### 1nc

#### **The world relies on the fundamental opposition to disability to exist – disabled bodies are modeled as the inverse reflection to the normate which drives the internal ableism and desire to eliminate disabled bodies.**

**Hughes 12** [Bill Hughes (professor of Sociology at Glasgow Caledonian University, BA in sociology from the University of Stirling, PhD in political philosophy from the University of Aberdeen). 2012. Accessed 8/9/20. “Civilising Modernity and the Ontological Invalidation of Disabled People.” <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137023001_2> //Xu]

The stratifying binary of disability/non-disability and the antagonism of the latter towards the former is mediated and maintained, principally, by the emotion of disgust. Disgust is the bile carried in a discursive complex that Campbell (2008: 153) calls ‘ableism’: ‘a network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the corporeal standard) that is projected as perfect, species-typical and therefore essential and fully human’. The body produced by ableism is equivalent to what Kristeva (1982: 71) calls the ‘clean and proper body’. It is the body of the ‘normate’, the name that Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (1997) gives to the body that thinks of itself as invulnerable and definitive. It is the hygienic, aspirational body of civilising modernity. It is cast from the increasingly stringent norms and rules about emotional behaviour and bodily display that mark mundane social relations in the lebenswelt (lifeworld). This curious non-disabled body/self has no empirical existence per se. On the contrary, the body of ableism is a normative construct, an invulnerable ideal of being manifest in the imaginary of ‘modernist ontology, epistemology and ethics’ as something ‘secure, distinct, closed and autonomous’ (Shildrick, 2002: 51). It embraces ‘human perfectibility as a normative physical or psychological standard’ and involves ‘a curious disavowal of variation and mortality’ (Kaplan, 2000: 303). It is what we are supposed to aspire to, to learn to be but can never become. It has no grounding in the material world. It is a ‘body schema, a psychic construction of wholeness that … belies its own precariousness and vulnerability’ (Shildrick, 2002: 79). It is a ‘body divorced from time and space; a thoroughly artificial affair’ (Mitchell and Snyder, 2000: 7), the epitome of civilisation, closed off from any connection with the animal side of humanity and from the ways in which our bodily nature wallows in its carnal improprieties. It is a body aghast at the messiness of existence. Disability is the opposite of this ideal body, its ‘inverse reflection’ (Deutsch and Nussbaum, 2000: 13). The disabled body is or has the propensity to be unruly. In the kingdom of the ‘clean and proper body’, disability is the epitome of ‘what not to be’. As a consequence the disabled body can be easily excluded from the mainstream ‘psychic habitus’ (Elias, 2000: 167). The ‘clean and proper’ – a normative body of delicacy, refinement and selfdiscipline – has powerful social consequences most manifest in its normalising dynamics. It is the standard of judgement against which disabled bodies are invalidated and transformed into repellent objects. It is the emblem of purity that by comparison creates existential unease. It apportions the shame and repugnance that underwrite the civilising process (Elias, 2000: 114–19, 414–21). Through ableism, modernity has been able to structure disability as uncivilised, outside or on the margins of humanity. One of the great books of the science of natural history published under the title Systema Naturae by Linnaeus in 1735 distinguishes between homo sapiens and homo monstrosus. In this classification impairment – at its extreme and highly visible end – is excluded from the human family. The distinction is, in itself, an act of violence and invalidation, an object lesson in transforming difference and ‘defect’ into the abominable. The distinction mobilises the aversive emotions of fear and disgust. Ableism is a cruel teacher. It embodies violence at many levels: ‘epistemic, psychic, ontological and physical’ (Campbell, 2008: 159). It is at its most bellicose when it is mediated by disgust: a mediation invoked mostly in the social fabrication of taboo and most compellingly in a context when the human/animal boundary is under threat. Ableism rests on the effort to eliminate from awareness, chaos, abjection, animality and death: all that civilisation seeks to repress. It encourages us to live in the false hope that we will not suffer and die, to adopt a perspective of invulnerability, to confuse morality with beauty and to see death, pain and disability as the repulsive woes of mortality rather than as the existen- tial basis for community and communication. Kolnai (2004: 74) reminds us that, ‘in its full intention, it is death ... that announces itself to us in the phenomenon of disgust’. Disability, in modernity, has been produced in the ontological household of the abject, as the antithesis of communica- tion and community, in a place that we might on occasion peer into only to ‘choke’ on the unsavoury sights that greet us. Disability is put out, put away, hidden, segregated or transformed into its opposite, covered up by whatever medical or aesthetic techniques are available to achieve this end. Any opportunity that disability might have to take its place at the heart of communication and community is thwarted by the ablest sensibilities that push it back down among the disgusting, the sick, the dead and the dying. In fact, as Elias (2000) suggested, the making of ‘civilised’ community and communication in modernity proceeds by exclusion and interdiction, by cutting out and hiding away whatever causes or might come to inspire angar (choking) or anguista (tightness).

