# No Inherency

### Current programs solve

#### The New Freedom program expanded on the Americans with Disabilities Act

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Wendy, Jana, April 2010, Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,”<http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, Accessed 6-30-12, p.5, CAS)

New Freedom Established in 2005, the New Freedom program is the latest of the FTA’s three specialized transportation programs. The program’s goals include reducing barriers to transportation services and expanding mobility for persons with disabilities, including access to employment. The 1990 ADA aimed to fully integrate persons with disabilities into society, including public transportation, but Congress determined that additional efforts were necessary. Thus, New Freedom funding must be used for transportation purposes that go “beyond the ADA”; for example, the expansion of ADA paratransit service beyond the required three-quarter-mile corridors around fixed routes.

#### The Federal Transit Administration created a coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Wendy, Jana, April 2010, Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,”<http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, Accessed 6-30-12, p.6, CAS)

The FTA’s new requirements for coordinated planning for its three specialized transportation funding programs and a new emphasis on mobility management show significant promise for improving specialized transportation. Coordinated Planning Requirements Formally Connect FTA’s Three Specialized Programs Beginning in 2007, the FTA required the development of a coordinated public transit–human services transportation plan from which all projects funded by Section 5310, JARC, and New Freedom must be derived. This is not a plan for coordination but rather a plan created using a coordinated process. This process is designed to bring together a wide range of providers and agencies that operate and fund specialized transportation, as well as persons who use the three FTA programs. The process must address “opportunities to improve efficiencies in service delivery.” The resulting plan may include a specific strategy or strategies to improve coordination among specialized transportation providers, but that is not a requirement. This new mandate for coordinated planning follows various federal government efforts over the past several decades to encourage the coordination of specialized transportation. However, the mandate does not extend to non-DOT transportation programs, such as Medicaid transportation. Although it is referred to as a “local plan,” the newly required coordinated public transit–human services transportation plan may be developed at the local, regional, or statewide level. The lead planning agency is decided locally; it does not have to be the state or the particular agency that is the designated recipient of FTA funds. It can be the MPO (the regional planning entity), a county or city, the local public transportation provider, or the state. While flexible on the lead planning entity and the planning process itself, the FTA is quite prescriptive regarding the actual plan and the participants. The participants should include the area’s transportation planning agencies, public and private transportation providers, passengers and advocates, human service agencies, and others, such as emergency management agencies, faithbased organizations, and school districts. It is important that representatives of the target populations—older adults, persons with disabilities, and people with low incomes—be at the table. Among the required elements of the coordinated plan are strategies, services, and projects to meet the identified transportation needs; these must be prioritized for funding and implementation. The plan must be adopted through a locally determined process.

### No Need to Increase Infrastructure

#### Current specialized transportation services are just inefficient

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Wendy, Jana, April 2010, Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,”<http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, Accessed 6-30-12, p.3, CAS)

Transportation observers have noted that the vast array of specialized transportation services creates “a complex web of providers and services:” Specifically, they note that many transportation providers duplicate services and expenditures; vehicles and related resources are often underutilized; service quality and safety vary significantly from program to program; and information is lacking about available services, particularly for persons who need transportation.

# No Solvency

## Universal Design

### No Solvency – Assimilation

#### Plan is just assimilation, turns their ableism advantage

Campbell, Griffith Law School Faculty, 9

(Fiona Kumari, Griffith University Australia, “Disability Advocacy & Ableism: Towards a re-discovery of the disability Imagination”, Keynote Address, 2nd Strengthening Advocacy Conference, Nov 17-18, <http://griffith.academia.edu/FionaKumariCampbell/Papers/118483/Disability_Advocacy_and_Ableism_Towards_a_re-discovery_of_the_disability_Imagination>, accessed 7/6/12 sl)

I am mindful of the time, so want to move onto my final topic, that of imagination – creating a positive imagination about disability, developing a Crip Horizon . Since 1981, the International Year of Disabled Persons, legal & policy discourses of disability have gravitated towards an equality as sameness model declaring that disabled people should be integrated into mainstream society and be able to claim the entitlements of citizenship. What has become clear is that the project of inclusion has become conditional. The working model of inclusion is really only successful to the extent that people with disabilities are able to ‘opt in’, or be assimilated(normalized). A drive towards self-independence may mean that it is not possible for some disabled people to be truly ‘free’ within the confines of liberal society. These people may lose person status because they fail to meet certain criterion. The conditions of disability acceptability are about the capacity of disabled people to mimic abledness, be seen to be productive and accept the reality of the provisionality of their impairment until an obliterating remedy comes along.

We might want to imagine how life might be different if instead of trying to change our unacceptability that we instead embrace it – to explore the richness of the disability experience whilst at the same time fighting for the entitlements of citizenship but on a new basis – not sameness but recognition ,recognition of our difference. In the same way that some of our indigenous brothers and sisters have said ‘no’ to assimilation and ‘yes’ to self-determination and difference.

### No Solvency – Multiple Funding Streams

#### Multiple funding programs stifle effectiveness

Ellis Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit,

Lynott Senior Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute, and Fox-Grage Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute 10

(Elizabeth Ellis, Jana Lynott, and Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP Public Policy Institute Insight on the Issues 39, April 2010 “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, pg. 15, accessed 6-30-12 BC)

The complexity of multiple funding programs spills down to the local operator level as well and hampers coordination efforts. Many local transit operators, particularly in small urban and rural areas, receive funding from more than one of the FTA grant programs and find it almost mandatory to run separate services just to satisfy the rules and reporting requirements of the separate grants. As a result, they might have one route in their system funded through JARC, another service that “goes beyond the ADA” funded with New Freedom dollars, and a third senior shuttle operated with a Section 5310-funded vehicle to ensure that the vehicle is used primarily for 5310 purposes. To meet the reporting requirements of the various grant programs, different data are collected and reported for each of these routes and services.

### No Solvency – Funding Complexity

#### Funding mechanisms are too complex – takes out solvency

Ellis, paratransit and transit planning specialist, 10

(Elizabeth Ellis is currently serving as Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit. Jana Lynottis Strategic Policy Advisor for Transportation & Livable Communities at AARP's Public Policy Institute. Wendy Fox-Grage is a Strategic Policy Advisor for the AARP Public Policy Institute. April 2010, Association of American Retired Persons, "Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation," p. 3-4, assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Observers have noted that the vast array of specialized transportation services creates “a complex web of providers and services:”11 Specifically, they note that

 many transportation providers duplicate services and expenditures;

 vehicles and related resources are often underutilized;

 service quality and safety vary significantly from program to program; and

 information is lacking about available services, particularly for persons who need transportation.12

Since the 1970s, transportation experts have recognized the problems created by this complex web, and the federal and many state governments have attempted to coordinate services to improve transportation for target population groups.

Coordination is difficult for various reasons, but particularly because federal agency funds often flow down to the state and local levels encumbered with each program’s specific rules and regulations. This “silo funding” constrains the ability of the programs to work together, even if the agencies serve the same people or those with similar or even identical transportation needs.

#### Funding mechanisms don’t fairly distribute resources

Ellis, paratransit and transit planning specialist, 10

(Elizabeth Ellis is currently serving as Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit. Jana Lynottis Strategic Policy Advisor for Transportation & Livable Communities at AARP's Public Policy Institute. Wendy Fox-Grage is a Strategic Policy Advisor for the AARP Public Policy Institute. April 2010, Association of American Retired Persons, "Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation," p. 14, assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Differences among states—and certainly among large urban, small urban, and rural areas—make it difficult to design a one-size-fits-all program structure. The ability to use funds flexibly varies across the three FTA programs. The JARC and New Freedom programs are structured so that funding is distributed among large urban, small urban, and rural areas by a 60-20-20 percent split. This distribution limits states’ ability to target funding to areas they determine are most in need. Section 5310 funding, on the other hand, is provided directly to the states, giving them freedom to allocate resources as they determine best for their individual state. Because of minor differences in the statutory authority of the two programs, the FTA does allow limited transfer of funds among population categories for the JARC program28 but not for New Freedom.

## Ablenormativity

### Public policy analysis key to solvency

#### As long as ableism is separated from public policy analysis, there’s no chance of full solvency

Watson, The Pew State Policy Initiatives Senior Officer, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, Policy Studies Journal, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” vol. 21(4), Chadwyk Periodicals Archive Online, p. 722, bs)

Because of this separation between people knowledgeable about disability issues and those knowledgeable about public policy theory, the field of public policy has missed the incredibly rich and varied lessons that decisions in disability policy can teach. And the field of disability policy has missed the benefit of experiences learned in other programs. The quandaries faced by people designing disability programs or mobilizing the disability constituency are not unique. For example, the voucher concept so controversial in education is also being considered for the publicly-funded rehabilitation system. While the underlying rationale is the same—the public system does not meet everyone's needs and there is curiosity about whether a private, market-driven system would produce better results—other circumstances put a different slant on the debate. As another example, the debate over whether immigrant children should be taught only in English is in some ways similar to the debate over whether deaf children should be taught sign language, oral speech, or some combination of the two. In both situations, a key question is whether the minority population should be forced to learn the language of the majority, or whether the majority should be expected to accommodate the needs of the minority. Other examples explored in this two-part symposium include the following: Jean Campbell (in the second part) explores the unintended consequences of public policy. In this case, her subject is people with mental illnesses under the ADA, but the lessons could apply to a variety of situations. Jean Flatley McGuire (in the second pan) explores an issue familiar to many involved in social movement politics: holding together a diverse coalition in order to pass controversial legislation. In an article that challenges conventional wisdom on media and public policy, Joseph Shapiro (in the second part) talks about the disability movement's disdain for media coverage as a tool for achieving their goals. Interestingly, this strategy bears some similarity to the new media strategy demonstrated in the 1992 presidential election. Issues of resource allocation and consumer control all have permeated past programs, particularly in the welfare system. Margaret Nosek and Carol How land's paper in this part illustrates this question for the personal assistance services program. All the issues relevant to other minority populations in the United States are relevant for people with disabilities; for example, the rise and progress of the civil rights movement. Recognizing the problems faced by older civil rights movements and applicable public programs can help the disability movement avoid them. My paper in this pan explores the similarities between the women's movement and the disability movement and examines how they illustrate the new policymaking philosophy of the Clinton administration. As Frank Bowe points out in this pan, telecommunications policy for people with disabilities illustrates the constant question in public policy of user fees—should a party using a service bear the extra cost, or should it be distributed among a larger group? The next step in the evolution of disability policy must be a conscious cross-fertilization among disability scholars and public policy experts; to that end, we include wonderfully specific papers by Gerben DeJong and Daniel M Fox (both in the second part) on building this capacity. This cursory description illustrates the vast potential of this field to inform other public policy debates, and vice-versa. It is our hope that the papers in this symposium will be used not only in research and curriculum on disability policy, but also in research and pedagogy that explore the larger issues in the public policy discipline.

