# Case

“Paralysis” metaphor is overtly ableist

Gent ‘10 [Pamela, PhD – Special Education – severe disabilities, in Stewart and Webster’s Problematizing Service-Learning: Critical Reflections for Development and Action, p233]

**We have said** students are "paralyzed perfectionists" (Higgins 8c Boone, 2003, p. 139), "**feel paralyzed, unsure of where to start or what to do**," (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 2004, p. 2), "become paralyzed by a sense of impotence, rage, and cynicism" (McNall, 1999), and "are crippled by an amazingly constricted frame of reference" (Barilen, 2003, p. 107). **People whose impairments have resulted in paralysis would tell us that their paralysis is not the result of feelings, rage, perfectionism, or their frame of reference. They would also tell us that it is ableist to assume that the type of temporary inactivity suggested in these quotes is in any way similar to their own lived reality.**While many of us would question the use of overtly racist or sexist language in our classrooms, we may never have questioned the use of such ableist language.

Voting issue—ableist language ensures ableist oppression

Wheelchair Dancer, 8

(“On Making Argument: Disability and Language”, <http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2008/04/on-making-argument-disability-and.html> Accessed: 2/10/11 GAL)  
If you are feeling a little bit of resistance, here, I'd ask you to think about it. If perhaps what I am saying feels like a burden -- too much to take on? a restriction on your carefree speech? -- perhaps that feeling can also serve as an indicator of how pervasive and thus important the issue is. As a community, we've accepted that commonly used words can be slurs, and as a rule, we avoid them, hopefully in the name of principle, but sometimes only in the name of civility. Do you go around using derivatives of the b**\*ch** word?If you do, I bet you check which community you are in**....** Same thing for the N word**.** These days, **depending on your age,** you might say something is retarded **or spastic,** but you probably never say that it's gay. I'd like to suggest that society as a whole has not paid the same kind of attention to disabled people's concerns about language. By not paying attention to the literal value, the very real substantive, physical, psychological, sensory, and emotional experiences that come with these linguistic moves, we have created a negative rhetorical climate. In this world, it is too easy for feminists and people of colour to base their claims on argumentative strategies that depend, as their signature moves, on marginalizing the experience of disabled people and on disparaging their appearance and bodies. Much of the blogosphere discourse of the previous weeks has studied the relationships between race, (white) feminism and feminists, and WOC bloggers. To me, the intellectual takeaway has been an emerging understanding of how, in conversation, notions of appropriation, citation, ironization, and metaphorization can be deployed as strategies of legitimation and exclusion. And, as a result, I question how "oppressed, minoritized" groups differentiate themselves from other groups in order to seek justice and claim authority. Must we always define ourselves in opposition and distance to a minoritized and oppressed group that can be perceived as even more unsavory than the one from which one currently speaks?  
As I watched the discussion about who among the feminist and WOC bloggers has power and authority and how that is achieved, I began to recognise a new power dynamic both on the internet and in the world at large. Feminism takes on misogyny. The WOC have been engaging feminism. But from my point of view, a wide variety of powerful feminist and anti-racist discourse is predicated on negative disability stereotyping. There's a kind of hierarchy here: the lack of awareness about disability, disability culture and identity, and our civil rights movement has resulted in a kind of domino effect where disability images are the metaphor of last resort: the bottom, the worst. Disability language has about it a kind of untouchable quality -- as if the horror and weakness of a disabled body were the one true, reliable thing, a touchstone to which we can turn when we know we can't use misogynistic or racist language. When we engage in these kinds of argumentative strategies, we exclude a whole population of people whose histories are intricately bound up with ours. When we deploy these kinds of strategies to underscore the value of our own existence in the world, we reaffirm and strengthen the systems of oppression that motivated us to speak out in the first place.

#### Not the death triv they are talking about

#### They make it impossible to discuss violence of patriarchy, debate conditions who we are yada yada

#### No rez basis

#### Counter-interp – d-rule against death debating except in this debate

#### Competing interpretations are bad because they’re not predictable – err aff on reasonability

#### Their ev is out of context – joke underlining – not about debate, just about overall discussion of death, makes impacts inevitable

#### Death cult links to their privilege arguments because they’re academics who don’t have to worry about life threatening situations

#### (\_\_) Analyzing death scenarios in the academy key to overall survival

Louis Rene Beres, professor of international law at Purdue University, 6/5/03 (Journal and Courier, “Anarchy and international law on an endangered planet”)

For us, other rude awakenings are unavoidable, some of which could easily overshadow the horrors of Sept. 11. There can be little doubt that, within a few short years, expanding tribalism will produce several new genocides and proliferating nuclear weapons will generate one or more regional nuclear wars. Paralyzed by fear and restrained by impotence, various governments will try, desperately, to deflect our attention, but it will be a vain effort. Caught up in a vast chaos from which no real escape is possible, we will learn too late that there is no durable safety in arms, no ultimate rescue by authority, no genuine remedy in science or technology. What shall we do? For a start, we must all begin to look carefully behind the news. **Rejecting superficial analyses of day-to-day events in favor of penetrating assessments of world affairs, we must learn quickly to distinguish what is truly important from what is merely entertainment**. With such learning, we Americans could prepare for growing worldwide anarchy not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet. Nowhere is it written that we people of Earth are forever, that humankind must thwart the long-prevailing trend among all planetary life-forms (more than 99 percent) of ending in extinction. Aware of this, we may yet survive, at least for a while, but only if our collective suppression of purposeful fear is augmented by a complementary wisdom; that is, that our personal mortality is undeniable and that the harms done by one tribal state or terror group against "others" will never confer immortality. This is, admittedly, a difficult concept to understand, but the longer we humans are shielded from such difficult concepts the shorter will be our time remaining. We must also look closely at higher education in the United States, not from the shortsighted stance of improving test scores, but from the urgent perspective of confronting extraordinary threats to human survival. For the moment, some college students are exposed to an occasional course in what is fashionably described as "global awareness," but such exposure usually sidesteps the overriding issues: We now face a deteriorating world system that cannot be mended through sensitivity alone; our leaders are dangerously unprepared to deal with catastrophic deterioration; our schools are altogether incapable of transmitting the indispensable visions of planetary restructuring. To institute productive student confrontations with survival imperatives, colleges and universities must soon take great risks, detaching themselves from a time-dishonored preoccupation with "facts" in favor of grappling with true life-or-death questions. In raising these questions, it will not be enough to send some students to study in Paris or Madrid or Amsterdam ("study abroad" is not what is meant by serious global awareness). Rather, all **students must be made aware** - as a primary objective of the curriculum - **of where we are heading, as a species, and where our limited survival alternatives may yet be discovered.**