#### Their unitary critiques of capitalism fail to account for interwoven nature of ableism in the political economy – that serves to reproduce capitalist and ableist violence

**Pimentel and Monteleone 19** “A Privileged Bodymind: The Entanglement of Ableism and Capitalism” *International Journal of Economic Development, Volume 12, Number 1, pp. 63-81 2019* Rebecca Monteleone is an assistant professor of disability and technology at the University of Toledo. PhD Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ. Human and Social Dimensions of Science and Technology. Graduate Certificate, Gender Studies. MA, The University of Kent, Canterbury, UK Intellectual and Developmental Disability (Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research)Fulbright Postgraduate Scholar BA, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. Disability Studies

While the term “ableism” has only entered academic and activist writings recently the normative orientation to which it refers has been immensely consequential in American society. The key feature of ableism is the privileging of certain arrangements of bodyminds, often labeled “typical” or “average,” and the subsequent discrimination against non-normative bodyminds. In this context ‘bodymind’ refers to what Price (2015) calls the “imbrication (not just the combination) of the entities usually called ‘body’ and ‘mind’…” (p. 270). This phrase not only challenges Cartesian dualism but flags cognitive and mental difference as an important category of analysis. Wolbring (2008), a bioethicist who has written extensively on the subject, describes ableism as a “set of beliefs, processes and practices that produce—based on abilities one exhibits or values—a particular understanding of oneself, one’s body and one’s relationship with others of humanity, other species and the environment, and includes how one is judged by others” (p. 90). Goodley et al. (2014) further describe ableism as “normatively privileg[ing] ablebodiedness…encourag[ing] an institutional bias towards **autonomous, independent bodies**…lend[ing] support to **economic and material dependence on neoliberal and hypercapitalist forms of production**” (p. 21, emphasis added). Critical disability studies, which allows disability “to be understood from the perspective of the person who experiences it,” has been a rich academic site to explore the entanglements of knowledge systems which privilege certain bodyminds (Reaume, 2014, p. 1248). It is an explicitly normative interdisciplinary commitment to understanding disability as more than individual 68 impairment, and to interrogating deeply entrenched social and political injustices. Simi Linton (1998) holds that the subject matter of disability studies is “not simply the variations that exist in human behavior, appearance, functioning, sensory acuity, and cognitive processing but, more crucially, the meaning we make of those variations” (p. 2). Ben-Moshe and Magaña (2014) add that such meaning is “socially constructed by people’s thoughts, words, and physical manifestations (such as the built environment) and become ways of defining human experiences that take on cultural and historical meaning, often of a negative tint” (p. 106). Moreover, the production of meaning, whether creative or symbolic, is cultural, and it structures identities, social imaginaries, and opinions (de Lauretis, as cited in Hawkesworth, 2006, p. 25). If as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels observe in The German Ideology (1970) the “ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas,” then **it is necessary to question how capitalism and capitalist ideology informs the meanings and constructions that are often the focus of disability studies** (p. 64). This work should contribute to disability studies and disability culture, as both “aim at breaking down the perception of disability as personal tragedy, pathology, or deficiency” (Ben-Moshe and Magaña, 2014, p. 106). Nor should capitalism’s critics take for granted how “major advances might be made in eroding aversive and rejecting perceptions of persons with disabilities.” Additionally, questioning the effects that capitalism and capitalist ideology have on meaning and its social construction, especially with regards to the intangible dimensions on which society is predicated**, does not suffice for understanding the ableist-capitalist relationship**. Thus, critiquing **capitalism also requires an interrogation of the built environment**, which facilitates so much of the productive output and functioning of capitalist societies— and which imposes on so many kinds of bodyminds. Indeed, 69 it is necessary to ask why the built environment is designed the way it is, how and why it should to be adapted to “accommodate a broad range of human abilities and disabilities,” and what the resultant political implications are (Hahn, 1986, pp. 273-87). Understanding disability as “fluid and contextual rather than biological” makes it possible to understand disability as something “imposed on certain kinds of minds and bodies.” Also, if disability is understood as a construction begotten by centuries of processes, both cultural and historical, then disability should be conceived of as a continuum, not as a binary. The fact is, “One is always dis/abled in relation to the context in which one is put.” For instance, if the definition and understanding of certain disabilities is medical, and thus contributive to the social construction of disabilities as medical “problems” to be mitigated by science and technology, it is imperative to acknowledge this understanding stems from culturally hegemonic standards about what “normal” is. Furthermore, such matters are determined by those who haveenough power to enforce their standards and impose them on others (Ben-Moshe et al., 2013, pp. 210-11). In a capitalist society, this is necessarily the social group or class that controls or owns the means of production. Finally, **it is necessary to take up an intersectional perspective when interrogating capitalistic forces** and the hegemonies. Complex and multi-faceted identities may vary across contexts and exist along a continuum. Certainly, identities are not monolithic constructs; nor can they be fully interrogated on an individual basis. This notion provides a point of departure for considering disability in capitalist context**. Intersectionality additionally provides grounds for understanding how ableism and capitalism are so caught up with one another, and how they work across populations and time.**