# AT: Ableism Advantage

### Aff Can’t Solve Ableism

#### The social model of “disability” and persons with disadvantages have no political implications

Samaha, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, 7

(Adam M. “What is the Social Model of Disability?” The University of Chicago Law Review, Volume: 74, No. 4, Fall 2007, P. 2, LPS)

A social model of disability relates a person's disadvantage to the combination of personal traits and social setting. The model appears to have had a profound impact on academics, politics, and law since the 1970s. Scholars have debated the model's force but its limitations are more severe than have been recognized. This Article claims that the model, like all social construction accounts, has essentially no policy implications. Its impact depends on normative commitments developed by some other logic, such as membership in the disability rights movement or adherence to versions of libertarian, utilitarian, or egalitarian theory that are triggered by the model's causation story. At the same time, a normative framework within which the social model is relevant may suggest not only policy goals but an institutional design. These points are illustrated by recent controversies involving genetic screening, cochlear implants, and sign language communities. Contrary to impressions left in the law literature, the social model has nothing to say about the proper response to such developments, although the model might have a mediated influence on our sense of the best decisionmakers.

#### There is no connection between the social model of “disability” and social change

Samaha, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, 7

(Adam M. “What is the Social Model of Disability?” The University of Chicago Law Review, Volume: 74, No. 4, Fall 2007, P. 23 LPS).

The simplicity of the social model helps account for its jarring effect on any conventional wisdom that portrays disability as a personal tragedy. Indeed the model has been credited with inspiring change in many forms. Parts of the Americans with Disabilities Act3 (ADA) in dicate that social settings must be revised to make individual traits less disabling. Reasonable accommodation for employees is an example,4 as is the qualified duty to make certain places accessible to mobility impaired people.5 A federal district court recently used similar principles to hold that U.S. paper currency violates the Rehabilitation Act.6 The complaint is that our denominations, unlike many foreign bills which vary in size and texture, are not readily distinguishable to blind people.7 In the same basic spirit, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in December 2006. The Convention stresses the "importance of accessibility to the physical, social, economic and cultural environment ... in enabling persons with disabilities to fully enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms."8 Academics have indicated that the social model is a normative basis for such measures.9 Despite the apparent connection between the social model and social change, there just is no necessary relationship there. That is the central claim of this Article. Although the social model is one way to define disability and a field of inquiry, it is not a disability policy. It is unclear whether plaintiffs will settle for expedited development of new portable electronic bill-reading devices. 8

### Turn – Recreates Oppressive Binaries

#### Their analysis of ableism only recreates oppressive binaries, turns the case

Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University UK, 2000

(Jill C., Disability & Society, Vol. IS, No. I, “Researching Disability Politics, Or, Some Problems with the Social Model in Practice”, Proquest, p. 64-65)

In academic texts, the social model begins with an appreciation of the individual and collective experiences of disabled people (e.g. Swain a al, 1993). It goes on to elaborate the nature of a disabling society in terms of the physical environment, the political economy, the welfare state and sedimented stereotypes (e.g. Barnes et ah, 1999). Finally, it endorses a critical or emancipatory paradigm of research (e.g. Barnes & Mercer 1997a). This analysis lends itself to a recognition of the array of diverse experiences of disabling barriers; a realistic appraisal of the need for broader political coalitions to combat entrenched structural inequalities and cultural oppressions; and an openness about the potential for non-disabled people to contribute to critical theory and research. In activist discourses, the emphasis is upon the fact that it is non-disabled people who have engineered the physical environment, dominated the political economy, managed welfare services, controlled research agendas, recycled pejorative labels and images, and translated these into eugenics policies. This analysis lends itself to a dichotomy between non-disabled and disabled people which becomes coterminous with the dichotomy between oppressors and oppressed; and this tightens the boundaries around the disabled identity, the disabled people's movement and disability research. Whilst this hermeneutic closure is designed to ward off incursions and, therefore, oppressions from non-disabled people, it may also have some unfortunate consequences.

I would like to illustrate these consequences by drawing upon a research project involving the four self-organised groups (SOGs) for women, black people, disabled members, and lesbian and gay members in UNISON (see Humphrey, 1998, 1999). Material drawn directly from conversations and observations in the disabled members' group is supplemented by interview transcripts with members of the lesbian and gay group, my own personal experiences of and reflections upon disability and discrimination, and recent developments in various social movements and critical research texts. The rest of the article depicts three problematic consequences of the social model in practice and redirects them back to the social model as critical questions which need to be addressed by its proponents. First, there are questions of disability identity where a kind of 'purism' has been cultivated from the inside of the disability community. Here, it can be demonstrated that some people with certain types of impairments have not been welcomed into the disabled members1 group in UNISON, which means that the disability community is not yet inclusive, and that its membership has been skewed in a particular direction. Second, there are questions of disability politics where a kind of 'separatism' has been instituted. Whilst the UNISON constitution allows for separatism to be supplemented by both coalitions and transformations, these have been slow to materialise in practice, and the dearth of such checks and balances in the wider disabled peoples\* movement implies that the danger of developing a specific kind of disability ghetto is more acute. Third, there are questions of disability research where a kind of 'provisional-ism1 is suspended over the role of researchers. The most obvious dilemmas arise for the non-disabled researcher as would-be ally, but it is becoming clear that disabled academics can also be placed in a dilemmatic position, and it is doubtful whether any researcher can practise their craft to their own standards of excellence when operating under the provisos placed upon them by political campaigners.

#### Aff doesn’t create anything politically or theoretically productive

Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University UK, 2000

(Jill C., Disability & Society, Vol. IS, No. I, “Researching Disability Politics, Or, Some Problems with the Social Model in Practice”, Proquest, p. 70-71)

The social model germinated from within the womb of the disability movement and has been the source of the movement’s consolidation and legitimation. If the model is predicated upon the upon the self-organisation of disabled people in combating this disabling society; since society has been arranged by and for non-disabled people, they are liable to be consigned to the enemy camp. Whilst such an over-simplified schema has been stamped upon the psyches of activists, rather than the texts of academics, it does create tensions in the writings of some academic-activists. No doubt some follow Tom Shakespeare's (1993, 1996a) valiant attempts to bury the disabled/non-disabled and oppressed/oppressor dualisms by reminding us of the multi-faceted oppression matrix. No doubt others follow Fran Branfield's (1998, 1999) attempts to resurrect such dualisms for the sake of separatism, which co-exists uneasily with an acknowledgement of complexity. Initially, she places non-disabled people in the role of oppressors—'[Tjheir experience, their history, their culture is our oppression ... Our oppression is their responsibility' (Branfield, 1998, p. 144). As such they must be outsiders—1 "Non-disabled" people are not where we are and can never be. This is the political impossibility of their relation to the disability movement' (Branfield, 1998, p. 143). Even if they are supporters, this support must not overspill into involvement and will not suffice to allay suspicions—\*[F)or non disabled people, the recognition of disabilism and the will to fight it, docs not exempt them from participating in and perpetuating disablist practices' (Branfield, 1999, p. 400). Their role as 'allies' is metaphorically bracketed by the use of quotation marks.

Non-disabled people who adhere to the tenets of the model and the movement roam around in a kind of 'No (Wo) Man's Land', and insert an aporetic space into disability theory. Drake (1997) has usefully formulated some rules of engagement ranging from positive injunctions to supply resources to disabled peoples' groups as and when requested, and without strings attached to negative prohibitions against speaking on behalf of disabled people and coveting positions of power in the movement. Nevertheless, this does not resolve various persona!, practical and political problems. First, the dualism between disabled and non-disabled people remains intact in a way which can militate against a recognition that many currently non-disabled people have been and/or will become disabled in their lifetimes, that many carers and some professional service-providers are also disabled people, and that the disability identity may have been constructed in a way which limits its inclusiveness. Second, there is no practical-political space that encourages supporters to organise themselves so that disabled people can call upon them if required for mass protests. For example, the women's movement has spawned pro-feminist men's movements which work towards the transformation of men, as well as marching in support of women's rights (see Messner, 1997), and the lesbian and gay movement has spawned organisations of 'parents and friends of lesbians and gays' in the US, which carry gay-affirmative messages into the heterosexual society (see Griffin el ai, 1986). Third, there is no theoretical-political space in which to differentiate actual and potential enemies and allies. For example, in gender studies we are now- familiar with distinctions between powerful and subordinated men, hegemonic and despised masculinities, outright misogynists and quasi-reconstructed men, potential allies and actual pro-feminist campaigners, etc. (cf. Segal, 1990; Broad & Kaufmann, 1994).

