#### Our advocacy is that the judge should endorse the 1AC’s performance of Sick Woman Theory as a method of recognizing and giving voice to the social invisible. Debate is unquestionably authoritarian- it gives us strict rules we must follow but we don’t know where the rules came from, or why we should follow them. Why is debate a game of skills and wins/losses? Why should we view debate a a ruthless game? Well, no one *really* knows. So, our advocacy detaches us from providing debate with the aid to oppress us; we reject the norms they want us to follow.

#### This resolution asks us to consider the political value of abolishing plea bargaining. But that misses the point. Shaping our discourse around the value of a public and political action forces us to forget about what really matters: questioning the value of the POLITICAL ITSELF. Using the political doesn’t work, it fails to recognize bodies that exist as invisible from the public sphere

#### Hedva 15 [[Johanna Hedva (writer and activist), adapted from her speech on October 7, 2015, Mask Magazine, Sick Woman Theory, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory //bwskr]

#### In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes [portions] of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on. There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and we must contend with the fact that many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists

#### Sick Woman Theory is a call for recognition. A call for vulnerability. It is a rallying cry for the invisible and a method of engagement for the visible, it is an all-encompassing method of relational understandings between agents, it is a resistance against the very world that makes us sick

#### Hedva 15 [Johanna Hedva (writer and activist), adapted from her speech on October 7, 2015, Mask Magazine, Sick Woman Theory, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory //bwskr]

Sick Woman Theory is for those who are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, were never meant to survive: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing. I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of our bodies and minds carry the historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick.

#### .

#### The Sick Woman is the definition of intersectionality. It is a method of empowerment, a method of engaging particularities of experiences while still providing a rallying cry to the un-cared for

#### Hedva 2 [Johanna Hedva (writer and activist), adapted from her speech on October 7, 2015, Mask Magazine, Sick Woman Theory, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory //bwskr]

To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a[n] strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way. But more than anything, I’m inspired to use the word “woman” because I saw this year how it can still be radical to be a woman in the 21st century. I use it to honor a dear friend of mine who came out as genderfluid last year. For her, what mattered the most was to be able to call herself a “woman,” to use the pronouns “she/her.” She didn’t want surgery or hormones; she loved her body and her big dick and didn’t want to change it – she only wanted the word. That the word itself can be an empowerment is the spirit in which Sick Woman Theory is named. The Sick Woman is an identity and body that can belong to anyone denied the privileged existence – or the cruelly optimistic promise of such an existence – of the white, straight, healthy, neurotypical, upper and middle-class, cis- and able-bodied man who makes his home in a wealthy country, has never not had health insurance, and whose importance to society is everywhere recognized and made explicit by that society; whose importance and care dominates that society, at the expense of everyone else. The Sick Woman is anyone who does not have this guarantee of care.

#### Not all bodies are the same nor do they ever have the same experiences. Universality is cruelly optimistic and forces identity to be static- only the 1ac’s acceptance of embodied performance can break the model of universality.

Hedva 16 [Johanna Hedva (writer and activist), May 10 2016, Guts Magazine, “In Defense of De-Persons” <http://gutsmagazine.ca/in/> //BWSKR]