**The ROB is to vote for the debater who best challenges ableism**

**Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question \*A Campbell 13\*C**

**Campbell 13 (Fiona Kumari Campbell, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Disability Studies at Griffith University. Wednesday 27 November 2013. Problematizing Vulnerability: Engaging Studies in Ableism and Disability Jurisprudence. Keynote speech at Disability at the Margins: Vulnerability, Empowerment and the Criminal Law)**

What is meant by the concept of ableism? The literature suggests that the term is often used fluidly with limited definitional or conceptual specificity. The work of Carlson (2001)5 and Campbell (2001) represented a turning point in bringing attention to this new site of subordination not just in terms of disablement but also ableism’s application to other devalued groups. **Ableism is** deeply **seeded at the level of knowledge systems** of life, personhood and liveability. **Ableism is not just** a matter of ignorance or **negative attitudes** towards disabled people; **it is a schema of perfection**, **a** deep **way of thinking about bodies**, wholeness and permeability.6 As such integrating ableism into social research and advocacy strategies represents a significant challenge to practice as ableism moves beyond the more familiar territory of social inclusion and usual indices of exclusion to the very divisions of life. Bringing together the study of existence and knowledge systems, ableism is difficult to pin down. Ableism is a set of processes and practices that arise and decline through sequences of causal convergences influenced by the elements of time, space, bodily inflections and circumstance. Ability and the corresponding notion of ableism are intertwined. **Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the** very **foundations of social theory**, therapeutic jurisprudence, advocacy, medicine and law; or in the mappings of human anatomy. Summarised by Campbell (2001, 44) Ableism refers to; …A network of beliefs processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the bodily standard) that is projected as the perfect, speciestypical and therefore essential and fully human. Disability then is cast as a diminished state of being human. Writing today (2013) I add an addition to this definition: ‘The ableist bodily configuration is immutable, permanent and laden with qualities of perfectionism or the enhancement imperative orientated towards a self-contained improvability’. Sentiency applies to not just the human but the ‘animal’ world. As a category to differentiate the normal from the pathological, the concept of **abledness is predicated on** some **preexisting notion about the nature of typical** species **functioning** that is beyond culture and historical context. **Ableism** does not just stop at propagating what is typical for each species. An ableist imaginary **tells us what** a healthy body means – a normal mind, the pace, the tenor of **thinking and** the kinds of **emotions** and affect that **are suitable to express**. Of course these ‘fictional’ characteristics then are promoted as a natural ideal. This abled imaginary relies upon the existence of an unacknowledged imagined shared community of able-bodied/minded people held together by a common ableist world view that asserts the preferability and compulsoriness of the norms of ableism. Such ableist schemas erase differences in the ways humans express our emotions, use our thinking and bodies in different cultures and in different situations. This in turn enacts bodily Otherness rendered sometimes as the ‘disabled’, ‘perverted’ or ‘abnormal body’, clearly demarcating the boundaries of normal and pathological. A critical feature of an ableist orientation is a belief that impairment or disability is inherently negative and at its essence is a form of harm in need of improvement, cure or indeed eradication. Studies in Ableism (SiA) inverts traditional approaches, by shifting our concentration to what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism. In not looking solely at disability, we can focus on how the abled able-bodied, non-disabled identity is maintained and privileged. Disability does not even need to be in the picture. SiA’s interest in abledness means that the theoretical foundations are readily [is]applicable to the study of difference and the dividing practices of race, gender, location and sexual orientation. **Reframing our focus** from disability to ableism prompts different preoccupations: • What does the study of the politics of ‘vulnerability’ tells us about what it me ty ans to be ‘non-vulnerable’? • Indeed how is the very conceptualisation of ‘autonomy’ framed in the light of discourses of ‘vulnerability’? • In representing vulnerabilias universal does this detract from the specificity of disability experiences? SiA examines the ways that concepts of wellbeing, vulnerability and deficiency circulate throughout society and impact upon economic, social, legal and ethical choices. Principally SiA focuses on the limits of tolerance and possessive individualism. Extending the theorization of disability, studies in ableism **can enrich our understanding of the** production of vulnerability and the **terms of engagement in** civic **life** and the possibilities of social inclusion. I now turn to unpacking the nuances and structure of a theory of ableism.