### Compassion Turn

#### **Accepting Difference does the exact opposite**

Roberts, Baylor University, Masters thesis in Communication, 7

(Jeff, *The Rhetorical Structure of Disability: Bridging the Gap Between What is ‘Spoken’ and What is ‘Said’ with Song - Over-Signifying with Personhood Against the Backdrop of Disease-Centric Discourse,* [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff\_Roberts\_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx07R2Oqb2EBg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff_Roberts_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx) , Pg. 6-7, FFF)

Just as disease-centric discourse creates these attitudes, imageries and actions rooted in notions of viral difference and hatred, it seems that any action towards people with disabilities conveyed in disease-centric discourse is premised on a notion of viral difference. Viral difference manifests itself not only in the actions and attitudes stemming from disease-centric discourse, but also in the rhetorical structure of diseasecentric discourse itself and its general deployment. Actions which place a primacy on difference and its domestication in the acts of “acceptance of difference” are often justified as acts of “compassion,” yet acts premised on such notions can never truly overcome difference, nor can they recognize and appreciate the alterity of the other necessary for ethical encounters. Deployment of disease-centric discourse represents and independent rhetorical act which, in the words of Emmanuel Levinas, “thematizes” disability as difference allowing difference to obscure alterity and unique otherness by “standing in” for the individual subject in all encounters. In other words, difference in terms of disability subsumes the entirety of the person by reducing the individual to a mere condition of difference, as Lois Shepherd (2006) explains:

On the other hand, however, focusing on the condition carries the risk of what Levinas calls "thematization." If the condition stands in for the person in evoking the right ethical response, i.e., compassion, then the condition may stand in for the person in other respects as well. In other words, the condition is the person, and thus we need to know nothing more about the person than the existence of the condition . . .

A compassionate response that focuses on the condition of a person in a way that permits us to see her in terms of a theme can result in unfair prejudice and discrimination. Even when less noxious results follow, such a response inappropriately shortcuts the more intense inquiry that is required to determine the needs and desires of that individual and can prevent the ethical response that is due . . .

. . . A compassionate response that thematizes a person as disabled can cause an underestimation of what that person can achieve and can thereby cut off opportunities for success, expression, respect, and self-worth. It can also result in alienation of people with disabilities as others cannot see beyond the apparent physical condition. The emphasis that advocates for people with disabilities place on language captures this concern that the focus of attention is properly placed on the person rather than the condition; advocates encourage the use of terms such as "person with a disability" rather than "the disabled person" so that the person comes first. (para.8.)

#### B. **Acceptance of difference dooms the struggle for equality**

Roberts, Baylor University, Masters thesis in Communication, 7

(Jeff, *The Rhetorical Structure of Disability: Bridging the Gap Between What is ‘Spoken’ and What is ‘Said’ with Song - Over-Signifying with Personhood Against the Backdrop of Disease-Centric Discourse,* [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff\_Roberts\_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx07R2Oqb2EBg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff_Roberts_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx) , Pg.7-8, FFF)

Founding action towards people with disabilities upon notions of difference, placing a primacy on difference particularly in the context of incorporation, domestication, and acceptance of such difference, dooms the struggle for equality to failure. “Over recent centuries all forms of violent otherness have been incorporated, willingly or under threat of force, into a discourse of difference which simultaneously implies inclusion and exclusion, recognition and discrimination (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” Once the Native American “savage” became “accepted” under U.S. law as “human,” or rather a different type of human, it was not long until viral hatred forced new boundaries of difference to be erected, and segregation of such difference to be enacted in the form of the reservation. Where the “savage” or “monster” is never understood, or assimilated, remaining radically exotic to the oppressive guise of society, when “accepted” by society on the basis of “difference” viral racism allows only two options for the future: assimilation or extermination (Baudrillard, 1993). Similarly, modern medicine has facilitated society with an understanding of disability, allowing it to accept the “different” or “disabled” person under law as “human,” more specifically a “disabled human” in which is different from “normal” individuals, but none the less similar. “Madness, once its exclusionary status had been revoked, was caught up in the far subtler toils of psychology (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” As soon as society began to understand and consequently attempt to “accept” the “monster” other, the other traded its quality of foreign “monsterness” for qualities of “feebleness,” with the social acceptance of the others difference, the “monster” soon became the “mongoloid.” “Difference” annihilated the subaltern subject by making all that was foreign and radically exotic within easy reach of societal understanding. With a compassion rooted in pity, and fear founded upon difference, society became locked into a mode of interaction with disability, and the individuals’ disability located itself within, which mandated oppression in the spirit of viral hatred.

### AT: Medical Model Bad

#### Traditional medical discourses of disability are useful in raising awareness and recovering from loss

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Given that the history of colonialism (and its post/neocolonial aftermath) is indeed a history of mass disablement, and that the acquisition of disability may be tied into wider patterns of dispossession—the loss of family, home, land, community, employment—there is a pressing need, as we see it, to resist the too-easy censure of narratives that construct disability as loss. We would caution especially against the blanket rejection and/or critique of medical discourse and medicalized terminology, which may be strategically important when campaigning for resources and raising awareness of (neo)colonial abuses. What individuals in such circumstances experience as loss should not be rendered an invalid response by arguments that fail to recognize the wider contexts and material environments in which disablement occurs.

## AT: Life Writing/Narratives

### Life Writing Bad

#### Narratives bad- writing for ones self could replicate structures they seek to destroy

Richards, Qualitative Health Research, 8

**(**Rose, December 2008, “Writing the Othered Self: Autoethnography and the Problem of Objectification in Writing About Illness and Disability,” <http://www.depthpsychology.net/Mythos/AutoethnogDisabilityRichards.pdf>, accessed: 7-13-1, CAS)

Autoethnography can be seen as a form of emancipatory discourse because those being emancipated are representing themselves, instead of being colonized by others and subjected to their agendas or relegated to the role of second-class citizens. However**, in representing themselves, those writing about themselves could replicate the very structures they seek to destroy, reverting to inauthentic identities that others have bequeathed them** (Marks, 1999).

**Writing about oneself presents certain unique problems to the writer**. Who am I writing about when I write about myself? Am I writing about myself here and now, or there and then? Is the me of yesterday the same as the me of today? If not, then I run the risk of objectifying a version of myself all over again.

Often the aim of such writing is to win back some power to a certain group of people, **but it can be seen as distracting attention from the bigger issues** (Marks, 1999, p. 183), and might result in self-subjection, voyeurism, and pathologism. It might reduce the narrator to a generalizable case file example, instead of bringing about change. If it is too individualizing it might create a dualism of individual/culture (Reed- Danahay, 1997). This could lead to the individual being seen out of context and the dynamic of the individual and society being overlooked.

### Representing Others Turn

#### Representing people with disabilities in their aff only reinforces oppression

Smith, Co-Founder Feminists with disabilities for a way forward, 11

(s.e., June 24, This Ain’t Livin’ blog, “The Best Advocacy Is Self-Advocacy: The Dangers Of Speaking For Others” <http://meloukhia.net/2011/06/the_best_advocacy_is_self-advocacy_the_dangers_of_speaking_for_others.html>, accessed 7/13/12)

There is a tendency among some groups of people to label themselves as advocates, or allies, and to use this label as a justification for speaking for others. These people claim to have the best of intentions. They just want to be supportive. To build a better world. To help. But any time you are speaking for someone else, you are silencing that person, because it is your voice being heard, and if you occupy a position of power, that means people are more inclined to listen to you than they are to listen to the voices of the marginalised people you claim to be helping.

I see this come up a lot in disability advocacy, where parents speak for disabled children. In some circles, it is generally accepted that parents are the most important voices and have the most to add to the conversation. Not their children. Not people who share the disabilities their children have. But the parents. And sometimes, the parents ‘advocating’ for disabled children say things that are not very helpful. Things like ‘we need to find a cure for autism.’ Sometimes parents are advocating eugenics and other hateful things, and we are placed behind glass to stare at, but we are not allowed to speak.

There is a certain amount of patronising involved in speaking for someone instead of allowing that person to self advocate. Especially when that person has not asked for your representation or assistance. I see this when I’m talking to someone with a cognitive impairment and someone jumps in and tries to finish her sentences instead of allowing her to communicate directly with me. I see this when someone asks me a direct question and another person answers it. I see this when ‘allies’ make pompous pronouncements ‘on behalf of the marginalised people’ and get angry when we say ‘we didn’t ask you to do that.’

When you speak for someone else, you take that person’s voice away and you dilute that person’s power. When a person who may have put considerable time and energy into communicating has that taken away, the feeling there is not ‘ah, I am so glad someone was there to help me.’ It is bitterness. Anger. Resentment. It is a reminder that certain modes of communication are preferred over others.

It is a reminder that people would rather hear things presented nicely, in an even, friendly tone. It is a reminder that, whenever possible, people will turn to ‘allies’ over actual marginalised people. I see nondisabled people speaking for people with disabilities all the time instead of centring the voices of people with disabilities. Instead of saying ‘well, I am not disabled, but here is someone who is, who has discussed this very issue.’ Instead of saying ‘why don’t you search for people who have that disability handling that topic, instead of appealing to me for information?’ Instead of saying, simply, ‘I am not qualified to address that, but here is some further reading that may lead you to an answer.’

People who position themselves as authorities and use that position to speak for others are not exactly breaking down oppressive systems. They are reinforcing them. They are making it that much harder for us to self advocate. I am painfully aware that there are nondisabled people who talk about disability much more nicely than I do; that some of those very same people even water down my words and ideas and repackage them, without credit, and receive accolades for doing so from ‘allies’ who want to say that they care about disability, but do not want to engage with actual disabled people.