“We must now collectively undertake a rewriting of knowledge as we know it.” —Sylvia Wynter I want to make a defence of “de-persons.” According to the American Psychiatric Association, I am one. That is, I have been diagnosed with depersonalization/derealization disorder (DP/DR for short), which means that I have “significant, persistent, or recurrent depersonalization (i.e., experiences of unreality or detachment from one’s mind, self, or body).” What that means is that, at various times, my body, self, environment, and the world itself do not feel real. There are many ways to talk about “personhood,” and many of them are discourses about what isn’t personhood, or more sinisterly, who does not qualify to be part of that category. DP/DR falls into this kind of discourse on personhood: the kind that defines who is not. The suffix “–hood” as it is attached to the word “person” is important here: “–hood” means “a state of condition or being.” So, when we’re talking about personhood, by definition, the state of the condition or the being of a person can be said to be different than the person. In other words, personhood is apart from the person, personhood is not the person. There is another way of looking at “–hood”: the Proto-Germanic etymology of “–hood” can literally be translated to mean “bright appearance.” I am moved by this at the same time that I’m antagonistic to what it arrogates—the implication that to “be” anything one must not only appear, but also be bright. Before I go further, I’d like to claim the soil that I stand on, so I can dig as deep as I can down into it. I am not a representative for a specific kind of experience; I am presentative of it. That is, I’m doing it right now, in front of you, and in front of myself. I am a proponent of aporia: thinking with holes in it, thinking that contradicts itself, that circles back, that reveals the knotting and fraying and re-weaving of an argument so that it contains all of its mistakes, so that you can see them, and so that I won’t forget how I got here. My address is from an affirmation of messiness, a testimony of and to disorder, an honouring of incomplete-ness. Anne Boyer writes: “It’s not just our errors we become brave about, but our projects’—and our own—incompleteness.” So here I am, in transit. If I’m going to wander around personhood, I’ve got to reckon with universality, because universality is the foundation for how we construct “persons.” It’s the bedrock beneath the patches of soil upon which all of us stand. Sara Ahmed explains it: The universal is a structure not an event. It is how those who are assembled are assembled. It is how an assembly becomes a universe… The universal is the promise of inclusion… Universalism is how some of us can enter the room. It is how that entry is narrated as magical; as progress. I am guilty of hoping for such magic. I’ve played the game of universalism, as we all have: it’s the main game in town. So this is me trying to get out of town. The concept of the “person” that has been defined, deployed, policed, and immured by universality is one that promises self-determined completeness, wholeness, and power. In other words, that which can be both mastered and the master. A defence of a de-person could be said to be an embodiment of incompleteness, a demonstration of bad thinking, a performance of un-comprehension, a refusal of mastery at all. Again, I’m trying to get out of town—I’m headed for the wilds.

#### Rules were invented for the unruly-We must accept and embody our unstable bursts of existance in order to take down the systems of oppression.

Hedva 16 [Johanna Hedva (writer and activist), May 10 2016, Guts Magazine, “In Defense of De-Persons” <http://gutsmagazine.ca/in/> //BWSKR]

In capitalism, the primary purpose of one’s life—both ideologically and materially—is to accumulate value. This is done through one’s labour, but of course primarily relies upon the exploitation of the labour of others and various resources of all kinds. As Silvia Federici has argued, such exploitation requires an accumulation of differences, beyond Marx’s “primitive accumulation” of natural and labour resources, to justify itself: self/other, white/black, male/female, society/nature, us/them, life/death. “The order that collects differences, the order that collects what Marx called labor still objectifying itself, is the order of governance,” write Moten and Harney. Governance was invented for that which is ungovernable—I’d like to suggest that it was invented for de-persons in their promiscuous lack of self-control (a feeling of detachment from, or unfamiliarity with, the world). Within such a system**, the person who is unable to labour because of their difference from the normatively ableist** well, is considered not only useless because they cannot work to accumulate value, but they also stand in direct opposition to two important tenets of capitalist ideology. The first is the premise that capitalist technology can take command of the body. As Carolyn Lazard has written: Capitalism objectifies the body. It views the body as an exploitable resource and attempts to render it indestructible and unstoppable with the aid of technology… And yet as advanced capitalism has deemed the physical body an obsolete, outdated tool, the body still remains. It continues to fail under capitalist conditions and gets pathologized as illness. The body is another inconvenience that must be enhanced and optimized. The second tenet the de-person antagonizes is the promise that neoliberalism can reduce everything, including the decision to survive, down to personal choice, a matter of willpower, and a problem the market can solve. In neoliberalism, “wellness” is a prevarication: it usually stands in for “life,” but life in terms of wealth, race, power, and, primarily, ability. Wellness in this context is paradoxically both an innate moral virtue and an individual’s own responsibility to maintain—and is soaked in ableism. Mia Mingus puts it perfectly: Ableism cuts across all of our movements because ableism dictates how bodies should function against a mythical norm—an able-bodied standard of white supremacy, heterosexism, sexism, economic exploitation, moral/religious beliefs, age, and ability.

# PART 2- Framing

#### Debate mandates endless ability checks, internalized ableism and psychic violence. Assimilation into normative debate fails – we have to upset standards.