#### Our ontology is constituted through the exclusion of the feminine—the idea that “everything is ontological” forgets the material always present within ontology

Anne **van Leeuwen** 20**10** Sexuate difference, ontological difference: Between Irigaray and Heidegger Cont Philos Rev (2010) 43:111–126 DOI 10.1007/s11007-010-9136-7

Luce Irigaray’s work contains two indissociable projects: the disruption of Western metaphysics and the thinking of sexuate difference. If we are to take seriously the philosophical richness of her work, then we must attempt to make sense of these two projects as co-implicative. Near the beginning of Speculum, Irigaray gestures in precisely this direction: [o]ne can only agree in passing that it is impossible exhaustively to represent what woman might be, given that a certain economy of representation— inadequately perceived by psychoanalysis, at least in the ‘scientific discourse’ that it speaks—functions through a tribute to woman that is never paid or even assessed. The whole problematic of Being has been elaborated thanks to that loan.1 We might do well to dwell on this last remark, Irigaray’s claim that through the grace of a loan that is never acknowledged or assessed the whole problematic of Being has been elaborated. Here Irigaray indicts the constitutive exclusion upon which the formulation of the problematic of Being has emerged. While much attention has been devoted to Irigaray’s incisive critique of the constitutive exclusion of woman, too little attention has been paid to her concomitant insistence that it is the domain of ontology that is constituted through this exclusion and, thus, that it is nothing less than the question of Being that is implicated by her critique.2 We must ask, then, precisely how Irigaray understands the formulation of the problematic of Being. In other words, given that the constitutive exclusion of woman has furnished the ground, what, according to Irigaray, is the ontological edifice emergent from this unacknowledged loan? To begin, we will see that Irigaray is deeply critical of the way in which Parmenides’ principle of identity has been taken up in and as the history of metaphysics at the cost of forgetting sexuate difference.3 Engaging with Heidegger’s work as the culminating moment of this metaphysical legacy, Irigaray identifies Heidegger’s interpretation of the principle of identity, an interpretation that expresses the implicit commitments of his ‘‘phenomenological ontology,’’4 as instantiating the forgetting of sexuate difference that is at the heart of metaphysics. Next, in the second section, we will see that Irigaray identifies this metaphysical legacy, one that remains vestigially present in Heidegger’s work, alternately as the univocity of thinking and Being or as the elision of carnality from the domain of ontology. Yet despite her devastating critique, by turning to Derrida’s second Geschlecht essay in the third section of this paper I attempt to motivate a rereading of Heidegger’s project. Derrida’s essay allows us to retrojectively locate in Heidegger’s work the latent possibility of articulating a phenomenological ontology that takes sexuate difference rather than the univocity of Dasein as its point of departure. Finally, returning to Irigaray’s work in the fourth section, we will be in a position to understand the philosophical salience of sexuate difference as at once the expression of her deep commitment to and critique of Heideggarian phenomenological ontology: By reformulating the principle of identity, by rethinking the implicit commitments of phenomenological ontology, Irigaray is able to reformulate the problematic of Being in accordance with sexuate difference.

# T

#### INTRODUCTION OF US ARMED FORCES is the assignment of forces to participate or engage in hostilities

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION 73 [50 USC Chapter 33 - WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, § 1547 - Interpretation of joint resolution, http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/50/1541]

(c) Introduction of United States Armed Forces

#### For purposes of this chapter, the term “introduction of United States Armed Forces” includes the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become

#### We are a restriction, don’t let president introduce forces that don’t have women.

1. Their card says quote
2. refer to all limitations, including those which are contractually binding and/or technically implemented limitations.

That’s what we are

#### Restrict means to restrain.

Words and Phrases 04 (Volume 37A, p. 406)

Miss. 1927. To “restrict” is to restrain within bounds; to limit; to confine; and does not mean to destroy or prohibit**.** Dart v. City of Gulfport, 113 So. 441, 147 Miss. 534.

#### That’s more predictable, only evidence in the context of US law, their evidence is about EU trade disputes

#### They make it so there are only four affs, that totally take away president’s power in the four areas. Our interp is key for aff specificity and diversity

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom.

# Cap

### AT: Historical Materialist Alt

**Perm do both—our methodologies are compatible—the alt alone makes gendered violence inevitable and is epistemologically incomplete**

**Nadell and Haulman 13**

Pamela S. Nadell - Chair of the Department of History and Director of the Jewish Studies Program @ American University and Kate Haulman - historian of early North America @ American University, “Making Women’s Histories”, 2013, pg 190)