### Post Colonality Turn

#### 1ac narratives all theorize disability from a US-centric perspective

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

The majority of disability scholarship has emerged from traditions that emphasize local aspects of social application. In Europe and the U.K. especially, such work has stressed the processes of law and governance, with a resulting focus on such issues as community-based social services. In the U.S., where a discourse- and humanities-based model has played a greater part in the development of Disability Studies, it has nevertheless been the case that American examples have predominated. In both instances, there has been an understanding that such models may well have application in non-Euro-American contexts (claims for the social model, for example, assert that it can adapt to the local variants of other cultures), but there has been a singular lack of specificity as to the detail of such applications, especially as they might take into account the nature of cultures shaped by colonization and its consequences. It is this question of applicability that concerns us in this special issue. In aiming to develop strategies for postcolonial disability analysis, we aspire toward future scholarship in which the nuanced methods we find in much Euro-American-focused disability criticism are replicated in work on global disability.

#### Westernized interpretations of Disability fail turns case – we must start from a postcolonial kritik of disability analysis

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Instead of imposing a hegemonic model of disability, then, and assuming that disability will function in comparable ways across disparate cultural texts and contexts, contemporary materialist postcolonial criticism gives us the tools to take particular, situated experiences as the starting point for disability analysis, enabling acts of criticism emerging from and informed by (rather than applied to) 'cultural locatedness' in the first instance. Christian Flaugh's article in this issue, for example, traces disability's role within the writings of Negritude, which necessarily involves attending to the details of linguistic and cultural difference inherent in the francophone Caribbean. In endorsing this method we echo the anthropologists Benedicte Ingstad and Susan Reynolds Whyte who, in Disability in Local and Global Worlds ([2007](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html" \l "b29), reviewed in this issue), seek to orientate disability research "in the direction of greater differentiation and specificity" (5) instead of the pursuit of overarching disability models. "We are interested in people's own experiences of what is disabling in their world rather than in some universal definition" (11), they write—a sentiment that resonates with the increasing emphasis on lived experience in the humanities-based scholarship of Siebers and Snyder and Mitchell. A focus on situated experience, then, forms the impetus of the articles in this special issue, which contribute to the globalization of Disability Studies precisely through their understandings of specific localities.

### Postcoloniality Ext.

#### Disability must be culturally defined - westernized interpretations limit understanding

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

A vital step toward such analysis is the recognition that key Disability Studies concepts, including minority identity, normalcy, and the relationship between impairment and disability, are contingent on cultural difference and may be challenged by situated critical reading practices. In a variety of postcolonial contexts, culturally specific beliefs about embodiment, ontology, communal identity and belonging continue to shape disability experiences. For example, [End Page 228] many indigenous communities do not identify with individualist models of impairment; in some American Indian cultures, for instance, "[t]he determination of 'normalcy' in health or wellness is dependent on whether or not the individual is in balance with all her relations" (Lovern), including a balance with the natural world. For Maori in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the individuality of impairment is similarly downplayed; "health is viewed as an interrelated phenomenon rather than an intra-personal one," meaning that "Maori are more likely to link good or bad health with interpersonal and inter-generational concerns" ([Durie, 71, 2](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html" \l "b7)). The presence of indigenous or local 'cultural models' of health and disability demonstrates that drawing generalized conclusions about the ways in which postcolonial cultures experience disability cannot account for either the ontological or the material conditions which are formative in constructing disabled lives.

#### Disability studies need to diversify from the dominant postcolonial narrative

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Sinha's deliberately provocative construction of his protagonist using animalistic analogies points to another challenge generated by postcolonial disability writing: the need to diversify the terms of our formal analysis. The exposure, problematization, dismantling and deconstruction of oppressive representational practices—and metaphor in particular—remains an incredibly powerful tool within humanities-based disability research, but in thinking about metaphor, we agree with Amy Vidali's suggestions that criticism should "[refrain] from policing metaphor" and instead "[invite] creative and historic reinterpretations" (34) of figurative language. This process surely has to include the varying cultural inflections that attach meaning and resonance to impairment, as is evident in Rachel Gorman and Onyinyechukwu Udegbe's discussion of (neo) colonial violence in recent African fiction in their article here.

While disability is frequently used, problematically, as a metaphor for the 'damaged' or abject postcolonial body politic, there are many semantic permutations to disability representation. Disability metaphors may be meaningful not just as "crutch[es]" ([Mitchell and Snyder, 49](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html" \l "b12)) in the telling of some 'other' tale of postcolonial experience, but as part of foundational cultural and historical disability narratives; the depiction of scars in narrative accounts of slavery is [End Page 233] just one conspicuous example of this. The situated reading practices we are proposing aim to highlight how particular disability experiences can shape cultural histories and are written into artistic and representational practices. Centrally, this involves consideration of what analogies might signify to the (disabled/postcolonial) community they represent and how they function within a particular literary form and cultural logic, rather than the wholesale dismissal of metaphor as damaging, ableist or stigmatizing. Ralph Savarese's identification of 'postcolonial neurology' in his article here is provocative evidence of how creative cross-fertilizations between disability and postcolonial metaphors can service the most radical disability agendas. The idea of the 'postcolonial brain', with its challenge to the assumptions that come with the terms postcolonialism or neurology, is, we feel, exactly the kind of productive criticism that can come when postcolonial and disability thinking are allowed to meet with an openness toward their possible interactions.

It is this sense of the radical and possible that draws us back to Edward Said and ideas of democracy and 'participatory citizenship'. For Said, near the end of his own life and still pursuing the need for a radical engagement with culture, participation meant both the production of criticism and the possibility of democratic agency. "Critique," he wrote, "is always restlessly self-clarifying in search of freedom, enlightenment and more agency, and certainly not their opposites." Working within such terms, he observed, "means situating critique . . . as a form of democratic freedom and as a continuous practice of questioning and accumulating knowledge" (Humanism and Democratic Criticism, 73, 74). Such statements, we feel, help us to understand that the knowledge we seek to bring to bear on thinking about postcolonial disability requires the scrutiny of such "continuous questioning" if it is to be of benefit. And they also remind us that, in the widest possible sense, 'participation' allows for the formation of a full and inclusive idea of citizenship, one radical and yet everyday in its appreciation of the real value of disabled lives.

# Counterplans

## Ableism Adv CPs

### ADA Compliance CP

#### Reinstatement of Federal Transit Administration assessments of compliance is necessary

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.3, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

Lack of enforcement is one of the biggest obstacles to realizing the goals of the ADA. There are no “ADA police,” so transit operators can often shirk responsibilities without repercussions. ADA enforcement is complaint-driven, which is burdensome for people with disabilities, especially in remote rural communities. In 1998, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) began conducting assessments in cities where the FTA had concerns about ADA compliance. These compliance assessments led to positive results. In a number of cities where assessments occurred, people with disabilities reported significant service improvements. However, in recent years the FTA has stopped doing assessments. To ensure vigorous oversight and compliance with ADA transportation requirements, the FTA must reinstate its compliance assessments.

#### Accessible transportation increases the mobility of persons with disabilities, but more investment in assessment needed

Leary, Easter Seals Office of Public Affairs Senior Director, and Bernardy, ENDependence Center of Northern Virginia Travel Trainer, 10

(Mary and Robyn, 2010, Easter Seals Project ACTION, “Evaluating Access: An Instrument to Measure Accessible Transportation,” <http://www.transed2010.hk/front/upload/20100615CR-xbkvwQfL3G.pdf>, p. 1, accessed 7/3/2012, bs)

Public transportation ridership has grown tremendously in the United States in the past 15 years, and millions of public transportation trips are taken each weekday. Increasing the accessibility of transportation choices will increase the number of people who will be able to maintain their mobility, with or without the ownership or ability to drive a car. Not only will accessible transportation options increase the independence of people with disabilities and older adults, but the additional passenger trips will also contribute to the sustainability of transportation providers. Yet, today, there is no agreed upon set of accessibility indicators or standardized national/international survey instrument that measures accessibility. A number of researchers have tried to develop such an instrument, but to date, more work is needed. This project sought to develop and test an accessibility survey instrument over a two year period. Findings suggest assessing accessibility is possible and that much can be learned about a community. However, it is a complex topic requiring specific training across myriad transportation modes and accessibility characteristics both within modes and in the infrastructure that surrounds various types of transportation services. Results of this pilot project point to the need for such an instrument, but just as importantly, to train on the use of such a tool and on how to communicate the results in order to accomplish positive change in furthering accessibility in a particular country or community.

### Fund Demonstration Grants CP

#### Increased research and grants reinvigorate programs for people of limited mobility

Ellis Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit,

Lynott Senior Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute, and Fox-Grage Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute 10

(Elizabeth Ellis, Jana Lynott, and Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP Public Policy Institute Insight on the Issues 39, April 2010 “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, pg. 8-9, accessed 6-30-12 BC)

Increased federal funding for improved and meaningful data tracking and dissemination is needed for more robust assessment of specialized services beyond the standard counts of passengers and trips. Enhanced data collection should investigate and measure increased specialized transportation as it relates to broad societal objectives such as improving health outcomes and allowing older adults to remain in their homes and live independently.

Funding for service demonstration grants would encourage innovation in specialized transportation. These grants could be structured similarly to the federal government’s Service Methods and Demonstration grants in the 1970s. The grants would help FTA program subrecipients experiment with pilot services to meet local needs, including creative services under the broad definition of mobility management. Additional funding for research and technical assistance should not mean reductions in funds allocated to service provision.

#### Disadvantaged population groups should be more effectively engaged in planning

Ellis Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit,

Lynott Senior Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute, and Fox-Grage Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute 10

(Elizabeth Ellis, Jana Lynott, and Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP Public Policy Institute Insight on the Issues 39, April 2010 “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, pg. 9, accessed 6-30-12 BC)

Low-income persons and veterans have not been well represented in the coordinated planning process. FTA guidance specifies that representatives of the targeted populations (older adults, persons with disabilities, and people with low incomes) should be invited to participate in the planning process. The guidance spells out notification and outreach efforts to invite these groups and stakeholders to the planning table. Lead planning agencies should increase their efforts to include stakeholders representing low-income persons, veterans, and other underrepresented groups in their local planning process.