#### The alternative is to frame our anti-capitalist organizing around the principle of non-productivity. By centering non-productive bodies, we breakdown the notion of valorizing labor and thus centering the able-bodied experience. Our alt is deconstructive methods that challenges the dominant norms of productivity the aff reaffies and produces a collective of disabled people who resist the discarding of their value

Mitchell & Snyder 2010. “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*. Volume 4, Number 2, 2010 (Associate Professor in the Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education Department in the College of Education at Temple University; founder of Brace Yourselves Productions AJM)

**"Non-productive bodies" represent those who belong to populations designated "unfit" by capitalism**. Thus, whereas **traditional theories of political economy tend to stop at the borders of the laboring subjects** (including potential laborers), **the concept of non-productive bodies expansively rearranges the potentially revolutionary subject of leftist theory. If one is "wired" into the system** in some manner—and, for Hardt and Negri, there is no such thing as an outside to this formulation—**then one actively participates in the global** **give and take of biopolitical life.** While such a claim may seem to deflate the potential for significant political action, given the seemingly boundless ability of capitalism to produce subjectivities advantageous to its own livelihood, **the alternative proves equally accurate**: **those whom** Frantz Fanon **designated "the wretched of the earth" come into greater contact with each other through immaterial communication networks characteristic of modes of production in affective labor markets and opportunities for "collective" action increase.** We now offer a brief description of how disability collectivities may be recognized as the paradigm of this alternative formula of resistance.Disability as "Deconstructive" Method: By the end of the nineteenth century, efforts to segregate, restrict, and oppress populations, identified variously as "feebleminded," "subnormal," "deviant," etc., went increasingly trans-national. Eugenics, the social engineering project that sought to eradicate defective traits from a nation's hereditary pool, went global. Scientific collectives were formed, restrictive policies were translated from one cultural context to another with relative ease, categories of pathology proliferated, and parallel populations found themselves increasingly the subjects of incarceration practices. Policy-makers, scientists, psychiatrists, and institutional administrators referenced the effective restrictions at work in other nations in order to put pressure on their home legislatures to adopt "firm measures." In other words, modern capitalism recognized the utility of international markets in segregation strategies toward disabled people (and others deemed non-normal) and actively traded in their dissemination (there are echoes of Homi Bhabha's "DIS-semi-nation" here). In *Cultural Locations of Disability*, we point out that a profound and devastating irony was at work in the progressive period: as the discourse of disciplinary eugenics became increasingly mobile and international, disabled people—the very subjects of that discourse—found themselves increasingly immobilized. Their labor was not absent, but rather cordoned off and contained within the parameters of the modern-day institution. A fully Foucauldian network burgeoned within this period with disabled people as the global objects of its efforts. Within the U.S., Canada, western Europe, and Australia, nations argued a logic of racial improvement and purity; in Russia the old czarist lines were disqualified as "inferior" due to the eugenics concept of "inbreeding"; in Asia entire countries such as Korea found themselves "disabled" by virtue of another (Japan in this case) colonizing power's emasculation of the country. In other words, the discourse of eugenics, [End Page 187] applied unevenly and non-uniformly, functioned as a meta-disqualifier of entire populations whose differences (perceived or actual) served as the source of their inferiority. Here we find the historical roots of a global effort to classify bodies as non-productive and therefore outside of capitalist competitive labor markets all together. **The modern-day disability-rights movement, consequently, is not** essentially European or American or "**Western" by necessity of the fact that wherever the discourse of eugenics could be found** (in one form or another), **counterinsurgent forces arise. These resistance strategies increasingly surface within populations designated as "non-productive**," but, for Hardt and Negri, "nonproductive bodies" prove imminently productive **because they occupy outposts of alternative biopolitical discourses, lives imagined and** realized in contrast to, even **counter-posed against**, more **dominant discourses of consumption, productivity, family, and nation**. In part **these** insurrectional communities of non-productive bodies begin with a "deconstructive method" in that they create group conceptions founded on theories of the malleability**—the necessary mutancy even—of strict borders, classifications, and social relationships. The introduction of this strategic fluidity proves critical to the creation of counter cultural formations as** they rely upon the exposé of the artificiality of late capitalism's "naturalness" as their political alternative. **Disabled bodies, as definitively multiple forms of embodiment that cannot be universalized even within "condition" groups, rely for their insurrectional force on the non-transcendental nature of their difference**. This is the impetus for upsetting medical and rehabilitation-based models of pathology that transect the globe. Disability movements function as counter-discursive resistance efforts at the global level while sustaining—and even honoring—local differences. This is one of the powerful lessons that Jim Charlton's *Nothing About Us Without Us* ([2000](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.2.mitchell.html#b2)) has brought to Disability Studies with its comparativist, international interview methodology.