It is true, however, that in this revisionist world history enterprise, questions of the political economy have taken center stage and so has the goal of (re-)mapping global connections. Related to this is the prominence of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century social theory in word history discourses (albeit often as an object of critical appraisal) and a traditional, institution-centered view of politics. As world historians themselves have noted, a deep engagement with culturalist theoretical paradigms from anthropology or literary studies remains the exception rather than the rule.12 Not surprisingly then, the cultural production of difference and its political deployment in all spheres of life, issues that are of paramount importance to historians of gender and sexuality, inhabit the analytical periphery of the world historical debate. More frustrating still, while a materialist emphasis does not per se preclude gender analysis—one only needs to recall the many superb feminist labor histories written within national frameworks—much of world history marches along merrily without paying much attention to gender and sexuality at all. Beyond their presumed transparent relation to demography, gender and sexuality remain altogether invisible, not to mention inoperative as categories of historical analysis. En-gendering World History within Area Studies: The Case of Latin America But the materialist and culturalist approaches that often separate world history and gender and sexuality studies are by no means inherently incompatible. For reasons specifi c to the history of Latin American studies as a field, Latin American history anticipated the concern of both world history and transnational cultural studies with international dynamics of domination, dependency, and difference.13 It has long been both comparative and interested in how a particular region fi ts into a global story. Like world history, the dominant narratives of Latin American history have been those of empire building, global capitalism, and state formation. At the same time, Latin Americanist feminist scholarship and studies of sexuality have been heavily materialist, even as they incorporated the linguistic turn’s emphasis on meaning. Scholars have engaged poststructuralist calls to see gender as a multilayered fi eld of power, and sexuality as constituted through ideology and performance. Yet what they have most produced is an outpouring of social and political history on gender and sexuality—in labor relations, government institutions, social movements, and national modernization. Much of this literature reworks, rather than jettisons older notions of political economy and the state, even as Foucault and Lacan enter more prominently into the framework. It is not that Latin Amercanists “lagged behind” or failed to take enough of a cultural turn, but rather that different questions were being asked about Latin America than about Europe and the United States, which compelled different uses of—and investments in—materialism, gender, and sexuality.

### AT: Ethics

#### Cap is ethical

Dr. Ronald Nash, Philosophy & Theology @ RTS, 1996 (<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/1352736/posts>) [gender modified]

Does Capitalism Exploit People? Capitalism is also attacked on the ground that it leads to situations in which some people (the “exploiters”) win at the expense of other people (the “losers”). A fancier way to put this is to say that market exchanges are examples of what is called a zero-sum game, namely, an exchange where only one participant can win. If one person (or group) wins, then the other must lose. Baseball and basketball are two examples of zero-sum games. If A wins, then B must lose. The error here consists in thinking that market exchanges are a zero-sum game. On the contrary, market exchanges illustrate what is called a positive-sum game, that is, one in which both players may win. We must reject the myth that economic exchanges necessarily benefit only one party at the expense of the other. In voluntary economic exchanges, both parties may leave the exchange in better economic shape than would otherwise have been the case. To repeat the message of the peaceful means of exchange, “If you do something good for me, then I will do something good for you.” If both parties did not believe they gained through the trade, if each did not see the exchange as beneficial, they would not continue to take part in it. Most religious critics of capitalism focus their attacks on what they take to be its moral shortcomings. In truth, the moral objections to capitalism turn out to be a sorry collection of claims that reflect, more than anything else, **serious confusions** about the real nature of a market system. When capitalism is put to the moral test, it beats its competition easily. Among all of our economic options, Arthur Shenfield writes: "Only capitalism operates on the basis of respect for free, independent, responsible persons. All other systems in varying degrees treat people as less than this. Socialist systems above all treat people as pawns to be moved about by the authorities, or as children to be given what the rulers decide is good for them, or as serfs or slaves. The rulers begin by boasting about their compassion, which in any case is fraudulent, but after a time they drop this pretense which they find unnecessary for the maintenance of power. In all things they act on the presumption that they know best. Therefore they and their systems are morally stunted. Only the free system, the much assailed capitalism, is morally mature." The alternative to free exchange is coercion and violence. Capitalism is a mechanism that allows natural human desires to be satisfied in a nonviolent way. **Little can be done to prevent people from wanting to be rich**, Shenfield says. That’s the way things often are in a fallen world. But what capitalism does is channel that desire into peaceful means that benefit many besides those who wish to improve their own situation in life. “The alternative to serving other people’s wants,” Shenfield concludes, “is seizing power of them, as it always has been. Hence it is not surprising that wherever the enemies of capitalism have prevailed, the result has been not only the debasement of consumption standards for the masses but also their reduction to serfdom by the new privileged class of Socialist rulers.” Once people realize that few things in life are free, that most things carry a price tag, and that therefore we have to work for most of the things we want, we are in a position to learn a vital truth about life. Capitalism helps teach this truth. But under socialism, Arthur Shefield warns, “Everything still has a cost, but everyone is tempted, even urged to behave as if there is no cost or as if the cost will be borne by somebody else. This is one of the most corrosive effects of collectivism upon the moral character of people.”

#### Cap key to individual rights

Larry Obhof, JD @ Yale, 2003 (“WHY GLOBALIZATION? A LOOK AT GLOBAL CAPITALISM AND ITS EFFECTS”. University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy. Fall 2003)