### Central Clearing House CP

#### A central clearing house should be created for specialized transportation services

AARP, Public Policy Institute, 10

(AARP, 4/2010, Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 14, Accessed: 6/30/12, MLF)

A central clearinghouse should be created to store comprehensive, smarter data on the specialized transportation programs, including program outcomes and results. Such a central, public repository of data and narratives would facilitate communication about specialized transportation program investments.

## Privates CP

### Solves Ableism

#### Solves better – need to move beyond public-sector only

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1654 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

There are no easy answers nor programmatic or prescriptive resolutions to these questions and it is only through the development of a `politics of mobility' that such questions can come to the fore as the basis for developing new perspectives and political programmes in relation to disabled people's movement and mobility. This, though, is a long way from realisation. Disabled people lack rudimentary levels of participation and involvement in civil society and a precondition for transforming their mobility and movement is, I would argue, increases in opportunities for participation in what Gould terms ``the discourse and associations of the public sphere'' (1996, page 181). This ought to be more than just the installation of deliberative democratic fora or procedural enactments that potentially do little to transform the social and institutional fixities of disablist attitudes and practices. In particular, discourses of movement and mobility ought to move beyond just public-sector participative networks towards the development and propagation of private-sector or corporate-sector responsibilities.

### Fund NonProfits

#### Non-profit organizations are the best at serving specialized transportation

Ellis, paratransit and transit planning specialist, 10

(Elizabeth Ellis is currently serving as Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit. Jana Lynottis Strategic Policy Advisor for Transportation & Livable Communities at AARP's Public Policy Institute. Wendy Fox-Grage is a Strategic Policy Advisor for the AARP Public Policy Institute. April 2010, Association of American Retired Persons, "Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation," p. 16, assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Aging and disability organizations— including AARP, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, Easter Seals, Jewish Federations of North America, and other members of the Senior Transportation Task Force— are concerned that consolidation of the programs could lower the quality of service provided under the Section 5310 program and lead to other unintended consequences. A particular concern for these organizations is that older adults, persons with disabilities, and low- income populations do not have identical transportation needs that can always be met by the same service. In an effort to meet the needs of each group, advocates could find themselves pitted against one another in unproductive competition. These organizations also believe that consolidation would remove the current priority for nonprofit human service providers under the Section 5310 program. Many feel that these nonprofit providers, given that their primary institutional purpose is to meet human service needs, are best able to offer the high-quality, specialized service that many older adults and persons with disabilities require.

### Private Taxis

#### Private taxis are a cost effective alternative to paratransit service

American Association of People With Disabilities, no date

(American Association of People with Disabilities, The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "Equity inTransportation for People with Disabilities," n. pag, www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Private transportation is an important alternative that should be considered to increase access for people with disabilities. A pressing issue in the disability community is the dearth of accessible taxis. Taxis are an important mode of transportation for people with disabilities. Many people with disabilities who cannot drive or afford a car utilize taxi services. Taxis can provide greater flexibility and independence than relying on public transportation systems, especially for those for whom mass transit is either unavailable or inaccessible.

Moreover, taxis can provide a cost-effective alternative to paratransit service. Public transit operators could save money by employing taxi services for people with disabilities, and taxi fare is less expensive than providing paratransit. Furthermore, health care-related travel could be provided more cheaply and effectively by accessible taxis than by privately operated ambulettes or public paratransit systems. This ultimately is a savings not only to transit but to taxpayers as well.

## States CP – Universal Design

### 1NC

#### States can distribute Federal Transit Authority fund as needed – plan is a mandate that overrides discretion that links to Federalism net benefit

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Wendy, Jana, April 2010, Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,”<http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, Accessed 6-30-12, p.4, CAS)

The FTA provides Section 5310 funds directly to the states, using a formula based on each state’s proportionate share of older adults (aged 65+) and persons with disabilities. As the designated recipients, the states have latitude to make funding decisions according to their needs. States distribute the funds to local agencies (subrecipients) in a variety of ways, most commonly through a discretionary selection process that is typically competitive.

\*\*FTA is Federal Transit Authority

### Solves Better – Local Needs

#### States solve best for their individual state

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Jana Lynott, AARP, Policy Advisor, Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP, Strategic Policy Advisor, April 2010, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 14, accessed 6-30-12, LH)

Differences among states—and certainly among large urban, small urban, and rural areas—make it difficult to design a one-size-fits-all program structure. The ability to use funds flexibly varies across the three FTA programs. The JARC and New Freedom programs are structured so that funding is distributed among large urban, small urban, and rural areas by a 60-20-20 percent split. This distribution limits states’ ability to target funding to areas they determine are most in need. Section 5310 funding, on the other hand, is provided directly to the states, giving them freedom to allocate resources as they determine best for their individual state. Because of minor differences in the statutory authority of the two programs, the FTA does allow limited transfer of funds among population categories for the JARC program 28 but not for New Freedom.

### AT: Perm – Do Both

#### Perm can’t solve – no coordination

Ellis, et al., KFH Group’s Senior Transportation Planner ‘10

(Elizabeth, KFH Group, transportation corporation, Jana Lynott, American Association of Retired Persons’ Strategic Policy Advisor, Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP’s Strategic Policy Advisor, April, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 3-4, accessed 6/30/12, YGS)

Observers have noted that the vast array of specialized transportation services creates “a complex web of providers and services:” 11 Specifically, they note that  many transportation providers duplicate services and expenditures;  vehicles and related resources are often underutilized;  service quality and safety vary significantly from program to program; and  information is lacking about available services, particularly for persons who need transportation. 12 Since the 1970s, transportation experts have recognized the problems created by this complex web, and the federal and many state governments have attempted to coordinate services to improve transportation for target population groups. Coordination is difficult for various reasons, but particularly because federal agency funds often flow down to the state and local levels encumbered with each program’s specific rules and regulations. This “silo funding” constrains the ability of the programs to work together, even if the agencies serve the same people or those with similar or even identical transportation needs.

## Agency CPs – Universal Design

### Multiple Agencies

#### Multiple agencies fund accessible transportation infrastructure

Ellis et al., paratransit specialist, ’10

[Elizabeth, Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit, and KFH Group, transit industry consultant, and Jana Lynott, Strategic Policy Advisor for Transportation & Livable Communities at AARP's Public Policy Institute, and Wendy Fox-Grage, policy adviser with the AARP, April 2010, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf, pg. 3, accessed 6/30/12, JTF]

Funding for specialized transportation services comes from many sources, primarily the federal government, but also state and local entities. 5 The DOT’s Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides three key funding programs, but the largest source of specialized service funding originates with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), with additional funding from such federal agencies as the Departments of Labor and Education. Together, these federal agencies sponsor more than 60 programs that support special transportation services for older adults, persons with disabilities, and persons with low incomes. 6

# Disadvantages

## AT: K of Nuclear War Impacts

#### Nuclear war turns morality.

Martin, University of Wollongong Social Sciences Professor, ’82

[Brian, 1982, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82bpp.html, 7/8/12, JTF]

In the event of a nuclear war or even of a nuclear crisis, many people will have to make difficult moral decisions. For example, how much time and effort should be spent trying to save the injured or relieving the pain of the terminally ill? Should euthanasia be considered for those certain to die? What priority should be put on saving one's own life? What should be done about refugees or marauders who descend on a self-reliant community? Should one evacuate to relative security? What actions should be taken to oppose repression? How should decisions be made about allocating scarce supplies of food, or places in fallout shelters? The answers to such questions are not easy. In the urgency and pressure of crisis, actions may be taken for wrong reasons: moral principles and sound political strategy may be overwhelmed by emotional impulses. Hence it is important to think through possible moral dilemmas, to work out the ethics of a post-war situation, beforehand.

#### Nuclear war causes authoritarianism and turns solvency for grassroots movements.

Martin, University of Wollongong Social Sciences Professor, ’82

[Brian, 1982, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82bpp.html, 7/8/12, JTF]

In addition to the important physical effects of nuclear war there would be important indirect political effects. It seems very likely that there would be strong moves to maintain or establish authoritarian rule as a response to crises preceding or following nuclear war. Ever since Hiroshima, the threat of nuclear destruction has been used to prop up repressive institutions, under the pretext of defending against the 'enemy'.[3] The actuality of nuclear war could easily result in the culmination of this trend. Large segments of the population could be manipulated to support a repressive regime under the necessity to defend against further threats or to obtain revenge.

A limited nuclear war might kill some hundreds of thousands or tens of millions of people, surely a major tragedy. But another tragedy could also result: the establishment, possibly for decades, of repressive civilian or military rule in countries such as Italy, Australia and the US, even if they were not directly involved in the war. The possibility of grassroots mobilisation for disarmament and peace would be greatly reduced even from its present levels. For such developments the people and the peace movements of the world are largely unprepared.

#### Nuclear war causes social issues to take a back seat.

Martin, University of Wollongong Social Sciences Professor, ’82

[Brian, 1982, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82bpp.html, 7/8/12, JTF]

Historically, periods of economic or military crisis often have preceded revolutionary change, though not always with desirable results. Crises provide opportunities for groups which are organised and able to take advantage of them. In the case of nuclear war, present governments have made some arrangements to preserve their type of rule after a nuclear war.[4] By contrast, the peace movement is almost completely unprepared to respond to a crisis engendered by nuclear war.

The primary objective of national security bureaucracies in the event of nuclear war is survival of the state apparatus. This has two components: continued defence against the outside enemy, and defence against challenges raised by the native population. The health and welfare of the general population is a secondary consideration, mainly important in its effects on the two primary goals. This emphasis is reflected in preparations for the survival of key officials, for continuity of official decision-making apparatuses and communications, and for quelling 'civil disturbances'.