#### The aff on it’s own fails, their sole focus on material oppression ignores the psychological and social violence disabled people face in the social which implicates their process of political organizing – proves disabled people always get blamed for fracturing the movement

Loja 12

(EMA CRISTINA RIBEIRO FERNANDES LOJA is Doctor of Psychology from the school of Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade do Porto, The impact of dis/abl(e)ism on disabled people in Portugal: Fado, citizenship and the embodied self, Doctorate Thesis, Doctor of Psychology, Online at: http://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/bitstream/10216/64846/2/91582.pdf)//TR

The British disability studies, developed in the 1980s, was heavily influenced by historical materialism (e.g. Finkelstein, 1981a, 1981b, 1996, 2001; Abberley, 1987; Barnes, 1990, 1991, 1998; Oliver, 1990, 1996; Zarb, 1992; Morris, 1993; Gleeson, 1999; Thomas, 1999, 2007; Barton, 2001). As it was influenced only by Sociology, the British social model focuses on issues of equality in political and material participation (Phillips, 1993, 1995). This model is called the ‘strong’ social model, the ‘politics of disablement’, the ‘social oppression theory’ (Oliver 1990, p. 1) or the ‘political economy of disability’ (Thomas, 2004d). Finkelstein (1980), Oliver (1990), Barnes (1991) and Barton (1996) are some of the academics who developed this model by using a perspective that draws upon a Marxist and materialist interpretation of the world.

**[SHE CONTINUES]**

Even though the replacement of the traditional deficit approach to a social oppression understanding of disability was and is an empowering and liberating process for disabled people (Barnes et al., 2005; Shakespeare, 2006), the British structuralist social model has been criticised by some academics, informed by postmodernist and poststructuralist theoretical perspectives, who began to question the focus on socio-structural determinants (e.g. Shakespeare, 1997; Corker, 1998; Corker & French, 1999; Corker & Shakespeare, 2002). Tom Shakespeare is one of the academics that has been the most outspoken critic of the British social model. His critiques draw on feminist, postmodernist and poststructuralists sources (Crow, 1996; Morris, 1996; Corker & French, 1999). Following Smith (2009), even though the structuralist model conceptualizes **normalization** in a different way than individual models, ordinary citizenship is the main goal as it focuses on the struggle for the same participation in the same ideal and normal state as ‘the non-disabled’ already are, supposedly, enjoying. Within this idea, it assumes falsely that all non-disabled people are independent and also that independence is a desirable ‘state of being’ (Smith, 2009). Also, the linear relation of the subordination of disabled people in relation to nondisabled is questionable since other factors might inverse these positions – ‘we all have the capacity to oppress people who are situationally less powerful than us’ (Tregaskis, 2003, p. 3; Vernon, 1999). As Erving Goffman (1963, p. 163) puts it: ‘The normal and the stigmatized are not persons but rather perspectives’. By considering disabled people as a homogeneous group (based on oppression), the structuralist model fails to engage adequately with the complex intersections of other social identities and disability. For example, social class or having more access to financial and community resources has a great influence on how well one can cope with a disabling society (Shakespeare, 2006; Blackmore, 2007). Even though material oppression is an important factor in disabled people’s lives, it is not the only one.

Many face oppression of a socio-cultural, communicative and discursive order (Goodley & Lawthom, 2005a). In fact, disablement is often felt in the relational dynamics between non/disabled people (Tregaskis, 2003). Therefore, relational, cultural and extra-material factors should also be taken into account in disabled people’s oppression. As far as barriers are concerned, Shakespeare (2006) argues that the structuralist model places great faith, perhaps unrealistically, on the removal of barriers.

### Case

#### Now do not let them weigh case – 5 answers –

#### [1] Perm solves – comparative worlds can be true in OTHER instances but if we prove their rhetoric is invested in ableist communicative manners you should bracket out substance.

#### [2] Link turns and de-links DEFINITELY solve because you can gain offense against the K off the link debate or you can de-link and collapse to the aff leaving the K with a floating alternative

#### [3]Dialogue turn – there’s infinite consequences based upon plan as a cause can have endless effects, their will to set neg ground based on hypotheticals is an attempt at negotiation the least change since it centers stasis upon WHAT debate is rather than should be – disabled liberation is a continuous project – the name of good intentions cements abled complacency.

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable.

Kaletsky ’11 (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

#### Transition wars cause extinction

Harris 03. Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe. Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

#### 4] Cap is inevitable – the alt fails

Wilson 2k (Wilson, 2000  Editor and Publisher of Illinois Academe of many books including ‘The Myth of Political Correctness’ – 2000 (John K. Wilson, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People” p. 123)//Lex AKu

The left often finds itself stuck in a debate between revolution and reform. To self-described revolutionaries, any attempt to reform the system is a liberal compromise that only delays the creation of a socialist utopia. The vision of workers casting off their chains and embracing the overthrow of capitalism is pure fantasy. No one actually knows what it means to overthrow capitalism, and it clearly isn't going to happen, anyway. Reforming American capitalism is not a halfhearted effort at modest change; it is a fundamental attack on the reigning ideology of "free market" capitalism. Progressive reforms, taken seriously, are revolutionary in every important sense. Reforms such as the New Deal were truly revolutionary for their time, and American capitalism has been saved from its own flaws by these progressive reforms. The problem is that these progressive reforms have not been carried far enough, in part because the revolutionary left has too often failed to support the progressives’ reformist agenda. The only leftist revolution in America will come from an accumulation of progressive policies, and so the question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant.