One attempt to measure political freedom is offered by the annual Freedom House survey of civil liberties and political rights. n128 This survey includes comprehensive information on 192 countries and 17 disputed territories. It measures political rights according to a citizen's ability to participate in the political process, including the rights of an individual to vote and compete for public office, as well the ability of elected representatives to determine public policies. Civil liberties include the freedom to develop views, institutions, and personal autonomy apart from the state. Open countries tend to score well on the Freedom House survey; with very few exceptions, countries that are highly globalized enjoy greater political freedom than those that are not. n129 Indeed, noting the link between [\*114] freedoms and capitalism, the most recent survey finds that "efforts to help strengthen property rights, market systems, and the rule of law should be part of the effort to assist less-developed countries." n130 Other studies have found a positive correlation between the presence of multinational corporations and the levels of civil and political rights in developing countries. n131 These results should come as no surprise. Although globalization per se need not expand freedoms, increasing economic liberalization almost certainly does. It has long been known that one of the greatest benefits of a capitalist system is its tendency to diffuse power among individual decision makers, allowing for greater individual autonomy than any other system. Under the invisible hand of the market, individual decision-making replaces centralized authority as the guiding force of society; the result of a market economy is more autonomy for individuals, and hence more freedom. This occurs almost out of logical necessity: capitalism takes power away from the masses, in the form of the state or some other authority, and disperses it among individuals. Freedom of action in the economic sphere underpins political and civil freedom. n132 As F.A. Hayek stated in 1944, "political feeling is meaningless without economic freedom," because economic freedom is the prerequisite for any other freedom. n133 Economic freedom allows us to choose how we spend our time, what we do with the resources we earn, and indeed, how we spend our lives. In a capitalist system, individuals answer these questions for themselves. In any other system, individuals face coercion from others. The fundamental threat to freedom is the power to coerce; political freedom can therefore be defined as the absence of coercion. n134 Removing the organization of economic activity from the control of political authority eliminates the source of coercive power. n135 Market forces tend to eliminate the concentration of power and disperse whatever [\*115] power cannot be eliminated. n136 Hence economic freedom is a check on political power. Capitalism may not be a sufficient condition for freedom, but it is a necessary one. Market economies also offer incentives for treating others well. Capitalism is itself an ethical economic arrangement - it is generally in the long-term interests of people in a market economy to act ethically. n137 There are always unfortunate exceptions, but most capitalists will find it beneficial "to act with restraint and in a way which best serves the interests of their clients or customers." n138 This system promotes values such as entrepreneurship, tolerance, and willingness to compromise, which are necessary to anyone wanting to make money in a free economy. n139 In addition to increasing political freedoms, globalization has a positive effect on human rights. This occurs for two basic reasons. First, growing economic interdependence makes countries more subject to the moral imperatives of others. Many advanced nations, or substantial numbers of people therein, have made human rights a priority. There are now influential people (with loud voices, holding the purse strings to foreign aid and investment) that stand against human rights abuses, however they are defined. Even some corporations advance human rights by refusing to follow the repressive traditions of host countries. Many Western corporations, for example, hire and promote women and ethnic minorities in countries where domestic employers will not. To continue with the theme of economic externalities, however, it is important to understand the effect of economic freedom on human rights abuses. At least one theory of human rights focuses on individual agency - the ability of each individual to engage in autonomous actions that do not harm other human beings. n140 "Human rights," argues Michael Ignatieff, "is the language of individual empowerment . . . when individuals have agency, they can protect themselves from injustice . . . [and] they can define for [\*116] themselves what they wish to live and die for." n141 This view of human rights finds abuses where individual agency is denied. n142 As noted above, economic liberalization increases individual autonomy by dispersing the coercive power of others. n143 While markets cannot guarantee that members of a society will be free, they order and diffuse power in such a way as to make its abuse more difficult and more unlikely. To paraphrase Milton Friedman: the wider the range of activities covered by the market, the fewer the issues on which agreement of another is required, and the fewer the opportunities for coercion or a violation of autonomy. n144 For all practical purposes, it does not matter if the stereotypical Western capitalist shares the goals of the human rights movement (although many invariably do, and some invariably do not). If agency is considered central to the definition of human rights, then the globalization of markets must be seen as an agent of human rights.

Their construction of the unitary president/state/Congress/other as destroyer of the world validates antiquated framings of power and collapses affronts to violence

Bernauer 90 (James W., Professor of Philosophy @ Boston College, Michel Foucault's Force of Flight*:* Toward an Ethics for Thought: Humanities Press International, Pg. 143-150).

More than a few might be troubled by Foucault's likening of our political condition to that of the early Christian era. For a long time the failure of the Second Coming to occur as anticipated bore major responsibility for a withdrawal from political concern and (or a passivity in the face of history. How could it have been otherwise, if the focus of the age emphasized the awaiting of an event over which man himself had no control? Foucault's comparison might be appropriate in a way that he himself had not intended. The same questions might be put to him as were posed after the appearance of *LMC.* Havethese studies conspired with his earlier work to undermine the possibility of human action changing the reality it finds? Whereas his notion of epistemic systems had once prompted doubts about the political efficacy of his thought, it was now his perspective on power and its functioning that generated suspicion. Just as archaeological thinking was divested of the target that the history of ideas had provided, so political movements were deprived of that clear opponent against which they struggled. Those movements that defined themselves in terms of the struggle against the power of the state or against the powers of a specific class seems to be antiquated. In the modern period, there is no king, no center of power to function as a magnet for revolt, only a vast network of diverse elements that have various natures and function at different levels. While the notion of a transgression against a prohibitive power may be attractive and galvanizing – as it had been for Foucault in the past – the present deployment of power does not permit a conception of its overthrow as obeying a law of all or nothing. There is "no single locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary.” Against whom, or against which constitution, does one revolt when the complex system of power-knowledge within which we exist has neither a great man nor any particular group of individuals that is consciously responsible for putting the system into operation and for maintaining its functioning? Foucault does not evade the possible implitcations of the type of society that his analysis shows modernity to have fabricated. Bio-power may well maintain its hegemony, and the questions of common concern that emerge within its system may simply involve its smoother functioning. Such questions will be responded to not by political debate but by the increasing intervention of experts for whom general political discussion on such issues has become anachronistic. In the light of our contemporary deployment of power, Foucault did not avoid considering whether politics itself is threatened with extinction, that we are perhaps experiencing the end of politics.'''105 And yet Foucault's imagining of this very real possibility is but a dimension of a critical hope. When he was censured in the past for having locked men into discourses and rules over which they had no control, Foucault argued that, far from wanting to make a prisoner of human being, his aim was to comprehend what needed to be changed and how such transformation could be enacted. While it is true that he deprived the “sovereignty of the subject of the exclusive and instantaneous right" to effect such transformation—which is only an obvious acknowledgement of the situation- the point of his studies was to master the rule in regard to which human creativity could operate. He had wanted to demonstrate how fragile an epoch’s order of things actually is so as to “show up, transform and reverse the systems which quietly order us about.”

