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### 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may only defend that a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### A just government is a moral government – that’s a hypothetical gov

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Just”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/just // MNHS NL

fair; morally correct:

#### Recognize means to accept as legal

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Recognize”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recognize // MNHS NL

to accept that something is legal, true, or important:

The international community has refused to recognize (= officially accept the existence of) the newly independent nation state.

[ + (that) ] He sadly recognized (that) he would die childless.

You must recognize the seriousness of the problems we are facing.

#### A worker is one who works manually or in an industry for a certain wage

Merriam Webster ND <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worker> VM

“one that works especially at manual or industrial labor or with a particular material”

#### They violate— they don’t defend a just government implementing the right to strike.

#### Vote neg to preserve substantive engagement --

#### 1] Preparation- changing the topic gives the aff a huge edge, they can prepare for 6 months on an issue that catches us by surprise. Preparation is better than thinking on your feet- research demonstrates pedagogical humility and research skills are the only portable debate training – the process of debate outweighs the content – only our interp generates the argumentative skills needed to rigorously defend their affirmative out of round and create engaged citizens

#### 2] Limits- there are an infinite number of non topical affirmatives. not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months.

#### 3] Truth testing - you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### 4] Switch side debate is good -- it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives which prevents ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

#### 5] fairness – debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary for any benefit to the activity. That outweighs om decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

#### 6] small schools disad: under-resourced are most adversely affected by a massive, unpredictable caselist which worsens structural disparities

#### TVA: read a soft left ableism aff in which the just government enforces the unconditional right to strike – none of their offense indicts a just government, but even if it does, x-apply switch side debate – the aff can rectify problems in the squo via policy

#### Disads to the TVA prove there’s negative ground and that it’s a contestable stasis point, and if their critique is incompatible with the topic reading it on the neg solves

#### Winning their thesis doesn’t answer T because only through the process of clash can they refine their defense of it—they need an explanation of why we switch sides and why there’s a winner and loser under their model

#### Reject the team—T is question of models of debate and the damage to our strategy was already done. Drop the team on theory generally to deter infinite abuse

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary, you can’t be reasonably topical, and causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### RVIs and impact turns encourage all in on theory which decks substance and incentivize baiting theory with abusive practices.

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### Case

#### Disabled activists have responded to Trump through mass mobilization in defense of political goals --- claims of ontological exclusion flatten individual orientations, and are profoundly depoliticizing

Abrams 18

Abigail Abrams, Politics writer for TIME, “'Our Lives Are at Stake.' How Donald Trump Inadvertently Sparked a New Disability Rights Movement,” TIME. February 26, 2018. <http://time.com/5168472/disability-activism-trump/>

One day last March, Kings Floyd’s boss came into work and asked if she’d like to get arrested.

At first Floyd, 23, did a double take. Floyd has muscular dystrophy and worked at an organization that advocates for people with disabilities, but had never been very political. But when she learned about the Republican health care bill that would repeal parts of the Affordable Care Act and make cuts to Medicaid, she decided to join more than 50 disability-rights activists in a protest in the Capitol Rotunda. Brand new to activism at the time, Floyd proudly recalls that she was one of the last people left chanting as police took protesters out of the rotunda one by one.

“That event changed everything,” she says. “I realized I had a responsibility to support my community.” In the year since that first protest, Floyd has revived her area chapter of the national disability-rights organization ADAPT, gotten arrested several more times for demonstrating against various proposed laws and spoken at the Women’s March anniversary event in Washington.

Floyd is part of a new wave of activism by disabled Americans who want to change the way disability is viewed in the U.S. Responding to federal policies they feel are threatening their community on issues from healthcare to education to fundamental civil rights, more people with disabilities are getting politically involved. Others are trying to build a political movement to define disability—roughly one in five Americans has one, according to the Census Bureau—as a form of personal identity, much like race or sexual orientation.

The push to recognize disability rights is not new, but it’s no coincidence that this current of activism surged during the first year of Donald Trump’s presidency. “It’s far more intense,” says Anita Cameron, a veteran disability activist who has been arrested more than 130 times with ADAPT, the grass-roots disability rights network. “We really feel our lives are stake.”