#### Imagining nuclear war scenarios is good – it helps us educate ourselves on nuclear policy and prevent real wars.

Martin, University of Wollongong Social Sciences Professor, ’82

[Brian, 1982, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82bpp.html, 7/8/12, JTF]

It is my belief that preparation for nuclear war by the peace movement would reduce the chance of nuclear war by providing a visible threat to the otherwise unchallenged continuance of existing political institutions. National decision-makers may wish to avoid nuclear war to save their own lives, but they have demonstrated a continued willingness to risk nuclear war, both in crises and confrontations and through the very existence of nuclear arsenals, through the policies they have promoted and the institutions they have constructed and supported. This institutionalised risk of nuclear war will seem less acceptable if one consequence of continued preparations for war were a major challenge to the complete system of political and economic power and privilege.

Nuclear weapons states have refrained from nuclear war thus far not primarily because of their perception of the human disaster of nuclear war but because of the possible political consequences. A prepared peace movement would ensure that such political consequences are as serious as possible.

#### Nuclear war causes militarism and suppresses minority groups – turns case.

Martin, University of Wollongong Social Sciences Professor, ’82

[Brian, 1982, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, “How the Peace Movement Should be Preparing for Nuclear War,” http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82bpp.html, 7/8/12, JTF]

There are very strong links between militarism and repression[18]: hierarchical, centralised bureaucratic structures underlie and thrive on each of them. Any fundamental challenge to war must challenge these structures as well. A nuclear emergency would greatly intensify the pressures both for military intervention in civil affairs and for state-sponsored repression. This points to the need to build very strong links between peace activists and those who are struggling against state power, such as groups opposing political police, civil liberties groups, groups defending the rights of racial minorities, women, homosexuals and prisoners, and groups supporting freedom of information and other checks on bureaucracies.

## Federalism

### Link – Universal Design

#### Plan is a mandate on the states

Ellis, Para transit specialist, Fox-Grage, Strategic Policy Advisor, Lynott, Senior Strategic Policy Advisor, 10

(Elizabeth, Jana Lynott, AARP, Policy Advisor, Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP, Strategic Policy Advisor, April 2010, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 3-4, accessed 6-30-12, LH)

Since the 1970s, transportation experts have recognized the problems created by this complex web, and the federal and many state governments have attempted to coordinate services to improve transportation for target population groups.

Coordination is difficult for various reasons, but particularly because federal agency funds often flow down to the state and local levels encumbered with each program’s specific rules and regulations. This “silo funding” constrains the ability of the programs to work together, even if the agencies serve the same people or those with similar or even identical transportation needs.

## Politics/Elections

### Disability Policy Popular

#### Bipartisan support for disability policy – CRPD proves.

Kaiser Health News, 5/29/12

[Kaiser Health News, 5/29/12, “Bipartisan Group Of Senators Say They'll Ratify Disability Treaty,” http://www.kaiserhealthnews.org/Daily-Reports/2012/May/29/senators-announce-support-for-disability-treaty.aspx, accessed 7/13/12, JTF]

A bipartisan group of senators Friday announced support for U.S. ratification of a treaty that, the senators say, would help protect Americans with disabilities who travel and work abroad. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) is in part patterned, advocates say, after the U.S. disability law and is the first treaty to address such rights globally. An American delegation under President George W. Bush negotiated and approved the convention in 2006. The U.S. signed the accord on July 30, 2009. So far, 153 countries have signed the treaty and 112 of those have ratified it. Last week, the Obama administration sent the treaty to the Senate for ratification (Bunis, 5/25).

#### New disability policies prevent fights.

Dao, New York Times, 6/20/12

[James, New York Times, 6/20/12, The New York Times Blogs, “Backlog of Disability Claims for Veterans Sends Democrat on a Tear,” Lexis, accessed 7/13/12, JTF]

On Tuesday, the House Veterans Affairs Committee held one of its perennial hearings on the ever-growing backlog of disability compensation claims pending before the Department of Veterans' Affairs. The usual polite questioning of V.A. officials was expected, followed by the usual complex answers that few on the committee might be expected to comprehend.

But the affair turned surprisingly contentious, not because of the Republican majority, but thanks to the ranking Democrat on the panel, Representative Bob Filner of California.

After a relatively tame opening statement in which the vice chairman, Representative Gus Bilirakis, a Republican of Florida, called on the V.A. "to break this cycle of unproductively and deliver the benefits that V.A. was created to provide," Mr. Filner, voice dripping with sarcasm, announced: "Well, here we are again."

Recalling his first backlog hearing some 20 years ago, Mr. Filner noted with rising irritation that the V.A. has hired, by his count, more than 10,000 new employees in recent years, but has seen the backlog more than double, to over 900,000 pending claims. Yet the Veterans Benefits Administration, the division that handles disability compensation, had done little more than "recycle programs," he said.

"The definition of insanity is to try the same thing over and over again and expect different results," he said, sounding a theme he would return to several times during the nearly five-hour hearing.

The congressman, who is running for mayor of San Diego, as veteran-friendly a town as exists in America, was just getting started. After a panel of experts from four major veteran service organizations, including the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, testified about V.B.A.'s problems, Mr. Filner tore into them, too. Heads turned.

Accusing the groups of "playing" the V.A.'s games by allowing themselves to be easily wooed into submission by promises of access to senior officials, Mr. Filner urged the groups to support "radical" change and "blow up" or "break" what he called "this stupid system."

### Disability Policy Unpopular

#### Disability policies are unpopular – they’re linked to Medicaid.

Mears, CNN Supreme Court Producer, 3/28/12

[Bill, CNN Supreme Court Producer, March 28, 2012, CNN Wire, “Supreme Court argues Medicaid expansion provision,” LexisNexis, accessed 7/13/12, JTF]

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A divided Supreme Court spent this week's final oral argument on health care reform Wednesday examining whether states would be "coerced" by the federal government to expand their share of Medicaid costs by the risk of losing funding if they refused to take part.

The session concluded three days of public debate on the 2010 Affordable Health Act and focused on the contentious legal issue of federal versus state powers, in this case involving the Medicaid government-run health care for the poor and disabled.

Medicaid, which operates on federal and state funding, would be expanded under the health care reform law, and 26 states filed legal challenges against what they contended was an unfair burden forced on them by Washington.

The debate on Medicaid was especially divided along ideological lines.

Paul Clement, arguing for the states that say they would suffer under the new Medicaid requirements, met skepticism from many on the left.

Justice Elena Kagan noted that 90% of current Medicaid funding comes from Washington and asked if it would be a bad deal "if the government were to give boatloads of money to the states."

#### Disability programs are contentious.

Marso, The Capital-Journal, 6/13/12

[Andy, cites Tom Laing from Topeka-based Interhab, oldest and largest Kansas association of developmental disability service providers, 6/13/12, Topeka Capital-Journal, “Common ground found on disability employment,” Lexis, accessed 7/13/12, JTF]

Laing said employment opportunities for the disabled have increased in recent decades in part because of better K-12 special education and job training programs. He warned that legislators have to invest in those programs, which is sometimes contentious, if their goal is to continue and accelerate that trend.

# Ks

## Capitalism

### Capitalism Link

#### Ableism creates a double outcast that is commodified by capitalism

Charlton, University of Illinois Assistant professor in the Department of Disability 10

(James, 2010, “Peripheral Everywhere,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 4.2 (2010), 195–200, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 7/1, JS)

Disabled people are peripheral everywhere. We are outsiders in core capitalist countries. We are outsiders in peripheral regions. This is the case for people with disabilities living in Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, Italy, Paris, Johannesburg, or Los Angeles, a village in Iowa or a village in Syria. If you look for us not just an individual person with a disability, but for us as a (dispersed) community, how we live, here or there, you will find us on/in the peripheral spaces wherever you choose to look. I know this might be a strange characterization but I think it is correct as a metaphor. There is a periphery everywhere. In Chicago, we have the impoverished west side. Even in New York, the epicenter of late capitalism, there are peripheral areas. Even in Manhattan—even at the center of the center. In the periphery you find the same patterns of core and peripheral spaces. For example, in Mexico, a dependent Third World nation-state, the center is in Mexico City (and less so in the other main cities). Inside Mexico City, there is a core and a periphery. The center zone in Mexico City is downtown, where the financial and commercial districts are and the residential areas of Polanco, Lomas, and Chapultepec, where people with lots of money live. In Mexico City, the vast majority of disabled people survive outside these center zone spaces and even when they/we find our way into the core, we are secluded/segregated within them, in nursing homes, back rooms, top floors, servant quarters, and institutions. This geography of exclusion, degradation, and dependency calls to mind the spatial properties of fractals: the idea that the further one goes down into a phenomenon the same patterns reoccur at every level. It is this pattern of periphery, even in the most varied places, that reveals a deep force immanent throughoutthe world system that is both hidden and hides many reasons for the disability condition. This structuring force is the commodity form. The centrality of the commodity form in the study of social phenomenon can be likened to the centrality of a cell in the study of living organisms. As Marx wrote at the beginning of his first volume of Capital, “In bourgeois society the commodity-form of the product of labor—or the value-form of the commodity –is the economic cell-form. . . . A commodity appears at first sight an extremely obvious, trivial thing. But its analysis brings out that it is a very strange thing, abounding in metaphysical subtleties and theological niceties” (257). The notion of unequal exchange was emphasized by dependency theorists:1 These functions orient the economies of the dependent states toward the outside: money, goods, and services do flow into dependent states, but the allocation of these resources are determined by the economic interests of the dominant states, and not by the economic interests of the dependent state. This division of labor is ultimately the explanation for poverty and there is little question but that capitalism regards the division of labor as a necessary condition for the efficient allocation of resources. The most explicit manifestation of this characteristic is the doctrine of comparative advantage. (Ferraro, 39) However generally correct, I believe there are a lot of problems with this thesis due to two things: (1) the strictly economic attention paid to “exchange” when unequal military relations underpinned the relation, and (2) the lack of attention paid to resistance and class struggle by its proponents. Numerous properties of the commodity form are relevant when discussing disability. These are control (rooted in unequal relationships), hierarchy, commodification, and mystification. Once feudalism fell and labor became “free,” it became dependent on finding an employer—people sell their labor, they work for someone else. Disabled people, like everyone else, have lost control of a basic activity of everyday life. Capital needs labor but it controls labor. Work increasingly is constituted by hierarchical relationships. People are valued based on the value they create for exchange. Social relations are reduced to exchange relations. People (and nature) are reduced to objects, cogs in the machine, or something to be used or discarded based on the requirements of commodity production. The commodity form is shrouded from full view. Many intrinsic aspects of it—alienation, commodification, exploitation, surplus value, and surplus people are concealed. There is a mystery to the commodity form that is breathtaking; it is phantasmological. Oppressed people, disabled people can-not easily “see” structures of oppression. The virus of the commodity-form is obscure, so they tend to blame themselves or rude and crude individuals for their misery and exclusion and the system gets off the hook. Everywhere production and reproduction, distribution and circulation, culture and ideology, power and hierarchy, exploitation and oppression, challenges and opportunities are located where the imprint of the commodity-form can be found, especially the imprinting of insider/outsider. The metaphor of fractal geography suggests that wherever, in whatever space you look for disabled people, study us as a social group, as a community, you should cast your eye on the outer fringes, regardless whether that space of inquiry is Manhattan, rural Japan, the industrial zones of Sao Paolo, or the shanty-towns of Lagos. I am not saying that all peripheral space is the same. Obviously, rural Germany is less peripheral than rural India and we could go further and speculate that rural India might be less peripheral than rural Africa. What I am suggesting is that wherever we are located, we are on the outside looking in.