What is material?  The affirmative disagrees with their representation of economics as a monocausal explanation for how power functions – the world is a collection of differences and attempting to impose a singular model of knowing on it paradoxically makes analysis impossible

**Manuel DeLanda, 1997**, Adjunct Associate Professor – Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation – Columbia University, A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History, p. 46-8

Even in this age of huge multinational corporations, the command element in the commercial mixture is far from 100 percent. The economist John Kenneth Galbraith, who sharply differentiates between spontaneous economic activity (markets) and planned economic processes (big business), calculates that today roughly half of the Western economy has been taken over by capitalist hierarchies. The other half comprises the low-profit regions, which those hierarchies willingly abandon to the market. According to Galbraith, what gives capitalism this freedom of motion is economy of scale, which is why since the Middle Ages commercial capitalism has been associated with wholesale and not retail. A large firm is better able to absorb shocks and fluctuations and create the plans and strategies that may win it a degree of independence from market forces, indeed the ability to control and manipulate those forces to a certain degree.     Such considerations led Braudel to the startling conclusion that "we should not be too quick to assume that capitalism embraces the whole of western society, that it accounts for every stitch in the social fabric...that our societies are organized from top to bottom in a 'capitalist system.' On the contrary...there is a dialectic still very much alive between capitalism on one hand, and its antithesis, the 'non-capitalism' of the lower level on the other."56 And he adds that, indeed, capitalism was carried upward and onward on the shoulders of small shops and "the enormous creative powers of the market, of the lower story of exchange.... [This] lowest level, not being paralysed by the size of its plant or organization, is the one readiest to adapt; it is the seedbed of inspiration, improvisation and even innovation, although its most brilliant discoveries sooner or later fall into the hands of the holders of capital. It was not the capitalists who brought about the fast cotton revolution; all the new ideas came from enterprising small businesses."57     There is a misconception, widely shared by economists and philosophers on either side of the political spectrum, that capitalism developed in several stages, being at first competitive and subservient to market forces and only later, in the twentieth century, becoming monopolistic. However, starting in the thirteenth century, capitalists engaged in various noncompetitive practices, in order to create the large accumulations of money that have always characterized the upper levels of the trade pyramid. As we discussed, the early medieval fairs, the meeting points of rich merchants from all over Europe, were veritable hierarchies of meshworks, in which the luxury and money markets dominated the upper echelons. Neither in the long-distance trade of prestige goods nor in the worlds of precious metals and credit did supply and demand reign supreme. On the contrary, most fortunes in these areas were made by the manipulation of these market forces through a variety of noncompetitive practices. There was, of course, intense competition among rich merchants and families, much as today large corporations compote with one another, but these rivalries among oligopolies are fundamentally different from the kind of "anonymous competition" in which small producers and traders engage.58     From the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century, not only did individual businesses engage in monopolistic practices, entire cities did too, even groups of cities. By means of noncompetitive practices, a town could greatly aid its merchants and financiers, protecting them from foreign rivals, and stimulating the accumulation of money within its walls. The medieval cities that controlled the Mediterranean and the Baltic and North Seas financed much of their growth from manipulation of markets and by acquiring exclusive control of certain flows, such as spices and silks from the Levant in the case of Venice, or salt in the case of Lübeck. With a monopoly on luxury goods, won and maintained by military force, fourteenth-century Venice dominated the cities around it, not only the small towns constituting its supply regions but other giant towns, such as Florence and Milan. In the north, between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, cities like Lübeck and Bruges formed a meshwork of cities known as the Hanseatic League, which was capable of collective action without a centralized organization behind it. The league also engaged in monopolistic practices to trap the towns within its zone of economic influence in a web of supervision and dependence.59     We will return shortly to other forms of market manipulation which, according to Braudel, have always characterized certain commercial institutions since the Middle Ages. This will make clear how wrong it is to assume (as many economists to the right and center of the political spectrum tend to do) that market power is something that may be dismissed or that needs to be studied only in relation to some aberrant institutional forms such as overt monopolies. But certain conceptions from the left (particularly the Marxist left) also need to be corrected, in particular, a teleological conception of economic history in terms of a linear progression of modes of production. In this Braudel explicitly agrees with Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari: capitalism could have arisen anywhere and long before it did in Europe.60 Its emergence must be pictured as a bifurcation, a phase transition that might have taken place somewhere else had the conditions been right (for instance, in the huge camel caravans along the Salk Road in the thirteenth century).61 Moreover, the institutions that emerged after this bifurcation must be viewed not as replacing previous institutions (i.e., markets) but as fully coexisting with them without forming a societywide "system." It is true that prices across Europe were pulsating to the same rhythm from medieval times and this gave the entire continent a certain economic coherence (sometimes referred to as a "world-economy"), but it would be a mistake to confuse world-economies with the "capitalist system," since India, China, and Islam also formed coherent economic areas (as powerful as those of Europe) without giving rise to capitalism.62     The conceptual confusion engendered by all the different uses of the word "capitalism" (as "free enterprise" or as "industrial mode of production" or, more recently, as "world-economy") is so entrenched that it makes an objective analysis of economic power almost impossible. One could, of course, simply redefine the term "capitalism" to include "power to manipulate markets" as a constitutive part of its meaning and to rid it of some of its teleological connotations. But as philosophers of science know well, when a theory begins redefining its terms in an ad hoc way to fit the latest round of negative evidence, it shows by this very act that it has reached the limits of its usefulness. In view of this, it would seem that the only solution is to replace this tired word with a neologism, perhaps the one Braudel suggested, "antimarkets," and to use it exclusively to refer to a certain segment of the population of commercial and industrial institutions.63