During his campaign, Trump promised not to touch entitlement programs. Since taking office, however, he and the GOP-controlled Congress have pursued an agenda that could have outsized consequences for disabled Americans. Each of the GOP’s proposals to repeal the Affordable Care Act included cuts to Medicaid, the [main health insurer](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/21/upshot/gop-health-plan-is-really-a-rollback-of-medicaid.html) for adults and children with disabilities. Medicaid covers services that other insurers typically do not, such as personal care assistants and lifts that allow people with disabilities to live in their own homes and communities. While the ACA repeal attempts failed, the Trump administration has now allowed states to enact work requirements for those who receive Medicaid—a policy change that [experts say](https://rewire.news/article/2018/01/12/despite-republican-claims-medicaid-work-requirements-hurt-people-disabilities/) will likely result in many disabled people losing coverage.

Affordable Care Act repeal attempts drove activism

The backlash from the disabled community was fierce. Activists staged a “die-in” at Republican Senate Leader Mitch McConnell’s office last June, while members of ADAPT organized an average of three protests per day across 30 states over the summer, according to national organizer Gregg Beratan. The demonstrations helped grow the group’s ranks: at least 10 new chapters have emerged since Trump took office, according to ADAPT’s Cameron. Larger chapters, like the one in Denver where ADAPT started, have seen increases in membership and donations. Before the 2016 election, the Denver chapter typically raised about $10,000 each year. In 2017 they doubled that sum. The American Association of People with Disabilities launched a National Disability Voter Registration Week in 2016; last year the number of voter registration events rose nearly 400%. An estimated 45,000 people with disabilities attended the Women’s March on Washington last year, making that day likely the largest gathering of disabled people in American history. For those who could not go in person, an online Disability March drew more than 3,000 participants.

Since disabled people often don’t have access to transportation and may not know others in their area who share their disability, many engage in activism through the Internet. Campaigns like #CripTheVote, started in 2016 by Beratan and activists Alice Wong and Andrew Pulrang, have encouraged disabled people to become politically active and sparked conversations about topics ranging from opioids and chronic pain to disability and identity under Trump.

“I didn’t know disability activism existed until I went on Twitter,” says Kayla Smith, a 20-year-old with autism in Winston-Salem, N.C. Smith joined Twitter just as the presidential primary season was heating up in 2015. “I remember asking why I’d heard about civil rights for African Americans and other groups but not for disabilities,” she recalls. Now Smith plans to start a disability club at her community college later this year. She frequently tweets about disability news, commenting on everything from disabled representation in pop culture to the latest Medicaid update.

Others are channeling their energy into running for office. No organization currently tracks disabled candidates, but advocates say there are more candidates openly discussing their disabilities than in recent cycles, from local school board and town council races all the way up to Congressional contests. “It’s time for those of us who have disabilities to step out and do what we can to assume leadership positions to bring visibility to our community,” says Reyma McCoy McDeid, a non-profit executive who is autistic and running for a seat in Iowa’s House of Representatives.

One of the most important goals for many disability advocates is getting people outside the community to see disability rights as a movement that extends beyond existing stigmas to encompass a broader political identity. Though the general population often views disabilities as inconveniences to be pitied or tolerated, advocates are proud of their disabilities and view them as essential to their identities in the way that many view race, ethnicity and sexual orientation. Academics point to strong links between disability identity and political involvement. When someone attends a protest or joins an activist group for the first time, they are likely exposed to ideas they hadn’t previously encountered, which can make them [see their own experience in new ways](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2167696815579830), says Michelle Nario-Redmond, a psychology professor at Hiram College in Ohio who [studies disabilities](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15298868.2012.681118) and political advocacy.

Floyd and Smith both followed this pattern. Smith’s explorations on social media led her to discover her identity, while Floyd wasn’t thinking about politics until her boss at the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL) invited her to the ADAPT protest. They’re also part of what some call the “ADA generation”: young adults who grew up largely after the Americans with Disabilities Act established civil rights protections for disabled people in 1990. “Up until this point, we have been fortunate in that we haven’t had to fight in the trenches like some of our predecessors,” says Anjali Forber-Pratt, an expert on disability and identity at Vanderbilt University who is also part of this generation. The threat of Trump’s policies, she says, is playing an important role in identity development. Research backs this up: a study published in the journal [Rehabilitation Psychology](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28758773) last summer found that stigma or discrimination makes people with disabilities much more likely to proudly identify with the disability community.

