technique comprising general rules**, particular knowledge, precepts, methods of examination, confessions, inter-views, etc. And while critique has at times played a role within the art of government itself, as we’ve seen in the case of both liberalism and neoliberalism, it has also made possible what Foucault calls “the art of not being governed, or better, the art of not being governed like that and at that cost” (WC, 45). **Critique is neither a form of ab-stract theoretical judgment nor a matter of outright rejection** or condemnation **of** specific forms of **governance. Rather it is a practical** and agonistic **engagement**, re-engagement, or disengagement **with the rationalities and practices that have led one to become a certain kind of subject**. In his essay “What is Enlightenment?” Foucault suggests that **this modern attitude is a voluntary choice made by certain people, a way of acting and behaving that at one and the same time marks a relation of be-longing and presents itself as a task**. **Its task amounts to a “historical investigation into the events that have led us to constitute ourselves and** to **recognize ourselves as subjects of what we are** doing**, thinking**, [and] saying” (WE, 125). But how can we distinguish the kinds of resistance Foucault was interested in from the endless calls to ”do your own thing” or ”be all you can be” that stream forth in every direction from political campaigns to commercial advertising? How is it, to return to the last of the three concerns raised above, that Foucault does not simply lend technical sup-port to neoliberal forms of subjectivation? On the one hand, we can distinguish criti-cal acts of resistance and ethical self-fashioning from what Foucault called ”the Cali-fornian cult of the self” (OGE, 245), that is, the fascination with techniques designed to assist in discovering one’s ”true” or ”authentic” self, or the merely ”cosmetic” forms of rebellion served up for daily consumption and enjoyment. On the other hand we might also be careful not to dismiss forms of self-fashioning as ”merely” aesthetic. As Timothy O’Leary points out in his book Foucault and the Art of Ethics, Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence countered the modern conception of art as a singular realm that is necessarily autonomous from the social, political, and ethical realms, at least as it pertained to his question of why it is that a lamp or a house can be a work of art, but not a life. O’Leary writes: Foucault is less interested in the critical power of art, than in the ‘artistic’ or ‘plas-tic’ power of critique. For Foucault, not only do no special advantages accrue from the autonomy of the aesthetic, but this autonomy unnecessarily restricts our possibilities for self-constitution. Hence, not only is Foucault aware of the specif-ic nature of aesthetics after Kant, he is obviously hostile to it. What O’Leary rightly identifies here is Foucault’s interest in an aesthetics of exis-tence that specifically stands in a critical but immanent relation to the ways in which our individuality is given to us in advance through ordered practices and forms of knowledge that determine the truth about us. **The issue is not a matter of how we might distinguish “authentic” forms of resistance** (whatever that might mean) from “merely” aesthetic ones. Rather **it is a matter of investigating whether or not the practices we engage in either reinforce or resist the manner in which our freedom**

I negate.

Value: Life

Criterion: The criterion is Consequentialism. In a political scheme, evaluation by the consequences makes the most sense because…

1. It holds those in power accountable to their people
2. Allows for decision making in morally contradicting situations.
3. Allows us to evaluate the solvency, and thus, consider the benefits of an action

Thus, you evaluate the round on who does the most good or prevents the greatest harm to the citizens of the US,

UHC polices like ACA will decrease pharmaceutical research significantly by 2015  
Daemmrich et al writes in 2011 (A. Daemmrich / U.S.Arthur A. Daemmrich is an assistant professor in the Business, Government and the International Economy unit at Harvard Business School. / Healthcare Reform and the Pharmaceutical Industry [A. Alesina, E. Glaeser, and B. Sacerdote, “Why Doesn’t the U.S. Have a European-Style Welfare 10-11-12State?”]<http://www.hbs.edu/research/pdf/12-015.pdf>)

The creation of state-run insurance exchanges as the means by which the United States will ¶ achieve universal coverage under the ACA is an effort to draw upon the advantages of ¶ competition to reduce costs and expand choices. Likewise, pharmaceutical price policy in the ¶ United States has been strongly shaped by economists’ ideas concerning the relationship of ¶ market prices to incentives for research and development. In a series of studies dating back to ¶ the Kefauver investigation in the late 1950s, economists have found that drug price regulation ¶ would reduce expenditures in the pharmaceutical “**silo,”** but at the cost of greater healthcare ¶ spending in other areas and more significantly, a reduction in industry research.¶ Some studies ¶ have gone so far as to quantify the likely effects of U.S. price regulation as a reduction in ¶ research spending between 36 and 47.5 percent.¶

B;

Pharmacuetical companies' research and development is key to solving pandemics in the future, this also functions as an independent turn on the affirmative.

**Bandow writes in 2005**, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 3/27/**05** (Doug, “A strong pharmaceutical industry is the best defense against pandemics”,

http://wwww.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20050327/news\_lz1e27bandow.html)

Diseases like SARS and avian flu, which have proved resistant to drugs commonly used to fight influenza viruses, demonstrate how we all benefit from profitable drugmakers and abundant pharmaceutical research**.** Although governments have an important role to play in fighting any disease pandemic,necessary for developing any effective treatment and putting into mass production any vaccine or other medicine is private industry**.** Indeed, the initial fight against SARS focused on finding an existing medicine that worked. Laboratories screened some 2,000 federally approved and experimental drugs to see if they were useful in fighting SARS. Gurinder Shahi, a doctor in Singapore, explained: "Given how little we know about SARS and the reality that it is killing people, it is justified for us to be daring and innovative in coming up with solutions." Daring innovation is most likely in a competitive, profit-driven market. For instance, Pfizer worked with the U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to test 350 compounds developed as part of an earlier project to cure the common cold. NIAID also collaborated with the California biotech company Vical Inc. to test a new, experimental vaccine that has protected mice from the disease. Adventis and Merck as well as laboratories around the world began working to develop vaccines. Indeed, most of today's medicines exist only because there is a bevy of sophisticated pharmaceutical companies devoted to finding drugs to heal the sick. Progress has been particularly dramatic in recent years. For instance, two decades ago not one drug was available to fight AIDS. Today 74 have been approved and another 83 are in development.

The c point is the impact;

#### Germann furthers the impact;

Mitigation strategies for pandemic influenza, Published 2006 Timothy C. Germann\*, Kai Kadau\*, Ira M. Longini, Jr.‡, and Catherine A. Macken\*

EpiCast large-scale epidemiological simulation model Timothy C. Germann is in the Physics and Chemistry of Materials Group (T-1) at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). Tim earned dual Bachelor of Science degrees in Computer Science and in Chemistry from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1991, and a Ph.D. in Chemical Physics from Harvard University in 1995, where he was a DOE Computational Science Graduate Fellow.

The threat of a global pandemic ultimately leads to the extinction of not only humans, but many other animal species as well. This could occur in as soon as five to ten years, and countermeasures need to be in place to prevent such a global catastrophe. Such an epidemic would be catastrophic, sweeping across all continents in a matter of days. This form of virus could have close to a 100% kill rate, leaving only scattered groups of survivors from all species scattered across separate continents. The chances that the human race could recover from such an event are close to zero.

Germann tells us that the NC will outweigh on magnitude and also on time frame because the brink is in the next 5 years. He explains that taking proper measures to counteract this is imperative and enabling pharmaceutical companies to research is necessary.