**Ethical judgments about capitalism in the abstract should be avoided – its complete abandonment is neither possible nor desirable – an insistence on meshwork alternatives will result in worse forms of oppression**

**Manuel DeLanda, 1997**, Adjunct Associate Professor – Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation – Columbia University, A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History, p. 66-70

Thus, much as sedimentary rocks, biological species, and social hierarchies are all stratified systems (that is, they are each the historical product of a process of double articulation), so igneous rocks, ecosystems, and markets are self-consistent aggregates, the result of the coming together and interlocking of heterogeneous elements. And just as the diagram defining the “stratifying abstract machine” may turn out to require more complexity than our basic diagram of a double articulation, so we may one day discover (empirically or through theorizing and computer simulations) that the diagram for the meshwork-producing process involves more than the three elements outlined above. Moreover, in reality we will always find mixtures of markets and hierarchies, of strata and self-consistent aggregates. As Simon says, it may seem prima facie correct to say that     whereas markets figure most prominently in coordinating economic activities in capitalist countries, hierarchic organizations play the largest role in socialist countries. But that is too simple a formula to describe the realities which always exhibit a blend of all the mechanisms of coordination. The economic units in capitalist societies are mostly business firms, which are themselves hierarchic organizations, some of enormous size, that make only a modest use of markets in their internal functioning. Conversely socialist states use market prices to a growing extent to supplement hierarchic control in achieving inter-industry coordinatnon.99      There is one final aspect of meshwork dynamics I must examine before returning to our exploration of the “geological” history of human societies. We may wonder why, given the ubiquity of self-consistent aggregates, it seems so hard to think about the structures that populate the world in any but hierarchical terms. One possible answer is that stratified structures involve the simplest form of causal relations, simple arrows going from cause to effect.100 According to Magoroh Maruyana, a pioneer in the study of feedback, Western thought has been dominated by notions of linear (nonreciprocal) causality for twenty-five hundred years. It was not until World War II that the work of Norman Wiener (and engineers involved in developing radar systems) gave rise to the study of negative feedback and with it the beginning of nonlinear thinking.     The classic example of negative feedback is the thermostat. A thermostat consists of at least two elements: a sensor, which detects charges in ambient temperature, and, an effector, a device capable of changing the ambient temperature. The two elements are coupled in such a way that whenever the sensor detects a change beyond a certain threshold it causes the effector to modify the surrounding temperature in the opposite direction. The cause-and-effect relation, however, is not linear (from sensor to effector) since the moment the effector causes a change in the surrounding temperature it thereby affects the subsequent behavior of the sensor. In short, the causal relation does not form a straight arrow but folds back on itself, forming a closed loop. The overall result of this circular causality is that ambient temperature is maintained at a given level.     Maruyana opposes negative feedback with "positive feedback" (a form of nonlinear causality that we have already encountered in the form of autocatalysis). While the first type of reciprocal causality was incorporated into Western thought in the 1950s, the second type had to wait another decade for researchers like Stanislav Ulam, Heinz Von Foerster, and Maruyana himself to formalize and develop the concept.101 The turbulent dynamics behind an explosion are the clearest example of a system governed by positive feedback. In this case the causal loop is established between the explosive substance and its temperature. The velocity of an explosion is often determined by the intensity of its temperature (the hotter the faster), but because the explosion itself generates heat, the process is self-accelerating. Unlike the thermostat, where the arrangement helps to keep temperature under control, here positive feedback forces temperature to go out of control. Perhaps because positive feedback is seen as a destabilizing force many observers have tended to undervalue it relative to negative feedback. (In the so-called Gaia hypothesis, for instance, where stabilizing negative feedback is postulated to exist between living creatures and their environment, positive feedback is sometimes referred to pejoratively as "anti-Gaian.")102     Maruyana sees the question in different terms. For him the principal characteristic of negative feedback as its homogenizing effect: any deviation from the temperature threshold at which the thermostat is set is eliminated by the loop. Negative feedback is "deviation-counteracting." Positive feedback, on the other hand, tends to increase heterogeneity by being "deviation-amplifying": two explosions set off under slightly different conditions will arrive at very different end states, as the small original differences are amplified by the loop into large discrepancies.103 We have already observed the many roles that positive feedback has played in the turbulent history of Western towns. However, it is important to distinguish between simple autocatalytic dynamics and complex autocatalytic loops, which involve not only self-stimulation but self-maintenance (that is, positive feedback and closure).     Another way of stating this distinction is to say that the increase in diversity that mutually stimulating loops bring about will be short-lived unless the heterogeneous elements are interwoven together, that is, unless they come to form a meshwork. As Maruyana writes, "There are two ways that heterogeneity may proceed: through localization and through interweaving. In localization the heterogeneity between localities increases, while each locality may remain or become homogenous. In interweaving, heterogeneity in each locality increases, while the difference between localities decreases."104 In other words, the danger with positive feedback is that the mere production of heterogeneity may result in isolationism (a high diversity of small cliques, each internally homogeneous). Hence the need for intercalary elements to aid in articulating this diversity without homogenization (what Maruyana calls "symbiotizatson of cultural heterogeneity").     Negative feedback, as a system of control and reduction of deviation, may be applied to human hierarchies. Decision making in stratified social structures does not always proceed via goal- directed analytic planning but often incorporates automatic mechanisms of control similar to a thermostat (or any other device capable of generating homeostasis).105 On the other hand, social meshworks (such as the symbiotic nets of producers whom Jacobs describes as engaged in volatile trade) may be modeled on positive-feedback loops as long in our model also incorporates a means for the resulting heterogeneity to be interwoven. Moreover, specific institutions will likely be mixtures of both types of reciprocal causality, and the mixtures will change over time, allowing negative or positive feedback to dominate at a given moment.106 The question of mixtures should be also kept in mind when we judge the relative ethical value of these two types of structure. If this book displays a clear bias against large, centralized hierarchies, it is only because the last three hundred years have witnessed an excessive accumulation of stratified systems at the expense of meshworks. The degree of homogeneity in the world has greatly increased, while heterogeneity has come to be seen as almost pathological, or at least as a problem that must be eliminated. Under the circumstances, a call for a more decentralized way of organizing human societies seems to recommend itself.     However, it is crucial to avoid the facile conclusion that meshworks are intrinsically better than hierarchies (in some transcendental sense). It is true that some of the characteristics of meshworks (particularly their resilience and adaptability) make them desirable, but that is equally true of certain characteristics of hierarchies (for example, their goal-directedness). Therefore, it is crucial to avoid the temptation of cooking up a narrative of human history in which meshworks appear as heroes and hierarchies as villains. Not only domeshworks have dynamical properties that do not necessarily benefit humanity (for example, they grow and develop by drift, and that drift need not follow a direction consistent with a society's values), but they may contain heterogeneous components that are themselves inconsistent with a society's values (for example, certain meshworks of hierarchies).Assuming that humanity could one day agree on a set of values (or rather on a way of meshing a heterogeneous collection of partially divergent values), further ethical judgments could be made about specific mixtures of centralized and decentralized components in specific contexts, but never about the two pure cases in isolation.     The combinatorial possibilities—the number of possible hybrids of meshworks and hierarchies—are immense (in a precise technical sense),107 and so an experimental and empirical attitude toward the problem would seem to be called for. It is surelyimpossible to determine purely theoretically the relative merits of these diverse combinations. Rather, in our search for viable hybrids we must look for inspiration in as many domains as possible. Here, we have looked to a realm that would normally seem out of bounds: the mineral world. But in a nonlinear world in which the same basic processes of self-organization take place in the mineral, organic, and cultural spheres, perhaps rocks hold some of the keys to understanding sedimentary humanity, igneous humanity, and all their mixtures.