That’s what happened for Jordan Sibayan. As a child growing up in Denver, Sibayan says he often felt discouraged by his muscular dystrophy. He wanted to be “normal.” But when Sibayan attended an ADAPT youth leadership training program in 2016, he learned how to effectively plan direct actions and lobby lawmakers. And once the Trump administration began proposing legislation he saw as an explicit threat to his community he threw himself into disability activism. “I felt like this is what I should be doing with my skills and my energy and my passion,” says Sibayan, who has now traveled to Boston, Washington, D.C., and to GOP Senator Cory Gardner’s Colorado home to protest with the group he describes as his family. “I’ve gained a sense of pride and self-worth that has taken a long time to develop,” he says.

Disability rights groups push for systemic change

As more young adults discover their sense of identity, the disability community is becoming more aware of how its concerns intersect with those of other minority groups. In 2018, this means both listening to people of color and LGBT individuals in the disability community, as well pushing for broader advocacy networks, such as the Women’s March, to include disability issues as part of their agendas. “Now we’re all forced to pay attention to what each others’ individual groups have been doing so that we can come together and be this coalition,” says Vilissa Thompson, a social worker and disability consultant in South Carolina who founded an initiative called Ramp Your Voice! to highlight the experiences of black disabled women.

The next step, activists say, is to capitalize on the conversations around identity and turn their community’s passion into political clout. One obstacle is that politicians have not typically tried to win the disability vote in the way they have with black or Latino voters, for example. Voter turnout rates among disabled people have remained stubbornly low in recent years, according to data collected by Lisa Schur and Douglas Kruse at Rutgers University. Even for disabled people who do plan to go to the polls, voting can be a challenge: voter ID laws may mean an extra hurdle for those who don’t drive, and 60% of polling places reviewed by the [Government Accountability Office](https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-18-4) in 2016 had one or more impediments, such as steep entrance ramps or poorly maintained paths into the building, that could prevent a disabled person from casting a ballot.

But the potential is there for the disability community to become a powerful political constituency. Nearly 57 million Americans have a disability, according to the Census Bureau, making the group the country’s largest minority. And despite the groundswell of protest against Trump and the GOP this year, disabled people do not especially favor one political party. Roughly 50% lean Democratic, according to the [Pew Research Center](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/22/a-political-profile-of-disabled-americans/), and 42% lean Republican. “That’s one of the hopeful things about this,” says Rutgers’ Kruse. “Because people with disabilities are not particularly aligned with one party or the other, both parties have incentives to get them out to vote.”

#### Legislative advocacy changes disability policy and attitudes – empirics prove

Landmark et al 17 (Leena Landmark, Professor at Ohio University. Dalun Zhang, Professor at Texas A&M University. Song Ju, Professor at the University of Cincinnati. Melissa Yi, MS from Texas A&M University. Timothy C. McVey, BA from Ohio University. “Experiences of Disability Advocates and Self-Advocates in Texas”. Journal of Disability Policy Studies 2017, Vol. 27(4) 203–211)