Richter 15. Zahari Richter is a Policy Debate Coach, is a Ph.D. Candidate in Communications and has a Master’s in Disability Studies. <https://stimstammersandwinks.blogspot.com/2015/01/conditions-of-judgment-ableist-ranking.html> “[Conditions of Judgment: Ableist ranking structures in educational and political environments](https://stimstammersandwinks.blogspot.com/2015/01/conditions-of-judgment-ableist-ranking.html)” “///” indicates paragraphs Language edited NT 17

While **rhetorical arenas are** commonly **cast as equalizing playing fields**, there is a way in which even the socratic can **yield to the authoritarian**. If we think of disability as a relationship defined in part by the terrain of normativity and in part by individual traits, one must recognize how **the entrance of an impaired body into an elitist highly competitive academic space necessarily entails the focusing of micro-aggressions onto such a body**, both in the structure of normative communications and in the framing of intellectual worth by efficiency. /// If one considers the design of political and scholarly competitive environments, one imagines two gazes through which players are evaluated. The first type of evaluation considers the intellectual performance of the player. The second evaluation monitors interpersonal conduct. /// I will call the first evaluative frame "pedagogical judgment" to reference how performance of ability as well as intellect are measured according to valuable and worthlessness. /// The second frame will be called "interpersonal judgment" to reference how performances of normative sociality are graded according to their closeness to pregiven notions of how the social should be played in various instances. /// The dual conditions of pedagogical and interpersonal judgment, as a **grids of meaning that are projected across bodies** as a function of a designed organizational structure, cooperate in the production of educational spaces as gesturally normative as well as intellectually normative. /// **Gestural as well as intellectual normativities** act as a net around which **atypical** or disruptive **embodiments are captured and disciplined**. On a social level, the truth of intellect is captured in good habits and appearances, but the multiplicity of types of intelligence may be forgotten about. Similarly, the standardization of gestural economies is a well known falsity, as different cultures require different emotional responses to situations. /// Conditions of **judgment set a value to bodies**, based on their ability to pass an inspection or to fulfill a given criteria. A condition of judgment can thus only isolate one aspect or strand of the complexity of human functioning. A condition of judgment is necessary to grade someone accord to hierarchies, but it is also a condition of peril. Competitions thrive on failure: the loss of a debater feeds **debate as an elite culture**. **To exist in debate is to constantly answer numerous ability checks positively**

**The role of the ballot is to endorse the discourse that most authentically represents underlying power –micropolitics are key to real, macro change while fiat removes the self from our discussion. Nayar 99 bracketed for ableist language:**

[Jayan Nayar (School of Law, University of Warwick), “Orders of Inhumanity” *Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs.* 599, Fall, 1999] SF

The "world," as we perceive it today, did not exist in times past. It does not exist today. There is no such thing as the global "one world." **The world can only exist in the locations and experiences revealed** through and **in human relationships.** It is often that we think that to change the world it is necessary to change the way power is exercised in the world; so we go about the business of exposing and denouncing the many power configurations that dominate. **Power** indeed **does lie at the core of human misery, yet we [fool] ourselves if we regard this power as the power out there. Power, when all the complex networks** of its reach **are untangled, is personal; power does not exist out there,**  [\*630**]  it only exists in relationship**. To say the word, power, is to describe relationship, to acknowledge power, is to acknowledge our subservience in that relationship. **There can exist no power if the subservient relationship is refused**--then power can only achieve its ambitions through its naked form, as violence.  **Changing the world therefore is a misnomer for in truth it is relationships that are to be changed**. And the only relationships that we can change for sure are our own. And the constant in our relationships is ourselves--the "I" of all of us. And so, to change our relationships, **we must change the "I" that is each of us. Transformations of "structures" will soon follow**. This is, perhaps, the beginning of all emancipations. This is, perhaps, the essential message of Mahatmas...Rightly, we are concerned with the question of what can be done to alleviate the sufferings that prevail. But **there are** **necessary prerequisites** **to answering the "what do we do?" question. We must first ask** the intimately connected questions of "about what?" and "**toward what end?" These questions**, obviously, **impinge on our vision** and judgment. **When we** attempt to **imagine transformations toward preferred human** futures, we engage in the difficult task of judging the present. This is difficult not because **we are oblivious to violence** or that we are numb to the resulting suffering, but because, outrage with "events" of violence aside, processes of violence embroil and implicate our familiarities in ways that defy the simplicities of straightforward imputability. Despite our best efforts at categorizing violence into convenient compartments--into "disciplines" of study and analysis such as "development" and "security" (health, environment, population, being other examples of such compartmentalization)--the encroachments of order(ing) function at more pervasive levels. And **without doubt, the perspectives of the** observer, commentator, and **actor become** **crucial determinants**. **It is necessary**, I believe, **to question** this, **"our," perspective, to reflect upon a perspective of violence which not only locates violence as a happening "out there" while we stand as detached observers** and critics, **but is** also **one in which we are ourselves implicated in the violence of ordered worlds where** **we stand very much as participants**. For this purpose of a critique of critique, it is necessary to consider the "technologies" of ordering.