#### Transition wars –

#### A) Interstate conflict – empires will go to war before considering degrowth.

Alexander ’12, [Dr. Samuel Alexander is co-director of the Simplicity Institute and a lecturer in ‘Consumerism and Sustainability’ at the Office for Environmental Programs, University of Melbourne. Aug 6, 2012 Degrowth, Expensive Oil, and the New Economics of Energy http://simplicitycollective.com/degrowth-expensive-oil-and-the-new-economics-of-energy]

Needless to say, the powers that be are not willing even to entertain this ‘degrowth’ diagnosis or its radical implications, for it implies establishing fundamentally new economic systems that operate on much lower energy inputs. Empire, we can be sure, will not contemplate self-annihilation; **it will struggle for existence all the way down.** In much the same vein, consumerist cultures are very unlikely to accept any proposal to voluntarily reduce levels of consumption. Overcoming or dealing with these forms of resistance is the near impossible task that lies before those of us who seek a radically alternative, post-carbon economy (Trainer, 2010b; Heinberg and Leach, 2010; Alexander, 2011c).

#### Indictment of pure capitalism is irrelevant – the issue should be regulated capitalism, which gets the benefits of capitalism without the problems

Newman ’12, Rick Newman, author of Rebounders: How Winners Pivot From Setback To Success. December 6, 2012

USNEWS.com HEADLINE: Why the Tension Between Socialism and Capitalism Will Intensify lexis

This year's presidential election included many bastardized references to both economic systems, which have been broadly mischaracterized for a long time. Many defenders of capitalism argue that the nation's economic system was more pure a decade ago (or two, or three), but America hasn't had pure capitalism in well over a century. And when it did have a raw form of capitalism, the consequences were often disastrous for significant chunks of the population, which is why public support grew for the kind of [ENJOY: Political Cartoons on the Republican Party] In the 1800s, the federal government largely stayed out of the economy, with nothing like the regulatory apparatus we have now. That's one reason people like Andrew Carnegie, John Jacob Astor, John D. Rockefeller, Cornelius Vanderbilt, and J.P. Morgan built vast fortunes -- often from monopolies or cartels--that still exist in various forms today. But unregulated capitalism also generated speculative bubbles, financial panics and destitution much more frequently than those things have occurred over the last 70 years. Public pressure led to a long series of reforms that morphed into the regulated free-market economy we have today. In the early 1900s, Teddy Roosevelt started to break up some of the all-powerful monopolies that enriched a few while overcharging the masses. Congress created the Federal Reserve and the income tax in 1913. A slew of regulatory agencies grew out of the Great Depression. During the 20th century, presidents of both parties signed legislation creating new agencies to oversee food, medicine, the environment and Wall Street (ahem). We still have a capitalist system centered on private ownership and prices set by the free market, but it's layered with rules meant to prevent abuses.

2. The “out-lefting” appeal of destroying economic colonialism presumes a materialist paradigm of action, bankrupting the alternative and formulating a stringent closure of politics which makes the impact inevitable and the 1AC a dis-ad to the alternative.