Legislative advocacy is a prime channel for disability advocates to affect civil rights and disability-related legislation and policy that leads to improved quality of life for individuals with disabilities. To highlight the current status of disability legislative advocacy, this study examined advocacy experiences based on recent data from one state that involved 113 disability advocates and self-advocates. Analyses were conducted to examine the characteristics of advocates, the causes advocated, leadership positions, level of engagement, and frequency of engagement in the legislative advocacy process. Relations among advocates’ characteristics and advocacy experiences were also examined. Results revealed that individuals with disabilities mostly relied on their peers in the advocacy process, and the type of disability was associated with the causes advocated. In addition, holding a leadership position was associated with engagement in the legislative advocacy process. Quality of life is an important goal for all people. For individuals who have disabilities, the degree to which they are satisfied with their lives may have increased importance because they have not always been afforded the opportunity to live according to their desires (Francis, Blue-Banning, & Turnbull, 2014; Verdugo, Navas, Gomez, & Schalock, 2012). Self-determination, one of the comprising domains of the quality-of-life construct, has been linked to positive adult outcomes for individuals with disabilities. Individuals who possess self-determination tend to achieve greater independent living and employment outcomes than individuals who are not as self-determined (Wehmeyer & Palmer, 2003). As a component element of self-determination, self advocacy is essential for improving quality-of-life outcomes. Self-advocacy (including parent advocacy) and leadership skills have played important roles in the history of special education and disability rights. As early as the 1930s, local groups of parents banded together to obtain educational services for their children with disabilities (Yell, Rogers, & Rogers, 1998). By the 1970s, individuals with developmental disabilities announced they were people first, and the self-advocacy movement was spawned in the United States (Longhurst, 1994). An early victory in the effort to gain services required for independent living was the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibited establishments receiving federal funding from discrimination against people with disabilities. One of the greatest victories was the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, a civil rights law prohibiting discrimination against people with disabilities. The advocacy movement has allowed people with disabilities the opportunity to explore their group identity, gain a sense of empowerment, and learn how to stand up for equal rights (Browning, Thorin, & Rhoades, 1984). Landmark legislation such as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (renamed the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act in 1990), and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 would not have been enacted without the advocacy efforts of individuals with disabilities and their families. Through legislative advocacy, Americans with disabilities have shaped public policy and made their lives better.

#### Legal and academic engagement is possible and productive—this is not ‘cruel optimism’, it’s putting theory into practice

Kanter 13

Arlene S. Kanter (Professor of Law, Syracuse University), Beth A. Ferri, Righting Educational Wrongs: Disability Studies in Law and Education, 2013, pp. 35-7

Disability studies has emerged within the academy as a new multidisci- plinarv field. It requires us to (re)consider how societv excludes people with disabilities not because of their limitations, but because of the wav in which societv itself is structured and operates. From this viewpoint, it is not as if there are no differences among people who are Deaf or blind or have other impairments, nor does this view deny the suffering, pain, and lack of needed support that many people with disabilities experience. Instead, disabilitv studies allows us to explore how to mitigate or even eliminate the social outcomes of differences with an awareness of the role that power plays in shaping the development of laws and legal rights. Disabilitv legal studies presents to the law and legal education both challenges and opportunities. It challenges legal scholars to view criticallv the place of disabilitv within the legal svstem and the legal academv as well as within society generallv. Viewing law through the lens of disabil- itv studies challenges us to examine disabilitv—like race, gender, class, and sexuality—as a social and political construct derived from a historv Of stigmatization and exclusion. It also challenges us to consider the complex wavs in which our system of laws, government, social structures, institu- tions, culture, and customs contributes to the disablement of persons in our own societv and in societies throughout the world. Disabilitv legal studies also presents opportunities. As part of the larger field of disabilitv studies, disabilitv legal studies provides legal scholars the tools to develop a critique of the law with respect to disabilitv and to explore the role and manifestations of ableism in social practices and insti- tutions that "portray people with disabilities as useless, marginal, abnor- mal, a burden on societv, and perhaps most offensivelv, as living a life that is not worth living" (MOT 69). It also provides the context in which to deconstruct and reconstruct the meaning Of disabilitv through investigat- ing the social construction of disability as well as the power structure that supports and enhances ableism. Disability legal studies does not seek to maintain the status quo. It is "a radical move as it seeks to transform mainstream legal education" (IMor 2006, 64n4). It provides theoretical tools as well as advocacv strategies to challenge our cultural norms that have resulted in the creation of legal, physical, and attitudinal barriers to inclusion Of people with disabilities in society. As such, it has the potential to expose legal scholars, our students, and the legal academv to new areas of academic inquiry bevond what disabilitv studies itself offers. It adds to the questions posed by disability studies, including: What does it mean to be "normal" for the purpose of legal decision making? How does and should the law respond to differ- ences among us? How can we challenge the privilege afforded to the able- bodied norm within the legal svstem? A first step in responding to these questions is to increase the visibil- itv of people with disabilities within law schools and within the academy itself. In recent vears, more students with disabilities are demanding their place in law schools, but few facultv with disabilities are visible in most law faculties. Further, when students and facultv with disabilities are noticed or discussed on campuses, thev are often portraved as threats or vulnerable victims, but not as valued members Of the academic communitv. Svracuse Universitv has taken steps to change this situation recruit- ing and retaining more students, faculty, and staff with disabilities; by nurturing the development of disabilitv studies programs; and by ing access and acconunodations with the goal of creating a conununitv of inclusion for all. Although we still have a long way to go, such efforts are well worth it. With such changes, our universities, legal institutions, and society as a whole will benefit from the participation of people with dis- abilities in our classrooms, our neighborhoods, and our lives.