### Cap Link – Universal Design

#### Here is how the proponents of their aff describe the benefit of the plan – proves our link

**American Association of People with Disabilities, 12**

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.1, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

Unfortunately, adults with disabilities are twice as likely as those without disabilities to have inadequate transportation (31 percent vs. 13 percent). Of the nearly 2 million people with disabilities who never leave their homes, 560,000 never leave home because of transportation difficulties. Leaving people out has real costs to the nation. Keeping people with disabilities at home keeps them out of jobs, away from shopping, and out of community life, and it prevents them from making valuable contributions to our society as individuals, as workers, as consumers, and as taxpayers.

### Capitalism – AT: Perm

#### Ableism creates those who are non-productive, but who constitute a vital site of resistance, the plan & perm are simply moves of incorporation & assimilation

Mitchell & Snyder, Temple University, 10

(David and Sharon, “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 2, 2010, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 6/30, JS)

The Work of "Non-Productive Bodies" Who are the inhabitants of "non-productive bodies"? What do they have to do with disabled people? Why have they existed below the radar of radical labor theory for so long? Non-productive bodies are those inhabitants of the planet who, largely by virtue of biological (in)capacity, aesthetic non-conformity, and/ or non-normative labor patterns, have gone invisible due to the inflexibility of traditional classifications of labor (both economic and political). They represent the non-laboring populations—not merely excluded from—but also resistant to standardized labor demands of human value. As many recognize, the term disability was first coined in the mid-1800s to designate those incapable of work due to injury. This grouping identified disabled veterans of the Civil War as eligible for various governmental supports: a pension, prosthetics, life training, etc. Likewise, the diagnostic category of feeblemindedness in the same period defined those who, due to congenital "feature," were incapable of participating in a competitive market-based economy. This group also qualified for levels of public support largely received in centralized, carceral forms of institutional care. As we argue in Cultural Locations of Disability (2006), membership in this latter classification group resulted in the coercion of individuals to exchange their liberties for social supports. This designation as "non-productive" developed in spite of the fact that many institutional residents participated in laboring economies developed within institutional societies: residents farmed [End Page 184] the institution's land, provided housekeeping services to fellow inmates and administrators, supervised each other on behalf of the institution, produced products for the state—brooms, clothing, baskets, etc.—at excessively low wage rates. In many cases nothing more was provided in exchange for their labors beyond the "benefit" of living an excluded life within the walls of the institution.

Within this context of disability as non-productive bodies lay an unseen network of labor practices where the presumably "insufficient" provided for themselves within the walls of an undetected economy. Institutions often operated as if they were small city-states that actively rendered the labor of the non-laboring classes invisible. In many cases by the early twentieth century, a majority of institutions could claim themselves as "self supporting." Ironically, such claims in effect disproved the theory upon which institutions were based: those who could not compete in a labor market should be sheltered from its demands in an institutional world that functioned as a closed circuit of dependency and care. Instead, institutional residents made an ideal labor force—those who could efficiently meet the needs of their own segregated society—when conditions could be adjusted according to the principle: from each according to their ability to each according to their need(s). The realization of Marx's famous formulation in his 1875 Critique of the Gotha within institutions consequently posed a threat to reigning orders of capitalism operating beyond the walls of the institution. In fact, historically, capitalists and bourgeoisie alike have sought remedies in legislatures across the country against institutional labor practices. Blind broom-makers in downtown Chicago were shut down because their efficiency undermined the ability of other broom manufacturers to make a profit during 1910. These workers with visual impairments, in turn, went on strike and forced the city to re-open their place of employment on the basis of their status as an exceptional class of laborers.2 This is one of the great ironies of institutional life for those who were deemed "non-productive" on the basis of physical, sensory, and/or cognitive incapacity.

The identification of hordes of people designated as "non-productive bodies" and located on the outermost fringes of productive economies replaces now antiquated categories such as "the masses." The potential for widespread civil unrest proved compromised because workers found themselves engulfed within networks of capital that kept them enthralled. Further, as modernity gave way to post-modernity, the antagonistic divisions between workers and [End Page 185] capitalists that were anticipated to fuel revolution became increasingly blurred. No longer did one participate in a simple, agonistic division of labor, but, for Hardt and Negri, David Harvey, Frederic Jameson, and other political theorists, late capitalism now saturated every nook and cranny of life and became increasingly confused with the natural order of things. One could find no outside to capitalist production given that the network of exchange had grown so diffuse and pervasive (here we find Hardt and Negri's concept of biopolitics, borrowed from Foucault). Capitalism's power came to be increasingly located in its ability to naturalize its own artificial economic context within every social interaction. This marked the birth of what Marx anticipated as social capitalism.

The critical question asked by today's theorists of postmodern political economy is that which Negri poses to himself in his essay, "Kairos, Alma Venus, Multitudo: Nine Lessons to Myself ": "how can this biopolitical (intellectual and co-operative) mass, which we call 'multitude,' exert 'governance over itself'?" (209). In other words, where does resistance manifest itself once a concept of the workers revolution no longer seems tenable and how will this resistance govern itself without the institution of new hierarchies of inequality?

In order to formulate responses to Negri's question as articulated further in his writings with Michael Hardt, Empire, Multitudes, and Commonwealth, we must unpack it in as literal a way as possible. Biopolitical represents the degree to which every aspect of living is ensnared by late capitalism: economic, social, artistic, cultural, etc. Whereas modernity's capitalism saw division and segregation as its strategy of divide and conquer among laboring parties in a strategically segmented labor production process (i.e., the prior economic production mode of Fordism), Postmodern capitalism elevates cooperation across spatially, geographically, and culturally diffuse networks that place individuals in contact with each across disparate geographies. "Multitude" replaces "masses" in that a multitude is defined as productive singularities (bodies) that cannot be collapsed into a universal formula of normative labor identity. And here we will make our claim: within this formulation of resistant "bodies" Hardt and Negri essentially recognize forms of incapacity as the new galvanizing agent of postmodern resistance.

"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 [End Page 186] 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.

#### Global capital relies on work forces—the disabled break that down

Mitchell & Snyder, Temple University, 10

(David and Sharon, “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 2, 2010, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 6/30, JS)

Meet Me at the Global We draw to a conclusion with a laundry list of ways in which disability groups produce a viable counter-narrative of biopolitics.

Disabled persons are made, willingly or not, into the legitimate "non-workers" —those who refuse to participate not in productivity but in the productive net of capitalism that ensnares all in the seemingly infinite practice of consumption as synonymous with life. The disabled people that we know are some of the worst [End Page 188] consumers on the planet because they have neither the means, the interest, nor the gullibility of mistaking meaning with market. For instance, disabled artists in the U.S. live some of the most sparingly non-consumptive lives and, yet, this is what we admire about them the most.

Those who identify as non-disabled often strain to occupy the increasingly common forms of prosthetization that supplement failing bodies trying to navigate late capitalist environments. To a great degree this prosthetic discomfort comes about for those still inhabiting narratives of the natural body. Disabled people, in turn and by necessity, have surrendered this artificial nostalgia for a version of their bodies as natural, pure, and unsupplemented. In this manner they become, truly, the quintessential project of postmodernity.

Global capital increasingly relies on the development of work forces that can manipulate immaterial data across an ever-expanding array of communication networks. Such labor often involves a variety of skills such as: (1) the ability to sit in rooms with others for hours on end; (2) the capacity to performatively represent oneself in cybernetic space through non-visual or oral forms of communication; (3) the ability, and even willingness, to function in virtual locations that are not subject to aesthetic criteria of appearance that so often result in exclusions of disabled people from employability; (4) substantial amounts of leisure time that goes relatively uninterrupted by the nuisance of family, friends, or love interests (we mean this only partially as tongue-in-cheek); and (5) a willingness to be devoted to one's job because so much of what counts as an "outside life" has already been rendered unavailable (the inaccessibility of recreation, religion, or geographies beyond an immediate space). We are increasingly approaching a time when all that formerly passed as the undesirability of life in a disabled body proves increasingly "advantageous" from the standpoint of an immaterial labor market.