**5] Cap key to the environment – assumes any possible neg warrant.**

**Bilgili, Koçak, & Bulut 16**—Faik Bilgili PhD in Economics from The City University of New York and Istanbul University; professor of Economics at Erciyes University, Turkey // Emrah Koçak research at Evran University // Ümit Bulut PhD in Economics from Gazi University and Professor of Economics at Ahi Evran University [“The dynamic impact of renewable energy consumption on CO2 emissions: A revisited Environmental Kuznets Curve approach,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, Vol. 54, Feb. 2016, p. 838-839]

Some seminal papers reveal that, **within the process of economic growth, environmental pollution level first scales up and later scales down**. This is **an inverted U-shaped relationship between GDP** per capita **and pollution level** (Grossman and Krueger [3,4], Panayotou [5], Shafik [6], Selden and Song [7]). Since this relationship resembles the relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality produced by Kuznets [8], Panayotou [5] calls it Environmental **Kuznets Curve (EKC)**. According to the EKC hypothesis, **the level of environmental pollution** initially intensifies because of economic growth, later **tampers after GDP per capita reaches a threshold value** (Panayotou [5], Suri and Chapman [9]; Stern [10]). Therefore, this hypothesis implies a dynamic process in which **structural change occurs together with economic growth** (Dinda [2]). Grossman and Krueger [3] first clarify how the EKC arises. They explore that **economic growth affects environmental quality through three channels:** (i) **scale effect,** (ii) **structural effect, and** (iii) **technological effect**. Fig. 1 presents the EKC within the periods of (i), (ii) and (iii). According to the scale effect, given the level of technology, more resources and inputs are employed to produce more commodities at the beginning of economic growth path. Hence, more energy resources and production will induce more waste and pollutant emissions, and the level of environmental quality will get worse (Torras and Boyce [11], Dinda [2], Prieur [12]). **The structural effect states that the economy will have a structural transformation, and economic growth will affect environment positively along with continuation of growth**. In other words, **as national production grows the structure of economy changes**, and **the share of less polluting economic activities increases gradually**. Besides, **an economy experiences a transition from capital-intensive industrial sectors to service sector and reaches technology-intensive knowledge economy** (the final stage of the structural change). Due to the fact **that technology-intensive sectors utilize fewer natural sources, the impact of these sectors on environmental pollution will be less**. The last channel of the growth process is the technological effect channel. **Since a high-income economy can allocate more resources for research and development expenditures, the new technological processes will emerge**. Thus, **the country will replace old and dirty tech**nologies **with new and clean tech**nologies, **and environmental quality will deepen** (Borghesi [13], Copelan and Taylor [14]). Consequently, **environmental pollution** initially increases and later **decreases as a result of scale, structural and technological effeerging along with growth path**. Some studies of EKC hypothesis consider income elasticity of clean environment demand (Beckerman [15], Selden and Song [16], McConnel [17], Panayotou [18], Carson et al. [19], Brock and Taylor [20]). Accordingly, the share of low-income people’s expenditures for food and basic necessities is higher than that of high-income societies’ expenditures for the same type of commodities (Engel’s Law). **As income level and life standards rise in conjunction with economic growth, the societies’ demand for clean environment advances**. Besides, **societies make often pressure on policy makers to protect the environment through new regulations**. One might argue that, because of these reasons, clean environment is a luxury commodity and the **demand elasticity of clean environment is higher than unity** (Dinda [2]).

#### 6] Solves war – capitalism peace theory

Harrison 11 (Mark, Department of Economics, University of Warwick, Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Birmingham, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, “Capitalism at War”, Oct 19 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/academic/harrison/papers/capitalism.pdf)

Capitalism’s Wars America is the world’s preeminent capitalist power. According to a poll of more than 21,000 citizens of 21 countries in the second half of 2008, people tend on average to evaluate U.S. foreign policy as inferior to that of their own country in the moral dimension. 4 While this survey does not disaggregate respondents by educational status, many apparently knowledgeable people also seem to believe that, in the modern world, most wars are caused by America; this impression is based on my experience of presenting work on the frequency of wars to academic seminars in several European countries. **According to the evidence, however, these beliefs are mistaken**. We are all aware of America’s wars, but they make only a small contribution to the total. Counting all bilateral conflicts involving at least the show of force from 1870 to 2001, it turns out that the countries that originated them come from all parts of the global income distribution (Harrison and Wolf 2011). Countries that are richer, measured by GDP per head, **such as America do not tend to start more conflicts**, although there is a tendency for countries with larger GDPs to do so. Ranking countries by the numbers of conflicts they initiated, the United States, with the largest economy, comes only in second place; third place belongs to China. In first place is Russia (the USSR between 1917 and 1991). What do capitalist institutions contribute to the empirical patterns in the data? Erik Gartzke (2007) has re-examined the hypothesis of the “democratic peace” based on the possibility that, **since capitalism and democracy are highly correlated across countries and time, both democracy and peace might be products of the same underlying cause, the spread of capitalist institutions**. It is a problem that our historical datasets have measured the spread of capitalist property rights and economic freedoms over shorter time spans or on fewer dimensions than political variables. For the period from 1950 to 1992, Gartzke uses a measure of external financial and trade liberalization as most likely to signal robust markets and a laissez faire policy. **Countries that share this attribute of capitalism above a certain level, he finds, do not fight each other, so there is capitalist peace as well as democratic peace**. Second, economic liberalization (of the less liberalized of the pair of countries) is a more powerful predictor of bilateral peace than democratization, controlling for the level of economic development and measures of political affinity.