#### Exclusion isn’t inevitable—other countries and fluid identities prove it’s contingent—reform is empirically effective but we need more of it to combat discrimination

Malhotra 14

Ravi Malhotra, Law & Society 48.4 (2014): 986-989, Review of Righting Educational Wrongs: Disability Studies in Law and Education, http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/docview/1660170810?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=11091

The volume opens with an engaging and powerful essay by Arlene Kanter on the relationship between law and disability studies. She effectively communicates for the uninitiated differences between a medical approach to disablement and a social model approach, as well as the various nuances in social model theory. Citing the seminal work of Robert Cover (1986), she also capably illustrates the importance of using appropriate language when writing and speaking about disability to dismantle discriminatory attitudes toward people with disabilities (p. 14). She provides three compelling reasons why disability studies ought to be of value to legal scholars. First, disability is an open-ended category that can affect anyone at any time. As Kanter correctly notes, people with disabilities are the fastest growing minority group in the world (p. 28). Second, disability is too often omitted from policy discussions on diversity, on university campuses and elsewhere (p. 31). While Kanter is undoubtedly accurate in describing the American legal and political context, I should note that some countries, such as Canada, have included disability as a long established legal criterion for what is known as affirmative action in the United States and it is very much part of the conversations around diversity and inclusion in universities and employment. Finally, she suggests that disability studies shed light on the values of our legal system through narratives and jurisprudence. From veterans to circus freaks to grassroots advocates for accessibility, the stories of people with disabilities require retelling. The role of the long forgotten League of the Physically Handicapped in challenging exclusion from government relief during the Great Depression is just one illustration (p. 32). Kanter might have added that the analysis of narratives of people with disabilities, and its relationship to identity and law has become a pivotal focus of some legal scholars (Engel and Munger 2002; Malhotra and Rowe 2014). She is right, however, to note that disability law extends to a surprisingly broad range of fields, forcing scholars to reconsider their perspectives on issues ranging from criminal law to guardianship law to the constitutional legal issues that have bitterly divided the Supreme Court in its consideration of the applicability of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to the States.

Thomas M. Skirtic and J. Robert Kent provide an interesting and compelling meditation on Martha Nussbaum's capabilities approach in the context of IDEA (Nussbaum 2006). Nussbaum developed the capabilities approach as an intervention in the debates surrounding Rawlsian liberal theory. Skirtic and Kent persuasively argue, however, that she fails to fully appreciate how individualized education programs (IEPs) mandated by IDEA have become largely symbolic, while there has been a far greater emphasis on ensuring that school boards conform to standardized testing regimes imposed by legislatures through the No Child Left Behind Act. They also rightly suggest that Nussbaum does not adequately support principles of inclusion for students with disabilities (pp. 76-80). Other chapters are equally stimulating. Mark Weber makes a valuable contribution in analyzing the role of parents of children with disabilities in education litigation. He suggests that parents, who most often do not share a disability with their children, sometimes favor segregated settings in an attempt to avoid harassment or because the local school board provides no other option. While a greater role for children with disabilities is recognized in the context of transition to adulthood, Weber suggests this could be applied more widely in the IEP process to give a greater voice to disabled youth (p. 212). A chapter by Alicia Broderick on the ethics of expert testimony in inclusion litigation under the IDEA is especially challenging for readers new to disability politics, as she raises philosophical questions about the meaning of what constitutes an expert and wades into the debates surrounding facilitated communication. Space constraints preclude a summary of every chapter but I found the volume consistently erudite and enjoyable.