Butler, 1998

(Judith, PhD @ Yale, Maxine Elliot Professor of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature at UC Berkeley, *New Left Review*, Issue 227, January-February 1998, “Merely Cultural”)

Thus, the result of parody is paradoxical: **the gleeful sense of triumph indulged by the avatars of an ostensibly more serious Marxism about their moment in the cultural limelight exemplifies and symptomatizes precisely the cultural object of critique they oppose; the sense of triumph over this enemy, which cannot take place without in some eerie way taking the very place of the enemy, raises the question of whether the aims and goals of this more serious Marxism have not become hopelessly displaced onto a cultural domain, producing a transient object of media attention in the place of a more systematic analysis of economic and social relations. This sense of triumph reinscribes a factionalization within the Left at the very moment in which welfare rights are being abolished in this country, class differentials are intensifying across the globe, and the right wing in this country has successfully gained the ground of the ‘middle’ effectively making the Left itself invisible within the media.** When does it appear on the front page of the New York Times, except on that rare occasion in which one part of the Left swipes at another, producing a spectacle of the Left for mainstream liberal and conservative press consumption which is all too happy to discount every and any faction of the Left within the political process, much less honour the Left of any kind as a strong force in the service of radical social change? Is the attempt to separate Marxism from the study of culture and to rescue critical knowledge from the shoals of cultural specificity simply a turf war between left cultural studies and more orthodox forms of Marxism? How is this attempted separation related to the claim that new social movements have split the Left, deprived us of common ideals, factionalized the field of knowledge and political activism, reducing political activism to the mere assertion and affirmation of cultural identity**? The charge that new social movements are ‘merely cultural’, that a unified and progressive Marxism must return to a materialism based in an objective analysis of class, itself presumes that the distinction between material and cultural life is a stable one. And this recourse to an apparently stable distinction between material and cultural life is clearly the resurgence of a theoretical anachronism,** one that discounts the contributions to Marxist theory since Althusser’s displacement of the base-superstructure model, as well as various forms of cultural materialism—for instance, Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Indeed**, the untimely resurgence of that distinction is in the service of a tactic which seeks to identify new social movements with the merely cultural, and the cultural with the derivative and secondary, thus embracing an anachronistic materialism as the banner for a new orthodoxy.** **This resurgence** of left orthodoxy calls for a ‘unity’ that **would**, paradoxically, **redivide the Left in precisely the way that orthodoxy purports to lament.** Indeed, one way of **producing this division becomes clear when we ask which movements, and for what reasons, get relegated to the sphere of the merely cultural, and how that very division between the material and the cultural becomes tactically invoked for the purposes of marginalizing certain forms of political activism**? And how does the new orthodoxy on the Left work in tandem with a social and sexual conservativism that seeks to make questions of race and sexuality secondary to the ‘real’ business of politics, producing a new and eerie political formation of neo-conservative Marxisms. On what principles of exclusion or subordination has this ostensible unity been erected? How quickly we forget that new social movements based on democratic principles became articulated against a hegemonic Left as well as a complicitous liberal centre and a truly threatening right wing? Have the historical reasons for the development of semiautonomous new social movements ever really been taken into account by those who now lament their emergence and credit them with narrow identitarian interests? Is this situation not simply reproduced in the recent efforts to restore the universal through fiat, whether through the imaginary finesse of Habermasian rationality or notions of the common good that prioritize a racially cleansed notion of class? Is **the point of the new rhetorics of unity not simply to ‘include’ through domestication and subordination precisely those movements that formed in part in opposition to such domestication and subordination, showing that the proponents of the ‘common good’ have failed to read the history that has made this conflict possible**?

# Politics

#### There is not a link argument in the 1nc

Treaty doesn’t actually change anything.

RVN 11/8 [Right Vision News Pakistan: US Senate revives UN disability treaty, fate uncertain November 8, 2013 Friday]

But social conservatives warn it would merely invite interference in domestic affairs, even though proponents say the basic treaty includes no enforcement mechanism or penalties.

Their Woodruff ev proves passage is inevitable – Republicans don’t want to be seen as obstructionist.

Some Republicans privately agree that the treaty’s odds of passage are higher this time. One Senate Republican aide close to opponents of the treaty tells National Review Online that he thinks blocking ratification will be more challenging than it was last December, in part because of the shutdown. “We have a lot of post-shutdown fatigue on the Republican side,” he says. “This is not the easiest issue to be out in front on being opposed to.” He adds that some Republicans are tired of being perceived as contrarian and obstructionist. “That is my fear, that there’s a little bit of that,” he says.

It’s an ideological issue – no one will switch their votes on matter of social justice vs. sovereignty because of a single war power restriction.

Their capital key evidence is a joke and it also concedes there’s no impact to the treaty.

Supporters of the treaty mostly claim that it would not have much of an effect on U.S. law. Instead, they argue, the primary reasons to support it include “leading” the world to respect the rights of disabled people and helping disabled Americans abroad. Of course, as countless analysts and lawmakers have pointed out, U.S. ratification of the treaty would do no such thing, as evidenced by all of the other controversial UN treaties on “human rights,” ending discrimination, and more.

And this is selective highlighting – Obama last spent capital on it in August – obviously he’s not pushing it post-healthcare debacle.

For Obama and certain Senate Democrats, however, ratifying a treaty that would supposedly do virtually nothing appears to be worth a great deal of political capital. “I know how disappointing it was last year when the Senate failed to approve the disabilities treaty,” Obama claimed during an August speech. “But we’re going to keep fighting to ratify that treaty, because the United States has always been a leader for the rights of the disabled.... It’s the right thing to do. We need to get it done.” Secretary of State John Kerry, who also appears to have never met a sovereignty-threatening UN treaty he did not support, called on the Senate to ratify the scheme as well.

#### Defense bill debates prove executive authority fights are happening now and overload the agenda.

Herb 11/11 [Jeremy, The Hill, November 11, 2013, 06:00 am The 5 biggest defense bill fights http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/budgetappropriations/189763-the-5-biggest-defense-bill-fights]

The Senate is poised to wage several major policy battles in rapid-fire fashion — including debates over military sexual assault and NSA surveillance — when it takes up the Defense authorization bill as early as this week. The annual Pentagon policy bill is always a magnet for hot-button issues and attracts hundreds of amendments, but this year a series of fights are bubbling up that make it particularly contentious. The issue that’s attracted the most headlines is the battle over military sexual assaults, where a sweeping proposal from Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) is opposed by the Pentagon, Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.) and Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.). Debates over National Security Agency spying, Guantánamo detainees, Iran sanctions, sequestration and more add up to an action-packed session before the Senate leaves for Thanksgiving.