#### Any other method only delays relevant discourse and denies the possibility of solving, recognition of the 1ACs discourse of giving visibility to those rendered invisible is key

#### Brinkley et al in 12 [ (Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley, Rashad Evans, et al Amber Kelsie and Jillian Martin, November 12th, 2012, “An Open Letter to Sarah Spring,” http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2012/11/12/an-open-letter-to-sarah-spring/))//gingE

Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral. We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum” arguments, in the demand for “evidence,” in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement. Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.” We will no longer wait for the community to respond, to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion, since largely the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural inequity. It seems that meta-debates/discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence. This silence is in fact a focused silence**.** It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.” We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) that has provoked response when response was given. Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point. The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling. **It** indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious. We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight. The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic. We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community. MPJ:

#### And an analysis of invisibility is a prior question to any other form of discourse, understanding why bodies are excluded from discursive spaces is necessary to have meaningful dialogue to begin with, Boys in 08[[1]](#footnote-1),

This shifts the inquiry from representations (on the body, in the space) to relationships, processes and contexts. Any encounter is **necessarily** mediated by who is there, who is not, why they are there **(or why not), what they bring to the situation and what they take away.** Such events involve meanings-in-the-making through a process in space and over time. **Importantly** encounters are not just a space of sharing and recognition but also of conflict, differentiation and negotiation. They involve interpretations, talk, gestures, bodily relationships, and actions. **So how do encounters** work? **In each case we now have two questions which allow the exploration of disability beyond being a stereotypical marker of identity or difference. What embodied knowledge and experience do we the participants bring to the encounter? What are the routine social and spatial practices which frame the encounter?** Here, disabled and ‘non-disabled’ participants are not separated out; all have parity in the space of the encounter itself. But the impact of framing disabled people in ways not of their making remains central to the investigation. **As Davis write**s**:** Disability is not so much the lack of a sense or the presence of a physical or mental impairment as it is the reception and construction of that difference.

#### Prefer the aff’s use of storytelling through poesis- lived experiences are key to understanding the past, present, and future of disability and order

Campbell 03 [Fiona Anne Kumari Campbell (B.L.S. (Hons) Latrobe; J.P. (Qual) Qld), 2003, Centre for Social Change Research, School of Humanities and Human Services, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, “THE GREAT DIVIDE: ABLEISM AND TECHNOLOGIES OF DISABILITY PRODUCTION,” pg 2-3//BWSKR]

The telling of stories is a significant medium for the communication of ideas and values of culture as well as the transmission of the ‘memory’ of a body of people; a form of anamnesis that makes connections between the past, present and the future. Stories help us make sense of the world and the way in which we interpret the ‘nature’ of things and interpolate ways of difference. Sometimes these stories are explicitly named and actively exchanged, whilst others are more mundane, somewhat insidious - passing on in a multitude of remnants, connected, disconnected, contrary and multiple, eventually taking on the status of being considered a naturalized state of affairs, part of an a priori objective form of social ordering. The focal concerns of this doctorate relate to matters of ordering, disorder and constitutional compartmentalization between the ‘normal’ and ‘pathological’ (c.f. Canguilhem, 1978) and the ways that stories about wholeness, health, enhancement and perfection are told. The Great Divide is for all intents and purposes a story (stories) about the creation and production of a certain kind of difference known under the contemporary neologism ‘disability’. As such, the stories are not finished, they are ongoing, they are highly contestable and the scripts are therefore necessarily partial. I have not set out to provide stories that speak of coherency or indeed conspiracy. Rather, just as the neologism ‘disability’ is elusive and catheretic, patterns of disorder and incongruity become the order

#### The classroom is key- it is a starting point for embodied knowledges which skew our epistemic lenses making challenging ableist mindsets necessary to evaluate any other layer of the flow,

#### Ervelles 2K [Educating Unruly Bodies: Critical Pedagogy, Disability Studies, and the Politics of Schooling, Nirmala Ervelles Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology Auburn University 2000]

For example, critical theorists of education have begun to describehow **bodies are inscribed by** the **dominant cultural practices** of schools **through** a process that Peter McLaren has called **“**enfleshment**.” To be “**enfleshed**,”** McLaren explains**, is to be marked by discourses that** not only sit on the surface of the fleshbut **are,** on the other hand, **embedded in the flesh**

1. (Jos, “challenging the 'normal': towards new conceptual frameworks”, <http://www.sowhatisnormal.co.uk/challenging>) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)