Overall, Kanter and Ferri have produced a highly readable and thoughtful anthology which will be of great use to legal scholars. One area that I think warrants future attention is the role played by teachers' unions in the accommodation process. There is a rich and controversial history on the questionable role played by many American trade unions during the long struggle against Jim Crow (Flill 1998). It stands to reason that teachers' unions, often overwhelmed with their own struggles, did not necessarily always enthusiastically support inclusion of students with disabilities. Scholars working at the intersection of disability studies, law, and education are ideally placed to analyze this history. The editors might have also divided the book into sections. Nonetheless, this volume poses many questions for future generations of scholars to answer and deserves to be read widely.

#### The negative’s advocacy results in a form of separatism that undermines social change and consciousness raising—viewing their advocacy as non-exclusive with the affirmative is a better approach

Jill Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University, Milton Keynes, January 2000, Disability & Society, 15.1, Proquest

As a result of researching disability politics in UNISON as a 'non-disabled' academic-activist who came to realise that disability oppression had shaped her life alongside gender and sexuality oppression, I have arrived at the conclusion that the social model in practice is grounded upon a dubious premise-namely the antinomy between 'disabled' and 'non-disabled' people. In terms of identity, this leaves no scope to deal adequately with those who cross-over between disabled and non-disabled worlds, or with those who inhabit a liminal space. In terms of politics, it lends itself to a separatism which closes off many doors to coalition and transformation. In terms of research, the danger is that the pervasive structural, cultural and material problems facing disabled and other disadvantaged people may be neglected in favour of critiquing or circumscribing the role of researchers who are would-be allies. These are controversial claims, which clearly need to be investigated further by other people who have lived, worked and researched on other sites. They do not entail the demise of the social model as such, but they do pose creative challenges to it. Other social movements and critical theories have been facing similar challenges, beckoning them towards the so-called 'postmodernist tum', although this is not without its own dilemmas (cf. Nicholson & Seidman, 1995; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 1996). In such transitional times, a 'both .., and' standpoint and strategy is likely to offer the most flexibility, although such `living with uncertainty' is easier from some positions than others. I have suggested that disabled activists and academics might like to consider the trilogy of identities, issues and ideologies in more depth-in particular, it may be fruitful to consider the points at which they converge or diverge, and the reasons for prioritising one over the other(s). To date, it seems that `identity' has been privileged, which is a perfectly good starting-point for an oppressed group, providing that group members are sensitive to the diversity within their ranks and the processes of creating and traversing group boundaries. My own conviction is that if a social movement is to flourish in the longer term, 'identity' needs to be tied in with 'issues' and 'ideologies' in order to open up the possibilities for coalitions with other oppressed groups and transformations of the wider society. In the process, identity will be displaced from the centre-stage, although this does not mean that it is supplanted-all social movements are grounded upon subjectivity, but subjectivity is itself open to transformation as a result of praxis (e.g. Phelan, 1995). I doubt that 'issues' around discrimination can be articulated let alone altered without tackling the things that disabled people share with other disadvantaged people. If we reflect upon Fraser's (1995) schema, the politics of redistributing resources will also be relevant to all poor people and many of our elders, whilst the politics of revaluing stigmatised identities will also be relevant to all lesbians, gay men and people from ethnic minorities. I doubt that any movement, let alone a coalition of movements, can be furthered without a shared `ideology' in terms of an understanding of what is wrong with our world and a vision of a better world: If we consider Young's ( 1990b) discussion of relational justice, it seems that a better world-order will be nurtured as much from our being; doing and relating as from our possessing, using and consuming, which suggests that if we are not learning how to live and work together along the journey to a non-oppressive society, then we will never reach our goal. It is not so much that links between identities, issues and ideologies are not made by disability activists in UNISON and elsewhere. It is rather that identity has been reduced to specific types of impairment in a manner which can only restrict political praxis; and that praxis has, in turn, been harnessed to a specific paradigm in a manner which can only restrict critical research: The potential for disability politics to change the world is immense, and the real tragedy is that it remains dormant. For example, the concept of `normalising regimes' could hold a key to forging coalitions between differently disabled people and other stigmatised peoples and reflecting back to non-disabled people the precariousness of their 'normality'. Howevers, a key is not about locking ourselves in: it is about opening a door outwards.