#### Solves poverty

Pipe 11--Nicholas, The South Australia Globalist, "The Global Financial Crisis", 2011, [www.perspectivist.com/business/the-global-financial-crisis](http://www.perspectivist.com/business/the-global-financial-crisis)

When assisted by the other neo-liberal views of globalisation and foreign investment, this economic growth leads to other social benefits; it “trickles down” to marginalised populations, while open borders ensure the most efficient distributions of goods worldwide. As a result, closing the gap between affluent and marginalised populations is encouraged. Ergas summarises the effects of this phenomenon as: “(liberalism) works, while the interventionist prescription doesn’t. Ask the hundreds of millions of Chinese, Indians and Vietnamese whom liberalisation has lifted out of poverty.”¶ The benefits of neo-liberalism are clear, and it is fallacious to overlook them when judging the system itself in the wake of the GFC. Yet there is something else that any critic of neo-liberalism must consider – the fact that, like it or not, neo-liberalism is here to stay. As Chris Brown notes, the system has become hegemonic and so deeply entrenched in society that its ideals are now part of how things really are. You only have to look at the US Government’s need to bail out and protect several corporations at the height of the GFC to see how deep rooted the neo-liberalism system is, and how its influence lives on.

# Acessiable formating

#### **The world relies on the fundamental opposition to disability to exist – disabled bodies are modeled as the inverse reflection to the normate which drives the internal ableism and desire to eliminate disabled bodies.**

**Hughes 12**

The stratifying binary of disability and antagonism is maintained by the corporeal standard the body of the ‘normate’ Disability is the opposite of this ideal its ‘inverse reflection’ the emblem of purity structure disability as outside humanity homo monstrosus Ableism rests on the effort to eliminate abjection death It encourages live in the false hope of invulnerability to see death and disability as repulsive woes rather than the existen- tial basis for community the phenomenon of disgust’ Disability produced in the ontologi of abject

#### Their unitary critiques of capitalism fail to account for interwoven nature of ableism in the political economy – that serves to reproduce capitalist and ableist violence

**Pimentel and Monteleone 19**

key feature of ableism is the privileging of certain arrangements of bodyminds institutional bias towards **, independent bodies** disability deeply entrenched social and political injustices the production of meaning identities ideas of the ruling class then **it is necessary to question how capitalism** **informs the meanings** **that are often the focus of disability studies** questioning the effects that capitalism on meaning **does not suffice for understanding the ableist-capitalist relationship** critiquing **capitalism also requires an interrogation of the built environment** disability should be conceived of as a continuum One is always dis/abled in relation to the context in which one is put such matters are determined by those who have powe **it is necessary to take** **an intersectional perspective** **Intersectionality** **provides grounds for understanding how ableism and capitalism** **work across** **time**

**The ROB is to vote for the debater who best challenges ableism**

**Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question \*A Campbell 13\*C**

**is** **seeded at the level of knowledge systems** **Ableism is not just** **negative attitudes it is a schema of perfection**, **a** **way of thinking about bodies**, **Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the** **foundations of social theory**, t **abledness is predicated on** **preexisting notion about the nature of typical** **functioning**. **Ableism** **tells us what** **and** **emotions are suitable to express**. **Reframing our focus** **can enrich our understanding of the terms of engagement in** **life**

#### The alternative is to frame our anti-capitalist organizing around the principle of non-productivity. By centering non-productive bodies, we breakdown the notion of valorizing labor and thus centering the able-bodied experience. Our alt is deconstructive methods that challenges the dominant norms of productivity the aff reaffies and produces a collective of disabled people who resist the discarding of their value

Mitchell & Snyder 2010.