However, and perhaps even more importantly, even outside of the formal workforce disabled people find themselves manipulating data of a political nature across national boundaries. Disabled people's organizations and disabled individuals now routinely exchange survival strategies and political tactics with other non-productive bodies in formerly unreachable locations. Thus, the international participation of eugenics discourse in the earlier part of the last century has been met by an increasingly globalizing discourse of counter-eugenic efforts. Disability rights movement leaders now exchange policies and solutions with each other in order to pressure their own legislatures into adopting "human rights platforms" based upon comparisons with other policy- and rights-based actions. These efforts effectively turn eugenic-based strategies on their heads and can be fueled by commerce across global cybernetic networks. [End Page 189]

Following out the logic of non-productive bodies allows us ways of conceiving of disability as a potentially effective political foundation for new forms of resistance, particularly in that disability (as those who refer to "TABS" [the temporarily able-bodied] remind us) potentially cuts across all marginalities. Yet, its founding recognition of unity based in difference (i.e. what we have called in another context, the politics of a typicality or intensive individual singularities that cannot be neatly collapsed in a coherent identity) could prove more effective than those diagnosed by Laclau and Mouffe and Žižek as balkanizing identity-based approaches to difference that undermine more spontaneous forms of collective action.

Of course we do not mean to overlook the fact that disability collectivities have discovered creative ways of fracturing their own collectivities, particularly on the basis of unproductive debates over who is "disabled" and who is "not-disabled," disability hierarchies, tokenism, marginalization of expressive modes (i.e. putting the pragmatics of policy over arts), the neglect of disabled people of color, old boys and old girls networks of power brokering, and so on. But there is also a series of productive ways to organize political constituencies that we owe to the creativity of disability movements around the world—namely, since disability movements continue to operate at the meta-national level, disabled people without borders.

To return to Hardt and Negri's thesis explicitly, we stress that disabled bodies prove so integral to late capitalism because the model upon which capitalist exchange rests has shifted so dramatically. Disability may present the best intervention object of all in that it provides an opportunity to renew capital in new geographies of the body. Because disabled bodies persist throughout history, and in militarized economies we produce them in great numbers at "home" and "abroad," market economies increasingly reference them among their target audiences.

## Race K

### Link- Ablenormativity

#### Disability life writing focuses on white bodies

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

Similar to other kinds of texts in disability studies, the proliferation of disability life writing4 continues to privilege White bodies, demonstrating the need to seek out narratives that can address the politics of race and disability. In fact, even authors like Mintz and Couser, who have written extensively on disability memoir, continue, with very few exceptions, to focus on texts written by White authors. A recent call for disability narratives on a disability listserv yielded an almost exclusive list of narratives written by White authors. This lack of diverse voices is mirrored in the dearth of authors of color in disability studies readers and anthologies (Bell, 2006). It has been said enough times that we as critical scholars can no longer innocently or inadvertently omit diverse voices from our research, our syllabi, our reading lists, our conceptual framing. Such willful forgetting should have no place in disability studies. Thus, until autobiographies of people of color are written and published as readily as those from White people, it may be that we need to expand our sites to nonprint narratives such as YouTube, blogs, and other new media.5 Students can be assigned the task of building a bibliography of disability memoirs, which can then be analyzed for erasures or gaps in our knowledge base.6

### Race K - AT: Disability Prior to Race

#### This argument denies the emancipatory potential of intersectional life writings

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

Making a conscious effort to include narratives that can speak to an intersectional politic is simply a start. According to Mollow (2002), disability studies scholars have been slow to incorporate intersectional analyses, placing race either in opposition to disability (ableism vs. racism); as analogous (ableism as racism); or in hierarchy with other forms of oppression (first ableism, then racism). These kinds of "like race" analogies have been widely criticized for obscuring and obliterating race and for assuming a false separation between race and disability (May & Ferri, 2005; Spelman, 1997) or between race and gender (Grillo & Wildman, in Mollow, 2002).

As Mollow's (2002) analysis of the book Willow Weep for Me by Meri Nana-Ama Danquah illustrates, however, engaging with texts that don't necessarily assume the primacy of ableism over other forms of oppression can complicate disability studies in productive ways. For example, Mollow wrote that for a Black woman, access to health care might be a more salient concern than a social critique of the medical model. Such texts contain more nuanced and intersectional analyses than much of the scholarly work in disability studies. As such, perhaps one of the most subversive aspects of disability narrative is its ability to talk back, not just to the medical model, but to the social model as well. This refusal to "follow the script" (Barton, 2007), even when the script in question is seen as emancipatory, should not be seen as something to suppress, but to embrace.

## Equity K

### AT: Permutation – Do Both

#### Consolidation bad – Causes tradeoff between groups

Ellis Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit,

Lynott Senior Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute, and Fox-Grage Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute 10

(Elizabeth Ellis, Jana Lynott, and Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP Public Policy Institute Insight on the Issues 39, April 2010 “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, pg. 15-16, accessed 6-30-12 BC)

Aging and disability organizations— including AARP, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, Easter Seals, Jewish Federations of North America, and other members of the Senior Transportation Task Force— are concerned that consolidation of the programs could lower the quality of service provided under the Section 5310 program and lead to other unintended consequences. A particular concern for these organizations is that older adults, persons with disabilities, and low income populations do not have identical transportation needs that can always be met by the same service. In an effort to meet the needs of each group, advocates could find themselves pitted against one another in unproductive competition. These organizations also believe that consolidation would remove the current priority for nonprofit human service providers under the Section 5310 program. Many feel that these nonprofit providers, given that their primary institutional purpose is to meet human service needs, are best able to offer the high-quality, specialized service that many older adults and persons with disabilities require.

# Framework

### Policy Analysis Good

#### It is important to analyze ableism from a policy perspective

Watson, The Pew State Policy Initiatives Senior Officer, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, Policy Studies Journal, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” vol. 21(4), Chadwyk Periodicals Archive Online, p. 720, bs)

Disability policy encompasses public policies that affect people with disabilities, either alone or in combination with other groups. As explored in David Pfeiffer's paper in this part, examples of these policies include those governing special education; civil rights statutes; accessible transportation, housing, and public facilities; publicly-funded rehabilitation services; and benefit programs for people with disabilities (such as Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid). As evidenced by this list, disability policy when considered in this manner is extraordinarily broad. We ordinarily think of better-known areas of public policy, such as defense or environmental issues, as more diffuse. But all federal agencies must consider disability issues in terms of their own workforce; especially since the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, most federal agencies must also consider it in terms of their substantive work. Most state and local agencies are in the same position. Disability scholars have written analyses of disability issues and programs for centuries—starting with medical practitioners and then gradually adding charitable reformers in the 1800s and rehabilitation experts in the early 1900s. In the 1970s the community of people interested in and affected by disability was transformed by the disability rights movement, whose leaders demanded equal access to all aspects of American society as a basic civil right. Since the movement began, the number and variety of people writing about disability policies has increased substantially. Sociologists are arguing about whether disabled people form their own culture; media experts debate the images of people with disabilities in books, movies, newspaper stories, advertisements, and television shows; historians arc writing about the lives and impact of important people with disabilities; a very few economists arc analyzing the economic incentives of public benefit programs; and advocates are constantly writing critiques of various policies from the perspective of consumers with disabilities.

### Only a plan solves Ableism

#### Public policy studies must begin to analyze ableism

Watson, The Pew State Policy Initiatives Senior Officer, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, Policy Studies Journal, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” vol. 21(4), Chadwyk Periodicals Archive Online, p. 720-721, bs)

The next field that needs to investigate disability policy is that of public policy studies. Disability policy is almost entirely public policy, rather than private initiatives, but there has been little cross-fertilization between disability experts and public policy experts. Few people who have started out as disability policy experts have achieved graduate degrees in public policy and/or ended up in the academic public policy community (although that situation is changing slowly). The research in different fields described above tends to look at disability issues only in the context of that population; it does not examine the significance of recent events in disability policy for other groups. For instance, the 1990 ADA was a major civil rights bill for people with disabilities and perhaps the most sweeping disability bill ever passed. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the areas of employment, transportation, public facilities, and communications. Disability advocates have written literally hundreds of treatises on the ADA—books, independent monographs, and articles in trade publications and academic journals. Yet virtually every paper discusses only the content of the Act and its impact on the target audience (mainly businesses). Few explore the political implications of the passage of this significant bill or the story behind its passage (except the recent paper by this author, Watson, 1993). Books on other disability policies focus on analyzing the individuaI program or policy; the next generation of literature could look at the relationships between these policies and other substantive areas, as well as general themes in public policy.

### Just read a Plan

#### Plan solves both sides Offense

Watson, Center for Study of Social Policy Senior Associate, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” Policy Studies Journal, vol. 21(4), p. 721-722, bs)

Looking at the relationship between disability and public policy the other way, the public policy field has viewed disability policies in the same way as it viewed environmental policies in the 1950s and early 1960s, before societal awareness changed: as narrow, technical decisions made by scientific experts about a population of limited importance and impact. To use the ADA example again, the passage of the ADA represents a remarkable political saga, but despite this rich potential for research, mainstream public policy analysts are not familiar with disability politics and so are not aware of the lessons to be learned. A very few well-known public policy experts or scholars have taken up disability policies as a major field of study and have conducted incisive analyses of the wisdom or folly of individual disability programs. However, for disability policy to achieve a level of true significance, the work must go beyond analyzing individual programs to examine what decisions in disability policy say about public policies towards other groups or in other subject areas. Because of this separation between people knowledgeable about disability issues and those knowledgeable about public policy theory, the field of public policy has missed the incredibly rich and varied lessons that decisions in disability policy can teach. And the field of disability policy has missed the benefit of experiences learned in other programs.