**"Non-productive bodies" represent those who belong to populations designated "unfit" by capitalism** **traditional theories of political economy tend to stop at the borders of the laboring subjects** **the concept of non-productive bodies expansively rearranges the potentially revolutionary subject** **the alternative proves equally accurate**: **those whom** **designated "the wretched of the earth" come into greater contact with each other through immaterial communication networks characteristic of modes of production in affective labor markets and opportunities for "collective" action increase** disability collectivities may be recognized as the paradigm of this alternative formula of resistance **wherever the discourse of eugenics could be found** **counterinsurgent forces arise** **These** **strategies** **surface within populations designated as "non-productive** **because they occupy outposts of alternative biopolitical discourses** **lives imagined and** **counter-posed against** **dominant discourses of consumption, productivity, family, and nation** **these** insurrectional communities of non-productive bodies begin with a "deconstructive method" in that they create group conceptions founded on theories of the malleability **the necessary mutancy even—of strict borders, classifications, and social relationships. The introduction of this strategic fluidity proves critical to the creation of counter cultural formations as** they rely upon the exposé of the artificiality of late capitalism's "naturalness" as their political alternative **Disabled bodies, as definitively multiple forms of embodiment that cannot be universalized even within "condition" groups, rely for their insurrectional force on the non-transcendental nature of their difference**.

#### The aff on it’s own fails, their sole focus on material oppression ignores the psychological and social violence disabled people face in the social which implicates their process of political organizing – proves disabled people always get blamed for fracturing the movement

Loja 12

British disability studies, developed in the 1980s, was heavily influenced by historical materialism social oppression theory’ developed using a Marxist and materialist interpretation the British structuralist social model has been criticised by academics, who question the focus on socio-structural determinants the structuralist model conceptualizes **normalization** ordinary citizenship is the main goal as it focuses on the struggle for the same participation in the same ideal and normal state as ‘the non-disabled’ already are enjoying. By considering disabled people as a homogeneous group the structuralist model fails to engage adequately with the complex intersections of other social identities and disability Even though material oppression is an important factor in disabled people’s lives, it is not the only one. Many face oppression of a socio-cultural, communicative and discursive order disablement is often felt in the relational dynamics between non/disabled people extra-material factors should be taken into account the structuralist model places great faith unrealistically, on the removal of barriers.

### Case

#### Now do not let them weigh case – 5 answers –

#### [1] Perm solves – comparative worlds can be true in OTHER instances but if we prove their rhetoric is invested in ableist communicative manners you should bracket out substance.

#### [2] Link turns and de-links DEFINITELY solve because you can gain offense against the K off the link debate or you can de-link and collapse to the aff leaving the K with a floating alternative

#### [3] Dialogue turn – there’s infinite consequences based upon plan as a cause can have endless effects, their will to set neg ground based on hypotheticals is an attempt at negotiation the least change since it centers stasis upon WHAT debate is rather than should be – disabled liberation is a continuous project – the name of good intentions cements abled complacency.

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable.

Kaletsky ’11

cap has adapted successfully to shocks upheavals in tech and economics The self-correcting mechanisms stems from the principle of competition which drives politics and markets. market forces generally reward wealth toward material demands competition directs political institutions toward solving problems

#### Transition wars cause extinction

Harris 03.

capitalist class could not be expected to relinquish the state and force No capitalist society has liquidated and it is utopian to think any will nothing short of revolution would do in a full-fledged war

#### 4] Cap is inevitable – the alt fails

Wilson 2k

No one knows what it means to overthrow cap it isn't going to happen Reforming American cap is a fundamental attack on ideology of "free market" cap Progressive reforms taken seriously, are revolutionary these reforms have not been carried enough because the revolutionary left has failed to support progressives’ reformist agenda only leftist revolution will come from accumulation of progressive policies

**5] Cap key to the environment – assumes any possible neg warrant.**

**Bilgili, Koçak, & Bulut 16**

**economic growth will affect environment positively along with continuation of growth**., **as national production grows the structure of economy changes**, **the share of less polluting economic activities increases gradually**.. **Since a high-income economy can allocate more resources for research and development expenditures, the new technological processes will emerge**., **the country will replace old and dirty techwith new and clean tech** **and environmental quality will deepen** **As income level and life standards rise in conjunction with economic growth, the societies’ demand for clean environment advances**., **societies make often pressure on policy makers to protect the environment through new regulations**.

#### 6] Solves war – capitalism peace theory

Harrison 11

**these beliefs are mistaken**. Countries that are richer **such as America do not tend to start more conflicts**, **since capitalism and democracy are highly correlated** **peace might be products of** **capitalist institutions** **Countries that share this attribute of** **capitalism above a certain level,** **do not fight each other** economic liberalization is a more powerful predictor of bilateral peace than democratization

#### Solves poverty

neo-liberal growth “trickles down” to marginalised populations closing the gap between affluent and marginalised populations “(liberalism) works Ask the hundreds of millions of Chinese, Indians and Vietnamese who liberalisation lifted out of poverty.” like it or not, neo-lib is here to stay. , the system has become hegemonic and deeply entrenched its ideals are how things are